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Abstract: The sigma-2 ( $\sigma 2$ ) receptor was discovered nearly 40 years ago and was recently identified as the Transmembrane Protein 97 (TMEM97, also known as MAC30 (Meningioma-associated protein). Aberrant $\sigma 2$ activity has been linked to disease and conditions such as schizophrenia, Alzheimer's disease, neuropathic pain, traumatic brain injury, and cancer. The utility of $\sigma 2$ as a therapeutic target is currently under investigation in numerous laboratories. Herein, we report on the synthesis and evaluation of a series of novel, functionalized $\gamma$-butyrolactones that are potent $\sigma 2$ receptor ligands.
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Introduction: The discovery and characterization of the sigma receptors began in 1976 with W. R. Martin et. al.'s exploration of the impact of the opioids on chronic spinal dogs. In these studies, they observed that the opioids morphine (1), ketocyclazocine, (2), and (rac)-SKF-100047 (3) produced different responses and hypothesized that each compound was interacting with a different receptor. They designated these receptors the $\mu$-opioid receptor (morphine type, MOR), the $\kappa$-opioid receptor (ketocyclazocine type, KOR), and the $\sigma$-opioid receptor (SKF-100047 like).[1] Follow-up studies conducted in the early 1980s using the individual enantiomers of SKF-100047) demonstrated that the two enantiomers elicited physiological responses through different biochemical pathways. The opioid mediated physiological response observed with (-)-SKF-100047 was determined to be the result of interactions with MOR and KOR. In addition, these studies revealed that (+)-SKF100047 interacts with a previously unknown, nonopioid receptor that was designate the sigma receptor (oR).[2] In 1993, W. D. Bowen et. al. determined that

there were two sub-types of this receptor, which were designated sigma-1 ( $\sigma_{1}$ ) and sigma-2 ( $\sigma_{2}$ ).[3] Three years later, Glossman H, et.al. cloned and expressed the mammalian $\sigma_{1}$ receptor in yeast cells,[4] and in 2016 a crystal structure of the human $\sigma_{1}$ receptor was reported.[5] To date, there is no known natural ligand for this receptor.

The nature and function of the $\sigma_{2}$ receptor, on the other hand, remains the subject of intense research, but some progress has been made. The natural ligand of this receptor remains a mystery, but A.C. Krusea et. al. have demonstrated that the protein originally described as the $\sigma_{2}$ receptor is identical to Transmembrane Protein 97 (TMEM97, also known as MAC30 (Meningioma-associated protein).[6] The $\sigma_{2}$ receptor is present in lysosomes and the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) and there is evidence that cholesterol binds this receptor.[7] Regulation of the Niemann-Pick protein NPC1 has also been suggested by H. Runz et. al.[8[Although the pharmacological role of $\sigma_{2}$
 remains unclear, substantial effort has been devoted to the development of $\sigma_{2}$ binders based on the premise that aberrant $\sigma_{2}$ pharmacology contributes to the progression of diseases and conditions such as Alzheimer's disease,[9] traumatic brain injury,[10] neuropathic pain,[11] schizophrenia,[12] and cancer.[13]

We recently reported a series of novel, selective $\gamma$-butyrolactones sigma-2 ligands that included the identification of (4). This compound was found to have moderate affinity $\sigma_{2}$ ligand ( $K_{i}=142 n M$ ), excellent selectivity for this target over $\sigma_{1}\left(K_{i}=10,000 \mathrm{nM}\right)$ and high stability in the presence of both mouse and human liver microsomes (MLM, HLM T ${ }_{1 / 2}=60 \mathrm{~min}$.). Herein we report follow up studies that describe the synthesis and characterization of a related series of novel $\gamma$-butyrolactones in which we explore (1) the impact of altering the length of the linker between the two ring systems, and (2) replacements of the aryl piperazine moiety with alternative ring systems.

Results and discussion: Synthesis of substituted $\gamma$-butyrolactones was conducted as shown in Scheme 1 (missing compound \#s) utilizing novel methods developed in our laboratory. The synthesis of these compounds begins with the known benzyl protected alkenyl alcohols (5), which were converted to the corresponding epoxide (6) with mCPBA. Ring opening of epoxide (6) with the enolate of 2-ethyl-N,N-dimethylbutanamide via deprotonation with LDA provided an intermediate alcohol, which cyclized to form the $\gamma$-butyrolactone ring (7) in the presence of trifluoroacetic acid. Removal of the benzyl protecting group via hydrogenation in the presence of palladium on carbon provided the corresponding alcohol, which was then reacted with tosyl chloride in the presence triethyl amine to provide (8). Reaction of (8) with amines in refluxing THF provided the final target molecules (9). Alternatively, the previously reported $\gamma$ butyrolactone alcohol (10) was reacted with
 tosyl chloride in the presence triethyl amine, followed by amines in refluxing THF to provided the final target molecules (9).

Tables 1 and 2 describe the in vitro binding ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ at $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ ), physicochemical properties (MW, TPSA, LogP, solubility), and mouse liver microsomal (MLM) stability. All of the compounds are consistent with Lipinski's rule of 5 (MW, cLogP) and have acceptable water solubility. In addition, TPSA and cLogP of the compounds are in a range that is indicative of BBB penetration. While the majority of compounds had low MLM stability, we were able to identify 3 compounds with MLM $\mathrm{T}_{1 / 2}$ values > 10 minutes. Stability in MLM is an important factor, as future in vivo studies will be performed in rodents.

The structure activity relationship analysis of this series of compounds begins with an examination of the impact of length of the linker chain between the two rings systems (9a-9c). As indicated in table 1, compounds with chain lengths of $2(9 a), 3(9 b)$, and $4(9 c)$ methylene units bind to $\sigma_{2}$ with moderate to high potency ( $\sigma_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ $=82,7.7$, and 12 nM ), but selectivity versus $\sigma_{1}$ was low ( $\sigma_{1} \mathrm{~K}_{1}=138.31$, and 5.5 nM ). Decreasing the size of the dialkyl side chains of the $\gamma$-butyrolactone (9d) lead to a nearly 10 -fold decrease in $\sigma_{2}$ potency ( $K_{i}=753 \mathrm{nM}$ ) relative to (9a).

We next examined the impact of changes to the aryl piperazine region. Replacing the phenyl piperazine of (9a) with the corresponding 1-naphthyl piperazine (9e) led to a moderate increase in $\sigma_{2}$ potency ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=32 \mathrm{nM}$ ), as well as increase in selectivity over ( $\sigma_{1} K_{1}=2167 \mathrm{nM}$ ) in comparison to (9a). Notably, this compound is the least soluble analog (sol $=47 \mathrm{mM}$ ), which is almost certainly the increase aromatic character of the aryl piperazine region. Employing heteroaromatic replacements for the aryl piperazine produced mixed results. While the 4pyridine analog (9f) is a moderate affinity $\sigma_{2}$ ligand ( $K_{i}=142 \mathrm{nM}$ ), with a high degree selectivity for this target over $\sigma_{1}\left(K_{i}=10,000 \mathrm{nM}\right)$, the corresponding 4-pyrimidine analog $(9 \mathrm{~g})$ had limited capacity to bind to $\sigma_{2}(\mathrm{KI}=$ $10000 \mathrm{nM})$ and low affinity for $\sigma_{1}\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}=1017 \mathrm{nM}\right)$.

Incorporation of potential piperazine bioisosteres produced compounds with high $\sigma_{2}$ potency and moderate to low selectivity versus $\sigma_{1}$. Specifically, the homopiperazine analog (9h), 2,6-diazaspiro[3.3]heptane analog (9i), and octahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrole analog ( $\mathbf{9} \mathbf{j}$ ) are all potent $\sigma_{2}$ binders ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=6.8,53$, and 3.5 nM ) with low to moderate selectivity over $\sigma_{1}\left(K_{i}=17,12,31 \mathrm{nM}\right)$. Interestingly, the combination of the octahydropyrrolo[3,4c] pyrrole bioisostere and 4 -pyrdine substituent ( 9 k ) led to improved $\sigma_{2}$ potency ( $\mathrm{K}_{1}=29 \mathrm{nM}$ ) versus the piperazine analog (9f), but decreased $\sigma_{1}$ selectivity ( $\mathrm{K}_{1}=142 \mathrm{nM}$ ). In addition, the high level of MLM stability observed with (9f) was maintained in (9k) (MLM $\left.\mathrm{T}_{1 / 2}=60 \mathrm{~min}\right)$.

We next turned our attention to replacing the aryl piperazine moiety with tetrahydroisoquinolines. The unsubstituted tetrahydroisoquinoline analog (9I) is a potent $\sigma_{2}$ binder ( $K_{i}=6.1 \mathrm{nM}$ ), with moderate $\sigma_{1}$ selectivity ( $\mathrm{K}_{1}=125 \mathrm{nM}$ ). Incorporating halogens in the 7-position of the tetrahydroisoquinoline nucleus produced compounds ( $9 \mathrm{~m}-9 \mathrm{o}$ ) with potency similar to that observed with the unsubstituted analog (7-F $(9 \mathrm{~m}) \sigma_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}=7.4$ $\left.\mathrm{nM}, 7-\mathrm{Cl}(9 \mathrm{n}) \sigma_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}=2.8 \mathrm{nM}, 7-\mathrm{Br}(9 \mathrm{o}) \sigma_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}=7.4 \mathrm{nM}\right)$. Interestingly, while the $7-\mathrm{F}(9 \mathrm{~m})$ and $7-\mathrm{Cl}(9 \mathrm{n})$ analogs had moderate selectivity for $\sigma_{2}$ over $\sigma_{1}$, the 7-Br analog (90) was nearly equipotent at these two receptors ( $\sigma_{1} K_{i}=$ $4.7 \mathrm{nM})$. Insertion of a pyridine nitrogen into the tetrahydroisoquinoline framework substantially diminished $\sigma_{2}$ binding. The 2,6-naphthyridine (9p) and 2,7-naphthyridine (9q) analogs had limited capacity to bind to $\sigma_{2}\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}\right.$ $=10,000 \mathrm{nM}$ ), while the 1,7-naphthyridine (9r) demonstrated moderate $\sigma_{2}$ binding ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=277 \mathrm{nM}$ ). As noted in tables 1 and 2, the majority of compounds are highly soluble in aqueous media (> $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and their physicochemical properties (MW, TPSA, cLogP) are consistent with drug-like properties as defined by Lipinski.

Conclusions: In summary, a series of substituted lactones with drug-like physicochemical properties (MW, TPSA, cLogP) have been investigated as potential selective $\sigma_{2} R$ ligands. We have determined that increasing the length of the linker chain from two (9a) to four carbons (9c) leads to increase $\sigma_{2}$ potency, but selectivity over $\sigma_{1}$ decreases. In addition, we have demonstrated that $\sigma_{2}$ potency and selectivity for $\sigma_{2}$ over $\sigma_{1}$ Is maintained when the phenyl ring of the aryl piperazine is replaced with 1-napthylene (9e) or 4-pyridine (9f), but replacement with a 4-pyrimidine ( $\mathbf{9 g}$ ) leads to a significant lose of $\sigma_{2}$ potency. Replacement of the piperazine ring with bioisosteres such as homopiperazine (9h) 2,6-diazaspiro[3.3]heptane (9i), and octahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrole (9j) was tolerated with respect to $\sigma_{2}$ potency, but $\sigma_{1}$ selectivity was substantially decreased. Incorporation of tetrahydroisoquinolines (9)-90) in place of the aryl piperazine also
produced high potency $\sigma_{2}$ binders, but naphthyridine analogs examined to date had limited $\sigma_{2}$ binding capacity. We anticipate these studies will help us further evaluate the potential value of this series for the identification of novel therapeutic agents for the treatment of diseases associated with abnormal $\sigma_{2}$ activity. Future studies will be focused on the identification of highly potent, selective, novel $\sigma_{2}$ binders that have improved MLM stability.

Experimental methods and materials: Reagents were purchased from Fisher Scientific, VWR International, Sigma Aldrich, and Combi-Blocks, Inc. Chromatographic purification of compounds (normal phase and reverse phase) were carried out on a Teledyne Isco Combiflash RF system. H-NMR spectra were obtained on a Bruker $400-\mathrm{MHz}$ NMR. Chemical shift values ([ values) were reported in ppm relative to TMS. For multiplicity, $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. Purity (\%) and mass spectral data were determined with a Waters Agilent 1200 HPLC/MS (Zorbax SB-C18, $2.1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mm}, 3.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 100 \%$ water/0.1\% formic acid to $100 \%$ acetonitrile/ $0.1 \%$ formic acid over 4.0 minutes, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$.) with a diode array detector from 210-400 nm and Agilent 6130 quadrupole MS. All compounds were purified to $95 \%$ purity or greater as determined by HPLC/MS and $1 \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$. Melting points were recorded on a capillary melting point apparatus.


Preparation of ((pent-4-en-1-yloxy)methyl)benzene: To a dry round bottom flask under nitrogen was added 1.4 g of $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}$ dispersion ( $0.834 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NaH}, 34.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$.), followed by $\sim 200 \mathrm{mg}$ of tetrabutylammonium iodide. 18 mL of dry THF was added and the reaction was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using an ice bath. Pent-4-en-1-ol (1.5 $\mathrm{g}, 17.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$.) was added dropwise. The reaction was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 minutes and then benzyl bromide $(3.57 \mathrm{~g}, 21 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$.$) was added. The reaction was warmed to room temperature and stirred overnight. The$ reaction was quenched with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ and then extracted $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ diethyl ether. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated onto Celite under reduced pressure. The crude material
was purified by flash chromatography (silica; ethyl acetate/hexanes, $0 \% \sim 5 \%$ ). Percent yield: $100 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.45-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.08(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=1.8,17.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.54(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(q u i n, \mathrm{~J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of ((hex-5-en-1-yloxy)methyl)benzene: The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for ((pent-4-en-1-yloxy)methyl)benzene, except hex-5-en-1-ol was substituted for pent-4-en-1-ol. Percent yield: $100 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.26-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=1.9,17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.35(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 2-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)oxirane (6a): To a round botton flask is added ((pent-4-en-1yloxy)methyl)benzene ( $3.15 \mathrm{~g}, 17.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$.$) and \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(45 \mathrm{~mL})$. Resulting solution is then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with an ice bath and then 3-chloroperbenzoic acid ( 5.25 g ( $6.82 \mathrm{~g}, 77 \%$ purity), $30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.67 \mathrm{eq}$.$) was added$ in portions. The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature and stir overnight. The solution was filtered through a plug of Celite and washed filter with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}$. The solution was then washed with $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N NaOH (aq.) solution, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude oil was used in the next step without further purification. Percent yield: $72 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.41-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, $4.53(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=4.2,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.6,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.55$ (m, 4H).


Preparation of 2-(4-(benzyloxy)butyl)oxirane (6b): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 2-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)oxirane, except ((hex-5-en-1-yloxy)methyl)benzene was substituted for ((pent-4-en-1-yloxy)methyl)benzene. Percent yield: $96 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.52$
$(\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.76(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=4.0,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.7,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-$ $1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 5-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (7a): A dry round bottom flask was placed under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere and then charged with 1M LDA solution (THF/Hexanes, $23 \mathrm{~mL}, 23 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.3$ eq.) and cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. While at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2$-ethyl-N,N-dimethylbutanamide ( $2.86 \mathrm{~g}, 20 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$.) was added dropwise. The reaction was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 minutes, then allowed to warm to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stir at that temperature for 15 minutes. Then the reaction was warmed to RT and stirred for 5 minutes before cooling back to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with an ice bath. At $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2$-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)oxirane ( $2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ eq.) was added. The reaction was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 minutes and then warmed to RT. After 48 hour, the reaction was quenched with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution (aq.) and extracted $3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure.

Crude material was then dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and trifluoroacetic acid $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added slowly. The resulting solution was allowed to stir at room temperature for 40 minutes before being slowly quenched with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution (aq.) and extracted with $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; ethyl acetate/hexanes, $0 \% \sim 30 \%$ ). Percent yield: $32 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 7.35-7.18 (m, 5H), $4.46(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.35(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, $1.57(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,16.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 5-(4-(benzyloxy)butyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (7b): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 5-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one, except 2-
(4-(benzyloxy)butyl)oxirane was substituted for 2-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)oxirane. Percent yield: $37 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.53(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8$, $13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.3,13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,19.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(3-hydroxypropyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one: To a round bottom flask was added $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ ( $182 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \% \mathrm{wt}$ ) followed by a solution of 5-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)one ( $910 \mathrm{mg}, 3.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$.) in $\mathrm{EtOH}(18 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was put under $\mathrm{H}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~atm})$ using a balloon and stirred at room temperature under $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ atm overnight. The reaction was then filtered through a plug of Celite and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was used in next step without further purification. Percent yield: $100 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{MeOD}\right) \delta 4.61(\mathrm{~b}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11$ (dd, J=6.8, 13.3 Hz, 1H), 1.73 (dd, J=9.3, 13.1 Hz, 1H), 1.68-1.32 (m, 8H), $0.81(d t, J=7.6,18.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-hydroxybutyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one: The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(3-hydroxypropyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one, except 5-(4-(benzyloxy)butyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one was substituted for 5-(3-(benzyloxy)propyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one. Percent yield: $100 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{MeOD}$ ) $\delta 4.38-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.08$ $(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.5,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.76(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,17.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 3-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)propyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate (8a): To a solution of triethylamine ( $493 \mathrm{mg}, 4.85 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$. ) and p-toluenesulfonyl chloride ( $744 \mathrm{mg}, 3.90 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$.) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was added a solution of 3,3-diethyl-5-(3-hydroxypropyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one ( $650 \mathrm{mg}, 3.25$
mmol, 1.0 eq.) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was allowed to stir at RT overnight before being washed with $2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ of sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution (aq.). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; ethyl acetate/hexanes, $0 \% \sim 40 \%$ ). Percent yield: 55\%. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.69(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05-3.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.5,19.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate (8b): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)propyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate, except 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-hydroxybutyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one was substituted for 3,3-diethyl-5-(3-hydroxypropyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one. Percent yield: $4.65 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.71$ (d, J= $8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00-3.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.29(\mathrm{~m}, 11 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,22.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate (9c): To a small vial was added 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate ( 25 mg , $0.0679 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$. ) and 1-phenylpiperazine ( $23.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.142 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.1 \mathrm{eq}$.) then both were dissolved in THF $(1.7 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was allowed to reflux for 72 hours and then cooled to room temperature. The mixture was filtered, the precipitate was washed with THF, and the combined organic layers were concentrated under reduced pressure. Crude product was then purified by HPLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 0.1 \%\right.$ Trifluoroacetic acid), $0 \% \sim 100 \%$ ) to give desired product as a trifluoroacetic acid salt. Percent yield: $41.4 \%$. 1 H NMR ( 400 MHz , CDCl3) $\delta 7.24(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.92(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78-3.47(\mathrm{~m}$,

4H), 3.34-3.14 (m, 2H), 3.09-2.79 (m, 4H), 2.04 (dd, J=6.8, $13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.88-1.64 (m, 3H), 1.64-1.34 (m, 8H), $0.85(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,20.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 359.2$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one dihydrocholoride (9a): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonat and 1-phenyl-piperazinewas substituted for 2-piperazin-1-yl-benzonitrile. Percent yield: $58.3 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta 7.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.27-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.69(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.11-3.09(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 2.39$ $-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.98(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.4,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=12.1,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 187.92,150.20,132.89,127.03,121.14,79.53,56.52,54.13,52.41,50.87,39.37,32.81,31.91$, 30.68, 11.00, 10.87; MS (LC/MS, $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$): 331.2; Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ : C, 59.55; H, 8.00; N, 6.94; Found: C, 59.62; H, 8.11; N, 6.90


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-dihydro-5-(3-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)propyl)furan-2(3H)-one (9b): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 3-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)propyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and the crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; MeOH :dichloromethane, $0 \% \sim 10 \%$ ). Percent yield: $32 \%$. 1 H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 7.32(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=1.1,7.7$, 2H), $7.00(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.16(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.1,2 \mathrm{H})$,
$3.01(\mathrm{~b}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,22.4,6 \mathrm{H})$ LC/MS $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 345.2$


Preparation of 3,3-dimethyl-5-(2-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9d): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-dimethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and the crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; MeOH:dichloromethane, $0 \% \sim 10 \%$ ) Percent yield: $45.2 \%$. 1 H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.99$ (d, J=7.9 Hz, 2H), $6.91(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 4.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.26(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.26$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) . \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 303.2$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate (9e): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate and 1-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazine for 1phenylpiperazine Crude product was then purified by $\mathrm{HPLC}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 0.1 \%\right.$ Trifluoroacetic acid), $0 \% \sim 100 \%$ ) to give desired product as a trifluoroacetic acid salt. Percent yield: $33 \% .1 \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 8.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.88(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.49(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.54-3.05(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.08$
$(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.3,13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,17.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=$ m/z 381.2


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(pyridin-4-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9f): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 1-(pyridin-4-yl)piperazine for 1-phenylpiperazine Percent yield: 37\%. 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) $\delta 8.27(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.67(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.35(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H})$ 2.68-2.46 (m, 6H), $2.15(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.6,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,19.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 332.2$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(pyrimidin-4-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9g): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran$2(3 \mathrm{H})$-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate and 4-(piperazin-1yl)pyrimidine for 1-phenylpiperazine. In addition the crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; MeOH:dichloromethane, $0 \% \sim 10 \%$ ). Percent yield: $52 \%$. 1 H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 8.52(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.13(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.44(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=1.0,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{~b}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.0,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.82(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.4,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) 0.86(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,20.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 333.20$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-phenyl-1,4-diazepan-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9h): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 1-phenyl-1,4-diazepane for 1-phenylpiperazine. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; MeOH:dichloromethane, $0 \% \sim 10 \%$ ). Percent yield: $68 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.73-6.64(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.56(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.80(\mathrm{t}$, $\mathrm{J}=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{~b}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.62(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,18.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$; MS (LC/MS, $\left.\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right): 345.2$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(6-phenyl-2,6-diazaspiro[3.3]heptan-2-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9i): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 2-phenyl-2,6-diazaspiro[3.3]heptane was substituted for 1-phenylpiperazine Percent yield: $10 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.67(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.37(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), $4.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{dd}$, $\mathrm{J}=9.4,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,21.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}, \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$: 343.2


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(5-phenylhexahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrol-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran$2(3 \mathrm{H})$-one $(\mathbf{9 j})$ : The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroac except 2-(4,4-dieethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 2-phenyloctahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrole dihydrochloride was substituted for 1phenylpiperazine.. Percent yield: $98 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.64(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.57$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.08(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=2.9,9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{~b}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.72(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.47(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.32(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3.9,8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.51(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.81(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}, \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right): \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 357.2$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(5-(pyridin-4-yl)hexahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrol-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran$2(3 \mathrm{H})$-one $(9 \mathbf{k})$ : The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)butyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroac except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 2-(pyridin-4-yl)octahydropyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrrole was substituted for1phenylpiperazine. Percent yield: $68 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.13(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=1.4,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.32(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $1.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.3,9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=3.4,9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.62$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.50(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=5.7,13.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}, \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right): \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 358.2$


Preparation of 5-(2-(3,4-dihydroisoquinolin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one hydrocholoride (91): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate and 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-isoquinolinewas for 1 phenylpiperazine. In addition the crude product was purified by flash chromatography (silica; MeOH :dichloromethane, $0 \% \sim 10 \%$ ) and converted to the HCl salt using HCl in ether. Percent yield: $36.4 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, MeOH) $\delta 7.39-7.17(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.63-4.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.49(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.75-3.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.54-$ $3.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.4,13.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.53$ $(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,12.2,6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{MeOH}$ ) $\delta 183.24,132.92,130.75,130.38,129.74$, $129.17,128.70,77.07,55.67,55.33,55.28,52.24,39.25,32.87,30.89,30.02,27.35,9.85,9.77$; MS (LC/MS, $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}+$ ): 302.2; Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{ClNO}_{2}$ : C, 67.54; H, 8.35; N, 4.15; Found: C, 67.60; H, 8.36; $\mathrm{N}, 4.14$


Preparation of 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(7-fluoro-3,4-dihydroisoquinolin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one $(9 \mathrm{~m})$ : The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 7-fluoro-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline was for 1 phenylpiperazine. Percent yield: $37 \%$. 1 H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 7.06(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.8,8.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.84(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=2.7,8.51 \mathrm{H}), 6.73(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.5,9.5$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.0,4 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 H), 1.64(\mathrm{qt}, \mathrm{J}=1.7,7.6,4 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,15.8,6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 320.1$.


Preparation of 5-(2-(7-chloro-3,4-dihydroisoquinolin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9n): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 7-chloro-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline was for 1 phenylpiperazine. Percent yield: $41 \%$. 1H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta \delta 7.02(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.2,8.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.77$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.63(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.07(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,13.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=1.2,7.3,4 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5$, $15.3,6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 336.1$


Preparation of 5-(2-(7-bromo-3,4-dihydroisoquinolin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (90): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2yl)ethyl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 7-bromo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline was for 1 phenylpiperazine. Percent yield: $37 \%$. 1H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCb}$ ) $87.13(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=1.8,8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{lH}), 7.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{lH}), 6.86(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\mathrm{lH}), 4.43(\mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{lH}), 3.49(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.73(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, lH), 1.91-1.69 (m, 3H), $1.52(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=5.6,12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 380.10$.


Preparation of 5-(2-(3,4-dihydro-2,6-naphthyridin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9p): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4-
methylbenzenesulfonate and 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-2,6-naphthyridine dihydrochloride was for 1 phenylpiperazine. Percent yield: $45 \%$. 1H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 8.29(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.24(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.76-2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.66-2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.07(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7$, $13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=2.1,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.7,15.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=$ m/z 303.2


Preparation of 5-(2-(3,4-dihydro-2,7-naphthyridin-2(1H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9q): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin-1-yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-2,6-naphthyridine dihydrochloride was for 1-phenylpiperazine Percent yield: $63 \%$. 1H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 8.36-8.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.92-2.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.80-2.63(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{qd}$, $\mathrm{J}=1.8,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 303.2$


Preparation of 5-(2-(5,8-dihydro-1,7-naphthyridin-7(6H)-yl)ethyl)-3,3-diethyldihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (9r): The title compound was prepared according to the procedure for 3,3-diethyl-5-(2-(4-(naphthalen-1-yl)piperazin1 -yl)ethyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one trifluoroacetate, except 2-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)ethyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate was substituted for 4-(4,4-diethyl-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-yl)butyl 4methylbenzenesulfonate and 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro-1,7-naphthyridine dihydrochloride was for 1-phenylpiperazine Percent yield: $90 \%$. 1H NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 8.34$ (d, J= $4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.06$ (dd,
$\mathrm{J}=4.8,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.96-2.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.80-2.64(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=1.7,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,15.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{LC} / \mathrm{MS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 303.2$

Computational values: TPSA and cLogP values were calculated using the Dotmatics software suite (Dotmatics LLC The Old Monastery, Windhill Bishops, Stortford Herts, CW23 2ND UK).

Sigma-1 and sigma-2 competitive radioligand-binding studies: Competitive binding assays were conducted by the Psychoactive Drug Screening Program (PDSP) at The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill under the direction of Professor Bryan Roth. Assay conditions can be found in the PDSP assay protocol book at https://pdsp.unc.edu/pdspweb/content/UNC-CH\ Protocol\ Book.pdf. A brief description of the assays is provided.

Sigma-2 receptor binding assay: $K_{i}$ values for test compounds for the sigma-2 receptor were determined using a filtration assay in a 96 well polypropylene plate using membranes prepared from HEK293T cells stably transfected with the sigma-1 receptor or PC12 cells. The membranes were prepared from cultured cells rinsed with PBS, lysed in cold 50 mM Tris-HCL (pH 7.4), centrifuged at 20000 xg , pellets resuspended in buffer and then stored at -80 C until used. In a final volume of 250 uL of assay buffer ( 50 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl}, 10 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MgCl} 2,1$ mM EDTA, pH 7.4 ) the membranes were incubated with $5-7 \mathrm{nM}\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ - 1,3-di-(2-tolyl)guanidine $\left(\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]-\mathrm{DTG}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}=\right.$ 9.9 nM ) and test compound (11 concentrations) at room temperature for 90 minutes. Nonspecific binding was defined with 10 uM haloperidol. Membranes were then collected by rapid filtration on to filter mats pretreated with 0.3 \% polyethyleneimine, washed $4 x$ with cold assay buffer, dried, microscintillant added and then counted in a Microbeta scintillation counter. IC $_{50}$ values were determined using a three-parameter non-linear curve fitting program in Prism 4.0 (GraphPad Software). $K_{i}$ values were calculated from the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values using the Cheng-Prusoff equation.[19] The reference standard haloperidol had a $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=13.9 \mathrm{nM}$.

Sigma- 1 receptor binding assay: $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values for test compounds for the sigma- 1 receptor were determined using the sigma-2 method except that membrane from HEK-293 cells stably transfected with the sigma-1 receptor or PC12 cells were used and 2-10 nM $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$-Pentazocine $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}=6.5 \mathrm{nM}\right)$ was the radioligand. Nonspecific binding was defined with 10 uM haloperidol. The reference standard haloperidol had a $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=3.54 \mathrm{nM}$.

Aqueous solubility ( pH 7.4 ) assay: Compounds were assessed for their solubility at pH 7.4 using the commercially available Millipore MultiScreenTM Solubility filter system (Millipore, Billerica, MA). Analysis was performed by liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS).

Microsomal stability assays: Test compounds were assessed for microsomal stability by incubating them at 37 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the presence of mouse or human liver microsomes and an NADPH regenerating system as described by Yang et. al.[21] Microsomal protein content was adjusted to give accurate rates of substrate consumption. Analysis was performed by Liquid Chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS) analysis.

Table 1. In vitro screening and physicochemical properties data for ( $\mathbf{9 a}$ ) - ( $\mathbf{9 k}$ )


| Entry | $\mathrm{R}^{1 a}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{1 \mathrm{~b}}$ | n | A | $\mathrm{R}^{3}$ | MW | TPSA | cLogP | $\sigma_{2}$ | $\sigma_{1}$ | $\sigma 2 / \sigma 1$ <br> ratio | MLM $\mathrm{T}_{1 / 2}$ (min.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sol } \\ (\mathrm{mM}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{nM})$ |  |  |  |  |
| 9a | Et | Et | 1 | Piperazine | Phenyl | 330 | 33 | 3 | 82 | 138 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 200 |
| 9b | Et | Et | 2 | Piperazine | Phenyl | 344 | 33 | 4 | 7.7 | 31 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 182 |
| 9c | Et | Et | 3 | Piperazine | Phenyl | 359 | 33 | 4 | 12 | 5.5 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 169 |
| 9d | Me | Me | 1 | Piperazine | Phenyl | 302 | 33 | 3 | 753 | 279 | 0.4 | 14 | 192 |
| 9 e | Et | Et | 1 | Piperazine | 1-Naphthyl | 381 | 33 | 5 | 32 | 2167 | 67.7 | 2.7 | 47 |
| 9f | Et | Et | 1 | Piperazine | 4-Pyridyl | 331 | 46 | 2 | 142 | 10000 | 38.7 | 60 | 199 |


| 9g | Et | Et | 1 | Piperazine | 4-Pyrimidine | 332 | 59 | 2 | 10000 | 1017 | 0.1 | 8.8 | 198 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9h | Et | Et | 1 |  | Phenyl | 344 | 33 | 4 | 6.8 | 17 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 183 |
| 9 i | Et | Et | 1 |  | Phenyl | 342 | 33 | 3 | 53 | 12 | 0.2 | 5.1 | 197 |
| 9 j | Et | Et | 1 |  | Phenyl | 357 | 33 | 4 | 3.5 | 31 | 8.9 | 2.0 | 200 |
| 9 k | Et | Et | 1 | $\mathrm{HN}^{\prime}$ | 4-Pyridyl | 357 | 46 | 2 | 29 | 171 | 5.9 | 60 | 200 |

* Sigma-2 assays: Conducted with PC12 membrane preparations. Radioligand: [ $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$-DTG, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}=9.9 \mathrm{nM}$, Reference standard:

Haloperidol, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=13.9 \mathrm{nM}$ **Sigma-1 assays: Conducted with HEK293 membrane preparations. Radioligand: $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$-Pentazocine, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}$ $=6.5 \mathrm{nM}$, Reference standard: Haloperidol, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=3.54 \mathrm{nM}$

Table 2. In vitro screening and physicochemical properties data for (91) - (9r)



| 90 | Et | Et | 1 |  | 380 | 30 | 5 | 8.9 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 111 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9p | Et | Et | 1 |  | 302 | 42 | 3 | 10000 | 10000 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 191 |
| 9q | Et | Et | 1 |  | 302 | 42 | 3 | 10000 | 1156 | 0.1 | 2.9 | 192 |
| 9 r | Et | Et | 1 |  | 302 | 42 | 3 | 277 | 10000 | 36.1 | 3.3 | 194 |

* Sigma-2 assays: Conducted with PC12 membrane preparations. Radioligand: $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$-DTG, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}=9.9 \mathrm{nM}$, Reference standard:

Haloperidol, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=13.9 \mathrm{nM}$ **Sigma-1 assays: Conducted with HEK293 membrane preparations. Radioligand: $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$-Pentazocine, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}$ $=6.5 \mathrm{nM}$, Reference standard: Haloperidol, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=3.54 \mathrm{nM}$
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