Supporting Information

Potent Benzimidazole Sulfonamide PTP1B Inhibitors Containing the Heterocyclic (S)-Isothiazolidinone Phosphotyrosine Mimetic

Andrew P. Combs,* ¶ Wenyu Zhu,¶ Matthew L. Crawley,¶ Brian Glass,¶ Padmaja

Polam,¶ Richard B. Sparks,¶ Dilip Modi,¶ Amy Takvorian,¶ Erin McLaughlin,¶ Eddy W.

Yue,¶ Zelda Wasserman,¶ Michael Bower,¶ Min Wei,§ Mark Rupar,§ Paul J. Ala,§ Brian

M. Reid,§ Dawn Ellis,§ Lucie Gonneville,§ Thomas Emm,‡ Nancy Taylor,‡ Swamy

Yeleswaram,‡ Yanlong Li,§ Richard Wynn,§ Timothy C. Burn,§ Gregory Hollis,§ Phillip

C.C. Liu,§ Brian Metcalf

Incyte Corporation, Discovery Chemistry and Applied Technology, Drug Metabolism, Experimental Station, Route 141 and Henry Clay Road, Wilmington, DE 19880

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Andrew P. Combs, Ph.D.

Discovery Chemistry

Experimental Station, E336/132A

Route 141 and Henry Clay Rd.

Wilmington, DE 19880

Ph: (302)-498-6832 Fax: (302)-425-2708

E-mail: acombs@incyte.com

Contents:

1-HPLC Purity Analysis

1- HPLC Purity Analysis: HPLC Purity Analysis

HPLC purity was determined to be >95% for all final products by the following two HPCL conditions (See Table below); 1) HPLC method A utilized a Phenominex Luna C18 column (6 x 75 mm, 3 μM particle size), with a gradient of 95% water/0.05% TFA to 5% acetonitrile/0.05% TFA at a flow rate of 1.5 mL/min over a total run time of 7 min. with UV monitoring at 220 nm and 254 nm. 2) HPLC method B utilized a Zorbax Eclipse XDB-C8 column (6 x 50 mm, 3.5 μM particle size), with a gradient of 95% water/0.05% TFA to 5% acetonitrile/0.05% TFA at a flow rate of 1.5 mL/min over a total run time of 5 min. with UV monitoring at 225 nm and 254 nm.

Compound	Formula	HPLC Analysis Data
2	C ₂₀ H ₂₀ N ₄ O ₄ S	Method A: $t_R = 2.23 \min (99.9\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 1.74 \text{ min } (99.9\%)$
10	C ₂₉ H ₂₉ N ₅ O ₅ S	Method A: $t_R = 2.99 \text{ min } (95.0\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.27 \text{ min } (99.9\%)$
12	C ₂₀ H ₂₀ N ₄ O ₄ S	Method A: $t_R = 2.23 \min (100\%)$

		Method B: t _R = 1.74 min (100%)
14	C ₂₄ H ₂₂ N ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: t _R = 2.75 min (99.7%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.25 \text{ min } (100\%)$
16	C ₂₄ H ₂₁ FN ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: t _R = 2.84 min (95.9%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.34 \text{ min } (99.1\%)$
67a	C ₂₄ H ₂₁ FN ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: t _R = 2.67 min (96.9%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.19 \text{ min } (98.6\%)$
67b	$C_{24}H_{20}F_2N_4O_5S_2$	Method A: $t_R = 2.77 \text{ min } (95.6\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.28 \text{ min } (97.2\%)$
67c	C ₂₅ H ₁₉ ClF ₄ N ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: $t_R = 3.66 \text{ min } (97.6\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.96 \text{ min } (98.2\%)$
67d	C ₂₀ H ₁₅ ClF ₄ N ₄ O ₄ S	Method A: t _R = 3.28 min (98.7%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.60 \text{ min } (97.8\%)$
79a	$C_{25}H_{24}N_4O_5S_2$	Method A: t _R = 2.71 min (96.0%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.27 \text{ min } (98.5\%)$
79b	C ₂₅ H ₂₄ N ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: t _R = 2.82 min (98.7%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.37 \text{ min } (99.0\%)$
79c	C ₂₆ H ₂₂ BrF ₃ N ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: $t_R = 3.32 \text{ min } (97.2\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.82 \text{ min } (99.5\%)$

79d	$C_{26}H_{23}N_5O_5S_2$	Method A: t _R = 2.69 min (95.2%)
		Method B: $t_R = 2.82 \text{ min } (96.5\%)$
79e	C ₂₅ H ₂₄ ClN ₄ O ₅ S ₂	Method A: $t_R = 3.02 \text{ min } (95.1\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.82 \text{ min } (95.5\%)$
87	$C_{24}H_{21}ClN_4O_5S_2$	Method A: $t_R = 2.77 \text{ min } (97.2\%)$
		Method B: $t_R = 2.27 \text{ min } (98.0\%)$