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## Abstract of the Dissertation

Total Synthesis of (-)-Chromodorolide B<br>and<br>Origins of Diastereoselectivity for Conjugate Additions of Trisubstituted Acetonide Radicals<br>\section*{By}<br>Daniel James Tao<br>Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry<br>University of California, Irvine, 2016<br>Professor Larry E. Overman, Chair

In Chapter 1, the rearranged spongian diterpene class of natural products is discussed. The biological effects of the natural product family on the Golgi apparatus are highlighted along with previous completed total syntheses of members in the family. Early efforts by the Overman group towards the chromodorolide natural products are also discussed, as these model system studies revealed several key insights in developing a second-generation approach.

In Chapter 2, the synthetic routes to (3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one are reported. This chiral fragment is embedded within the hydrophobic subunit of the chromodorolides and is surprisingly difficult to access enantioenriched on multigram scale using previously reported routes. Chapter 2 discusses the multiple approaches
that have been developed by other research groups and ours to access this compound. In particular, a novel route using reductive transposition proved nearly thrice as high yielding relative to previously reported methods in preparing to (3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one.

In Chapter 3, the total synthesis of (-)-chromodorolide B is described. The first section discusses an unsuccessful approach to the chromodorolides using a formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition as a novel method to couple highly oxygenated nucleophiles. The second section discusses a revised synthetic strategy using a radical addition/cyclization/fragmentation (ACF) cascade to form two $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond and four stereocenters in a single step. Using this key transformation, (-)-chromodorolide B was completed in 21 steps by the longest linear sequence.

In Chapter 4, the diastereoselectivities observed in the ACF cascade are examined. As the cyclization step disfavored the desired C8 stereochemistry, strategies to synthesize $\alpha$-substituted butenolides are reported. The stereoselection of the coupling reactions with trisubstituted acetonide radicals is also discussed as the couplings typically occurred with diastereoselectivity from the contrasteric face. Detailed experimental and computational studies are reported which reveal several parameters that govern the facial selectivity for the conjugate addition of trisubstituted acetonide radicals.

# Chapter 1: Rearranged Spongian Diterpenes and Early Synthetic Efforts to the Chromodorolides 

### 1.1 Rearranged Spongian Diterpenes and Their Biosynthesis

Rearranged spongian diterpenes (RSDs) are a family of natural products ${ }^{1}$ with unique terpenoid structural motifs. Each member contains a hydrophobic fragment and an oxygen-rich, hydrophilic fragment often connected by a single $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond (Figure 1.1). ${ }^{2}$ The oxygenated fragment varies dramatically in structure, from monocyclic (1.7) to complex bicyclic (1.3, 1.4, 1.10) and tricyclic (1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.12, 1.14) frameworks. These marine natural products exhibit a variety of biological activities, including antimicrobial, ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~h}, 2 \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{m}, 3}$ anti-inflammatory, ${ }^{4}$ antileukemic, ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~m}, 5}$ and antinematocidal activity. ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ RSDs are isolated from both marine sponges and their nudibranch predators. It is believed that nudibranches acquire these natural products from the marine sponges as a chemical defense mechanism. ${ }^{6}$

These natural products arise biosynthetically from a common spongian diterpenoid skeleton 1.17 (Scheme 1.1). ${ }^{1 \mathrm{~b}, 7}$ The biosynthetic pathways for RSDs have not been elucidated to date, but certain insights have been made based on the structures of isolated family members. RSD biosynthesis is hypothesized to commence with oxidative cleavage of the C9/C11 bond of $\mathbf{1 . 1 7},{ }^{8}$ which activates the C 9 position for a Wagner-Meerwein shift. Subsequent alkyl shift from C8 or C10 to C9 of decalin $\mathbf{1 . 1 8}$ forms a variety of the observed bicyclic diterpene frameworks. These rearranged skeletons are then proposed to undergo oxidation of the tetrahydrofuran fragment and ring closure to afford the RSD natural products (e.g. 1.8, 1.11, 1.12, 1.15).
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Figure 1.1. Representative Examples of Rearranged Spongian Diterpenes.

Scheme 1.1. Hypothesized Biosynthesis of Several RSDs.
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chromodorolide A (1.12)



### 1.2 Previous Total Syntheses of Rearranged Spongian Diterpenes

Because of the structural complexity, the RSD natural product family has received little attention from the synthetic community. To date, total syntheses of only six members in the natural product family have been reported. ${ }^{9,10}$ These total syntheses, with the exception of those of gracilin B and $C,{ }^{9 a}$ targeted RSDs which have the hydrophobic and
hydrophilic fragments joined by a single $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond. As this bond provides a convergent disconnection to two equally sized subunits, the total syntheses of these RSDs will be briefly highlighted with emphasis on construction of the central $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond.

### 1.2.1 The Total Synthesis of (+)-Shahamin K

The Overman group's first total synthesis of a RSD was reported in 2001, completing (+)-shahamin K in 18 steps and $4.2 \%$ overall yield (Scheme 1.2). ${ }^{9 \mathrm{~b}}$ The cisperhydroazulene fragment was constructed from cyclohexanone $\mathbf{1 . 2 4}$ using a previously developed Prins-pinacol reaction ${ }^{11}$ initiated by dimethyl(methylthio)sulfonium tetrafluoroborate (DMTSF). ${ }^{12}$ Thioether $\mathbf{1 . 2 5}$ was then functionalized to ketone $\mathbf{1 . 2 6}$, the nucleophilic precursor for fragment coupling. Treatment of ketone $\mathbf{1 . 2 6}$ with strong base under equilibrating conditions generated the thermodynamic enolate, which underwent an intermolecular Michael addition to activated cyclopentenone acceptor $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ to forge the central $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond in good yield as a single stereoisomer (1.28). The high diastereoselectivity of this coupling originates from enolate attack from the convex face of the cis-bicyclo[5.2.0]decanone anti to the substituted $\gamma$-methylene sidechain of acceptor 1.27. With all requisite carbon bonds constructed, dione 1.28 was carried forward to complete (+)-shahamin K.

## Scheme 1.2. Total Synthesis of (+)-Shahamin K.




### 1.2.2 The Total Syntheses of Norrisolide

### 1.2.2.1 The Theodorakis Route

Theodorakis reported the first total synthesis of (+)-norrisolide in 2004 (Scheme 1.3). ${ }^{9 \mathrm{c}}$ Synthesis of the oxygenated fragment commenced with a Diels-Alder reaction between 1,3-butadiene and butenolide 1.30. Following carbonyl reduction and ringopening oxidative cleavage, cis-dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octane aldehyde $\mathbf{1 . 3 2}$ was transformed over several steps to electrophilic coupling precursor 1.33. The hydrophobic fragment, vinyl iodide $\mathbf{1 . 3 4},{ }^{13}$ underwent lithium-halogen exchange with tert-butyllithium. The corresponding vinyl lithium species then underwent 1,2 -addition to aldehyde $\mathbf{1 . 3 2}$, constructing the central $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond in $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ yield after oxidation to enone $\mathbf{1 . 3 5}$. Following several manipulations, Theodorakis completed the synthesis of (+)-norrisolide in 24 steps and $1.3 \%$ overall yield.

Scheme 1.3. The Theodorakis Total Synthesis of (+)-Norrisolide.


### 1.2.2.2 The Snapper Route

Snapper reported an alternate route to (+)-norrisolide in 2012 (Scheme 1.4), ${ }^{9 \mathrm{~d}}$ beginning with rhodium-catalyzed asymmetric cyclopropanation of furanone 1.36. ${ }^{14}$ Ring expansion of cyclopropane $\mathbf{1 . 3 8}$ and further functionalization afforded amide 1.39. Hydrazone 1.40 was treated with $n$-butyllithium to mediate Shapiro-like decomposition to a vinyllithium intermediate which coupled to amide $\mathbf{1 . 3 9}$, forming the central $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond of 1.41 in $92 \%$ yield. Following several redox manipulations, (+)-norrisolide was completed in 14 steps and $1.7 \%$ overall yield.

Scheme 1.4. The Snapper Total Synthesis of (+)-Norrisolide.



### 1.2.3 The Total Syntheses of Aplyviolene

### 1.2.3.1 The Overman First-Generation Route

The first total synthesis of (-)-aplyviolene was reported in 2011 by the Overman group, ${ }^{9 \mathrm{e}}$ in which the hydrophobic and hydrophilic fragments were coupled using a Michael addition strategy similar to the approach utilized in the total synthesis of (+)shahamin K. Shown in Scheme 1.5, ketone $\mathbf{1 . 2 6}^{\text {9b }}$ underwent thermodynamic enolate formation and 1,4-addition to bromocyclopentenone $\mathbf{1 . 4 2}$ in $81 \%$ yield giving 1.43 as a single stereoisomer. ${ }^{9 b}$ Completion of (-)-aplyviolene required three steps to remove the extraneous C7 carbonyl after fragment coupling. Following deoxygenation and construction of the dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octa-3-one ring system, the natural product was completed in 14 steps and 5.6\% overall yield from 1.26.

## Scheme 1.5. The Overman First-Generation Total Synthesis of (-)-Aplyviolene.



### 1.2.3.2 The Overman Second-Generation Route

The second-generation synthesis of (-)-aplyviolene ${ }^{9 f}$ circumvented the three-step sequence to remove the C 7 ketone in the first-generation synthesis by employing a radical coupling strategy. The cis-perhydroazulene coupling partner, ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.44, was synthesized in 15 steps from (+)-fenchone (Scheme 1.6). The ( $N$ acyloxy)phthalimide functionality would serve as the radical precursor. Okada previously reported reductive photoredox conditions ${ }^{15}$ that induced decarboxylation of $(\mathrm{N}$ -
acyloxy)phthalimides to generate carbon-centered radicals. The resulting nucleophilic radicals could be reduced by hydrogen atom abstraction or trapped by 1,4-addition to electron-deficient alkenes. Exposure of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 4 4}$ to a modification of Okada's photoredox conditions generated tertiary radical 1.45, which underwent 1,4addition to chlorocyclopentenone $\mathbf{1 . 4 6}$. Coupled product $\mathbf{1 . 4 7}$ was isolated in $61 \%$ yield as a single diastereomer with the desired configuration to be carried forward to (-)aplyviolene using methods developed in the first-generation route. This key radical coupling reduced the step count of the overall synthesis, completing the natural product in 20 steps.

## Scheme 1.6. The Overman Second-Generation Total Synthesis of (-)-Aplyviolene.



### 1.3 RSDs and Biological Effects on the Golgi Apparatus

The Overman group has been interested in RSDs for their structural complexity and more recently for their intriguing Golgi-modifying properties. The Golgi apparatus is an organelle in eukaryotic cells responsible for post-translational modifications and packaging of proteins into vesicles for transportation to various cellular destinations. ${ }^{16}$ This organelle has garnered attention by the biological community as its function or dysfunction has been associated with a variety of ailments, including cancer ${ }^{17}$ and neurodegenerative diseases. ${ }^{18}$

Previous research groups have elucidated key features of the Golgi's function in protein transport and regulation of membrane dynamics using small molecule Golgi disruptors (Figure 1.2: brefeldin $\mathrm{A}, \mathbf{1 . 4 8} ;{ }^{19}$ ilimaquinone, $\mathbf{1 . 4 9} ;{ }^{20}$ norrisolide, $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}{ }^{21}$ ). Upon exposure to rat kidney cells, these small molecules induced fragmentation of the Golgi wherein the resulting Golgi fragments dispersed throughout the cytosol (Figure 1.3B). Macfarlandin E (1.9), a RSD, exhibited a unique biological phenotype on the Golgi structure of rat kidney cells. ${ }^{22}$ Upon exposure to rat kidney cells, $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ induced irreversible fragmentation of the Golgi apparatus, but the Golgi fragments remained localized around the endoplasmic reticulum (Figure 1.3D). A truncated macfarlandin E analog, tert-butyl MacE (1.50), was synthesized by the Overman group and found to exhibit the same phenotype as the natural product in rat kidney cells. ${ }^{22}$ This study demonstrated that the oxygenated 2,7-dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-one subunit was responsible for this unusual biological activity on Golgi morphology. Incorporation of oxidation at C6 of $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 5 0}$ was essential to induce this unique Golgi phenotype, as aplyviolene (1.8) and related analogues did not exhibit the same phenotype. ${ }^{22,23}$ Shown in Scheme 1.7, the novel Golgi phenotype is hypothesized to arise from ring-opening to dialdehyde species $\mathbf{1 . 5 2}$ under physiological conditions in the cell. It is believed that a lysine residue then condenses with the dialdehyde portion to form pyrrole 1.53. Gramine fragmentation of pyrrole $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$ then generates an electrophile (1.54) for reaction with a separate nucleophile. Access to other RSDs or their truncated analogues embedding these structural features could provide novel biological probes for further insight into the Golgi's function.
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Figure 1.2. Known Golgi-Modifying Agents.


Figure 1.3. Fragmentation Phenotypes of Golgi Disruptors.

Scheme 1.7. Proposed Mechanism for Unique Golgi Phenotype of 6-Acetoxy-2,7-dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octa-3-ones.


The 7-dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-one subunit (highlighted in red, Figure 1.4) is also found in the RSDs chromodorolides $\mathrm{A}^{2 \mathrm{k}}$ and $\mathrm{D} .{ }^{2 \mathrm{n}}$ These natural products feature an additional 5-membered ring fused to the biologically relevant 7-dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-one moiety. Chromodorolides B, C, and E (1.14-1.16) also contain similar oxygenation patterns (highlighted in blue); but the lactones in these natural products are incorporated into a fused tricyclic motif. The impact of these bridged and fused tricyclic ring systems
on the Golgi apparatus has not been explored. At the start of my dissertation research, no synthetic efforts for any of the chromodorolides ${ }^{24}$ or their highly functionalized, oxygenrich tricyclic frameworks had been reported. The unprecedented ring systems and the potential Golgi-modifying properties of the chromodorolides prompted the Overman group to develop a synthetic strategy to access these natural products.


chromodorolide $A$ (1.12): $R=A c$ chromodorolide D (1.13): R = H


Figure 1.4. The 7-Dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-one in Bridged Chromodorolides and Related Framework in Fused Chromodorolides.

### 1.4 Approach to Both Chromodorolide Scaffolds

Structural examination of representative bridged and fused chromodorolides A (1.12) and $C$ (1.15), respectively, revealed similar carbon skeletons with variation of the lactone and acetyl group at C15 and C16. Retrosynthetically, disconnection of the lactoneacetal bond in $\mathbf{1 . 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 1 5}$ would arrive at acid intermediate $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ as a common precursor (Scheme 1.8). We envisioned that both fused and bridged tricyclic frameworks would be accessible from acid $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ by site-selective oxocarbenium ion formation followed by intramolecular carboxylic acid trapping. To generate fused chromodorolide 1.15, we hypothesized that closure to the 5-membered lactone would be thermodynamically favorable if oxocarbenium ion formation occurred at both C15 and C16. In contrast, to construct the bridged system of 1.12, oxocarbenium ion formation must occur
regioselectively at C 15 to permit 6 -membered ring closure. This result could potentially be accomplished by installation of a more activated leaving group on C15 relative to the acetal group on C16.

Scheme 1.8. Access to Bridged and Fused Chromodorolides from Acid 1.56.


### 1.5 Preliminary Studies Toward the Chromodorolides

### 1.5.1 Model System Retrosynthetic Analysis

To assess the site-selective oxocarbenium ion formation/trapping strategy in accessing both the bridged and fused chromodorolides, truncated versions of the RSDs replacing the hydrophobic fragment for an isopropyl group were targeted (1.59 and $\mathbf{1 . 6 0}$, Scheme 1.9). These compounds would arise from site-selective oxocarbenium ion formation/carboxylic trapping at C15 or C16 from carboxylic acid 1.61, in which C15 would harbor a more activated acetoxy group than C16's methoxy group. The vicinal cisdiols of acid 1.61 would be installed by dihydroxylation of an $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ester from the convex face of the cis-oxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone. The C15 acetoxy group would arise
from reduction and acylation of lactone 1.62, which would arise from a phosphinepromoted [3+2] dipolar cycloaddition between allene $\mathbf{1 . 6 3}$ and butenolide $1.64 .{ }^{25}$

Scheme 1.9. Retrosynthesis of Truncated Chromodorolide Analogues.


### 1.5.2 Synthesis of Cis-Oxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone and Unexpected Dihydroxylation Diastereoselectivity

The synthesis commenced with preparation of the $[3+2]$ dipolar cycloaddition precursors (Scheme 1.10), which was developed exclusively by Dr. Philipp Kohler. ${ }^{26}$ The 1,3-dipole precursor was accessed by a three-step sequence from methyl bromoacetate 1.66. Halogen displacement by triphenylphosphine followed by deprotonation afforded ylide 1.67. Exposure of ylide $\mathbf{1 . 6 7}$ to acyl chloride $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ with triethylamine induced ketene Wittig olefination to give allene 1.63. Dipolarophile 1.64 was accessed from ( $\pm$ )-3hydroxybutenolide (1.69) by its conversion to methoxybutenolide $\mathbf{1 . 7 0}$ followed by onepot dibromination and elimination.

## Scheme 1.10. Synthesis of Dipolar Cycloaddition Precursors.



With both cycloaddition precursors in hand, the key [3+2] dipolar cycloaddition was then explored. Using slight modifications to reported conditions, ${ }^{27}$ allene $\mathbf{1 . 6 3}$ and bromobutenolide 1.64 underwent a phosphine-promoted [3+2] dipolar cycloaddition in $36 \%$ yield as a single diastereomer (1.71, Scheme 1.11). The $\alpha$-bromide of cycloadduct 1.71 was then reduced with zinc, ${ }^{28}$ and dihydroxylation of enoate $\mathbf{1 . 7 2}$ was examined. Unexpectedly, dihydroxylation using NMO and catalytic $\mathrm{OsO}_{4}$ took place with high selectivity from the undesired concave face of the cis-oxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone (product 1.74). A collaboration with the Houk group ${ }^{29}$ revealed the contrasteric selectivity for dihydroxylation arose from torsional steering effects. The computed transition state structures for osmium-mediated dihydroxylation from the convex face (Figure 1.5, right) revealed larger destabilizing eclipsing interactions than from the concave face (Figure 1.5, left). As Dr. Kohler was unable to find conditions favoring dihydroxylation or epoxidation from the desired convex face (requisite for the chromodorolides), ${ }^{26}$ I sought an alternative route to investigate the site-selective oxocarbenium formation/trapping strategy.

Scheme 1.11. [3+2] Dipolar Cycloaddition and Dihydroxylation of Resulting Cycloadduct.


(1: 11.5)


Figure 1.5. Torsional Steering Effects in Osmium-Mediated Dihydroxylation of Cisoxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone.

### 1.5.3 Hydrogenation and Cyclization to Fused Tricyclic Framework

As the vicinal diol functionality was not essential for probing site-selective oxocarbenium ion trapping, I investigated these issues in a model system lacking the natural products' oxygenation. Cycloadduct $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}^{30}$ underwent chemoselective lactone reduction and in situ acetylation to give diacetal $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ in low yield (Scheme 1.12). A variety of reduction conditions were attempted, but selective reduction of the lactone proved difficult in the presence of the enoate. ${ }^{31}$ Small quantities of diacetal $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ were obtained as an anomeric mixture, which underwent palladium-catalyzed benzyl ester deprotection and alkene hydrogenation to give a mixture of carboxylic acid diastereomers 1.77. I believed
these diastereomers were inconsequential as the carboxylic acid's $\alpha$-stereocenter could epimerize under oxocarbenium ion formation reaction conditions. Treatment with $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ afforded fused tricyclic product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ as a mixture of anomers in $80 \%$ yield. The exclusive formation of the fused tricyclic product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ under strongly Lewis acidic conditions provided experimental support for our hypothesis that the fused tricyclic framework was thermodynamically favorable compared to the analogous bridged framework.

These preliminary studies were successful in constructing the tricyclic carbon skeleton embedded within fused chromodorolides B, C, and E. However, the model system also revealed that the proposed synthetic route would not install the vicinal diol functionality with the desired stereochemistry. Therefore, I required an alternative strategy to incorporate this challenging oxygenation and access the chromodorolides.

## Scheme 1.12. Construction of the Truncated Fused Chromodorolide Framework.



### 1.6 Experimental Section

### 1.6.1 General Experimental Details

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of nitrogen or argon. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethylether, toluene, dichloromethane, methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$, pyridine, and triethylamine were dried by passage through activated alumina. All commercial reagents were used as received unless otherwise
noted. Reaction temperatures were controlled using an IKAmag temperature modulator. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with E. Merck silica gel 60 F254 precoated plates ( 0.25 mm ), and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or stained with anisaldehyde, ceric ammonium molybdate, and potassium permanganate. Flash column chromatography was performed using normal phase silica gel ( $60 \AA, 230-240$ mesh, Merck KGA). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 500 or 600 MHz ) and are reported relative to $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant $(\mathrm{Hz})$ and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Spectrometers (at 125 MHz ). Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ). IR spectra were recorded on a Varian $640-\mathrm{IR}$ spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. High resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility with a Micromass LCT spectrometer. See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations (available at http://pubs.acs.org/userim ages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah _abbreviations.pdf).

### 1.6.2 Experimental Procedures

(Triphenyl- $\lambda^{5}$-phosphanylidene)benzyl acetate (S1.1): The procedure for the preparation
 of S1.1 was followed from the literature procedure. ${ }^{32}$ To a solution of triphenylphosphine $(44.9 \mathrm{~g}, 171 \mathrm{mmol})$ in benzene $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added benzyl bromoacetate $(40.0 \mathrm{~g}, 175 \mathrm{mmol})$ dropwise over 15 min to maintain the temperature below $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for

3 h , at which point the resulting suspension was filtered, retaining the solid formed from the reaction. This solid was washed with benzene $(1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and pentanes $(1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solid was air dried and dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(180 \mathrm{~mL})$. Solid NaOH pellets ( 6.85 g , $171 \mathrm{mmol})$ dissolved in water ( 60 mL ) was added dropwise over 20 min at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the mixture stirred for 40 min . The solution was filtered, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting solid was recrystallized from EtOAc. Upon concentration in vacuo, S1.1 was obtained as a colorless powder ( $52.4 \mathrm{~g}, 127 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%$ ). Spectral data were consistent with previously reported data. ${ }^{32}$
rac-5-Methylhexa-2,3-dienoic acid benzyl ester (S1.2): The procedure for the
 preparation of S1.2 was followed from the literature procedure. ${ }^{29}$ To a solution of $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(1.97 \mathrm{~g}, 19.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(48 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $\mathbf{S} 1.1(8.00 \mathrm{~g}, 19.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ and, the solution was maintained for 10 min at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Isovaleryl chloride $(2.35 \mathrm{~g}, 19.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(16 \mathrm{~mL})$ was then added slowly over 20 min and then allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h . The solution was concentrated in vacuo, and hexanes ( 100 mL ) was added. After sitting for 30 min , the solution was filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting yellow filtrate was then purified by flash column chromatography $\left(100 \% \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ to yield $\mathbf{S 1 . 2}$ as a clear oil (2.58 $\mathrm{g}, 11.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 61 \%$ yield). Spectral data were consistent with previously reported data. ${ }^{33}$ tetrahydro-1H-cyclopenta[c]furan-4-carboxylate (S1.3): The procedure for the
 preparation of $\mathbf{S 1 . 3}$ was followed from the literature procedure. ${ }^{29}$ Butenolide 1.64 ( $1.16 \mathrm{~g}, 6.01 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and allene $\mathbf{S 1 . 2}$ ( $1.95 \mathrm{~g}, 9.02$ mmol) were charged in a flask in benzene ( 6 mL ). Triphenylphosphine ( $3.15 \mathrm{~g}, 12.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in benzene ( 6 mL ) was degassed by bubbling nitrogen gas through the solution for 10 min , which was added to the flask followed by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.210 \mathrm{~g}, 12.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The solution stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 50 min at which point silica gel ( $\sim 3 \mathrm{~g}$ ) was added, and the solution was concentrated in vacuo. Upon purification with flash column chromatography (5\% EtOAc in hexanes), cycloadduct S1.3 $\left(0.619 \mathrm{~g}, 1.92 \mathrm{mmol}, 32 \%\right.$ yield) was isolated as a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.43-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\operatorname{app~t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{dt}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\operatorname{app} \operatorname{sext}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.1,162.1,146.2,135.2,131.5,128.8,128.7,128.4$, 105.2, 67.0, 66.8, 64.1, 57.5, 53.6, 27.4, 23.5, 20.6; IR (thin film) 2960, 2927, 1784, 1714, $1349 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21}{ }^{79} \mathrm{BrO}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 431.0470, observed 431.0453.
rac-(3R,3aS,6S,6aS)-Benzyl-6-isopropyl-3-methoxy-1-oxo-3,3a,6,6a-
tetrahydrohydro-1H-cyclopenta[c]furan-4-carboxylate (1.75): The procedure for the
 preparation of $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ was followed from the literature procedure. ${ }^{29}$

To a solution of cycloadduct $\mathbf{S 1 . 3}$ ( $0.568 \mathrm{~g}, 1.39 \mathrm{mmol})$ in AcOH ( 10 mL ), Zn dust ( $1.42 \mathrm{~g}, 21.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The mixture stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h before the solution was filtered through Celite with EtOAc ( 30 mL ), washed with aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$, and washed with brine ( $1 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to afford lactone $1.75(0.411 \mathrm{~g}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 90 \%$ yield $)$ as a colorless solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.43-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.423(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.29$ (d, $J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.39$ (app t, $J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19(\mathrm{sept}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.5,163.4,148.3$, $135.4,132.4,128.5,128.3,128.2,104.7,66.4,56.5,55.9,53.2,42.7,26.9,22.9,21.1$; IR (thin film) 2960, 1778, 1713, $1270 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 353.1365, observed 353.1374.
rac-(3R,3aS,6S,6aS)-Benzyl 1-acetoxy-6-isopropyl-3-methoxy-3,3a,6,6a-tetrahydro-1H-cyclopenta[c]furan-4-carboxylate (1.76): Lactone $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ ( $0.286 \mathrm{~g}, 0.866 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was

1.76: $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ Molecular Weight: 374.4330 issolved in toluene ( 5 mL ) and THF ( 2 mL ). The solution was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and DIBAL-H ( $0.15 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.19 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) dissolved in toluene ( 0.7 mL ) was added to the reaction flask slowly over 10 min . The solution then stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h , at
which point propionaldehyde $(0.181 \mathrm{~g}, 3.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to quench remaining DIBAL-H. The solution was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min before the addition of DMAP $(0.212 \mathrm{~g}, 1.73 \mathrm{mmol})$ and pyridine $(0.21 \mathrm{~g}, 2.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added, followed by slow addition of $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.53 \mathrm{~g}, 5.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ over 15 min . After 1 h , saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ soln $(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated aqueous Rochelle's salt soln $(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The reaction mixture was then warmed to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10$ $\mathrm{mL})$, followed by washes with aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ soln $(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were then dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to provide recovered starting material $1.75(0.225 \mathrm{~g}, 0.681 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%)$ and $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.085 \mathrm{mmol}$, $10 \%$ yield) as a clear oil in a 7.4:1 ratio of inseparable diastereomers. Data for major anomeric isomer of 1.76: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.88(\mathrm{t}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.36(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.27(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.25(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64$ (app dt, $J=7.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\operatorname{app~td}, J=7.7,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{ddd}, J$ $=7.8,2.2,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.82(\mathrm{sept}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ $0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.6,164.2,148.0,135.9,133.7$, $128.8,128.5,128.4,108.8,99.8,66.5,56.9,55.8,55.1,48.7,28.6,22.1,21.8,21.4 ;$ IR (thin film) 2962, 2873, 1734, 1368, $1235 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}$ (M+Na) 397.1627, observed 397.1620.
rac-(3R,3aS,6R,6aS)-1-Acetoxy-6-isopropyl-3-methoxyhexahydro-1H-
cyclopenta[c]furan-4-carboxylic acid (1.77): Diacetal 1.76 ( $24 \mathrm{mg}, 0.064 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was
 dissolved in EtOAc ( 3 mL ) and $\mathrm{AcOH}(4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$. Pearlman's catalyst ( $13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added to the solution. The flask was placed under vacuum and backfilled with hydrogen gas before being maintained at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The mixture was filtered through Celite with EtOAc ( 5 mL ) and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting yellow oil was washed in the flask with hexanes $(2 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the hexane layer was removed. The resulting product was then concentrated in vacuo to provide 1.77 as a yellow oil ( $14 \mathrm{mg}, 0.047 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%$ yield) as a 8.6:1.3:1 mixture of diastereomers. Data for major diastereomer of 1.77: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.32(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.31(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{t}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96-2.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.99(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{dt}, J=11.2,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.45(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{q}, J=12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.6,109.3,99.6,55.0,51.3,50.4,49.8,32.0,29.6,22.5,21.8,21.4 ;$ IR (thin film) 3527, 2962, 2873, 1738, $1235 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ (M-H) 285.1138, observed 285.1142.
rac-(2aS, $\left.2 \mathrm{a}^{1} S, 3 R, \quad 4 \mathrm{a} R, \quad 6 \mathrm{a} R\right)$ - 3-Isopropyl-2-methoxyhexahydro-1,6-dioxa-cyclopenta[cd]pentalen-5(2H)-one (1.78): Carboxylic acid 1.77 ( $13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.045 \mathrm{mmol}$ )
 was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}(17 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added slowly over 15 min . The solution stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 $h$, and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The aqueous layer was diluted with water $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{EtOAc}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was then purified by flash column chromatography ( $30 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ as a yellow oil ( $8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%$ yield) as a 2.2:1 ratio of acetal diastereomers. Data for major anomeric isomer of $\mathbf{1 . 7 8 :}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.57-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.02(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{q}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.79-2.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39(\mathrm{ddd}, J=12.9,9.4,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.85(\mathrm{ddd}, J=17.1,13.3,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $1.64(\mathrm{ddd}, J=17.1,13.0,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.52(\operatorname{app~dt}, J=13.0,10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 107.2, 105.7, 56.5, 53.7, $52.4,50.0,43.6,34.8,30.1,22.6,21.7$; IR (thin film) $2958,2929,2871,1779,1364 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 249.1103, observed 249.1106.
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## Chapter 2: Synthesis of (3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-Trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one

### 2.1 Previous Syntheses of (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1

Central to completing the total synthesis of the chromodorolides was accessing multi-gram quantities of (+)-hydrindanone 2.1. Despite a seemingly simple scaffold, this molecule presents two major synthetic challenges (Figure 2.1): 1) two quaternary carbons, C4 and C9, with C9 being stereogenic; and 2) a kinetically ${ }^{1}$ and thermodynamically ${ }^{2}$ disfavored trans-bicyclo[4.3.0]nonane (shown in red). In choosing how to access (+)hydrindanone 2.1, I first considered the three reported syntheses of (+)-hydrindanone 2.1; and a brief discussion of each strategy is highlighted below.


Figure 2.1. Hydrindanone 2.1 and its Synthetic Challenges.

### 2.1. 1 The Theodorakis Route

The first synthesis of (+)-hydrindanone $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ was reported in 2004 by Theodorakis. ${ }^{3}$ The synthesis was completed in 11 steps and 20\% overall yield from Hajos-Parrish ketone 2.2 (Scheme 2.1). (+)-Dione 2.2 was a choice starting material because of accessibility on large scale in high enantiomeric purity with a preformed quaternary C9 stereocenter. ${ }^{4}$ Theodorakis found construction of the trans-bicyclo[4.3.0]nonane particularly challenging, ultimately performing hydroboration on alkene $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ with modest selectivity
( $\sim 2.3: 1$ ) for the trans-bicyclic framework. Considering its long sequence with stereoselectivity challenges, I decided against this route to (+)-2.1.

Scheme 2.1. Theodorakis Route to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1.


### 2.1.2 The Alvarez-Manzaneda Route

The second synthesis of (+)-hydrindanone $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ was reported in 2007 by AlvarezManzaneda from (-)-sclareol (Error! Reference source not found.). ${ }^{5}$ A ring-contracting pinacol rearrangement of $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ transformed sclareol's trans-bicyclo[4.4.0]decane to the desired trans-bicyclo[4.3.0]nonane (2.7). Unfortunately, (+)-hydrindanone 2.1 was obtained in $2 \%$ overall yield as a result of inefficient removal of the hydroxyacetyl group of hydrindane 2.7 to install the ketone functionality. This ring contraction was an innovative method to obtain the desired trans ring system, but the low overall yield would not permit access sufficient quantities of (+)-2.1.

Scheme 2.2. Alvarez-Manzaneda Route to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1.


### 2.1.3 The Snapper Route

The Snapper group reported a third route to (+)-hydrindanone 2.1 in 2012, ${ }^{6}$ requiring five steps and providing (+)-2.1 in $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ overall yield and $98 \% e e$ (Scheme 2.3).

The quaternary centers were constructed in the first two steps to give diene 2.10, and subsequent ring-closing metathesis constructed the trans-hydrindene framework. Hydrogenation followed by kinetic resolution provided (+)-hydrindanone $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ with high enantiomeric enrichment (98\%). Despite a modest $15 \%$ overall yield, I believed this route to be the preferred method for accessing multi-gram quantities of (+)-2.1.

## Scheme 2.3. Snapper Route to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1.



### 2.2 Modified Snapper Route to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1

I began exploring the Snapper route with copper-mediated conjugate addition of prenyl magnesium bromide (2.8) ${ }^{7}$ to 2-methylcyclopenten-2-one (2.9) in the presence of HMPA, followed by trapping of the resulting enolate with TMS-Cl (Equation 2.1). An important limitation for this initial conjugate addition was the dilute concentrations. Prenyl magnesium bromide solution was generated in $0.15-0.25 \mathrm{M}$ concentrations, ${ }^{8}$ which rendered a large scale reaction difficult. The resulting enoxysilane underwent activation with methyllithium and alkylation with allyl bromide to give an unexpected mixture of ketones $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ resulting from $\gamma$ - and $\alpha$-prenylation, respectively.

## Equation 2.1



Surprisingly, ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ was not mentioned as a byproduct by the Snapper group. Lipshutz previously observed $\alpha$-prenylation as a minor byproduct (<5\%) in the coppermediated conjugate addition of prenyl magnesium bromide to 2-methylcyclopenten-2one. ${ }^{7}$ Using the reported conditions by Snapper, ketones $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ were obtained in variable ratios, from $2: 1$ to $10: 1$, respectively. The inconsistent regioselectivity of prenylation led me to examine the conditions reported by Lipschutz, in which LiCl was employed as an additive. By adding LiCl prior to addition of $\mathrm{HMPA}^{9}$ and TMS-Cl, the conjugate addition and alkylation sequence afforded ketones $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ in a consistent 10:1 ratio favoring $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and 52-61\% combined yield (Equation 2.2). As these ketones were inseparable, the next challenge was to remove undesired ketone 2.12.

## Equation 2.2



Attempts to separate undesired ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ by distillation or column chromatography were unsuccessful. Separation of these isomers at a later stage in the
synthesis of (+)-hydrindanone $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ failed as well. Fortunately, the undesired ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ was chemically distinguishable from ketone 2.10. Taking advantage of 2.12's trisubstituted alkene, exposure of the ketone mixture to $11 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{~m}$-CPBA selectively oxidized ketone 2.12 to epoxide 2.13. Epoxide 2.13 was then separable by column chromatography, and desired ketone 2.10 was recovered in pure form (Scheme 2.4). Subsequent RCM and hydrogenation afforded ( $\pm$ )-hydrindanone 2.1 in high yield over two steps, leaving kinetic resolution as the final step in the sequence.

Scheme 2.4. Modified Snapper Route to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1.


Employing Snapper's reported conditions for the CBS-mediated kinetic resolution afforded (+)-2.1 with low enantioenrichment (50-60\% ee). By examining a number of reaction parameters to improve enantioenrichment, I found temperature to be a critical factor. By running the reaction at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ rather than the reported $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, ketone 2.1 was consistently recovered in $41 \%$ yield and $98 \%$ ee on gram scale. With access to sufficient quantities of $(+) \mathbf{- 2 . 1}$, this material was carried forward to complete the synthesis of $(-)-$ chromodorolide B (Chapter 3). However, this route's modest overall yield (20\%) coupled with scalability issues and a late-stage kinetic resolution left an opportunity to develop an improved route to (+)-hydrindanone 2.1.

### 2.3 First-Generation Approach: Biomimetic Polyene Cyclization

In light of the previous approaches to (+)-hydrindanone 2.1, I considered a biomimetic approach to constructing trans-hydrindanes. In steroid synthesis, enzymatically-controlled polyene cyclizations are remarkable transformations which form trans-hydrindanes in a single step with high stereochemical fidelity (Equation 2.3). ${ }^{10}$ Nature, as well as the synthetic chemist, typically initiates cationic polyene reactions by Lewis acid activation of epoxides, ketones, or ketals, ${ }^{11}$ but these activating groups are not always required.

## Equation 2.3



### 2.3.1 Retrosynthetic Approach and Literature Precedent

Retrosynthetically, I proposed ketone 2.1 could arise from oxidative cleavage of allene 2.16, the product of a proton-initiated polyene cyclization (Scheme 2.5). Dieneyne $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ would be protonated at the terminal alkene, generating tertiary carbocation 2.18. Two bond-forming events would then construct the trans-bicyclic system harboring both quaternary centers by a polyene cyclization in a chair-like conformation. The resulting linear vinyl carbocation 2.19 could be quenched by elimination to give allene 2.16. Dieneyne $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ is not only readily accessible but prochiral, presenting the opportunity for an enantioselective polyene cyclization.

Scheme 2.5. Retrosynthesis using a Proton-Initiated Polyene Cyclization.


Enantioselective proton-initiated polyene cyclizations (EPIPCs) are biomimetic transformations that utilize a chiral cation-anion complex to facilitate stereoselective formation of the carbon skeleton upon protonation of an alkene. The first report of an EPIPC by Yamamoto ${ }^{12}$ in 1999 (Equation 2.4) found BINOL derivative 2.21 in the presence of a strong Lewis acid capable of facilitating EPIPCs to give cyclized products (e.g. 2.22) in high yields (56-95\%) with varying enantioselectivity (42-87\% ee). The acid promoting this EPIPC was proposed to be complex $\mathbf{2 . 2 3}$ in which BINOL coordination to the Lewis acid dramatically increases phenol acidity. Yamamoto's EPIPC precursors (e.g. 2.20) were always functionalized with an alcohol, ${ }^{12,13}$ phenol, ${ }^{14}$ or arene ${ }^{15}$ to terminate the cationic cascade.

## Equation 2.4



Since Yamamoto's seminal contributions to EPIPCs, few advancements in this area have been reported. ${ }^{16}$ Recent methodology developed by Corey ${ }^{17}$ (Equation 2.5) used the same ligand class as Yamamoto. Specifically, o-o'-dichloro-BINOL 2.25 with $\mathrm{SbCl}_{5}$ accomplished EPIPCs of arylated polyene substrates (e.g. 2.24) in high yields and high $e e$ 's. While Yamamoto's and Corey's work were encouraging for the proposed cyclization with dieneyne 2.17, this substrate's cyclization had two key differences: 1) termination of the polyene sequence with an alkyne rather than precedented alcohol or arene nucleophiles; and 2) cyclization to a trans-bicyclo[4.3.0]nonane instead of a trans-bicyclo[4.4.0]decane.

## Equation 2.5



In considering these important differences, pioneering work by Johnson in the 1970's shed light on both of these issues. Johnson previously examined formation of transbicyclo[4.3.0]nonanes using allylic alcohols for cationic initiation in polyene cyclizations with tethered alkynes as the cascade terminators. ${ }^{18}$ Seen in Equation 2.6, allylic alcohol 2.27 was exposed to $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}$ at low temperatures to generate an allylic carbocation which underwent polyene cyclization to afford three identified products. ${ }^{19}$ The major product was trans-hydrindane 2.28, with a small amount of cis-hydrindane $\mathbf{2 . 2 9}$ also formed (9.3:1 dr). The other identified product, trans-decaline 2.30, arose via either 6 -endo cyclization by the alkyne or 1,2-alkyl shift of intermediate vinyl carbocation $\mathbf{2 . 3 1}$ prior to chloride trapping.

## Equation 2.6



Johnson also examined the effects of alkyne substitution (Scheme 2.6), observing that terminal or silylated alkynes (2.32) ${ }^{20}$ favored formation of 6 -endo products (2.33) while internal alkyl alkynes (2.34) favored formation of 5-exo products (2.35). Therefore, proposed EPIPC precursor $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ would require alkyl substitution on the alkyne to favor formation of the required 5-exo product.

Scheme 2.6. Alkyne Substitution Effects on 5-exo versus 6-endo Products.


### 2.3.2 Optimization of the Proton-Initiated Polyene Cyclization

With precedent for the proposed EPIPC to construct the transbicyclo[4.3.0]nonane, I synthesized the requisite cascade precursor, dieneyne $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ (Scheme 2.7). Starting from 1-trimethylsilyl-propyne 2.36, propargylic deprotonation with $n-\mathrm{BuLi}$ followed by exposure to geranyl chloride 2.37 gave the alkylated product. ${ }^{21}$ Upon in situ desilylation with TBAF, terminal alkyne $\mathbf{2 . 3 8}$ was obtained in $73 \%$ yield. Subsequent alkylation with methyl iodide ${ }^{22}$ afforded desired polyene cyclization precursor
$\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ in only two steps and $62 \%$ overall yield from commercially available 1-trimethylsilylpropyne.

Scheme 2.7. Synthesis of EPIPC Precursor 2.17.


Having accessed multiple grams of dieneyne 2.17, the EPIPC was investigated using conditions reported by Corey ${ }^{17}$ (Scheme 2.8). Employing $50 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of $o, o^{\prime}$-dichloro-(R)-BINOL 2.25 and $\mathrm{SbCl}_{5}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, a mixture of two bicyclic products was isolated in $35 \%$ yield. The major product, vinyl chloride $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$, contained the desired transbicyclo[4.3.0]nonane while minor product $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ contained the trans-bicyclo[4.4.0]decane. Ozone-mediated oxidative cleavage of vinyl chloride 2.39 verified the structure via conversion to known ketone 2.1 in modest yield. Unfortunately, HPLC analysis of a hydrazone derivative ${ }^{6}$ of 2.1 revealed the ketone to be racemic, indicating no enantioinduction occurred in the polyene cyclization.

Scheme 2.8. EPIPC and Ozonolysis to Hydrindanone 2.1.


Shown in Table 2.1, a number of conditions were screened to improve both yield and enantioinduction of the EPIPC. The reported conditions by Corey afforded a low
combined yield favoring vinyl chloride 2.39 with no enantioenrichment (entry 1). Several other Lewis acids were screened (entries 2-3), in which $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}$ (entry 3 ) was found superior in yield (55\%) and enantioinduction ( $-18 \%$ ee ). However, the ratio of products 2.39:2.40 decreased to $1.5: 1$. Lower temperatures using $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}$ were also explored. At $-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (entry 4), formation of desired vinyl chloride $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ was further disfavored relative to vinyl chloride 2.40 (1.1:1). At $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (entry 5), a complex product mixture was observed with a low yield of desired 2.39. ${ }^{23}$ Lastly, unsubstituted BINOL was examined as a ligand, which provided similar results to the chlorinated variant (entry 6). As the bicyclo[4.4.0]decane 2.40 was generally the major byproduct, I aimed to attenuate this unproductive reaction pathway and increase the yield of vinyl chloride 2.39.

Table 2.1. Screening of Conditions for the EPIPC of Dieneyne 2.17.

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The isolated yield of the combined vinyl chlorides. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ ee determined from the corresponding trisyl hydrazone of ketone 2.1 following ozonolysis. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Multiple uncharacterized byproducts were observed in the reaction.

### 2.3.3 Attempts to Trap Linear Vinyl Carbocation

In one mechanistic scenario to undesired vinyl chloride 2.40 (Scheme 2.9), competitive rates between chloride attack on carbocation 2.19 and 1,2-alkyl shift would determine the distribution of products $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$, respectively. If this mechanistic pathway was operative, increasing the concentration of the reaction mixture may favor
trapping to give vinyl chloride $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ over undesired alkyl shift to 2.41. Shown in Table 2.2, reaction concentration (relative to $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ ) had no effect on the product ratio of 2.39:2.40, indicating that the chloride anion was not involved in the product-determining step between 2.39 and 2.40.

Scheme 2.9. Possible Mechanism to Vinyl Chlorides 2.39 and 2.40.


Table 2.2. Concentration Effects on EPIPC Product Distribution.


An alternative method to prevent formation of $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ would be intramolecular trapping of the vinyl carbocation. Propargylic silanes were previously employed by Johnson in polyene cyclizations in which the silyl substituent stabilized the final vinyl
carbocation intermediate in the cascade. Upon loss of the trimethylsilyl group, allene products would be obtained. ${ }^{20,24}$ To examine this strategy, propargylic silane 2.42 was synthesized from terminal alkyne 2.38 (Scheme 2.10). Exposure to EPIPC conditions with $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}$ unfortunately afforded low yields of desired allene 2.43. Analysis by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of the crude reaction mixtures showed multiple polyene byproducts, which may result from undesired protonation of the propargylic silane rather than the terminal alkene. In light of the modest yields and poor enantioinduction, the EPIPC route was ultimately abandoned. ${ }^{25}$

Scheme 2.10. Synthesis of Propargylic Silane 2.42 and EPIPC.


### 2.4 Second-Generation Approach: Reductive Transposition

### 2.4.1 Synthetic Considerations and Retrosynthesis

Dissatisfied with the available routes to synthesize (+)-hydrindanone 2.1, the molecule was again reexamined for a more efficient approach. Hajos-Parrish ketone $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ seemed a logical starting material because of its accessibility in high enantioenrichment. Only two formal transformations of Hajos-Parrish ketone 2.2 would be required to arrive at hydrindanone 2.1 (Figure 2.2): 1) full reduction of the enone carbonyl (in red); and 2) stereoselective hydromethylation to give the trans-hydrindane (in blue). This synthetic approach would require a stereospecific transformation to set the transbicyclo[4.3.0]nonane and avoid formation of the thermodynamically and kinetically favored cis ring fusion.

$(+)-2.2$

(+)-2.1

Figure 2.2. Structural Comparison Between Ketones 2.2 and 2.1.

In this second-generation retrosynthesis of (+)-hydrindanone 2.1 (Scheme 2.11), the desired product would arise from formal hydromethylation of trisubstituted alkene $\mathbf{2 . 4 4}$ via two-step cyclopropanation/C-C bond hydrogenolysis. The trans ring fusion of $\mathbf{2 . 4 4}$ would then be constructed from a stereospecific reductive transposition of allylic alcohol 2.46, transferring the stereochemistry of the $\beta$-alcohol to the bridgehead methine stereocenter with inversion. Reductive transpositions of allylic alcohols ${ }^{26}$ and their derivatives ${ }^{27}$ have relayed stereochemical information in related systems with high fidelity (Scheme 2.12). Allylic alcohol 2.46 would then arise from selective 1,2-reduction of Hajos-Parrish ketone

## 2.2.

Scheme 2.11. Second-Generation Retrosynthesis of Hydrindanone 2.1


Scheme 2.12. Examples of Stereospecific Reductive Transpositions
A)

B)

C)


### 2.4.2 Forward Synthesis of Hydrindanone 2.1

As Yuriy Slutskyy experimentally developed this second-generation route, a brief summary of the optimized sequence is provided below. ${ }^{28}$ Starting from (+)-enone $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ which is commercially available or synthesized in two steps and $98 \% e e,{ }^{4}$ ketalization of the unsaturated ketone followed by stereoselective 1,2-reduction of the enone afforded $\beta$ allylic alcohol 2.56 as a single diastereomer. 2.56 was initially examined in the Myers reductive transposition, ${ }^{26}$ but low yields and undesired byproducts rendered this approach inefficient. Rather, acylation of $\mathbf{2 . 5 6}$ with methyl chloroformate gave allylic carbonate 2.57, which could undergo Tsuji-Trost reductive transposition. ${ }^{29}$

## Scheme 2.13. Synthesis of Allylic Carbonate 2.57.



Exposure of allylic carbonate $\mathbf{2 . 5 7}$ to Tsuji's reported conditions ${ }^{27}$ with $\operatorname{Pd}(\text { acac })_{2}$ precatalyst and $(n-B u)_{3} \mathrm{P}$ gratifyingly resulted in the stereospecific transposition. $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$-like displacement of the allylic carbonate and palladium-hydride reductive elimination provided desired trans hydrindene $\mathbf{2 . 5 8}$ in $77 \%$ yield without formation of cis-hydrindane (Scheme 2.14). ${ }^{30}$ Miyano-modified Simmons-Smith cyclopropanation with chloroiodomethane ${ }^{31}$ and in situ acid-mediated deketalization afforded cyclopropyl ketone 2.45 in high yield as a single diastereomer. Subsequent platinum-catalyzed hydrogenolysis afforded alcohol 2.59 containing the necessary geminal dimethyl functionality. At this stage, removal of a minor impurity by recrystallization ${ }^{32}$ gave alcohol $\mathbf{2 . 5 9}$ in high purity; and upon oxidation, (+)-hydrindanone $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ was obtained in $59 \%$ overall yield and 7 steps from Hajos-Parrish ketone 2.2.

Scheme 2.14. Transformation of Allylic Carbonate 2.57 to Hydrindanone 2.1.


Highlighted in Table 1 are the unique approaches that have been developed synthesize (+)-hydrindanone 2.1. Upon completion of this second generation approach, I believe this route to be the best currently available method to access multi-gram quantities of (+)-hydrindanone 2.1. Its scalability and high overall yield should assist future research groups in need of enantioenriched hydrindanone 2.1.

Table 2.3. Known Routes to (+)-Hydrindanone 2.1.


### 2.5 Experimental Section

### 2.5.1 General Experimental Details

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of nitrogen or argon. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), deithylether, toluene, dichloromethane, methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$, pyridine, and triethylamine were dried by passage through activated alumina. TMSCl was distilled directly before use from CaH . All commercial reagents were used as received unless otherwise noted. Reaction temperatures were controlled using an IKAmag temperature modulator. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with E. Merck silica gel 60 F254 pre-coated plates ( 0.25 mm ), and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or stained with anisaldehyde, ceric
ammonium molybdate, and potassium permanganate. Flash column chromatography was performed using normal phase silica gel ( $60 \AA$ A $230-240$ mesh, Merck KGA). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 500 or 600 MHz ) and are reported relative to $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift $(\delta \mathrm{ppm})$, multiplicity, coupling constant $(\mathrm{Hz})$ and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Spectrometers (at 125 MHz ). Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ). IR spectra were recorded on a Varian 640-IR spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. High resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility with a Micromass LCT spectrometer. See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations (available at http://pubs.acs.org/userim ages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah _abbreviations.pdf).

### 2.5.2 Experimental Procedures

rac-(2S,3S)-2-allyl-2-methyl-3-(2-methylbut-3-en-2-yl)cyclopentan-1-one (2.10): The
 procedure for preparation of $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ was a modification from the literature. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{CuBr} \cdot \mathrm{DMS}(14.38 \mathrm{~g}, 75.51 \mathrm{mmol})$ and anhydrous LiCl $(4.26 \mathrm{~g}, 101 \mathrm{mmol})$ were charged into a flask with THF ( 130 mL ). After maintaining the solution at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min , the flask was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Prenyl magnesium bromide solution ${ }^{7}$ ( $62.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 286 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.22 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added slowly over 15 min . After maintaining the reaction at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $15 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{TMS}-\mathrm{Cl}(12.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 101$ mmol ) was added followed immediately by 2 -methyl-cyclopent-2-enone ( $4.84 \mathrm{~g}, 50.3$ mmol ) in THF ( 5 mL ). The reaction was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , and then HMPA
( $17.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 101 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. After $1 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{NEt}_{3}(15.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 111 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added, and the reaction was then warmed to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h . The reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $10 \%$ aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution precooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. Upon separation of the heterogeneous mixture, the organic layer was washed with $10 \%$ aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution precooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give the crude enoxysilane as a yellow oil which was carried forward immediately.

The crude enoxysilane was dissolved in THF ( 150 mL ) and cooled to $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{MeLi}$ ( $33.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 50.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.50 \mathrm{M}$ in hexanes) was added at a rate which kept the reaction temperature below $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was then allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h . The reaction was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HMPA ( $35.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the reaction was maintained at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min . Freshly distilled allyl bromide ( 21.8 mL , 252 mmol ) was added to the reaction flask, which was allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 6 h . The reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the resulting aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( 150 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification of the resulting residue by column chromatography ( $0 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes to $3 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) provided a mixture of ketones $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ as a clear oil (5.38 g, $26.1 \mathrm{mmol}, \sim 10: 1$ ratio, $52 \%)$.

Ketones 2.10 and 2.12 (14.9 g, $72.1 \mathrm{mmol}, \sim 10: 1$ ratio) were dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . m-\mathrm{CPBA}(1.83 \mathrm{~g}, 7.93 \mathrm{mmol})$ was then added, and the reaction was maintained at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The reaction was concentrated in vacuo and directly purified by column chromatography ( $6 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to afford ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$
(13.3 g, $64.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 89 \%$ recovery) as a clear oil. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6}$
rac-(3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyl-2,3,3a,4,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-1-one (2.11): The
 procedure for preparation of $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ was a slight modification from the literature. ${ }^{6}$ Ketone 2.10 ( $3.26 \mathrm{~g}, 15.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(80 \mathrm{~mL})$, and Grubb's GII catalyst ( $67 \mathrm{mg}, 0.079 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to the flask. The reaction was maintained for 16 h , at which point silica ( $\sim 3 \mathrm{~g}$ ) was added. Upon stirring for 30 min , the suspension was concentrated in vacuo and filtered over Celite with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. Concentration in vacuo and distillation ( $195^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 10 torr) provided ketone 2.11 ( $2.68 \mathrm{~g}, 15.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, $95 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6}$
rac-(3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one (2.1): The procedure for

( $\pm$ )-2.1: $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}$ Molecular Weight: 180.2910 preparation of $( \pm)-\mathbf{2 . 1}$ was a slight modification from the literature. ${ }^{6}$ $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(1.59 \mathrm{~g}, 1.50 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to a solution of ketone $2.11(2.68 \mathrm{~g}, 15.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in EtOAc ( 60 mL ). The reaction vessel was evacuated and filled with 1 atm $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ (repeated 3 x ). The reaction was maintained at 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h before purging the vessel of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The resulting black suspension was filtered through Celite with EtOAc ( 30 mL ). Upon concentration, ( $\pm$ )-ketone 2.1 ( $2.65 \mathrm{~g}, 14.7$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 98 \%$ ) was isolated as a colorless, amorphous solid. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6}$
(+)-(3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one (2.1): The procedure for preparation of (+)-2.1 was a slight modification from the
$\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l}\text { (+)-2.1: } \mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O} \\ \text { Molecular Weight } 180.2910\end{array} \\ & \text { of }\end{aligned}$ (S)-1-methyl-3,3-diphenyl-tetrahydro-
pyrrolo[1,2c][1,3,2]oxazaborole ( $0.86 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.86 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in toluene) dissolved in THF $(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min , at which point (+)-2.1 $(1.55 \mathrm{~g}, 8.60 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added rapidly as a single potion. After 2 min , $\mathrm{MeOH}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(40 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 M soln $)$ were added to quench the reaction. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{x}$ 30 mL ), and the combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes to $15 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) provided (+)-ketone $2.1(0.652 \mathrm{~g}, 3.62 \mathrm{mmol}, 98 \% \mathrm{ee}, 42 \%$ recovery) as a colorless, amorphous solid. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6}$ Ee was determined by chiral HPLC of corresponding hydrazone $\mathbf{S 1}$ (vide infra).
(3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one (S2.1): The procedure of
 hydrazone S2.1 was repeated from literature. ${ }^{6}$ (+)-Ketone 2.1 ( $0.105 \mathrm{~g}, 0.582 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeCN}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$, and 2,4,6triisopropylbenzenesulfonylhydrazide $(0.182 \mathrm{~g}, 0.611 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The suspension was vigorously stirred for 15 min before one drop of $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ was added to the suspension (which immediately became a homogeneous solution). The reaction was left 14 h before adding $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude product was dried over $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}(\sim 2 \mathrm{~g})$ and purified by flash column
chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to provide hydrazone $\mathbf{S 2 . 1}$ as a colorless solid $(0.110 \mathrm{~g}, 0.238 \mathrm{mmol}, 41 \%)$. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6}$ HLPC analysis was used to determine enantiomeric ratios to be $99: 1$ (Chiracel ODH column; flow: $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1 \%$ isopropanol: $n$-hexane; $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; minor enantiomer $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ $=13.65 \mathrm{~min}$, major enantiomer $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}=21.34 \mathrm{~min}\right)$.
( $\boldsymbol{E}$ )-6,10-dimethyl-5,9-undecadien-1-yne (2.38): The procedure for preparation of $\mathbf{2 . 3 8}$
 was a modification from the literature. ${ }^{33}$ 1-Trimethylsilylpropyne ( $2.96 \mathrm{~g}, 26.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in THF ( 100 mL ) and cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . n-\mathrm{BuLi}(30.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 11.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.5 \mathrm{M}$ in hexanes) was added slowly, and the reaction was then warmed to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h . The reaction was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and geranyl chloride ( $3.80 \mathrm{~g}, 22.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The reaction was allowed to warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 16 h . The reaction vessel was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and TBAF ( $28.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 28.6 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was then added. The reaction was allowed to warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before diluting with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with hexanes ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ); and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( 50 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oil was then purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes) to provide dieneyne $\mathbf{2 . 3 8}$ as a clear oil ( $2.85 \mathrm{~g}, 16.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%$ ). Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{33}$
( $\boldsymbol{E}$ )-7,11-dimethyl-6,10-dodecadien-2-yne (2.17): Dieneyne 2.38 ( $2.17 \mathrm{~g}, 12.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ )

was dissolved in THF ( 120 mL ) and cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . n-\mathrm{BuLi}$ ( $18.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 7.10 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.5 \mathrm{M}$ in hexanes) was added slowly to the reaction, which was then warmed to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 min , the reaction was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and methyl iodide ( $8.73 \mathrm{~g}, 61.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The reaction was then allowed to warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 2 h . The reaction was quenched with saturated aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with hexanes ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( 50 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes) to provide dieneyne $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ as a clear oil ( 1.99 g , $10.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 85 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.16(\mathrm{dt}, J=6.6,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09(\mathrm{tt}, J$ $=6.9,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.68(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 136.41,131.48,124.40,123.09,79.36,75.51,39.80,27.91,26.79,25.82,19.35,17.81$, 16.20, 3.62; IR (thin film) 2966, 2918, 2855, 1443, $1377 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{NH}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)$ 208.2065, observed 208.2067.
rac-(3aS,7aS,E)-1-(1-chloroethylidene)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-indene (2.39) and
rac-(4aS,8aS)-7-chloro-4,4,8,8a-tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,8aoctahydronaphthalene (2.40): (Procedure for entry 3 from Table 2.1) To a solution of
 $o, o$ '-dichloro-( $R$ )-BINOL $\mathbf{2 . 2 5}^{34}(0.357 \mathrm{~g}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(6.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}(1.25 \mathrm{mmol}$, $1.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) dropwise. After 15 min , a solution of dieneyne 2.17 ( 0.475 g , 2.49 mmol ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 6.5 mL ) cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added via cannula to the reaction. Upon full consumption of dieneyne 2.17 (monitored by TLC), saturated aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the reaction warmed to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting residue was concentrated over $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}(\sim 1 \mathrm{~g})$ and then purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes) to provide an inseparable mixture of vinyl chlorides 2.39 and $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ as a clear oil $(0.310 \mathrm{~g}, 1.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%)$ in a 1.5:1 ratio by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. Diagnostic peaks for 5-exo product 2.39 on ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.13$ (app $\mathrm{t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; diagnostic peaks for 5-exo product $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ on ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 147.41, 120.84. Diagnostic peaks for 6-endo product $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ on ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.72(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; diagnostic peaks for 6-endo product 2.40 on ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 139.28, 127.12; IR (thin film) 2949, 2866, 1665, 1458, $1378 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{Cl}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right) 226.1488$, observed 226.1497.
(3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-one (2.1): A mixture of vinyl

chlorides $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}(0.303 \mathrm{~g}, 1.42 \mathrm{mmol})$ were dissolved in acetone $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ozone was passed through the solution until TLC analysis confirmed complete consumption of starting material. The solution was sparged with $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and then concentrated over $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}(\sim 1 \mathrm{~g})$ in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes to $15 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to provide ketone 2.1 as a clear oil ( $91 \mathrm{mg}, 0.50 \mathrm{mmol}$, $38 \%)$. Spectral data was consistent with reported values. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Ee}$ was determined to be $-18 \%$ by chiral HPLC of corresponding hydrazone $\mathbf{S 2 . 1}$. ${ }^{6}$

### 2.6 References and Notes
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## Chapter 3: Total Synthesis of (-)-Chromodorolide B

### 3.1 Radical-Mediated Formal [3+2] Cycloaddition Approach

The initial synthetic approach to the chromodorolides was complicated by the diastereoselectivity of alkene dihydroxylation of the cis-oxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone model system (Section 1.5). The phosphine-promoted [3+2] dipolar cycloaddition efficiently assembled the carbon skeleton requisite for the chromodorolides, but subsequent dihydroxylation revealed that torsional steering effects would likely direct oxidation to occur from the undesired concave face of the cis-oxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone. Attempts to perform a dipolar cycloaddition reaction with analogous substrates possessing this oxygenation (3.1) would likely result in elimination of the $\beta$-alkoxy group to generate enoate 3.4 (Scheme 3.1). As installation of the vicinal diols would not be feasible before or after the dipolar cycloaddition, access to the chromodorolides required an alternative approach that would tolerate the additional oxygenation.

## Scheme 3.1. Consideration of Complex [3+2] Dipolar Cycloaddition.



### 3.1.1 Retrosynthesis using a Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition

Prior to efforts developing a revised approach toward the chromodorolides, the Overman group demonstrated that visible-light photoredox catalysis could facilitate
construction of sterically congested C-C bonds. Dr. Martin Schnermann devised a strategy wherein conjugate addition of a tertiary radical, generated by photoredox-mediated fragmentation of an ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide, ${ }^{1}$ to a complex cyclopentenone was critical in forging vicinal quaternary and tertiary stereocenters towards completion of (-)-aplyviolene (Section 1.2.3.2). ${ }^{2}$ Separate methods using tertiary alcohols in a related fragmentation of oxalate esters/acids as radical precursors were subsequently developed by our group and others. ${ }^{3}$

Applying related methodology in a biological context, Dr. Michelle Garnsey focused on utilizing ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides in radical conjugate additions to butenolide acceptor 3.7 to synthesize truncated analogues of rearranged spongian diterpenes. ${ }^{4}$ Her synthetic work was part of a collaborative effort ${ }^{5}$ to study the Golgi-modifying properties of molecules of this type (Section 1.3). Of particular note, a photoredox reaction by Dr. Garnsey between ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.5 and butenolide 3.7 produced cisoxabicyclo[3.3.0] octenone 3.9 in 55\% yield (Scheme 3.2). The intermediate $\alpha$-acyl radical 3.8, formed from addition of tertiary radical 3.6 to butenolide 3.7, underwent 5-exo cyclization on the tethered alkyne prior to hydrogen atom abstraction. This radical cascade constructed the two analogous bonds that the [3+2] dipolar cycloaddition formed in the original strategy toward the chromodorolides. Because of the thermodynamic preference for a carbon-centered radical over an oxygen-centered radical (Figure 3.1), I speculated that a similar radical cascade with a highly oxygenated substrate could be developed to circumvent the issues encountered in the previous strategy and allow access to the chromodorolides.

## Scheme 3.2. Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition.


A)
B)


Figure 3.1. Differences between $\alpha$-Oxy Radicals and Anions.

In light of Dr. Garnsey's discovery, I was interested in applying this bimolecular radical addition/cyclization cascade, or formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition, to the synthesis of the chromodorolides. In a retrosynthetic sense (Scheme 3.3), both bridged and fused chromodorolides would arise from site-selective oxocarbenium ion formation and trapping of common precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ (Section 1.4). This acid would be formed by a series of redox manipulations of tert-butyldimethylsilyl ether 3.11, ${ }^{6}$ the product of late-stage coupling between hydrindanone $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ (Chapter 2) and highly oxidized fragment 3.13. The cisoxabicyclo[3.3.0]octenone of $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ would be formed from a formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition between ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ and chiral, nonracemic butenolide 3.2 Under visible-light photoredox conditions, $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ would undergo reductive decomposition to trisubstituted acetonide radical 3.15. ${ }^{1}$ This radical would then undergo conjugate
addition to butenolide 3.2 to yield $\alpha$-acyl radical intermediate 3.14. Cyclization of $\mathbf{3 . 1 4}$ with the tethered alkyne followed by hydrogen atom abstraction would give alkene 3.13, constructing three contiguous stereocenters and two $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds in the radical cascade.

Scheme 3.3. Retrosynthetic Analysis from the Chromodorolides Using Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition.


Critical to the success of this approach would be the diastereoselectivity obtained during the formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition. Intermediate 3.14 would be formed by conjugate addition generating vicinal stereocenters, the fully substituted carbon (C12) and the tertiary stereocenter at C 13 ( $\beta$-position of butenolide 3.2). The C13 stereocenter was expected to form stereoselectively by addition of the trisubstituted radical anti to the $\gamma$ substituent of the butenolide. ${ }^{3}$ However, it was unclear at the outset whether addition of radical 3.15 to butenolide 3.2 would occur from the requisite face syn to the tethered alkyne to set the desired C12 stereochemistry. Approach from the same face of the alkyne would be sterically disfavored; but to my knowledge, ${ }^{7}$ diastereoselective couplings of trisubstituted acetonide radicals were without precedent. Thus, I believed this ambitious
approach to be an opportunity to investigate a radical addition/cyclization strategy and showcase photoredox catalysis in a complex setting.

### 3.1.2 Synthesis of Radical Precursor 3.16

Radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ proved more challenging to synthesize than anticipated. Initial efforts toward radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ by alkylation of desymmetrized tartrate derivative $\mathbf{3 . 1 7}$ were unsuccessful (Scheme 3.4A). Instead, an alternate approach was taken using known alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 2 3},{ }^{8}$ which can be prepared in a reported five-step sequence from $L$-arabinose (Scheme 3.4 B ). In this route, $L$-arabinose underwent selective acetonide formation followed by oxidative cleavage and hydrolysis to give bicyclic lactol $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ as an anomeric mixture. Base-promoted aldol reaction of lactol $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ with paraformaldehyde (via aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ ) provided primary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ as a mixture of anomers. Selective silyl protection of the primary alcohol and ring-opening Wittig olefination afforded known alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}^{8}$ in $20 \%$ overall yield from $L$-arabinose. Oxidation of $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}$ to the corresponding aldehyde occurred smoothly, but purification of the aldehyde proved challenging. ${ }^{9}$ Instead, exposure the crude aldehyde directly to $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ and dimethyl (1-diazo-2-oxopropyl)phosphonate ${ }^{10}(\mathbf{3 . 2 4})$ in MeOH provided eneyne 3.25 in $71 \%$ yield over the two steps. ${ }^{11}$ Eneyne $\mathbf{3 . 2 5}$ then underwent chemoselective ozonolytic cleavage of the alkene, which was directly oxidized under Pinnick-Lindgren conditions to acid 3.26. Coupling $N$-hydroxyphthalimide to acid $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ using Steglich conditions ${ }^{12}$ then provided radical cascade precursor ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ in ten steps from $L$-arabinose.

Scheme 3.4. Synthetic Approaches to ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.16.
A)

B)




### 3.1.3 Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition

With sufficient quantities of radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ in hand, the photoredoxcatalyzed formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition was then examined. Detailed mechanistic studies of the photoredox-catalyzed decarboxylation mechanism will not be discussed here as they were thoroughly investigated by Dr. Gerald Pratsch and Greg Lackner in previous studies. ${ }^{13}$ Under standard photoredox conditions, ${ }^{1,13}$ ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ underwent decarboxylative radical coupling and cyclization with enantiopure butenolide 3.27 ${ }^{14}$ to provide tricyclic lactone $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ in $43 \%$ yield. ${ }^{15}$ The only other isolated product was
alkyne $\mathbf{3 . 2 9}$ in $11 \%$ yield, with NOE data supporting orientation of the lactone fragment anti to the alkyne on the acetonide.

## Equation 3.1



Shown in Scheme 3.5, the proposed mechanism begins with reductive fragmentation of radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ to trisubstituted acetonide radical 3.15. Conjugate addition of $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ to butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 2 7}$ from the acetonide face syn to the alkyne (blue arrows) forms the fully substituted C12 stereocenter as desired. Resulting $\alpha$-acyl radical $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ then undergoes 5-exo cyclization onto the pendant alkyne. The resulting vinyl radical $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$ abstracts a hydrogen atom to yield desired product 3.28. Byproduct $\mathbf{3 . 2 9}$ arises from addition of radical $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 2 7}$ from the acetonide face anti to the alkyne (red arrows), affording the undesired configuration at C 12 in 3.32. Resulting $\alpha$-acyl radical $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ is not positioned to cyclize onto the tethered alkyne. Instead, the radical is quenched either by hydrogen atom abstraction or SET reduction/protonation to give minor product 3.29. The origin for the observed C12 diastereoselectivity favoring syn addition of the trisubstituted radical ( $\sim 4: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) was unclear; ${ }^{16}$ but at the time, effort was directed towards optimization of the formal [3+2] radical cycloaddition.

Scheme 3.5. Proposed Mechanism to Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition Products.


Having now verified the success of this key step, I aimed to increase the yield of radical cycloadduct 3.28. Shown in Table 3.1, different equivalents of the coupling partners were examined (entries 1-3). Employing an excess butenolide 3.27 was preferred (entry 1) to an excess of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ (entry 2 ), as the radical precursor was the more valuable starting material. Adding greater than 1.5 equiv of acceptor 3.27 was detrimental to product formation (entries 4 and 5). Changing the additives such as ( $i-$ $\mathrm{Pr})_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ (entry 6) or solvents (entries 7-9) did not increase the yield of desired product 3.28. On a larger scale (entry 10), $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ was consistently isolated in $38 \%$ yield. Despite accounting for only $50 \%$ of the mass balance, access to sufficient quantities of $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ allowed for investigation of its late-stage coupling to the hydrindane fragment.

Table 3.1. Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition Optimization.

${ }^{1}$ NMR yields in parentheses were taken with an internal standard of ethylene glycol. ${ }^{2}$ Yield based on butenolide 3.27 as limiting reagent. ${ }^{3}$ 1-Benzyl-1,4-dihydronicotinamide.

### 3.1.4 Attempted Coupling of Hydrophobic and Hydrophilic Fragments

To connect the hydrophobic fragment to the radical cycloadduct 3.28, hydrindanone 3.12 ${ }^{17}$ was transformed into several potential coupling precursors (Scheme 3.6). These coupling precursors were previously employed for uniting the hydrindane subunit to oxygenated fragments in the total syntheses of (+)-norrisolide ${ }^{18}$ (Scheme 3.7). Hydrindanone $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ was converted to vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ in a two-step sequence in $78 \%$ yield by hydrazone formation and iodination in the presence of 1,1,3,3-tetramethylguanidine (TMG). ${ }^{19}$ Vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ could then act as a cross-coupling partner by oxidative addition or as a nucleophile after lithium-halogen exchange. Alternative coupling precursor, such
as vinyl triflate $\mathbf{3 . 3 3}$ and 2,4,6-triisopropylbenzenesulfonyl (trisyl) hydrazone 3.34, were also prepared from ketone 3.12.

Scheme 3.6. Synthesis of Hydrindane Coupling Precursors.


Scheme 3.7. Previous Examples of Coupling Derivatives 3.32, 3.33, and 3.34.


Union of the two fragments also required elaboration of radical cascade product
3.28 (Scheme 3.8). The exo methylene group of $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ was excised by ozonolysis, which
gave $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ in $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ yield. Attempts to form the vinyl triflate $\mathbf{3 . 4 2}$ from $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ using a variety of bases (e.g., NaH, LHMDS or KHMDS) and triflating reagents ( $N$-phenylbis(trifluoromethanesulfonimide) or N -(5-chloro-2pyridyl)bis(trifluoromethanesulfonimide) ${ }^{20}$ ) were unsuccessful. It was unclear whether deprotonation of the $\beta$-ketoester or $O$-triflation was inefficient as vinyl triflate 3.42 was never observed. Starting material 3.41 was the only readily characterized compound in the reaction mixtures. Deprotonation of this cis-bicyclo[3.3.0]octanone to form bridgehead enolates may be particularly difficult despite adjacent carbonyl groups for two reasons: 1) poor orbital overlap of the $\alpha$-C-H $\sigma$-bond and carbonyl $\pi$-bonds would render the $\alpha$-proton relatively non-acidic; and 2) deprotonation to the enolate would generate an additional $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ carbon in the highly functionalized and considerably strained central cyclopentane. Of note, deprotonation and $O$-alkylation of a similar system was previously reported. ${ }^{21}$

Scheme 3.8. Formation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-Ketolactone 3.41 and Failed Triflation.


Unable to functionalize $\beta$-ketolactone 3.41, I then investigated its potential as an electrophile for 1,2-alkylation. Both pronucleophiles $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 3 4}$ would generate the same vinyl lithium intermediate (3.43) when treated with $n$-butyllithium. Subsequent 1,2addition of this organolithium intermediate to $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ would give tertiary alcohol 3.44 (Scheme 3.9). Under no conditions, including the use of additives such as $\mathrm{CeCl}_{3},{ }^{22}$ was a coupled product observed using either pronucleophiles $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ or $\mathbf{3 . 3 4}$. Analysis of crude reaction mixtures provided little insight, ${ }^{23}$ as $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ was the sole identifiable compound. Other synthetic manipulations of $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ were considered, but
this route was ultimately abandoned in favor of one that would bypass this challenging coupling between two sterically congested fragments ( $\mathbf{3 . 4 3}$ bears a vicinal quaternary carbon and ketone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ is embedded within a complex tricyclic framework).

Scheme 3.9. Failed 1,2-Alkylation with Vinyl Iodide 3.32 and Trisyl Hydrazone 3.34.


### 3.2 Radical Addition/Cyclization/Fragmentation Cascade

Formation of radical cycloaddition product $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ was an encouraging step toward completion of the chromodorolides. However, the ten-step synthesis of ( N acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}$ was inefficient, requiring alkyne homologation and later oxidative removal of that carbon unit to access $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ (Scheme 3.10). This inefficiency, along with the inability to couple $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$, led me to propose the following route to the chromodorolides.

Scheme 3.10. Summary of the Formal [3+2] Radical Cycloaddition Route.


### 3.2.1 Revised Retrosynthesis of the Chromodorolides

Centered on developing a more efficient route, a revised retrosynthesis was proposed from the fused and bridged chromodorolides, which would arise from site-
selective oxocarbenium ion formation and trapping of common precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ (Scheme 3.11). Acid $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ would be formed from several redox and protecting group manipulations of lactone 3.45. The oxygenated framework of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 5}$ would then be constructed from a related radical addition/cyclization cascade with butenolide acceptor 3.2, wherein $\alpha$-acyl radical intermediate $\mathbf{3 . 4 6}$ would undergo a 5-exo cyclization onto a tethered alkylidene hydrindane subunit. The desired C8 stereochemistry was hypothesized to be favored in the 5-exo cyclization via a conformation $\mathbf{3 . 4 6}$, which minimizes destabilizing allylic $\mathrm{A}^{1,3}$ interactions. The C12 and C13 stereocenters would be set in analogous fashion to the previous alkyne radical $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ in that addition of the trisubstituted acetonide radical to butenolide 3.2 would occur syn to the hydrindane fragment and anti to the butenolide's $\gamma$ methoxy substituent (Section 3.1.3). The initial trisubstituted acetonide radical for the cascade would be generated from ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.47, which would be assembled from hydrindanone $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ and tartrate derivative 3.48.

Scheme 3.11. Revised Retrosynthesis of the Chromodorolides.






### 3.2.2 Synthesis of Tartrate-Derived Aldehyde 3.55

I aimed to access diester $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ from inexpensive and enantiopure $L$-dimethyl tartrate.
This route required a desymmetrizing alkylation of dimethyl 2,3-O-isopropylidene- $L$ tartrate (3.49). Desymmetrizing alkylations and aldol reactions with tartrate-based nucleophiles were previously examined by Seebach ${ }^{24}$ and Evans. ${ }^{25}$ Both groups reported these derivatives to be competent in enolate-mediated transformations (Scheme 3.12A and B). Crich later applied Seebach's methodology for alkylation of tartrate derivative $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$
with benzyloxymethyl chloride (BOM-Cl), ${ }^{26}$ a useful electrophile for my synthetic efforts (Scheme 3.12C).

Scheme 3.12. Previous Examples of Tartrate Derivative Desymmetrizing Alkylations/Aldol Reactions.
A)

B)

C)


Applying Crich's procedure to the tartrate-based acetonide 3.49, LDA-mediated alkylation with BOM-Cl afforded benzyl ether 3.48 in $46 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.13). The modest yield for this step was mitigated by the value of formally alkylating and benzylating a formaldehyde equivalent in one step as a single diastereomer and enantiomer. Subsequent reduction of the less hindered ester of $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ using Crich's procedure ${ }^{19}$ afforded alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ in modest yield. ${ }^{27}$ Oxidation of $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ to aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ was achieved by a number of methods, but purification of this aldehyde proved challenging. However, use of DessMartin periodinane (DMP) and filtration with hexanes ${ }^{28}$ afforded aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ with trace impurities (<5\%). Notably, decomposition was observed within 24 h regardless of storage conditions, ${ }^{29}$ and the compound was carried forward immediately to minimize degradation. ${ }^{30}$ This route proved to be a concise and scalable route to aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$, which allowed examination of the coupling between $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ and hydrindanone 3.12

Scheme 3.13. Synthesis of Aldehyde 3.55.


### 3.2.3 Coupling of Hydrindane Fragment to Aldehyde 3.55

With access to several hydrindane-based nucleophilic precursors (Section 3.1.4), early screening revealed that vinyl anions generated from vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ or trisyl hydrazone 3.34 were too reactive for coupling to sensitive aldehyde 3.55. ${ }^{31}$ Desiring a milder method to couple the two fragments, Nozaki-Hiyama-Kishi (NHK) protocols were examined, which Theodorakis previously employed to couple vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ to monocyclic aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ in $71 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.14A). ${ }^{32}$ Theodorakis found that analogous attempts to couple $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ to a more hindered bicyclic aldehyde (3.58) resulted in low conversion to the desired coupling product 3.59 (Scheme 3.14B). ${ }^{18 \mathrm{~b}}$ Employing similar NHK coupling conditions between vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ with aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ proved inefficient (Scheme 3.14C), ${ }^{33}$ likely because of fragments' steric congestion and the instability of aldehyde 3.55. A survey of the literature reaffirmed that NHK couplings between hindered aldehydes and/or hindered nucleophiles are challenging because of the attenuated nucleophilicity of organochromium compounds. ${ }^{34}$

## Scheme 3.14. NHK Couplings of Vinyl Iodide 3.32.

A)

3.32

(71\%)
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C)

$(15-36 \%, \sim 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \quad 3.60$

To counteract the low reactivity of organochromium reagents, ligands for chromium have been developed over the last two decades to enhance reactivity and induce asymmetry in NHK couplings to aldehydes (Figure 3.2). ${ }^{35}$ Specifically, oxazoline ligand $(R)-3.62$ was employed to accelerate an NHK coupling on process scale by Eisai Co. in the synthesis of eribulin. ${ }^{36}$ Employing ligand ( $R$ )-3.62 in an NHK coupling between vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ (1.6 equiv) and aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ (1.0 equiv) afforded allylic alcohol ( $R$ )- $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ as a single alcohol diastereomer in $28 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.15A). ${ }^{37}$ Identical reaction conditions with enantiomer $(S)$-ligand $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ inverted diastereoselectivity favoring epimeric ( $S$ )-alcohol 3.65 (4:1 dr, Scheme 3.15B).




Figure 3.2. Representative Ligands Developed for Asymmetric NHK Couplings.

## Scheme 3.15. Ligand-Accelerated NHK Coupling of Vinyl Iodide 3.32 and Aldehyde 3.55.


(B)

(18\%, 1:4 3.64:3.65)
With high diastereoselectivity observed with oxazoline $(R)-\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$, I then optimized the ligand-accelerated NHK coupling. Because of the aldehyde's proclivity to decompose, an excess of aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ (1.6 equiv) ${ }^{38}$ was used relative to vinyl iodide 3.32, which afforded allylic alcohol 3.64 in $43 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.16, entry 1). As the reaction scale increased from 0.35 mmol to 2.74 mmol (entry 4), the yield of allylic alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ steadily increased. A minor byproduct was observed in large scale reactions, which was later identified as lactone 3.66. ${ }^{39}$ This compound arose from epimerization of aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ to 3.67 followed by NHK coupling and lactonization. This was a surprising result as organochromium reagents are typically considered nonbasic nucleophiles. ${ }^{34}$ As lactone 3.66 was easily separated, no significant efforts were taken to prevent in situ epimerization; ${ }^{40}$ and allylic alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ was carried forward.

## Scheme 3.16. Optimized Ligand-Accelerated NHK Coupling of Vinyl Iodide 3.32 and Aldehyde 3.55.



### 3.2.4 Alkene Transposition/Functionalization to Radical Precursor

Having forged all $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds required for the radical cascade precursor, the next challenge was transposition of the alkene (Equation 3.2) to the requisite position (3.68) for the 5-exo cyclization event in the addition/cyclization cascade. To accomplish this transformation, palladium-catalyzed carbonate reductions ${ }^{41}$ and reductive retro ene reactions using $o$-nitrobenzenesulfonylhydrazine $(\mathrm{NBSH})^{42}$ were the most precedented methods. The latter with NBSH was preferable as it facilitates a stereospecific reductive transposition. ${ }^{43}$ Unfortunately, efforts to induce reductive transposition of allylic alcohol 3.64 with this reagent proved ineffective, only affording recovered starting material. ${ }^{44}$

## Equation 3.2



I turned my attention to a [3,3]-sigmatropic rearrangement, as a similar transformation with hydrindene $\mathbf{3 . 6 9}$ to allylic thiocarbonate $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$ had been reported (Scheme 3.17). In light of the difficulties attempting the Mitsunobu/retro ene sequence with NBSH, I hoped that acylation of $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ would overcome the secondary alcohol's hindered nature. To facilitate thioacylation and rearrangement with chlorothionoformate $\mathbf{3 . 7 0}$, a variety of conditions were screened with alcohol 3.64. Typical bases for this transformation (pyridine, imidazole) did not facilitate thioacylation of the hindered allylic alcohol, even at refluxing temperatures. Stronger bases such as LiHMDS and NaHMDS were also unsuccessful in thioacylation with chlorothionoformate 3.70. However, treatment of alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ with KHMDS at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by addition of $\mathbf{3 . 7 0}$ resulted in thioacylation and spontaneous [3,3]-sigmatropic rearrangement upon warming to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to give allylic thiocarbonate $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ as a single stereoisomer with $E$ configuration (Scheme 3.18). ${ }^{45}$

## Scheme 3.17. Previous Sigmatropic Rearrangement to Allylic Thiocarbonate 3.72.



Scheme 3.18. Rearrangement of Allylic Alcohol 3.64 and Attempted Saponification to Acid 3.74.


With the alkene transposed, installation of the ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide functionality was attempted via two-step saponification and DCC coupling. I presumed selective hydrolysis of the methyl ester in the presence of a thiocarbonate would be feasible because of the greater electrophilicity of the ester. Unfortunately, the methyl ester of thiocarbonate $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ could not be selectively cleaved to acid $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ under a variety of conditions. Classical hydroxide conditions resulted in complex mixtures, while $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ methods ${ }^{46}$ resulted in uncontrolled allylic displacement of the thiocarbonate of 3.73. Other nonbasic methods ${ }^{47}$ also failed to provide acid 3.74.

In an effort to circumvent this selectivity issue, the order of alkene transposition and ester hydrolysis was reversed. Hydrolysis of allylic alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ and amide coupling yielded ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$, which proved sensitive to column chromatography (Scheme 3.19). ${ }^{48}$ Subsequent treatment of $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$ with KHMDS in the presence of phenyl chlorothionoformate 3.70 at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in immediate decomposition of the ( N acyloxy)phthalimide functionality. ${ }^{49}$ Switching to LHMDS or NaHMDS did not decompose ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.75, but no thioacylation or rearrangement was observed. ${ }^{50}$ The ineffectiveness of these bases presumably arose from the less ionic nature of the sodium and lithium counterions. Screening other potassium bases ( $\mathrm{KOt} t$-Bu, KDA, trityl potassium, $\mathrm{TMSCH}_{2} \mathrm{~K},{ }^{51}$ potassium 1,1,3,3-tetramethyl-1,3-diphenyldisilazane ${ }^{52}$ ) uniformly led to decomposition of the ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide functionality. Unable to selectively activate the hindered alcohol of $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$ for acylation with chlorothionoformate 3.70, a more reactive electrophile to facilitate alkene transposition was then pursued.

Scheme 3.19. Attempted Alternate Route to Access Radical Precursor 3.76.


Among the most reactive reagents mediating allylic rearrangements are halogensubstituted thionyl compounds which transform allylic alcohols to allylic halides. While the mechanism of these rearrangements varies depending on substrate and reaction conditions, ${ }^{53}$ other research groups successfully transposed allylic alcohols with thionyl bromide, ${ }^{54}$ thionyl chloride, ${ }^{55}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2} / \mathrm{PPh}_{3} .{ }^{56} \mathrm{~A}$ survey of conditions found $\mathrm{Br}_{2} / \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{PBr}_{3}$ to be suitably reactive with alcohol 3.75 to transpose the alkene and give allylic bromide 3.77; however, low conversion and unidentified byproducts were observed (Scheme 3.20A). When thionyl bromide was employed at $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C},{ }^{54}$ a suprafacial rearrangement occurred to deliver the desired allylic bromide 3.77 in $90 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.20B). The analogous reaction with thionyl chloride was attempted in the hope that an allylic chloride would be less photolabile in the photoredox cascade. ${ }^{57}$ Rearrangement to allylic chloride 3.78 occurred smoothly in $62 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.20). ${ }^{58,59}$ With radical precursor 3.78 in hand, the key radical cascade reaction was investigated.

Scheme 3.20. Transposition Reactions of Allylic Alcohol 3.75 to Allylic Halides.

B) $3.75 \xrightarrow[(90 \%)]{\substack{\mathrm{SOBr}_{2}, \text { pyridine } \\ \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O},-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}} 3.77$
C)
3.75


### 3.2.5 Radical Addition/Cyclization/Fragmentation Cascade

### 3.2.5.1 Proposed Mechanism of ACF Cascade

Radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ differed from the proposed radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 4 7}$ in the revised retrosynthesis (Scheme 3.11) with the addition of an allylic chloride. However, this halogen was anticipated to have a beneficial role in the radical cascade. Scheme 3.21 highlights the proposed reaction pathway of radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ in the cascade sequence to yield the desired product 3.82. Allylic chloride 3.78, under reductive photoredox conditions, would undergo loss of phthalimide anion and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ to generate trisubstituted acetonide radical 3.79. Diastereoselective conjugate addition of radical $\mathbf{3 . 7 9}$ to chiral butenolide 3.2 from the face syn to the hydrindane fragment would construct the first $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond and two stereocenters (C12 and C13) to provide $\alpha$-acyl radical 3.80. Subsequent 5exo cyclization of $\alpha$-acyl radical $\mathbf{3 . 8 0}$ onto the trisubstituted alkene would forge the second
$\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond and two additional stereocenters ( C 8 and C 14 ). The resulting tertiary radical 3.81, adjacent to the chloride, would undergo $\beta$-fragmentation of the homolytically weak $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Cl} \sigma$-bond ${ }^{60}$ to form a double bond. Extrusion of the chloride radical would quench the cascade and pentacyclic product 3.82. For the previously proposed radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 4 7}$ lacking an allylic chloride, a bimolecular termination of the tertiary radical by hydrogen atom abstraction would be required to quench the cascade. Presence of the chloride atom was hoped to result in rapid intramolecular termination by $\beta$-fragmentation, preventing potential deleterious reaction pathways. This overall sequence can be described as an addition/cyclization/fragmentation (ACF) cascade.

Scheme 3.21. Proposed Mechanism for ACF Cascade with Allylic Chloride 3.78.


### 3.2.5.2 Initial ACF Cascade Results and Product Identification

Exposure of allylic chloride $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ to standard reductive photoredox conditions ${ }^{13}$ with enantiopure butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 2 7}$ generated ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 3}$ as the major product along
with several unidentified minor products (Equation 3.3). Upon detailed NMR analysis, NOE data confirmed ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 3}$ to be the undesired C 8 epimer.

## Equation 3.3




As identification of the minor products proved difficult with menthol butenolide 3.27, the methoxy variant (3.84) was then employed in the reaction to simplify analysis and purification of the products. Upon exposure of $(R)$-methoxy butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 8 4}^{61}$ to photoredox conditions with radical precursor 3.78, ACF C8 epimer $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ was again the major product (35\%) along with desired ACF product 3.86 (20\%) and prematurely quenched product 3.87 (29\%) as minor products (Equation 3.4). A fourth minor product, 3.88 ( $11 \%$ ), was later assigned as the product of radical addition from the undesired face of the acetonide radical anti to the hydrindane fragment (3.88). ${ }^{62}$

## Equation 3.4



Scheme 3.22 highlights the complexity of the ACF cascade with reaction pathways to each of these observed products, which together typically account for $>80 \%$ of the mass
balance. The product distribution from Equation 3.4 revealed that the initial conjugate addition of the trisubstituted acetonide radical (3.79) to the butenolide occurred with high diastereoselectivity ( $\sim 7: 1$ ) favoring the desired but more hindered face syn to the hydrindane. The product distribution also indicated two key areas for optimization: 1) preventing premature quenching of $\alpha$-acyl radical 3.89 to permit 5-exo cyclization; and 2) finding conditions/substrates to favor 5-exo cyclization giving the desired C 8 stereochemistry.

Scheme 3.22. Reaction Pathways to Observed Products in ACF Cascade.




### 3.2.5.3 Optimization to Prolong Radical Lifetime

The $29 \%$ yield of prematurely quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$ revealed that intramolecular 5-exo cyclization onto the tethered alkene was kinetically competitive with intermolecular radical quenching of the $\alpha$-acyl radical. Prevention of premature radical quenching was challenging, as the $\alpha$-acyl radical was quenched by both SET reduction/enolate protonation and direct hydrogen atom abstraction under the standard photoredox conditions (Scheme 3.23). ${ }^{13}$ Therefore, prolonging the lifetime of $\alpha$-acyl radical $\mathbf{3 . 8 9}$ in the ACF cascade would require addressing both of these pathways.

## Scheme 3.23. Pathways to Quenching $\alpha$-Acyl Radical Under Reductive Photoredox Conditions.



In considering attenuation of both pathways, the roles of diisopropylethylamine (DIPEA) and diethyl 1,4-dihydro-2,6-dimethyl-3,5-pyridinedicarboxylate (Hantzsch ester) were first considered in the photoredox mechanism. DIPEA promotes SET reduction of the $\alpha$-acyl radical to the corresponding enolate, and Hantzsch ester is a stoichiometric reductant which turns over the catalytic cycle. ${ }^{13}$ As the ACF cascade quenches the radical cascade by $\beta$-fragmentation to release chloride radical, DIPEA should not be mechanistically
required to obtain ACF products $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ or 3.86. Shown in Table 3.2, standard conditions with DIPEA (entry 1) afforded a significant amount of prematurely quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$ ( $29 \%$ ). By removing DIPEA (entry 2), the amount of quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$ diminished from $29 \%$ to $14 \%$ without an increase in the yields of ACF products $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ (52\% combined). The remaining $14 \%$ of quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$ presumably arose from hydrogen atom abstraction from Hantzsch ester. Because of its role in turning over the photocatalyst, ${ }^{13}$ removal of Hantzsch ester was not possible under these conditions. Thus, dilution of the reaction mixture was investigated to slow intermolecular hydrogen atom abstraction (entry 3). The dilution lessened the amount of prematurely quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}(3 \%)$ at the expense of lower yields for ACF products $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ ( $45 \%$ combined). As dilution decreased the combined yield of the ACF products, I then attempted to slow hydrogen atom abstraction with deuterium incorporation into Hanzsch ester. I presumed that employing $\mathrm{d}_{2}$-Hantzsch ester at the 4-position of the dihydropyridine would slow premature deuterium abstraction of the $\alpha$-acyl radical but still allow turnover of the photocatalyst. Use of $d_{2}$-Hantzch ester without DIPEA (entry 4) increased the combined yield of ACF products $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ to $70 \%$ while affording minimal prematurely quenched product 3.87 (with deuterium incorporation at the $\alpha$-position). Lowering the equivalents of $\mathrm{d}_{2}$-Hantzch ester did not further improve the combined yield of the ACF products (entry 5).

Table 3.2. Optimization to Minimize Premature Radical Quenching.


As these photoredox conditions used Hantzsch ester as a stoichoimetric reductant, I also examined redox-neutral processes with the hope of improving the overall yield. Photoredox methodology with carboxylic acids was recently reported by MacMillan ${ }^{63}$ using an iridium photocatalyst which acted as both an oxidant to initiate decarboxylation and a reductant for the $\alpha$-acyl radical following conjugate addition. Because of the dual roles of the iridium photocatalyst, the reaction did not contain a stoichiometric reductant such as Hantzsch ester, which would presumably minimize premature quenching of $\alpha$-acyl radical 3.89. Acid radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 9 8}$ was synthesized by an alternative route from NHK alcohol 3.64, in which thionyl chloride-mediated transposition followed by nonbasic hydrolysis ${ }^{47 \mathrm{~b}}$ afforded the desired acid radical precursor (Scheme 3.24). Exposure of acid 3.98 to butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 8 4}$ under MacMillan's reported photoredox conditions ${ }^{63}$ resulted in minimal formation of prematurely quenched product $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$ (8\%) with ACF products $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ obtained in $51 \%$ combined yield. While this result was promising, I ultimately
settled on optimization of the ACF cascade with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ over acid 3.95 for two reasons: 1) acid $\mathbf{3 . 9 8}$ was found more difficult to obtain in pure form than crystalline ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$; and 2 ) the MacMillan conditions permitted examination of fewer solvents because of the low solubility of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}$.

Scheme 3.24. Synthesis of Acid Radical Precursor 3.98 and ACF Cascade.



### 3.2.5.4 Attempts to Improve Diastereoselectivity of 5-Exo Cyclization

Having now attenuated premature radical quenching, I turned my attention to finding conditions to favor desired ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ over the undesired C8 epimer $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$. I sought to explore temperature, solvent, and structural modifications to improve diastereoselectivity for desired ACF product 3.86 (1.8:1 dr favoring epimeric ACF product 3.85 from Table 3.2, entry 4). Investigations with different enantioenriched butenolide acceptors revealed that decreasing steric bulk at the $\gamma$-position was beneficial for the desired C8 diastereoselectivity (Table 3.3, entries 1-3). In addition, studies of the reaction temperature showed a slight increase in diastereoselectivity at a lower temperature (entries 3-5). Operationally, the photoredox reactions were difficult to cool below room
temperature while still permitting adequate light penetration into the reaction vessel. Therefore, the reactions were run at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ because of ease in screening further conditions.

Table 3.3. Screening Butenolide $\gamma$-Substitution and Temperature.


I then sought to further bias 5-exo cyclization diastereoselectivity by solvent effects. Having performed all previous reactions in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, I surveyed other solvents in hopes of improving the yield and diastereoselectivity (Table 3.4). An examination of five additional solvents did not reveal a meaningful trend in diastereoselectivity. Acetonitrile as the solvent (entry 4) provided the best combination of yield and diastereoselectivity (1.3:1 dr) in the ACF cascade, affording $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ as the minor diastereomer in $28 \%$ yield ( $27 \%$ isolated). To date, these conditions are the highest yielding for desired ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ and have been scaled to 0.2 mmol to access sufficient amounts of material to carry forward in the total synthesis of (-)-chromodorolide B (Section 3.2.6). As epimer $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$ remained the major product, I investigated structural derivation of radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ to potentially bias diastereoselectivity of the 5-exo cyclization.

Table 3.4. Solvent Screen for ACF Cascade.


| Entry | Solvent | Respective Yields by ${ }^{1} \underline{H}$ NMR (with internal standard) | dr 3.85:3.86 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | 45\% : 25\% : 6\% : $10 \%$ | 1.8:1 |
| 2 | DME | 36\% : 23\% : 4\% : 9\% | 1.6:1 |
| 3 | THF | 34\% : $21 \%$ : $5 \%$ : 8\% | 1.6 : 1 |
| 4 | MeCN | 37\% : $28 \%$ : 8\% : $13 \%$ | 1.3 : 1 |
| 5 | MeOH | 24\% : 12\% : 15\% : $12 \%$ | 2.0 : 1 |
| 6 | DMSO | 20\% : 17\% : 17\% : $15 \%$ | 1.2 : 1 |

Proposing impactful structural modifications of $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ to affect the diastereoselectivity of the 5-exo cyclization in the ACF cascade was challenging, as well as developing efficient syntheses for these derivatives. Previously synthesized radical precursor 3.77 containing an allylic bromide (Scheme 3.20) was examined in the ACF cascade, but the alternate halogen had no effect on diastereoselectivity of the 5-exo cyclization. With no working hypothesis for diastereoselectivity, readily accessible derivatives $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 0}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 1}$ were then targeted (Scheme 3.25). Thiophenol radical precursor 3.100 ${ }^{64}$ containing an inverted allylic stereocenter had no effect on the 5-exo diastereoselectivity, whereas ethyl ketal radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 1}$ increased selectivity for the undesired C8 epimer (3.102). With a limited supply of radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ available and no predictive model, I prioritized completion of the total synthesis of the chromodorolides with the intent of returning to this challenge at a later juncture.

Scheme 3.25. Synthesis and Coupling of Structurally Modified Radical Precursors 3.100 and 3.101.
A)


B)



### 3.2.6 Completion of the Total Synthesis of (-)-Chromodorolide B

With access to small quantities of ACF product 3.86, I targeted common acid precursor 3.10, which required acetonide deprotection of ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ at this stage. ${ }^{65}$ Numerous conditions ${ }^{66,67}$ for acetonide deprotection were investigated with epimeric ACF product 3.85, but enal formation from lactone opening (3.105, Equation 3.5) or decomposition were consistently observed. After significant effort exploring conditions for
selective acetonide deprotection, the most useful conditions were found to be a $1: 1: 1$ mixture of $\mathrm{MeOH} / 4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl} /$ dioxanes at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ which unreliably provided diol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 4}$ in 30$40 \%$ yield. Because of low and irreproducible yields, acetonide deprotection was postponed to later in the sequence when formation of enal $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 5}$ would be disfavored.

Equation 3.5


In delaying acetonide deprotection, ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ was instead exposed to DIBAL-H and trapped in situ with acetic anhydride to provide diacetal $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 6}$ in $82 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.26). This diacetal was isolated as a single diastereomer, with NOE correlations supporting hydride delivery from the concave face of the bicyclic motif. The contrasteric hydride delivery may have arisen from unanticipated directing effects by the benzyl ether. ${ }^{68}$ I then attempted concurrent alkene hydrogenation and debenzylation of diacetal 3.106, which were unsuccessful in providing reduced alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 7}$ in a single step. ${ }^{69}$ Rather, a two-step process was required wherein debenzylation under transfer hydrogenation conditions, ${ }^{68,70}$ followed by platinum-mediated hydrogenation, afforded saturated alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 7}$ in $83 \%$ yield over two steps. Alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 7}$ was then oxidized to acid $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 8}$ over two steps using DMP and a Pinnick-Lindgren oxidation. ${ }^{71,72}$ At this stage, removal of the acetonide on $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 8}$ was attempted with the anticipation that the carboxylic acid would thermodynamically favor equilibration to lactol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 9}$ over decomposition to the enal (e.g. 3.105). Exposure to $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl} / \mathrm{THF}$ for 72 hours provided a $1.6: 1$ anomeric mixture of desired lactol 3.109. ${ }^{73,74}$ Treatment of this mixture with acetic anhydride and pyridine
converged the anomers to a single triacetylated product, (-)-chromorodolide B (3.110), which was isolated in $49 \%$ yield from alcohol 3.107. ${ }^{75}$ Spectroscopic data of the synthetic compound correlated closely with reported values of the natural product. ${ }^{76}$ Additionally, recrystallization of $\mathbf{3 . 1 1 0}$ afforded single crystals which allowed for the first X-ray structure of a fused chromodorolide to be obtained (Figure 3.3). ${ }^{77}$ This unambiguously verified the constitution and absolute configuration of the natural product.

Scheme 3.26. Late-Stage Sequence Transforming ACF Product 3.86 to (-)Chromodorolide B.




Figure 3.3. Single Crystal X-Ray Image of (-)-Chromodorolide B.

### 3.3 Experimental Section

### 3.3.1 General Experimental Details

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of nitrogen or argon. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether, toluene, benzene, dichloromethane, methanol (MeOH), pyridine, DIPEA, and triethylamine were dried by passage through activated alumina. Benzyloxymethyl chloride (BOM-Cl) distilled under Ar from CaH directly before use. 1,1,3,3-Tetramethylguanidine was distilled under Ar from barium oxide directly before use. Thionyl chloride was distilled from quinoline under Ar. All other commercial reagents were used as received unless otherwise noted. Hantzsch ester ${ }^{78}$ and its 4-dideutero derivative ${ }^{79}$ were prepared according to literature procedures. All other commercial reagents were used as received unless otherwise noted. Reaction temperatures were controlled using a temperature modulator, and unless stated otherwise, reactions were performed at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (rt, approximately $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with silica gel 60 F254 pre-coated plates, ( 0.25 mm ) and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or by $p$-anisaldehyde, ceric ammonium molybdate, and
potassium permanganate staining. Silica gel 60 (particle size $0.040-0.063 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) was used for flash column chromatography. pH 7 Silica gel was prepared according to previous literature procedure. ${ }^{80} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 500 or 600 MHz and are reported relative to deuterated solvent signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant $(\mathrm{Hz})$, and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 125 MHz and reported in terms of chemical shift. IR spectra were recorded on a FT-IR spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained with a LCT spectrometer. Optical rotations were measured with a Jasco P-1010 polarimeter. Kessil KSH150B LED Grow Light 150, Blue LEDs were purchased from http://www.amazon.com. The radical coupling reactions using these blue LEDs were maintained at approximately $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by passing a constant stream of air over the reaction vessels for the 18 h period. See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations (available at http://pubs.acs.org/userim ages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah _abbreviations.pdf).

### 3.3.2 Experimental Procedures

(+)-Tert-butyl(((4S,5S)-5-ethynyl-2,2-dimethyl-4-vinyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-
yl)methoxy)dimethylsilane (3.25): To a suspension of known alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}^{8}$ ( $0.732 \mathrm{~g}, 2.42$
 $\mathrm{mmol})$ and solid $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1.01 \mathrm{~g}, 12.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added Dess-Martin periodinane ( $1.23 \mathrm{~g}, 2.90 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was vigorously stirred for 2 h , at which point the suspension was filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was then washed with pentanes $(4 \times 8 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic washes were filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude aldehyde as a yellow oil which was carried forward immediately.

The crude aldehyde and dimethyl (1-azoacetonyl)phosphonate $\mathbf{3 . 2 4}{ }^{10}$ ( 0.558 g , $2.90 \mathrm{mmol})$ were dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(9 \mathrm{~mL})$. Solid $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(0.669 \mathrm{~g}, 4.84 \mathrm{mmol})$ was then added, and the suspension was vigorously stirred for 2 h . Celite $(\sim 5 \mathrm{~g})$ was added to the reaction vessel, and the reaction was concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography (5\% EtOAc in hexanes to 7\% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded alkyne $\mathbf{3 . 2 5}$ $\left(0.550 \mathrm{~g}, 1.86 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \%\right.$ yield) as a colorless solid. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.90$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.12(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.53(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.5,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.9,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.07(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 136.46,116.73$, $110.27,85.75,79.25,77.10,69.70,65.41,27.87,27.01,26.00,18.44,-5.23,-5.49$; IR (thin film) $3312,2988,2955,2858,1741,1378,1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+0.79\left(\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$;

HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})$ 297.1887, observed 297.1890; mp 39-41 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## (-)-(4S,5S)-4-(((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-ethynyl-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (3.26): A solution of alkyne $3.25(0.553 \mathrm{~g}, 1.87 \mathrm{mmol})$ in
 methanol ( 8 mL ) was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ozone from an ozone generator was bubbled through the solution until a pale blue color was observed ( $\sim 5 \mathrm{~min}$ ). The solution was then sparged with oxygen until the pale blue color disappeared. Dimethyl sulfide $(0.31 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to the solution, which was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The reaction vessel was allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude aldehyde which was carried forward without further purification.

The crude aldehyde was dissolved in a $3: 1$ solution of $t-\mathrm{BuOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$. A solution of 2-methyl-2-butene ( $2.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 19 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to the mixture, followed by $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}(1.80 \mathrm{~g}, 15.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{NaClO}_{2}(0.845 \mathrm{~g}, 9.35 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was maintained at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h , at which point $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. This mixture was washed with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were washed with aq. NaOH ( 5 mL of 0.5 M soln ). The aqueous layer was then acidified with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(7 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 0.5 M soln). The aqueous layer was then washed with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to provide acid $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ as a colorless oil ( $0.450 \mathrm{~g}, 1.43 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$,
$0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.25,113.33,88.23,77.69$, $69.04,63.64,26.99,26.97,25.95,18.48,14.32,-5.26,-5.48$; IR (thin film) 3505, 3277, 2990, 2931, 2858, 1731, $1379 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-30.0\left(\mathrm{c}=2.1, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}) 313.1471$, observed 313.1467.
(+)-1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl(4S,5S)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-ethynyl-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (3.16): Acid 3.26 ( $0.453 \mathrm{~g}, 1.44$

mmol) was charged into a flask with THF ( 8 mL ). Nhydroxyphthalimide $\quad(0.399 \mathrm{~g}, \quad 2.45 \mathrm{mmol}), \quad N, N^{\prime}-$ dicycylohexylcarbodiimide ( $0.446 \mathrm{~g}, 2.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and DMAP ( 9 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to the reaction vessel, which was maintained at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h . Hexanes ( 5 mL ) was added to the reaction, and the resulting suspension was filtered through Celite. The yellow filtrate was concentrated in vacuo and then purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to provide ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $3.16(0.539 \mathrm{~g}, 1.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 82 \%$ yield) as a colorless, crystalline solid. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.14$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 166.77,161.37,134.87,129.09,124.07,113.53,88.06,78.80,76.25$, $68.81,62.80,26.7,26.64,26.00,18.54,-5.18,-5.49$; IR (thin film) $3283,2930,2855$, 2360, 2340, 2118, 1789, $1748 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+38.3\left(\mathrm{c}=2.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{7} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 482.1611$, observed 482.1612; mp 105-109 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

(-)-(3aS,3bS,4R,6aR,7aS)-3a-(((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-4-(((1R,2S,5R)-
2-isopropyl-5-methylcyclohexyl)oxy)-2,2-dimethyl-7-methylenehexahydro-6H-
furo[3',4':3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-6-one (3.28) and (-)-(4S,5R)-4-((4R,5S)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-ethynyl-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-(((1R,2S,5R)-2-isopropyl-5-methylcyclohexyl)oxy)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (3.29): To a vial charged with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 1 6}(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.218 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ that had been separately sparged with argon for 5 min . Butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 2 7}{ }^{14}(78 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.32 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester ( $82 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.002 \mathrm{mmol})$, and Hünig's base ( $80 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were then added to the reaction. The vial was then vigorously stirred while being irradiated by a single strip of blue LED lights (450 nm) at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 6 h , the reaction mixture was diluted with hexanes $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through Celite. The resulting solution was then concentrated in vacuo and separated by flash column chromatography ( $3 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to provide lactone 3.28 ( $42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.083 \mathrm{mmol}, 38 \%$ yield) as a colorless, crystalline solid and addition product 3.29 ( $7.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.015 \mathrm{mmol}, 7 \%$ yield) as an oil. A single crystal X-ray structure of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ was obtained after recrystallization in $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{hexanes}$. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ for 3.28: 0.65 (10\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ for 3.29: 0.60 (10\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate).

Characterization data for 3.28: for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.3,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.50(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.7,0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.73(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.96-3.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.77 (d, $J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.6,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.07$ (dd, $J=10.3,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.60(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.04-$ $0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90-0.80(\mathrm{~m}, 13 \mathrm{H}), 0.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.05,143.32$, 116.61, 112.69, 99.71, $90.76,86.88,77.22,64.36,57.42,48.22,47.87,40.01,34.42,31.51,28.37,27.04,25.93$, 25.51, 23.20, 22.39, 21.03, 18.41, 15.81, $-5.45,-5.50$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2929, 2858, 1779, $1461 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-133\left(\mathrm{c}=1.9, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 531.3118, observed 531.3126; mp 136-142 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Characterization data for 3.29: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.9,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82-2.65(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.37-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 0.99 (app qd, $J=12.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86-0.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.77$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 175.88, 110.04, 100.76, $83.81,78.81,77.21,76.74,71.62,64.38,47.88,46.89,39.88,34.46,31.50,29.82,28.24$, 27.07, 26.04, 25.56, 23.22, 22.42, 21.02, 18.36, 15.80, -5.44, -5.46; IR (thin film) 3311,
$3262,2955,2929,2858,1791,1462,1374,1252 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-93.7\left(\mathrm{c}=1.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 531.3118, observed 531.3131.

(3aS,3bS,4R,6aR,7aR)-3a-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-4-(((1R,2S,5R)-2-isopropyl-5-methylcyclohexyl)oxy)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydro-

4Hfuro[ $\left.3^{\prime}, 4^{\prime}: 3,4\right]$ cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxole-6,7-dione (3.41): Lactone 3.28 (20 mg,
 $0.039 \mathrm{mmol})$ was charged into a flask with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ozone from an ozone generator was passed through the solution until a pale blue color was observed. The solution was then sparged with oxygen until the pale color disappeared. Dimethyl sulfide ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to the solution which was maintained at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The reaction was then warmed to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, concentrated, and separated by column chromatography ( $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes to $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to provide $\beta$-ketolactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}(15 \mathrm{mg}, 0.029 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.08(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.54(\mathrm{td}, J=10.7,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.62(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.39(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.04-0.92(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87$
$(\mathrm{d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125
$\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 202.0,168.2,114.4,100.0,87.1,83.1,64.7,54.0,53.6,47.8,40.0,34.4$, $31.5,29.9,28.5,27.7,25.9,25.6,23.2,22.4,21.0,18.4,15.8,-5.41,-5.54$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2928, 2857, 1797, 1751, $1461 \mathrm{~cm}-1$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{SiNa}$ (M+Na) 533.2911, observed 533.2903.
(-)-(3aS,7aS)-3-iodo-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-indene
(3.32):

Hydrazine hydrate ( 20 mL ) and $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(16.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 118 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added to a solution of (+)-ketone $3.12(1.06 \mathrm{~g}, 5.88 \mathrm{mmol})$ in EtOH ( 45 mL ). The reaction was heated to reflux for 20 h ; upon cooling to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The aqueous layer was washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Mg}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The remaining white solid (excess hydrazine) was removed by filtration using hexanes. Concentration in vacuo provided the crude hydrazone as a yellow oil, which was carried forward without further purification.

A solution of 1,1,3,3-tetramethylguanidine ( $5.15 \mathrm{~mL}, 41.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 30 mL ) was added dropwise over 10 min to a solution of $\mathrm{I}_{2}(3.28 \mathrm{~g}, 12.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 30 mL ). The hydrazone ( 5.88 mmol ) in THF ( 6 mL ) was then added dropwise over 10 min , and the reaction was maintained for 30 min . The dark red solution was then concentrated in vacuo, and the resulting red oil was heated neat at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 h with a reflux condenser attached. The reaction was then cooled to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$, and concentrated in vacuo over $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}(\sim 10 \mathrm{~g})$. Purification by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes)
provided light-sensitive vinyl iodide $3.32(1.33 \mathrm{~g}, 4.58 \mathrm{mmol}, 78 \%)$ as a colorless, crystalline solid. Spectral data were consistent with reported values. ${ }^{18 c}$
(-)-Dimethyl (4R,5R)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4,5dicarboxylate (3.48): The procedure for the preparation of diester 3.48 was a slight
 modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{26}$ Dimethyl 2,3,-O-isopropylidene-L-tartrate ( $3.83 \mathrm{~g}, 17.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in THF ( 67 mL ) and cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HMPA $(13 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, followed by BOM-Cl ( $5.6 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). Freshly prepared LDA ( 17.7 mmol ) in THF ( 50 mL ) was then added to the reaction flask via cannula over $\sim 30 \mathrm{~min}$. The reaction was maintained for 5 h at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, before warming to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 h , the reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( $1 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. Unreacted dimethyl 2,3,-O-isopropylidene-L-tartrate was distilled from the crude product $\left(120{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.3\right.$ torr $)$. The remaining oil was purified by flash column chromatography ( $8 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to provide diester $3.48(2.75 \mathrm{~g}, 8.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 46 \%)$ as a light yellow oil. This reaction could be run on larger scale ( $\sim 6 x$ ) with similar yields (41-43\%). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.80$ ( $40 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.34-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.59(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.80,168.80,137.60,128.43$, $127.77,127.53,112.71,85.27,77.56,73.71,70.11,53.17,52.40,27.44,25.95$; IR (thin
film) 2989, 2950, 1743, 1442, 1436, 1391, 1382, 1256, $1211 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-33.8(\mathrm{c}=1.7$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 361.1263, observed 361.1271.
(-)-Methyl (4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (3.54): The procedure for the preparation of alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ was a
 slight modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{26}$ Diester $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ ( $17.7 \mathrm{~g}, 52.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in THF $(450 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DIBAL-H ( $14 \mathrm{~mL}, 79 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise to the reaction. After 5 min , the reaction was warmed to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1 h , a saturated solution of Rochelle's salt ( 250 mL ) and EtOAc ( 100 mL ) were added. The reaction was allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the heterogeneous mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $4 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was then purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $50 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to provide recovered diester $3.48(6.34 \mathrm{~g}, 18.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, $36 \%$ ) as a light yellow oil and alcohol $3.54(7.44 \mathrm{~g}, 23.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 46 \%)$ as a clear oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.35$ ( $40 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.36-7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.56-4.51(\mathrm{~m} 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.91(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.1,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85$ (dd, $J=12.2,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.37 (bs, 1H), $1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 171.80, 137.24, $128.70,128.07,127.89,110.16,83.83,73.94,70.51,60.65,52.91,27.75,25.34$; IR (thin film) $3500,2989,2937,2871,1743,1454,1380 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}$ D $:-2.17(\mathrm{c}=1.2) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{NH}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)$ 328.1760, observed 328.1754.
(-)-Methyl (4R,5R)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-formyl-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4carboxylate (3.55): To a stirring suspension of alcohol $3.54(4.80 \mathrm{~g}, 15.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ and

$\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(6.50 \mathrm{~g}, 77.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added DessMartin periodinane ( $7.87 \mathrm{~g}, 18.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in two portions over 5 min. After 2 h , the reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (40 mL ) and filtered through a cotton plug to remove solid $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo, resulting in a white solid. The solid was then washed with hexanes (6 x 30 mL ), and the combined hexane washes were filtered through Celite. Upon concentration, aldehyde 3.55 ( $4.33 \mathrm{~g}, 14.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%$ ) was obtained as a colorless oil. Notes: 1) Aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ was found to decompose within 14 h upon its formation (at room temperature or in the freezer), possibly from self-aldol polymerization. Therefore, it was always carried forward immediately into the next reaction. 2) Aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ did not appear unstable to column chromatography, but it could not be purified in that manner. 3) Aqueous washes diminished the yields, possibly from hydrate formation. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 9.69(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59$ (s, 3H), 1.42 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 197.23, 170.67, 137.15, 128.54, 127.84, 127.68, 112.75, 86.30, 82.95, 73.47, 69.28, 53.27, 27.30, 25.77; IR (thin film) 2991, 2937, 2868, 1740, 1454, $1374 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-2.37\left(\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right) 326.1604$, observed 326.1612.
(-)-Methyl
(4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy ((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-3-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolane-4-carboxylate (3.64): $(R)$-Oxazoline $3.62^{35 \mathrm{a}}$ ( $2.86 \mathrm{~g}, 9.65 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{CrCl}_{2}$

3.64: $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{6}$
Molecular Weight: 472.6220 ( $1.19 \mathrm{~g}, 9.65 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were dissolved in THF ( 20 mL ) in the glove box, and $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(1.34 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.65 \mathrm{mmol})$ was then added. The suspension was vigorously stirred for 6 h , and then $\mathrm{NiCl}_{2}(36 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.28 mmol ) was added, followed by a solution of vinyl iodide $3.32(0.80 \mathrm{~g}, 2.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ and aldehyde $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}(1.30 \mathrm{~g}, 4.21 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 10 mL ). Vigorous stirring was maintained for 20 h before removing the flask from the glovebox and cooling the solution to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ethylene diamine ( 2 mL ) was added to quench the reaction. After stirring for $30 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(4 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution ( 40 mL ) and brine ( $1 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography (5\% EtOAc in hexanes to $11 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) provided a single diastereomer, alcohol $3.64(0.860 \mathrm{~g}, 1.82 \mathrm{mmol}, 66 \%)$ as a clear oil. ( $R$ )-Oxazoline $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ was recovered during flash column chromatography ( $60-80 \%$ recovery) and recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes for reuse. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.50$ for $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.36-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.78-5.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.61(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-1.99$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.5-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.25-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$

NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.59,155.05,137.89,128.42,127.76,127.72,126.03$, $110.24,80.41,73.71,71.94,65.50,59.97,52.69,41.51,35.53,33.29,32.93,28.76,27.61$, $25.46,21.45,20.15,18.15$; IR (thin film) $3527,2989,2926,2848,1741,1454,1380 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; $[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-4.85\left(\mathrm{c}=1.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{NH}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)$ 490.3169, observed 490.3165 .
(-)-1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl
(4S,5R)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-3-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (3.75): Alcohol 3.64 ( $0.850 \mathrm{~g}, 1.80 \mathrm{mmol}$ )
 was dissolved in a mixture of $\mathrm{MeOH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. KOH pellets $(0.807 \mathrm{~g}, 14.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ were then added, and the reaction was warmed to $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 h , TLC analysis confirmed starting material was consumed; and the reaction was cooled to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Aqueous $\mathrm{HCl}(18 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 M soln) was added to the flask, and the heterogeneous mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $5 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to provide the crude acid as a clear oil which was carried forward without further purification.

The crude acid was dissolved in THF ( 20 mL ) to which $N$-hydroxyphthalimide $(0.881 \mathrm{~g}, 5.40 \mathrm{mmol})$, DCC ( $0.483 \mathrm{~g}, 2.34 \mathrm{mmol})$, and DMAP ( $11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.090 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The reaction was maintained for 3 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, at which point Celite ( $\sim 2 \mathrm{~g}$ ) was added. The reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo, and the resulting residue was purified by flash column chromatography using pH 7 silica gel (10\% EtOAc in hexanes to
$20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to provide ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.75 as a colorless solid. Recrystallization from acetone/hexanes afforded ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.75 ( 0.750 g , $1.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%)$ as colorless needles. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25(20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.91-7.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.81-7.78$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.42-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.69(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.49(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-$ $1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\operatorname{app~d}, J=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\operatorname{app~td}, J=12.5,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{td}, J=13.5,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 169.29,161.58,154.82,137.69,134.94,129.11,128.46,128.03$, $127.75,126.32,124.17,111.30,85.13,80.61,74.20,71.82,65.56,59.87,47.34,41.49$, $35.42,33.28,32.93,28.79,27.39,25.05,21.48,20.13,18.18$; IR (thin film) 3524,2989 , $2928,2862,1813,1788,1747,1454,1373 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-7.60\left(\mathrm{c}=1.6, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{NO}_{8} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 626.2730$, observed 626.2712; mp 139-141 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
(+)-1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl (4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(((2S,3aS,7aS,Z)-2-chloro-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-ylidene)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolane-4-carboxylate (3.78): ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 3.75 ( $0.223 \mathrm{~g}, 0.369 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was
 dissolved in a $10: 1$ mixture of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ pyridine $(3.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $-45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of $\mathrm{SOCl}_{2}(54 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.74 \mathrm{mmol})$ in a $10: 1$ mixture of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ pyridine $(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was then added dropwise to the reaction over 5 min . The reaction was maintained at $-45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until full conversion of starting material was observed by TLC analysis ( $\sim 45 \mathrm{~min}$ ). Saturated aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution ( 2 mL ) was added, and the reaction was allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was then diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with EtOAc $(3 \times 3 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite $(\sim 1 \mathrm{~g})$. Purification by flash column chromatography using pH 7 silica gel (5\% EtOAc in hexanes to $11 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) provided allylic chloride $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ as a colorless solid. Recrystallization from acetone/hexanes afforded allylic chloride 3.78 ( $0.143 \mathrm{~g}, 0.229$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%)$ as colorless needles. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.40(20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.95-7.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.83-7.78(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.40-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.32(\operatorname{app} q u i n t, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{td}, J=13.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{~d}, J=12.6 \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.55-1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.41(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{~d}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.84(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.07,161.68,161.30,137.64,134.99,129.09,128.45$,
$127.95,127.80,124.25,114.32,111.61,84.96,76.44,74.04,71.07,54.60,54.10,45.10$, $41.19,37.03,34.08,32.24,32.81,27.55,24.78,21.25,21.11,19.49$; IR (thin film) 2986, $2928,2866,2350,2336,1813,1787,1747,1459 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+83.2\left(\mathrm{c}=1.8, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{ClNO}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 644.2391, observed 644.2383; mp $154-158^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
(-)-(R)-5-Acetoxyfuran-2(5H)-one (S3.1): The procedure for preparation of acetoxy
 butenolide S3.1 was a slight modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{81}$ 5-Hydroxyfuran-2(5H)-one ${ }^{14}(2.90 \mathrm{~g}, 28.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in vinyl acetate ( 30 mL ). Amano lipase AK (2.00 g) was then added, and the suspension was stirred for 8 days at 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The suspension was then filtered through Celite, and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. Purification of the residue by flash column chromatography (40\% EtOAc in hexanes) provided ( $R$ )-5-acetoxyfuran-2(5H)-one $\mathbf{S 3 . 1}$ ( $3.58 \mathrm{~g}, 25.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 87 \%$ yield) as a yellow oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.35$ (40\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ ). Spectral data were consistent with reported values. ${ }^{81}$ The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $92 \%$ by known methods. ${ }^{81}$
(-)-(R)-5-Methoxyfuran-2(5H)-one (3.84): Acetoxy butenolide $\mathbf{S 3 . 1}$ ( $1.23 \mathrm{~g}, 8.65 \mathrm{mmol}$ )
 was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(35 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(0.500 \mathrm{~g}, 0.433$ mmol) was added to the solution. The solution, which turned a deep red, was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 50 min . Upon TLC analysis confirming consumption of starting material (TLC, $10 \%$ acetone
in hexanes and running the TLC plate $3 x$ ), the reaction solution was directly filtered through a silica gel plug ( 250 mL of $40 \%$ acetone in hexanes). The eluent was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was distilled $\left(0.8\right.$ torr, $\left.110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ to provide methoxy butenolide 3.84 and a trace amount of AcOH . Removal of AcOH upon further concentration in vacuo afforded methoxy butenolide $3.84(0.705 \mathrm{~g}, 6.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%$ yield) as a clear oil. Spectral data were consistent with reported values. ${ }^{82}$ HLPC analysis was used to determine the enantiomeric ratio to be 92:8 (Chiracel AS column; flow: $2.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 10 \%$ isopropanol: $n$ hexane; $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$; major enantiomer $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}=8.70 \mathrm{~min}$, minor enantiomer $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}=11.60 \mathrm{~min}$ ); $[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-124\left(\mathrm{c}=1.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$.


Radical ACF Cascade Reaction (Table 3.4, entry 4): Allylic chloride $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ (70 mg, 0.11 mmol ), methoxy butenolide $3.84(51 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{D}_{2}$-Hantzsch ester ( $43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left[\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\right]\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.001 \mathrm{mmol})$ were charged into a vial. Acetonitrile
$(1.1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the solution was sparged with argon for 5 min . The vial was then vigorously stirred while being irradiated by a single strip of blue LED lights (450 nm) at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 6 h , the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{EtOAc}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(4 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 4 M soln) followed by brine ( $2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue using an internal standard (dimethoxybenzene) showed $37 \%$ yield of $\mathbf{3 . 8 5}$, $28 \%$ yield of $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}, 8 \%$ yield of $\mathbf{3 . 8 7}$, and $13 \%$ yield of 3.88. Purification of the crude residue by flash column chromatography ( $0 \%$ acetone in hexanes to $5 \%$ acetone in hexanes) provided desired ACF product $\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ ( 15 mg , $0.030 \mathrm{mmol}, 27 \%)$ as a clear oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ for 3.86: $0.55(20 \%$ acetone in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). Flash column chromatography under separate conditions of the remaining mixed fractions from the first purification (4\% EtOAc in hexanes to $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) provided epimeric ACF product 3.85 ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.039 \mathrm{mmol}, 35 \%$ ) as a clear oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ for 3.85: 0.45 ( $20 \%$ acetone in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate).

## (-)-(3aS,3bS,4R,6aS,7aS)-3a-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-4-methoxy-2,2-dimethyl-7-

((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-3-yl)hexahydro-6Hfuro[ $\mathbf{3 '}^{\prime}, \mathbf{4}^{\prime}: \mathbf{3 , 4}$ ]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-6-one (3.86): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$

$7.38-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.48(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.38(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.43(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{t}, J$ $=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.00(\mathrm{app}$ $\mathrm{t}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.10(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.9,6.3,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{app}$
$\mathrm{t}, J=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.7,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.19(\mathrm{td}, J=13.2,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.92-0.82(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 174.65, 150.69, 137.18, $128.71,128.38,128.30,124.70,113.17,103.64,89.95,86.77,73.97,70.81,58.24,56.76$, $55.12,47.84,45.94,43.72,41.46,34.73,33.05,32.90,20.22,29.38,29.16,21.45,20.18$, 17.70; $[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-84.9\left(\mathrm{c}=1.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; IR (thin film) 2993, 2934, 2862, 1785, 1636, 1455, 1371, 1234, $1215 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{NH}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)$ 528.3325, observed 528.3331.


## (-)-(3aS,3bS,4R,6aS,7R,7aS)-3a-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-4-methoxy-2,2-dimethyl-7-

((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-3-yl)hexahydro-6H-furo[3',4':3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-6-one (3.85): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$

$7.39-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.75(\operatorname{app~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.57$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{app}$ $\mathrm{t}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.41(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.7,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.72 (app d, $J=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.65(\mathrm{~m}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{td}, J=13.6$,
$4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.92-0.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125
$\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.80,148.52,137.12,128.69,128.26,128.05,127.25,111.58,105.02$, $89.60,87.36,73.83,72.05,59.28,58.09,57.57,47.71,47.54,45.77,41.61,35.68,33.09$, 32.97, 29.17, 27.80, 26.00, 21.47, 20.22, 17.36; $[\alpha]^{25}$ D : -88.2 (c $\left.=2.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; IR (thin film) 2988, 2929, 2861, 1775, 1454, 1373, $1246 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 533.2879$, observed 533.2897.

(+)-(4S,5R)-4-((4S,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(((2S,3aS,7aS,Z)-2-chloro-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-ylidene)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one-3-d (3.87): An analytical sample of clean 3.87 was
 obtained from flash column chromatography ( $0 \%$ acetone in hexanes to $4 \%$ acetone in hexanes). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.60$ ( $20 \%$ acetone in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.36-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.61(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=9.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.6,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{td}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{~d} . J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.53$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-$ $1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.04-0.95(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 0.91-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.60(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.4,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 176.81,159.67,137.02,128.73,128.34,128.26,115.56$, $109.03,106.81,82.60,78.24,74.46,74.39,56.90,54.57,54.53,45.17,44.93,41.17,36.72$,
$33.93,33.15,32.96,29.85,27.58,26.19,21.49,21.15,19.49 ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+109.1(\mathrm{c}=0.57$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); IR (thin film) 2986, 2931, 2864, 2359, 2342, 1787, 1455, 1370, $1252 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{DClO}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 570.2709$, observed 570.2702.

(4S,5R)-4-((4R,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(((2S,3aS,7aS,Z)-2-chloro-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-ylidene)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one-3-d (3.88): Addition product $\mathbf{3 . 8 8}$ could never be
 isolated in pure form. Diagnostic peaks of addition product $\mathbf{3 . 8 8}$ for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.21$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=9.6,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.59(\operatorname{app~t}, J=$ $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$.
(-)-(3aS,3bS,4R,6R,6aS,7S,7aS)-3a-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-4-methoxy-2,2-dimethyl-7-((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-inden-3-yl)hexahydro-4Hfuro $\left[3 ', 4^{\prime}: 3,4\right]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxol-6-yl acetate (3.106): Desired ACF product

$3.86(40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.078 \mathrm{mmol})$ was charged into a flask with toluene (1.4 mL) and then cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of DIBAL-H (18 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$ in toluene $(0.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise to the reaction vessel, keeping the temperature near $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 45 min, TLC analysis showed some remaining starting material, and an additional solution of DIBAL-H ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in toluene $(0.05 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. After 45 min , a solution of DMAP ( $19 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), pyridine ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, followed by $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(44 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.47 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h , at which point it was allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. An aqueous solution saturated with Rochelle's salt ( 3 mL ) was added, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (1 x 5 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification of the residue by flash column chromatography ( $6 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) provided a single diastereomer, diacetal $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 6}(36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.065 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%)$, as a colorless oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.35$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.38-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.60(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.17(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{td}, J=7.8,4.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-2.00(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\operatorname{app~d}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-$
$1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20(\mathrm{td}, J=12.7,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{td}, J=13.7,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.90-0.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 170.46, 151.77, 137.54, $128.61,128.36,128.13,125.03,113.25,107.80,99.65,90.22,85.91,73.84,70.54,50.88$, $47.64,43.33,42.11,36.75,35.58,33.29,32.95,31.72,30.64,29.72,29.01,24.81,22.79$, 21.25, 21.17, 20.09, 17.24, 14.27; $[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-46.3\left(\mathrm{c}=2.1, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; IR (thin film) 2991, 2930, 2861, 1748, 1455, $1367 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 577.3141, observed 577.3127.

## (-)-(3aS,3bS,4R,6R,6aS,7R,7aS)-3a-(Hydroxymethyl)-4-methoxy-2,2-dimethyl-7-((1R,3aS,7aR)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)hexahydro-4H-

furo[3',4':3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-6-yl acetate (3.107): Diacetal 3.106 (28 mg,
 $0.050 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{mg})$ were charged into a flask with $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\operatorname{Ar}(3 \mathrm{x})$. Formic acid $(50 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was then added dropwise to the vigorously stirring suspension. After $2 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{TLC}$ analysis showed full consumption of starting material. The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{MeOH}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$, filtered through Celite, and concentrated in vacuo to provide the crude alcohol, which was carried forward to the subsequent step.

To a flask containing the crude alcohol $(0.050 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}(12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.050$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and EtOAc ( 1.0 mL ). The reaction vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ ( $3 \mathrm{x}, 1 \mathrm{~atm} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ ). The reaction was maintained under 1 atm of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ for 12 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, at which point the reaction vessel was refilled first with Ar and then air. Filtration of the suspension through Celite, concentration of the filtrate in vacuo, and purification of the residue by
flash column chromatography ( $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) provided alcohol 3.107 ( 20 mg , $0.043 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%)$ as a colorless oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25(30 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.31(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.31(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.19(\operatorname{app~td}, J=7.4,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.87(\operatorname{app~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.30(\operatorname{app~dt}, J=10.1,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.11-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.90-0.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.76(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.76-0.69$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.84,112.73,106.84,97.67,90.98,88.07$, $63.62,57.74,56.04,54.85,52.29,50.68,44.98,42.90,41.39,40.00,33.60,33.26,30.71$, $30.49,29.84,25.75,21.20,20.99,20.94,20.22,13.86 ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-17.6\left(\mathrm{c}=1.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; IR (thin film) 3490, 2951, 2931, 2873, 1745, 1459, $1368 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 489.2828$, observed 489.2813 .
(-)-Chromodorolide B (3.110): Alcohol 3.107 ( $9.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and Dess-Martin
 periodinane ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.029 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were charged into a flask with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.3 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was maintained at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 h , at which point it was diluted with hexanes ( 0.5 mL ), filtered through Celite, and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was dissolved in hexanes ( 1 mL ) and filtered through Celite. The filtrate was then concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude aldehyde which was carried forward into the next step.

To a solution of crude aldehyde in $\operatorname{THF}(0.1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $t-\mathrm{BuOH}(0.1 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 0.1 mL ), 2-methyl-2-butene ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\left(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}\right.$ ), and $\mathrm{NaClO}_{2}(14 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h and then diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1$
$\mathrm{mL})$. The solution was washed with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$; and the combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to provide crude carboxylic acid 3.108.

Crude acid $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 8}$ was then dissolved in a solution of THF ( 0.3 mL ) and aq. HCl $\left(0.3 \mathrm{~mL}\right.$ of 4 M soln), which was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 72 h . The reaction was then diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the solution was washed with EtOAc $(3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( 1 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to afford crude lactol anomers 3.109.

Crude lactol $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 9}$ was then dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.3 \mathrm{~mL})$. Next, DMAP ( 2 mg , $0.019 \mathrm{mmol})$ and pyridine $(31 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.38 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added, followed by $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(28 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.29$ mmol ). The reaction was maintained at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , at which point it was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the heterogeneous solution was washed with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( 3 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) provided $\mathbf{3 . 1 1 0}(4.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \%$ from $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 7}$ ) as a colorless solid. Recrystallization of the solid from acetone/hexanes afforded colorless needles. The NMR data correlated closely to the isolation data. ${ }^{76}[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-66.8(\mathrm{c}=0.12$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ compared to isolation sample $[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-95\left(\mathrm{c}=0.10, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)^{12}$; IR (thin film) 2948, 2876, 1813, 1752, 1370, 1214, 1093, 1000, $964 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 515.2257, observed 515.2260; mp 236-238 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp).


| Literature ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) |  |  | Synthetic ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pos | $\delta \mathrm{H}$ (multiplicity, $\mathrm{J} / \mathrm{Hz}$ ) | ¢C | $\delta \mathrm{H}$ (multiplicity, $\mathrm{J} / \mathrm{Hz}$ ) | ¢C |
| 1 | 1.03 (dt, $J=12.3,3.6)$ | 40.9 | 1.03 (dt, $J=12.3,3.6)$ | 41.06 |
| 1a | 1.38 (m) |  | 1.39 (m) |  |
| 2 | 1.55 (m, 2H) | 21.1 | 1.56 (m, 2H) | 21.27 |
| 3 | 0.95 (m) | 39.1 | 0.95 (dt, $J=12.6,3.6)$ | 39.26 |
| 3a | 1.51 (m) |  | 1.52 (m) |  |
| 4 |  | 33.1 |  | 33.31 |
| 5 | 1.09 (dd, $J=13.1,6.6)$ | 57.0 | 1.10 (dd, $J=13.7$, 3.7) | 57.10 |
| 6 | 1.40 (m) | 19.9 | 1.42 (m) | 20.08 |
| 6a | 1.56 (m) |  | 1.57 (m) |  |
| 7 | 1.48 (m) | 25.2 | 1.50 (m) | 25.36 |
| 7a | 1.58 (m) |  | 1.61 (m) |  |
| 8 | 2.57 (ddd, $J=12.1,11.6,7.9)$ | 48.0 | 2.58 (ddd, $J=12.2,11.1,7.6)$ | 48.13 |
| 9 | 1.69 (bdd, $J=12.0,9.9)$ | 50.3 | 1.71 (q, $J=10.0)$ | 50.43 |
| 10 |  | 43.9 |  | 44.00 |
| 11 |  | 169.1 |  | 169.24 |
| 12 |  | 81.4 |  | 81.48 |
| 13 | 3.79 (dd, $J=8.9,6.1)$ | 50.4 | 3.80 (dd, $J=9.0,6.0)$ | 50.56 |
| 14 | 2.93 (bt, $J=8.2)$ | 45.6 | 2.94 (bt, $J=8.2$ ) | 45.74 |
| 15 | 6.50 (bs) | 97.8 | 6.51 (bs) | 97.88 |
| 16 | 6.08 (d, J = 6.1) | 103.4 | 6.09 (d, $J=6.0)$ | 103.51 |
| 17 | 5.30 (d, J = 11.6) | 73.9 | 5.31 (d, $J=12.4)$ | 74.06 |
| 18 | 0.79 (s, 3H) | 33.4 | 0.79 (s, 3H) | 33.55 |
| 19 | 0.83 (s, 3H) | 21.0 | 0.84 (s, 3H) | 21.11 |
| 20 | 0.84 (s, 3H) | 13.7 | 0.85 (s, 3H) | 13.82 |
| OAc | 2.04 (s, 3H) | 20.8 | 2.05 (s, 3H) | 20.96 |
|  |  | 169.2 |  | 169.32 |
| OAc | 2.11 (s, 3H) | 20.8 | 2.12 (s, 3H) | 20.98 |
|  |  | 170.0 |  | 170.13 |
| OAc | 2.19 (s, 3H) | 20.9 | 2.21 (s, 3H) | 21.05 |
|  |  | 170.2 |  | 170.38 |
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## Chapter 4: Origins of Radical Diastereoselectivity in ACF Cascade

### 4.1 Investigations of Selectivity in ACF Cascade's 5-Exo Cyclization

Upon completion of the total synthesis of (-)-chromodorolide B, a thorough investigation of the diastereoselectivities observed in the ACF cascade was conducted. This study focused on the origins of stereoselection in the initial addition of the trisubstituted acetonide radical to the butenolide and the subsequent 5-exo cyclization onto the appended alkene (Section 3.2.5). Concerning the latter, I never observed conditions in which 5-exo cyclization onto the pendant alkene favored the desired C8 stereoisomer (Section 3.2.5.4). I aimed to probe the diastereoselectivity of the 5-exo cyclization by subjecting $\alpha$-substituted butenolides to the ACF cascade. I hypothesized that substitution at this position would increase the destabilizing steric interactions in undesired conformation 4.1, favoring cyclization from conformation 4.2 to give the desired C8 stereochemistry (Figure 4.1).


Figure 4.1. Potential Effects of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-Substituted Butenolides in ACF Cascade.
To access enantioenriched $\alpha$-substituted butenolides, I chose to start from $(R)$ methoxybutenolide 4.3 (Equation 4.1) as it was accessible in $84 \%$ ee on gram scale. This butenolide's sole stereocenter is sensitive to a variety of reaction conditions, leaving few synthetic options to accomplish $\alpha$-functionalization without racemization. Previously reported bromination conditions ${ }^{1}$ successfully provided enantioenriched bromobutenolide
4.2, ${ }^{2}$ which was then subjected to the optimized ACF reaction conditions (Table 3.4, entry 4) with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 4.5. Analysis by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of the crude reaction revealed a more complex product mixture than previous ACF reactions with butenolide 4.3, but three coupled products $(\mathbf{4 . 6}, 4.7$, and 4.8$)$ were identified (Equation 4.2). For ACF products $\mathbf{4 . 6}$ and 4.7, it was unclear whether the $\alpha$-acyl bromides were retained under the reaction conditions or reduced in situ to the deuterated products. Desired ACF product 4.7 was favored over its C8 epimer in $\sim 2: 1$ ratio, indicating $\alpha$-substitution on the butenolide did bias the diastereoselectivity of the 5-exo cyclization. The major product, 4.8, resulted from premature quenching of $\alpha$-acyl radical, which revealed that the bromide stabilized the intermediate $\alpha$-acyl radical and likely slowed 5-exo cyclization more than its reduction.

## Equation 4.1



## Equation 4.2



I then pursued the analogous $\alpha$-chlorobutenolide which would have similar steric implications to a bromide but might not inhibit 5-exo cyclization relative to reductive quenching. ( $\pm$ )-Chlorobutenolide 4.9 is both commercially available ${ }^{3}$ and accessible by a
known sequence, ${ }^{4}$ but I required enantioenriched chlorobutenolide 4.9 as the trisubstituted acetonide radical in the ACF was enantiopure. ${ }^{5}$ I first attempted to synthesize chlorobutenolide 4.9 by direct chlorination of enantioenriched butenolide 4.3 using tetraethyl ammonium trichloride (Mioskoski's reagent) ${ }^{6}$ or chlorine gas (Equation 4.3), but no chlorination was ever observed. ${ }^{7}$

## Equation 4.3



I then examined Baylis-Hillman type transformations for chloride installation, which were previously reported with butenolides using organoselenides (Scheme 4.1). ${ }^{8}$ These literature examples only employed aldehyde electrophiles, but I hypothesized the enolate intermediate would react with an electrophilic chlorine source. Exposure of phenylselenyl magnesium bromide to butenolide 4.3 , followed by addition of a variety of electrophilic chlorine reagents ( $N$-chlorosuccinimide, Mioskowski's reagent, 2-chloro-2-fluoro-2-phenylacetonitrile ${ }^{9}$ ), resulted in decomposition or recovered starting material. I also attempted this transformation in a stepwise fashion by isolating the 1,4-addition product, selenolactone 4.17 (Scheme 4.2B). I then exposed 4.17 to strong bases (LHMDS, KHMDS) with electrophilic chlorine sources. These reactions also failed to provide either chlorinated products 4.9 or 4.16. Having exhausted ideas to access enantioenriched chlorobutenolide 4.9, I abandoned these efforts and turned my attention to studying the diastereoselectivity of the reaction of the trisubstituted acetonide radical with butenolide 4.3 in the ACF cascade.

Scheme 4.1. Previous Seleno Baylis-Hillman Examples with Butenolides.
A)

B)


Scheme 4.2. Failed Seleno Baylis-Hillman Route to Chlorobutenolide 4.9.
A)

(+)-4.3

4.9
or

4.16
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### 4.2 Diastereoselective Additions of Trisubstituted Acetonide Radicals

### 4.2.1 Initial Considerations and Previous Examples in the Literature

The contrasteric diastereoselectivity of addition of trisubstituted acetonide radicals was first observed with alkyne radical 4.18 (Section 3.1.3) which favored addition to butenolide 4.10 from the face syn to the alkyne ( $\sim 1: 4 \mathrm{dr}$, Figure 4.2). Trisubstituted
acetonide radical 4.19 from the ACF cascade (Section 3.2.5.2) preferentially added to butenolide 4.3 syn to the hydrindane fragment ( $\sim 1: 7$ anit:syn ${ }^{10}$ ).


Figure 4.2. Observed Diastereoselectivity of Trisubstituted Acetonide Radicals to Butenolides.

To rationalize this observed diastereoselectivity, I searched the literature for reactions with related acetonide radicals. Only three references in the literature of similar acetonide radicals coupling to electron deficient alkenes were found. ${ }^{11}$ Shown in Scheme 4.3A, Barton unambiguously demonstrated that disubstituted acetonide radical $\mathbf{4 . 2 0}$ underwent conjugate addition to methacrylate 4.21 with high anti facial selectivity (25:1 dr), ${ }^{12}$ coinciding with steric predictions. Renaud examined trisubstituted acetonide radicals and found that the diastereoselectivity was dependent on the adjacent alkyl substituent. ${ }^{13}$ In the case of benzyl radical precursor 4.23 (Scheme 4.3B), radical generation and addition to phenyl vinyl sulfone (4.25) occurred with low anti selectivity (2.4:1 dr favoring 4.26). However, when the benzyl group was exchanged for a tert-butyl group (Scheme 4.3C), radical precursor $\mathbf{4 . 2 8}$ coupled to $\mathbf{4 . 2 5}$ favoring the contrasteric syn addition product $\mathbf{4 . 3 1}$ in a 1:6.3 ratio. These results indicated that factors beyond the trisubstituted acetonide radical's facial accessibility influenced the diastereoselectivity of additions. Therefore, I investigated this diastereoselectivity on an experimental level to identify the origins of antilsyn addition for acetonide radicals.

Scheme 4.3. Previous Examples of Acetonide Radicals Coupling with Acceptors.


### 4.2.2 Experimental Results with Simplified System

I initially proposed a hypothesis similar to Renaud's, ${ }^{13,14}$ in that increasing the steric bulk of the acetonide radical's substituents ( $\mathrm{R}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ in Figure 4.3) would increase selectivity for $\operatorname{syn}$ addition because of destabilizing eclipsing interactions between $\mathrm{R}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ in the anti addition transition state (4.32). I conducted studies using simplified ( N acyloxy)phthalimides 4.34a-4.34c with increasing steric bulk on oxygen. However, upon coupling to butenolide 4.3, all radical substrates underwent addition with low stereoselectivity syn to the $\beta$-substituent with minimal influence from the oxygen substituent. ${ }^{15}$


TS for anti addition (4.32)


TS for syn addition (4.33)

## Figure 4.3. Destabilizing Interactions Influencing Radical Diastereoselectivity.

Table 4.1. Probing $\boldsymbol{O}$-Substitution on Radical Diastereoselectivity.


Stereochemical assignments for syn addition products were determined by diagnostic NOE correlations between the acetonide methine and the methylene hydrogens of the acetonide alkoxymethyl substituent (Figure 4.4). Likewise, anti addition products were assigned by NOE correlations between the acetonide methine and the methylene hydrogens of the lactone. ${ }^{16}$ These stereochemical assignments were further validated by chemical derivation of syn addition product $\mathbf{4 . 3 6 b}$ to $\mathbf{4 . 3 9}$ (Scheme 4.4B) and a single crystal X-ray structure of syn addition product 4.42f. ${ }^{17}$


Figure 4.4. Diagnostic NOEs for Syn- and Anti Addition Products.

## Scheme 4.4. Chemical Derivation of Addition Products.

A)

B)



At this point in exploring these photoredox couplings, I switched to the MacMillan methodology using carboxylic acids ${ }^{18}$ as radical precursors. The carboxylic acids required one less synthetic step than corresponding ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides; and the coupling reactions were typically easier to analyze and purify. Shown in Table 4.2, I first examined the coupling of the disubstituted acetonide radical generated from acid 4.40a with butenolide 4.3, which occurred in 3.5:1 dr favoring anti addition (entry 1). This lower diastereoselectivity is not a reflection of a chirality mismatch between the ( $R$ )-butenolide 4.3 and the chiral radical of acid 4.40a. The coupling of the ( $S$ )-butenolide 4.3 with the radical of 4.40a gave a similar 4.0:1 dr favoring anti addition (Equation 4.4). ${ }^{19}$

Table 4.2. Photoredox-Catalyzed Radical Couplings of Simplified Acids.



## Equation 4.4


(41\%)
I then turned my attention to precursors which would yield trisubstituted radical intermediates. In entries $2-5$ of Table 4.2, the radical center bore a hydroxymethyl or protected-hydroxymethyl substituent, and addition occurred with low stereoselectivity syn to the $\beta$-substituent. The only outlier was ethyl variant 4.40e (entry 6), which gave high
selectivity for the syn addition product (1:9.3 dr). This increase in syn selectivity presumably arose from increased steric interactions between the larger ethyl group and the methyloxymethylene substituent in the transition state, supporting our hypothesis from Figure 4.3. Concerning the minimal changes in diastereoselectivity with varying $O$ functionalization (Table 4.2, entries 2-5), the oxygen substituents' ability to freely rotate away from each other likely rendered their steric bulk insignificant. With a working hypothesis to explain the observed diastereoselectivity, I then assessed radical precursors relevant to the synthetic efforts towards the chromodorolides in analogous couplings.

### 4.2.3 Coupling with Hydrindane-Based Radical Precursors

I synthesized radical precursors embedding the requisite hydrindane fragment embedded in the chromodorolides. Reduction of the double bond on allylic alcohol 4.45 (Section 3.2.3) was performed to prevent potential side reactions with the alkene in the radical coupling. Selective alkene reduction proved challenging, ${ }^{20}$ but hydrogen atom transfer conditions ${ }^{21}$ afforded saturated product 4.46 in $65 \%$ yield. Hydrolysis of methyl ester 4.46 gave carboxylic acid radical precursor 4.47, which was subjected to photoredox coupling conditions with butenolide 4.3.

I anticipated higher syn diastereoselectivity than that observed with analogous simplified radical precursor 4.40d (1:2.6 anti:syn, Table 4.2), but acid 4.47 underwent coupling to butenolide 4.3 favoring anti addition in a 1.2:1 ratio. While the energetic difference between these two diastereoselectivities is small, ${ }^{22}$ the result stood in contrast to our hypothesis (Figure 4.3). Addition of the bulky hydrindane fragment would increase destabilizing interactions between the vicinal substituents in the anti addition transition
state, which should translate to higher syn selectivity under the eclipsing interaction-based hypothesis.

Scheme 4.5. Synthesis and Coupling of Acid Radical Precursor 4.47.



Perplexed by this experimental result, I synthesized a second hydrindanecontaining radical precursor with two unprotected hydroxyl groups. Exposure of allylic alcohol 4.45 to $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ under 1 atm $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ cleanly afforded diol ester 4.50. Saponification of ester 4.50 with LiOH afforded diol carboxylic acid radical precursor 4.51. Exposure of this acid to photoredox conditions with butenolide 4.3 yielded coupling product 4.52 and 4.53 with high anti preference ( $9.8: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) in $45 \%$ yield. ${ }^{23}$ The high anti diastereoselectivity was unexpected, as Table 4.2 indicated that $O$-functionalization had minimal effect on the radical addition's diastereoselectivity.

## Scheme 4.6. Synthesis and Coupling of Acid Radical Precursor 4.51.



At this point, I initiated a computational collaboration with Dr. Mikko Muuronen and Prof. Filipp Furche to understand the intricate factors controlling radical diastereoselectivity. We systematically examined the roles of protected and unprotected alcohols on the radical substrates experimentally and computationally.

Experimentally, I synthesized several additional radical precursors from allylic alcohol 4.45. First, tert-butyldimethylsilyl protection of $\mathbf{4 . 4 5}$ followed by debenzylation and hydrogenation gave ester 4.55. ${ }^{24}$ To prevent silyl migration, ester hydrolysis under nonbasic conditions with $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{SnOH}^{25}$ yielded radical precursor 4.56 with a free primary alcohol. To access the free secondary alcohol radical precursor, diol ester $\mathbf{4 . 5 0}$ was exposed to TBS-Cl for selective silylation of the primary alcohol. Nonbasic saponification afforded the desired free secondary alcohol radical precursor 4.58. The third radical precursor, bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyl) acid 4.60, was accessed from exposure of diol ester $\mathbf{4 . 5 0}$ to TBS-OTf followed by nonbasic saponification. With these three radical precursors in hand, I examined their diastereoselectivities in radical coupling to butenolide 4.3.

Scheme 4.7. Synthesis of Acid Radical Precursors 4.56, 4.58, 4.60.




Shown in Table 4.3, coupling of the hydrindane-containing acids under photoredox conditions revealed a trend in the diastereoselectivity. For reference, benzyl ether acid 4.47 coupled to butenolide 4.3 with 1.2:1 dr favoring anti addition (entry 1), while diol acid 4.51 coupled with $9.8: 1$ dr favoring the anti product (entry 2 ). Switching from a primary benzyl ether to a primary tert-butyldimethylsilyl ether (4.58, entry 3 ) had virtually no effect on the diastereoselectivity (1.3:1 dr favoring anti addition). Silyl protection of both alcohols (4.60, entry 4) inverted diastereoselectivity to give 1:8.2 ratio favoring the syn addition product. Acid 4.56 with a free primary alcohol (entry 5) coupled also with high syn addition preference in 1:7.0 ratio, further confirming the secondary alcohol's role in diastereoselectivity. ${ }^{26}$ Having experimentally observed the reversal in diastereoselectivity between acids $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ and $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ (entries 2 and 4), I then turned to computational modeling of
the syn and anti transition states of these radicals coupling to butenolide 4.3 to rationalize the origins of this diastereoselectivity.

Table 4.3. Photoredox-Catalyzed Radical Couplings of Hydrindane-Substituted Acids.


| Entry | Radical Precursor | $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\underline{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { anti } \leq \text { svn } \\ \text { (bv } \left.{ }^{1}-\underline{N M R}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Isolated Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 (a) | 4.47 | $B n$ | H | 1.2:1 | 49\% |
| 2 (b) | 4.51 | H | H | 9.8:1 | 27\% |
| 3 (c) | 4.58 | TBS | H | 1.3:1 | 71\% |
| 4 (d) | 4.60 | TBS | TBS | 1:8.2 | 37\% |
| 5 (e) | 4.56 | H | TBS | 1:7.0 | 22\% |

### 4.2.4 Computational Methods and Parameters Guiding Selectivity

After combining the Furche group's computational work with my experimental results, ${ }^{27}$ I can provide three parameters which govern the diastereoselectivity for addition of trisubstituted acetonide radicals to electron-deficient alkenes.

### 4.2.4.1 Destabilizing Steric Interactions

The first parameter that affects the diastereoselectivity of trisubstituted acetonide radical additions is destabilizing eclipsing interactions between the acetonide substituents. My and Renaud's initial hypothesis concerning destabilizing eclipsing interactions
between the substituents (Figure 4.3) was correct in that increasing the size of the alkyl substituents will increase selectivity for syn addition, presuming all other parameters (vide infra) are not affected. This principle is exemplified in Renaud's work ${ }^{13}$ (Figure 4.5A) and by comparison of radicals 4.63 and 4.64 (Figure 4.5B). This diastereoselectivity is counterintuitive as bulky substituents typically direct reactivity to occur from the opposite, sterically-accessible face. However, for trisubstituted acetonide radicals, the eclipsing interactions between these substituents along with an early radical transition state (the forming bond is calculated to be $2.40 \AA$ ) overcome the sterically-disfavored approach of the electrophile. To visual the destabilizing effects of the vicinal substituents, a three dimensional image of the computationally optimized transition state structure ${ }^{28}$ for syn addition of bis(trimethylsilyl) radical $\mathbf{4 . 6 5}$ shows the acetonide substituents oriented away from each other during addition to butenolide 4.3 (Figure 4.6). However, destabilizing eclipsing interactions between acetonide substituents alone cannot rationalize the observed diastereoselectivities from other radical precursors in Table 4.3.


Figure 4.5. Destabilizing Interactions Affecting Radical Diastereoselectivity.


## Figure 4.6. Computational Transition State for Syn Addition of Bis-trimethylsilyl Radical 4.65 to Butenolide 4.3.

### 4.2.4.2 Stabilizing Noncovalent Interactions

The second parameter that guides diastereoselectivity is stabilizing noncovalent interactions between the vicinal substituents on the acetonide radical. In the case of unprotected alcohols, diol radical 4.66 displayed high anti selectivity (Figure 4.7); and stepwise protection of the alcohols increased selectivity for syn addition (Table 4.3). Shown in Figure 4.8, optimized transition state structures of radicals 4.66, 4.69, and 4.70 undergoing anti addition to butenolide 4.3 revealed a hydrogen bond between the two oxygens on the side chains. ${ }^{29}$ The length of the computed hydrogen bond correlated to the syn:anti selectivity, which I rationalized as stronger/shorter hydrogen bonds increasing stability for the transition state leading to anti addition. Impeding this hydrogen bonding by alcohol protection minimized these stabilizing interactions in the anti transition state and thus decreases selectivity for anti addition products.

4.66
9.8:1

4.67
$1.3: 1$

4.68

1 : 7.0

4.64 $1: 8.2$

Figure 4.7 Noncovalent Stabilizing Interactions Affecting Radical Diastereoselectivity.


4.66


4.69
(computational equivalent to radical 4.67)


4.70
(computational equivalent to radical 4.68)

Figure 4.8. Computational Transition States for Anti Addition with Hydrogen Bonding.

### 4.2.4.3 Radical/Acceptor Interactions

The last parameter guiding diastereoselectivity is interaction between the radical intermediate and the acceptor. Subtle interactions between the nucleophilic radical and the acceptor can alter diastereoselectivity, but these interactions may not be readily apparent. For example, coupling of bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyl) radical 4.64 to methacrylate $\mathbf{4 . 2 1}$
resulted in lower selectivity for the syn addition (1:2.2 dr, Figure 4.9) than to butenolide 4.3 (1:8.2). ${ }^{30}$ Deprotection of the secondary silyl ether on the trisubstituted acetonide radical (4.67) predictably led to increased selectivity for anti addition to methacrylate $\mathbf{4 . 2 1}$ (5.8:1 dr), and deprotection of both silyl groups (4.66) shifted addition to 4.21 further favoring anti addition (>10:1 dr). In comparing acceptors 4.21 (Figure 4.9) and butenolide 4.3 (Figure 4.7), the observed diastereoselectivities were quantitatively different with identical trisubstituted radicals, but the trends of stereoselection remained consistent. It is not obvious whether this differing stereoselection arose from steric or electronic differences between acceptors, which makes predicting the radical/accepter interactions challenging.


Figure 4.9. Radical/Acceptor Interactions Affecting Radical Diastereoselectivity.

### 4.2.4.4 Reliability of Computational Predictions

Structural modifications to radical precursors inevitably alter more than one parameter governing the radical addition's diastereoselectivity. The complexity in changing multiple parameters between radical precursors highlights the utility of advanced computational methods to account for the combination of these subtle interactions in radical couplings. Shown in Figure 4.10, correlations between computationally predicted diastereoselectivity and experimentally observed diastereoselectivity for the trisubstituted
radical substrates mentioned in this chapter are consistent, ${ }^{31}$ and the computational analysis developed by the Furche group provides accuracy within $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}( \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$. While these results are an exciting showcase for their methods, many organic transformations determining diastereoselectivity and enantioselectivity require computational accuracy below $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for quantitative predictions on stereochemical outcomes. As these and other computational methods continue to improve in accuracy, experimental organic chemists will find a plethora of applications to exploit computational prediction.


Figure 4.10. Computational and Experimental Correlations for Trisubstituted Acetonide Radical Additions to Butenolide 4.3.

### 4.3 Experimental Section

### 4.3.1 General Experimental Details

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of nitrogen or argon. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether, toluene, benzene, dichloromethane, methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$, pyridine, DIPEA, and triethylamine were dried by passage through activated alumina. TBS-OTf was distilled prior to use and stored in a Schlenk tube. 2,6-lutidine was distilled prior to use and stored in a Schlenk tube. Butenolide 4 was prepared according to literature procedures. ${ }^{32}$ All other commercial reagents were used as received unless otherwise noted. Reaction temperatures were controlled using a temperature modulator, and unless stated otherwise, reactions were performed at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{rt}$, approximately $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with silica gel 60 F254 pre-coated plates, ( 0.25 mm ) and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or by $p$-anisaldehyde, ceric ammonium molybdate, and potassium permanganate staining. Silica gel 60 (particle size $0.040-0.063 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) was used for flash column chromatography. pH 7 Silica gel was prepared according to previous literature procedure. ${ }^{33}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 500 or 600 MHz and are reported relative to deuterated solvent signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant (Hz), and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 125 MHz . Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift. IR spectra were recorded on a FT-IR spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained with a LCT spectrometer. Optical rotations were measured with a Jasco P-1010 polarimeter. Kessil KSH150B LED Grow Light 150, Blue LEDs were purchased from http://www.amazon.com. The radical coupling reactions using these blue

LEDs were maintained at approximately $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by passing a constant stream of air over the reaction vessels for the 18 h period. See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations (available at http://pubs.acs.org/userim ages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah _abbreviations.pdf).

### 4.3.2 Experimental Procedures

## (-)-Methyl (4R,5S)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate

 (S4.1): A solution of methyl $(4 R, 5 S)$-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4- carboxylate ${ }^{34}(1.06 \mathrm{~g}, 5.57 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMF $(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and methyl iodide ( $1.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 28 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. $\mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil, $0.234 \mathrm{~g}, 5.85 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the reaction vessel was allowed to slowly warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 4 h . Sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ soln $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{EtOAc}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ were then added, and the resulting layers were separated. The aqueous phase was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine $(1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic phase was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield ester S4.1 as a colorless oil ( $0.671 \mathrm{~g}, 3.29 \mathrm{mmol}, 59 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.30$ ( $40 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.32-4.26(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.6,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.54(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.6,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.40(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.11,111.74,78.18$, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-15.5\left(\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O} 5 \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 227.0895, observed 227.0900.
(-)-(4R,5S)-5-(Methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid
(4.40a): Ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 1}$ ( $0.104 \mathrm{~g}, 0.509 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in 1:1:1 THF: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{MeOH}(1.5$

mL ), and KOH pellets ( $43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.76 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The resulting homogeneous solution was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h before $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The resulting organic layer was discarded, and the remaining aqueous layer was acidified with $\mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 4 M soln) and then washed with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were then washed with brine ( 3 mL ) and dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. Concentration in vacuo afforded acid 4.40a ( $69 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.39(\operatorname{app~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.37-4.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.73$ (dd, $J=10.6,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.6,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46$ (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.96,112.24,77.94,75.34,72.43,59.77,26.96$, 25.73; IR (thin film) $3504,2991,2938,1737,1384,1215 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:-1.2(\mathrm{c}=4.2$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 213.0739, observed 213.0741.


## (-)-(4R,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-((5S)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-

$\mathbf{y l})$ dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41a/4.42a): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.40a ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.094$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)\right.$ ppy $\left.)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.002$ mmol). Next, DME ( $0.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.94 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide 4.3 ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 3.5:1 ratio of 4.41a:4.42a. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $25 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield an inseparable mixture of lactones $\mathbf{6 a}$ and 7a as a yellow oil ( $9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.35$ ( $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.41a (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 5.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.2,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79-3.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.55(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.8,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3,46(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.7,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.5,10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59-2.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.39(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.41a (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.19,109.94,107.49,77.59,77.56,72.99$, 59.71, 57.28, 43.38, 28.64, 27.07, 27.01; IR (thin film) 2987, 2936, 1789, 1585, 1451, 1381
$\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-96.7\left(\mathrm{c}=0.8, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 283.1158, observed 283.1160 .
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR NOE studies were unsuccessful to assign diastereomers 4.41a and 4.42a. The distinctive vicinal coupling constant of the methine hydrogens noted below was 3.2 Hz for the major product and 9.7 Hz for the minor product. Conformer populations of 4.41a and 4.42a were generated by molecular mechanics, and low energy conformations were optimized by DFT calculations at the B3LYP/631-G* level. Calculations and predictions of Boltzmann-weighted vicinal coupling constants for low-energy conformers were done using Spartan 14 (Wavefunction, Inc.).


Image of conformer 4.41a representin $61 \%$ of the Boltzmann distribution
 $76 \%$ of the Boltzmann distribution


Computational Prediction: $J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$


Computational Prediction:
$J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$


## (+)-(4R,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-((5S)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-

$\mathbf{y l})$ dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.43/4.44): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.40a ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.094 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.002 \mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME ( $0.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.94 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and entbutenolide 4.3 ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 4.0:1 ratio of 4.43:4.44. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $0 \%$ acetone in hexanes to $12 \%$ acetone in hexanes) to yield lactone 4.43 as a colorless oil ( $10 \mathrm{mg}, 0.038$ mmol, $41 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.20$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.43\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 5.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.3,6.3,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.9,4.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10-3.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.25(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.43\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta$ 174.24, 109.34, 105.99, 78.86, 78.20, 73.29, 58.98, 56.31, 44.58, 30.32, 27.31, 27.10; IR (thin film) 2986, 2922, 2851, 1787, 1454, 1371, $1240 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+51.0\left(\mathrm{c}=1.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 283.1158, observed 283.1150.


NOE for 4.43
(NOE in $\mathrm{d}^{6}$-benzene)

## (-)-Methyl (4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

 dioxolane-4-carboxylate (S4.2): A 25 mL round-bottom flask was charged with methyl(4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate ${ }^{32}$ ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.61 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of DMF ( $11 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.15 \mathrm{M}$ ). The resulting mixture was cooled down to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Next, the solution was treated with NaH ( $60 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil, $77 \mathrm{mg}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol})$. After 15 min at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $\mathrm{MeI}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 8 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise. After 1 h at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the heterogeneous reaction mixture was allowed to warm to 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 2 h . Upon complete consumption of the starting material, as indicated by TLC analysis ( $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized ceric ammonium molybdate), the reaction was quenched via dropwise addition of sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ soln. ( 10 mL ). The mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield acid S4.2 as a colorless oil ( $468 \mathrm{mg}, 1.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 88 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.20$ ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.35-7.27$ (m, $5 \mathrm{H}), 4.57-4.50(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 3.56-3.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.69,137.78,128.56,127.93,127.81,110.77,83.90,78.66,73.79,70.83$, $70.60,59.57,52.89,27.94,25.43$; IR (thin film) $2988,2874,1742,1454,1103 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}$ : $-3.65\left(\mathrm{c}=6.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 347.1471, observed 347.1464.

## (-)-Methyl (4R,5S)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

 dioxolane-4-carboxylate (S4.3): A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 2}$ ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.616 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.8$ $\mathrm{mL}, 0.14 \mathrm{M})$. Next, $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(200 \mathrm{mg})$ was added. The reaction vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\mathrm{Ar}(3 \mathrm{x})$. The heterogenous mixture was then treated with formic acid $(90 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and stirred vigorously for 18 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through Celite, and evaporated under reduced pressure to provide ester $\mathbf{S} 4.3(143 \mathrm{mg}, 0.610 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.50(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.6,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82$ (s, 3H), 3.79-3.76 (m, 3H), 3.71 (dd, $J=10.2,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.14,110.69,84.72$, 78.46, $70.33,63.73,59.80,53.09,27.87,25.35$; IR (thin film) $3472,2938,1741,1383,1098 \mathrm{~cm}^{-}$ ${ }^{1} ;[\alpha]^{21}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-4.44\left(\mathrm{c}=3.4, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 257.1001, observed 257.0997.
(+)-(4R,5S)-4-(Hydroxymethyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-
carboxylic acid (4.40b): A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 3}$ ( 80 mg ,

$0.34 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of $1: 1$ dioxane: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, 0.17 M ). Next, $\mathrm{KOH}(76 \mathrm{mg}, 1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The resulting biphasic mixture was stirred vigorously at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h . Upon allowing reaction mixture to cool down to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln) and EtOAc ( 1 mL ) were added. The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid 4.40 b ( $56 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.46(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.0,3.6$ Hz, 1H), 3.84-3.77 (m, 3H), 3.72-3.66 (m, 2H), 3.45 (s, 3H), 1.53 (s, 3H), 1.45 (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.27,109.96,77.23,68.93,66.13,62.50,58.69,26.70$, 24.23; IR (thin film) $3509,2984,1740,1377,1091 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{21} \mathrm{D}:+3.69\left(\mathrm{c}=1.9, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 243.0845, observed 243.0845.


## (-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4-(Hydroxymethyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41b/4.42b): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.40b $(16 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.070 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \quad(13 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and
$\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol}) . \mathrm{Next}$, DME $(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a $1: 3.3$ ratio of $\mathbf{4 . 4 1 b} \mathbf{4}$.42b. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $35 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield an inseparable mixture of lactones 4.41b and 4.42b as a colorless oil ( $11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.38 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.2$ ( $40 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer $\mathbf{4 . 4 2 b}$ ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}$ $\left.\mathrm{Cl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.61(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.5,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62-3.60$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.58-3.52(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.75-2.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.45(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.39(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.42b ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 176.42,109.33,106.45,83.86,78.92,69.39,65.01,59.73,56.97$, $43.64,29.25,27.12,26.31$; IR (thin film) $2986,2925,1785,1375,1108 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-$ $10.5\left(\mathrm{c}=1.3, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 313.1263, observed 313.1262.


NOE for 4.42b
(+)-(4R,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4carboxylic acid (4.40c): A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 2}$ ( 100 mg , $0.308 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of $1: 1 \mathrm{THF}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.8 \mathrm{~mL}$,
$0.17 \mathrm{M}) . \mathrm{Next}, \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.62 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The resulting biphasic mixture was stirred vigorously at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h .

The reaction was then treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$ and EtOAc (1 mL). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid $4.40 \mathrm{c}(84 \mathrm{mg}, 0.27 \mathrm{mmol}, 88 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 9.14$ (br s, 1 H ), 7.32-7.28 (m, 5H), 4.57 (app $\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.0,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75-3.71(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.50, ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.29,136.20,127.34,126.77$, $126.61,109.98,82.89,77.23,72.71,69.19,69.13,58.29,26.60,24.14$; IR (thin film) 2989, 2934, 1738, 1375, $1099 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+10.4\left(\mathrm{c}=3.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 333.1314, observed 333.1303.

(-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41c/4.42c): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid
4.40c $(22 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.070 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \quad(13 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol}) . \mathrm{Next}$, $\mathrm{DME}(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:2.8 ratio of 4.41c:4.42c. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $17.5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield 4.42c as a colorless oil ( $13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol}, 47 \%$ yield) and 4.41c as a colorless oil ( $4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 17 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of 4.42c: 0.33 ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate); $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of 4.41c: 0.27 (20\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.42c $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.37-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, $5.64(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.53(\mathrm{t}, J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.67-3.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.49-3.48(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.60-2.58(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.36(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.42 \mathrm{c}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $176.44,137.33,128.71,128.20,128.03,109.52,106.89,82.36,80.41,74.03,73.52,70.64$, 59.64, 57.01, 44.42, 29.68, 27.24, 26.31; IR (thin film) 2986, 2927, 1785, 1598, $1106 \mathrm{~cm}^{-}$ ${ }^{1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-20.1\left(\mathrm{c}=1.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 403.1733, observed 403.1727.


NOE for 4.42c
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for minor diastereomer 4.41c $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.38-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, $5.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{dd} J=$ $7.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.58-3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.86-2.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.62-2.57(m, 1H), $1.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for minor diastereomer 4.41c (125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.17,137.59,128.72,128.22,128.08,109.22,106.43,81.38,79.84$, $73.75,70.60,69.58,59.58,57.22,44.23,29.76,28.75,26.67$; IR (thin film) 2985, 2923, 1787, 1598, $1107 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-19.4\left(\mathrm{c}=0.4, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 403.1733$, observed 403.1740.

(+)-(4R,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4carboxylic acid (4.40d): A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with a $(4 R, 5 S)-5-$
 (hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate ${ }^{32}$ ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.644 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of $1: 1: 1$ THF:MeOH: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $2.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.32 \mathrm{M}$ ). Next, KOH ( $72 \mathrm{mg}, 1.3$ mmol ) was added. The resulting biphasic mixture was stirred vigorously at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h . The reaction was then treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$ and EtOAc (1 mL). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 d}$ ( $188 \mathrm{mg}, 0.634 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ yield) as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.35-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.59(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.43$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.0,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.0,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.92,137.15,128.70,128.19,127.95,111.01,84.37,79.36,74.15$, $70.56,60.35,27.79,25.48$; IR (thin film) $3457,2989,2937,1738,1382,1100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ $:+9.53\left(\mathrm{c}=4.3, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 319.1158, observed 319.1157.


## (-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

 dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41d/4.42d): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.40d $(21 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.070 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME $(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:2.6 ratio of 4.41d:4.42d. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $32 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield an inseparable mixture of lactones 4.41d and 4.42d as a colorless oil (17 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 66 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25$ ( $40 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.42 \mathrm{~d}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.39$ 7.27 (m, 5H), $5.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.48-4.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.21(\mathrm{t}, J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88-3.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.67-2.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.43$ $(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.42d (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 176.43,136.75,128.92,128.49,128.33,109.39$, $106.51,83.03,81.98,74.20,73.54,60.47,56.95,44.32,29.74,27.16,26.25$; IR (thin film)3468, 2986, 2935, 1784, $1373 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-21.7\left(\mathrm{c}=1.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 389.1576$, observed 389.1576.

(+)-Methyl
carboxylate (S4.4): A reaction vessel was charged with methyl (4R,5S)-4-
(4R,5S)-4,5-bis(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-
((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate ${ }^{32}(0.250 \mathrm{~g}, 0.806 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ $(0.200 \mathrm{~g})$. The vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\operatorname{Ar}(3 \mathrm{x})$ before $\mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added followed by formic acid ( 0.2 $\mathrm{mL})$. The suspension was then vigorously stirred for 4 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before filtering through Celite. Upon concentration in vacuo, ester S4.4 was isolated ( $0.172 \mathrm{~g}, 0.781 \mathrm{mmol}, 97 \%$ yield) as a colorless solid. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25$ ( $60 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.42(\mathrm{t}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{dd}$, $J=12.3,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.3,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84-3.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.97(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $172.37,110.37,84.48,79.44,63.50,60.23,53.06,27.75,25.29$; IR (thin film) 3426,2990 , 2954, 2886, 1742, 1457, 1438, $1384 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+6.1\left(\mathrm{c}=2.6, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 243.0845, 243.0842.
dioxolane-4-carboxylate ( $\mathbf{S 4 . 5}$ ): To a solution of ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 4}(0.108 \mathrm{~g}, 0.490 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added imidazole ( $0.167 \mathrm{~g}, 2.45$


S4.5: $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ Molecular Weight: 448.7470 mmol) followed by DMAP ( $3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and then TBS-Cl $(0.222 \mathrm{~g}, 1.47 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was maintained for 2 h before quenching with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the heterogeneous solution was concentrated in vacuo over Celite ( $\sim 2 \mathrm{~g}$ ). The resulting solid was purified by flash column chromatography (8\% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 5}$ as a colorless oil ( 0.185 g , $0.412 \mathrm{mmol}, 84 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.80$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.43(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.11(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $12.0,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85-3.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.76$ (s, 3H), 3.71 (d, $J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.47$ (s, 3H), $1.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.03(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.02(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.87,109.96,84.46,80.68,64.26,62.21,52.52,28.06,26.17$, $25.90,25.55,18.67,18.30,-4.98,-5.0,-5.42,-5.57$; $\mathbb{I R}$ (thin film) 2930, 2857, 1747, 1472, $1381 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-7.84\left(\mathrm{c}=4.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 471.2574$, observed 471.2574 .

## (+)-(4R,5S)-4,5-Bis(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (4.40e): The procedure for the preparation of 4.40 e was a
 slight modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{25}$ A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 5}$ ( $80 \mathrm{mg}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of DCE ( $1.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.16 \mathrm{M}$ ). Next, $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{SnOH}$ ( $225 \mathrm{mg}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The resulting
heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h . Upon allowing reaction mixture to cool down to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the solution was treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(5 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln). The organic layer was washed with brine ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a colorless oil. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \%$ acetone in hexanes) to yield 4.40e as a colorless oil ( $72 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 94 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.5$ ( $20 \%$ acetone in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.30(\mathrm{t}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{dd}$, $J=11.4,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.4,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.73,110.81,85.95,80.04,64.96$, $61.56,28.22,26.29,26.22,25.83,18.76,18.69,-4.87,-4.96,-5.09$; IR (thin film) 2954 , $2858,1726,1472,1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22} \mathrm{D}:+2.70\left(\mathrm{c}=1.3, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 457.2418$, observed 457.2430.


## (-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4,5-Bis(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-

dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41e/4.42e): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.40e $(30 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.070 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \quad(13 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol}) . \mathrm{Next}$, DME ( $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was
added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.077 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:2.2 ratio of 4.41e:4.42e.The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (0\% EtOAc in hexanes to 4\% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield 4.42e as a colorless oil ( $16 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%$ yield) and 4.41 e as a colorless oil ( $8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 22 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of 4.42 e : 0.18 ( $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate); $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of 4.41e: 0.13 (5\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.42 \mathrm{e}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.65(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.07(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.8,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75-3.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.63(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.6,11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58-2.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.36$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 0.08-0.06(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.42e ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 176.61,108.91,107.21,83.83,80.51,66.89,61.26,56.96,44.07$, $30.01,27.40,26.56,26.09,18.57,18.48,-5.14,-5.22,-5.41,-5.51$; IR (thin film) 2954, 2930, 1790, 1254, $1104 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-18.0\left(\mathrm{c}=1.4, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 527.2836, observed 527.2828.


NOE for 4.42e
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for minor diastereomer $4.41 \mathrm{e}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80-3.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.41$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=10.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.83(\mathrm{t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.69(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.4,9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $17.4,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91-0.88(\mathrm{~m}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 0.08-0.05(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for minor diastereomer $4.41 \mathrm{e}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.63,108.68,106.44,82.21$, $82.12,62.60,62.03,56.97,43.43,29.68,28.95,26.64,26.25,25.91,18.65,18.23,-4.92$, 5.04, -5.64, -5.71; IR (thin film) 2954, 2930, 1795, 1253, $1098 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; $[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}:-19.7(\mathrm{c}=$ 0.7, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 527.2836$, observed 527.2825.


NOE for 4.41e
(+)-(5S)-4-Ethyl-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (S4.6): Ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 1}$ ( $0.151 \mathrm{~g}, 0.739 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in a mixture of THF ( 3 mL ) and
 HMPA ( 0.6 mL ). The solution was then cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and ethyl iodide ( $0.24 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added followed by LHMDS ( 0.8 mL of 1.0 M soln in THF, 0.8 mmol ). The reaction was maintained for 1 h at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ soln $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The vessel was then allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The resulting aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 3 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic phases were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography
(0\% EtOAc in hexanes to $8 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to afford ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 6}$ as a colorless oil in a 9:1 mixture of diastereomers $\left(0.108 \mathrm{~g}, 0.465 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \%\right.$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25$ ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for $\mathbf{S 4 . 6}$ 's major diastereomer ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.27(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=10.1,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.54(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.1,8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.39(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-$ $1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for $\mathbf{S 4 . 6}$ 's major diastereomer (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.84,110.23,85.18,79.32,71.20,59.45,52.57$, 27.99, 26.21, 25.40, 8.11; IR (thin film) 2987, 2938, 2883, 1759, 1731, 1458, $1381 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; $[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+10.1\left(\mathrm{c}=1.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 255.1208, observed 255.1218.
(4.40f): Ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 6}$ ( $59 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in 1:1:1 MeOH:THF: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.9 \mathrm{~mL})$, and KOH pellets ( $29 \mathrm{mg}, 0.51 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to the solution. The reaction was maintained at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 14 h , at which point the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were discarded. The aqueous layer was then acidified with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 4 M soln) and then extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic phases were washed with brine ( $1 \times 3 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo to provide acid 4.40f as a colorless solid in a 9:1 mixture of diastereomers ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}$, $90 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for 4.40 f 's major diastereomer ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.32$ (dd, $J=$ $8.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.1,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.83-1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$;
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for 4.40 f 's major diastereomer ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.55,110.83,85.31$, $78.92,70.76,59.58,27.26,25.61,25.56,7.92$; IR (thin film) $3472,3180,2988,2939,2884$, 1731, 1459, 1381, $1247 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+37.8\left(\mathrm{c}=1.1, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 241.1052, observed 241.1054.

(-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4-ethyl-5-(methoxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.41f/4.42f): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 f}$ ( 20 mg , $0.092 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.002$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME ( $0.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.94 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide 4.3 ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:9.3 ratio of 4.41f:4.42f. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to afford an inseparable mixture of lactones $\mathbf{4 . 4 1 f}$ and $\mathbf{4 . 4 2 f}$ as a yellow solid ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.062 \mathrm{mmol}, 68 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.20(20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). Recrystallization from acetone and hexanes afforded yellow crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray diffraction of 4.42f. ${ }^{17}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for $\mathbf{4 . 4 2 f}$ (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.56(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.0$,
$6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.41(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.0,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.0$, $10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.61-2.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.1,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-$ $1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for $4.42 \mathrm{f}(125$ $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 176.65,108.24,106.94,83.81,78.47,70.35,59.57,56.89,45.48,29.39$, 27.56, 26.44, 25.82, 7.89; IR (thin film) 2975, 2937, 2900, 2812, 1780, 1459, $1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; $[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{D}:-17.7\left(c=1.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 311.1471, observed 311.1474; mp 105-113 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; X-ray: CCDC 146074.


NOE for $\mathbf{4 . 4 2 f}$
(+)-Methyl
(4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy ((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4carboxylate (4.46): A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with alcohol $\mathbf{4 . 4 5}^{\mathbf{3 2}}$ ( 130 mg ,

$0.275 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of $n$-hexanes ( $0.55 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.5$ M). To this stirring solution, $\mathrm{PhSiH}_{2} \mathrm{Oi} \operatorname{Pr}(69 \mathrm{mg}, 0.41 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a solution of TBHP in hexanes $(75 \mu \mathrm{~L} \mathrm{~mL}$ of 5.5 M soln, 0.41 mmol) were added and the resulting mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 10 min . Next, $\mathrm{Mn}(\mathrm{dpm})_{3}(17 \mathrm{mg}, 0.028 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added in one portion and the reaction was then further degassed for an additional 30 seconds. The resulting mixture was allowed to stir at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . Upon complete consumption of the starting material, as indicated by TLC analysis (10\% EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with
ceric ammonium molybdate), the reaction was transferred directly onto a silica gel column and purified by flash column chromatography (5\% EtOAc in hexanes to $8 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes), yielding ester $\mathbf{4 . 4 6}$ as a colorless oil ( $83 \mathrm{mg}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.40$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.32-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.31(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{t}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78-3.76(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.47-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.12-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.78$ (s, 3H) ; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 172.78, 138.02, 128.47, 127.81, 127.76, 109.91, $85.32,80.22,73.71,72.28,69.97,58.54,55.63,52.71,42.26,41.47,39.67,33.70,33.27$, 27.67, 25.34, 25.19, 20.94, 20.68, 19.20, 13.81; IR (thin film) 2923, 1765, 1727, 1598, $1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+19.1\left(\mathrm{c}=0.4, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}$ (M+Na) 497.2879, observed 497.2855.

## (+)-(4R,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-

## trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylic

 acid (4.47): A 20 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester 4.46 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of $1: 1: 1 \mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{THF}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 4.9 mL , $0.033 \mathrm{M}) . \mathrm{Next}, \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(42 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 72 h . Upon allowing reaction mixture to cool down to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the solution was treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$ and EtOAc ( 1 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ).

Combined organic layers washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid 4.47 as a colorless oil $(55 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}$, $76 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.34-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.58(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.27(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87-3.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-$ $1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.45(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.82,137.68,128.59,127.92,127.81$, $110.64,85.84,80.40,73.97,72.19,70.18,58.56,55.60,42.34,41.46,39.61,33.69,33.27$, 27.76, 25.56, 25.04, 20.95, 20.68, 19.92, 13.89; IR (thin film) 1943, 2924, 1737, 1383, $1217 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{D}}:+27.8\left(\mathrm{c}=2.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}$ (M+Na) 483.2722, observed 483.2706.

(+)-(4S,5R)-4-((4R,5S)-4-((Benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy ((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-
methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.48): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.47 ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.070$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014$ mmol). Next, DME ( $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide 4.3 ( $9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( 2 x 34 W blue LED lamps)
for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1.2:1 ratio of 4.48:4.49.The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (4\% EtOAc in hexanes to $8 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield 4.48 as a colorless oil ( 18 mg , $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \%$ yield). Minor diastereomer 4.49 could not be isolated in pure form by column chromatography. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.26$ ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for $4.48\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.37-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.42$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=4.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.88-2.81(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-$ $1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-0.96(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.73(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for 4.48 ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.01,137.45,129.00,128.57,128.53,108.43,106.83,81.72$, $81.70,74.27,69.88,68.34,58.62,57.63,54.99,44.99,42.63,41.68,40.07,33.91,33.47$, 30.38, 28.97, 27.13, 24.38, 21.19, 20.95, 20.18, 14.81; IR (thin film) 2924, 2873, 1789, 1454, $1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}:+12.17\left(\mathrm{c}=1.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 553.3141, observed 553.3146.


NOE for 4.48
(+)-Methyl (4R,5S)-5-((R)-hydroxy ((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate
(4.50): To a suspension of $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(0.207 \mathrm{~g}, 0.195 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added
 alcohol $4.45{ }^{32}(0.230 \mathrm{~g}, 0.487 \mathrm{mmol})$ in a solution of $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.5$ mL ). The reaction vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ (3x). The reaction was then vigorously stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h , at which point the reaction vessel was purged with Ar to remove remaining $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The suspension was then filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $40 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield diol ester 4.50 as a colorless solid $(0.127 \mathrm{~g}, 0.330 \mathrm{mmol}$, $69 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.40$ ( $50 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.34(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 2.82-1.98(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.52$ (s, 3H), $1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.19-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{td}, J=13.4,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.21,109.67,84.93,79.61,70.20$, 63.99, 58.49, 55.50, 52.84, 42.33, 41.36, 39.59, 33.63, 33.22, 27.76, 25.60, 25.26, 20.87, $20.60,19.88,13.69 ;$ IR (thin film) $3415,2985,2963,2875,1739,1457 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+40.1$ (c = 1.3, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 407.2410$, observed 407.2393.
(+)-(4R,5S)-5-((R)-Hydroxy ((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (4.51): A


20 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester $\mathbf{4 . 5 0}(82 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21$ mmol ), followed by the addition of $1: 1: 1 \mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{THF}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (3.6 $\mathrm{mL}, 0.06 \mathrm{M}) . \mathrm{Next}, \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.42 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously at 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h . Next, the solution was treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln) and EtOAc ( 1 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 $\times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). Combined organic layers washed with brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ as a colorless solid ( $77 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.62-4.43(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98-$ $3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.00(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.72(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.05,110.29$, 84.97, 79.86, 70.35, 63.83, 58.56, 55.47, 42.40, 41.40, 39.60, 33.68, 33.28, 27.61, 25.60, $25.33,20.93,20.64,19.92,13.83$; IR (thin film) $3418,2932,1733,1373,763 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ $:+22.6\left(\mathrm{c}=1.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 393.2253, observed 393.2256 .

(+)-(4S,5R)-4-((4R,5S)-5-((R)-Hydroxy $((1 S, 3 \mathrm{aS}, 7 \mathrm{aS})-4,4,7 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{trimethyloctahydro-1H-}$

## inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-

methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.52/4.53): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.067$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}_{( }\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME ( $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide 4.3 ( $9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 9.8:1 ratio of $\mathbf{9 c} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{1 0 c}$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography using pH 7 buffered silica gel ( $15 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes to $23 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield lactone 4.52 as a clear oil ( $8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 27 \%$ yield). Minor diastereomer 4.53 could not be isolated in pure form by column chromatography. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.25$ ( $40 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{td}, J=9.4,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.9,9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.9$, $9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.11$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;$
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.87,108.25,106.39,81.73,80.31,68.96,61.66,58.46$, 57.94, 55.01, 43.60, 42.26, 41.24, 39.86, 33.57, 33.20, 30.14, 28.68, 26.85, 25.29, 20.86, $20.54,19.89,14.28$; IR (thin film) $3453,2927,1790,1460,1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+37.0(\mathrm{c}=$ $0.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 463.2672, observed 463.2667.

(+)-Methyl
(4R,5S)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-((R)-

## hydroxy((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-

dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (4.57): To a solution of 4.50 ( $80 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}$ )
 in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added imidazole ( $85 \mathrm{mg}, 1.3$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ followed by TBS-Cl ( $94 \mathrm{mg}, 0.62 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until starting material was consumed as monitored by TLC (about 45 min$). \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added to the solution, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were then dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $5 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield ester 4.57 as a light yellow oil ( $0.104 \mathrm{~g}, 0.209 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.50$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.14(\mathrm{~d}, J$
$=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\operatorname{appt} \mathrm{t}, J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.53$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.2,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09-$ $1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89-0.81(\mathrm{~m}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.04(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.60,109.24,85.12,79.41,69.39,64.80,58.51,55.57,52.44$, $42.20,41.48,39.64,33.67,33.22,27.67,25.84,25.45,25.41,20.90,20.62,19.95,18.24$, $13.72,-5.44,-5.59$; IR (thin film) $3568,2952,2929,2858,1742,1462 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+23.0$ ( c $=2.9, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 521.3275$, observed 521.3280.
(+)-(4R,5S)-4-(((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-((R)-hydroxy((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-
carboxylic acid (4.58): The procedure for the preparation of 4.58 was a slight modification
 from the literature procedure. ${ }^{25}$ A 4 mL scintillation vial was charged with ester 4.57 ( $94 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of DCE ( $1.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.16 \mathrm{M}$ ). Next, $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{SnOH}$ ( $170 \mathrm{mg}, 0.94$ mmol ) was added. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 36 h . Upon allowing reaction mixture to cool down to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the solution was treated with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(5 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 N soln $)$. Organic layer was washed with brine ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield acid $\mathbf{4 . 5 8}$ as a colorless oil ( $91 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.34(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-$ $1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-0.94(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87-0.84(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.37,110.05,86.30,79.82,70.10,65.66,58.58,55.66,42.31$, $41.48,39.63,33.71,33.28,27.77,25.97,25.48,25.28,20.95,20.67,19.95,18.41,13.84,-$ 5.29, - 5.31 ; IR (thin film) $3322,2922,2613,1734,1073 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+24.4(\mathrm{c}=2.0$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 507.3118$, observed 507.3131 .


## (-)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-4-(((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-5-((R)-

## hydroxy((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-2,2-

dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.61c/4.62c): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid $4.58(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.067 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and
$\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol}) . \mathrm{Next}$, $\mathrm{DME}(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a $1.3: 1$ ratio of $4.61 \mathbf{c}: 4.62 \mathrm{c}$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (5\% EtOAc in hexanes to 30\% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield lactone 4.61c as a yellow oil ( $15 \mathrm{mg}, 0.027 \mathrm{mmol}, 41 \%$ yield $)$ and acid $\mathbf{S 4 . 7}$ from $\mathrm{SiO}_{2-}$ mediated rearrangement of $\mathbf{4 . 6 2} \mathbf{c}\left(11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.020 \mathrm{mmol}, 30 \%\right.$ yield) as a yellow oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of 4.61c: 0.40 ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ of S4.7: 0.20 ( $50 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate).

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.61c $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.48$ (d, $J=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.88(\operatorname{app~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.83-2.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $17.3,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.3,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.85(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.18-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{td}, J=13.1,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.10(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer $4.61 \mathrm{c}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 175.28,108.33,106.27,82.33,81.30,67.57,62.26,58.41,56.96,55.79,44.42,42.14$, $41.37,39.94,33.60,33.18,30.00,28.85,26.98,25.83,24.94,20.87,20.55,19.91,18.17$, $14.29,-5.59,-5.77$; IR (thin film) $3568,2953,2929,2858,1794,1463,1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}$
: -1.7 ( $\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 577.3536, observed 577.3520 .


NOE for 4.61c

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for minor diastereomer $\mathbf{S 4 . 7}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.54$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.20(\operatorname{app~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.58(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.36(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.6,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41(\operatorname{app~td}, J=8.1,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.5,8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-$ $1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.30$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.09-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.76(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.07(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for minor diastereomer $\mathbf{S 4 . 7}(125 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 177.52,110.52,102.00,82.19,79.43,72.01,65.56,58.29,55.32,51.03,41.96$, 41.57, 39.50, 37.81, 33.71, 33.36, 33.21, 29.22, 27.38, 25.95, 25.40, 20.94, 20.79, 19.99, $18.26,14.24,-5.43,-5.48$; IR (thin film) 2928, 2858, 1712, 1463, $1366 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+45.1$ ( $\mathrm{c}=1.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 577.3536$, observed 577.3536.


NOE for $\mathbf{S 1 2}$
(-)-Methyl
(4R,5S)-4-((benzyloxy)methyl)-5-((R)-((tert-

## butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((3aS,7aS)-3a,7,7-trimethyl-3a,4,5,6,7,7a-hexahydro-1H-

inden-3-yl)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (4.54): To a solution at 0

${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ of alcohol $4.45(0.132 \mathrm{~g}, 0.279 \mathrm{mmol})$, in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and 2,6-lutidine ( $0.10 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added TBSOTf ( $160 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $0.56 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was maintained at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min before allowing to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h , at which point $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added to the reaction. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were then dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $0 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes to $8 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to afford ester 4.54 as a yellow oil ( $0.142 \mathrm{~g}, 0.242 \mathrm{mmol}, 87 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.70\left(20 \%\right.$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.34-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.54$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.38(\operatorname{app~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.25(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{ddd}, J=15.2,6.4,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{t}, J$ $=11.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{appqt}, J=12.9,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.41$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{td}, J=13.4,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.03(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.4,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $0.94(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}),-0.03(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),-0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz ,
$\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.16,153.08,138.24,128.39,127.66,127.64,127.36,110.37,85.45,82.22$, $73.62,71.84,67.04,59.66,52.52,47.30,41.56,35.62,32.29,32.89,28.54,27.69,26.25$, 25.87, 21.48, 20.15, 18.43, 18.14, -2.82, -4.37; IR (thin film) 2987, 2950, 2855, 1744, 1461, $1379 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-27.9\left(\mathrm{c}=2.2, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 609.3588, observed 609.3602.
(+)-Methyl
$(4 R, 5 S)-5-((R)-(($ tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy $)((1 S, 3 \mathrm{aS}, 7 \mathrm{aS})-4,4,7 \mathrm{a}-$
trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolane-4-carboxylate (4.55): Ester $4.54(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.055 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{mg}$,
 $0.011 \mathrm{mmol})$ were charged into a flask with $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction vessel was then evacuated and refilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}(3 x)$. The reaction was then vigorously stirred at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h , at which point the reaction vessel was purged with Ar to remove remaining $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through Celite, concentrated in vacuo, and then dissolved EtOAc ( 1 mL ). To the solution was added $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol})$ which was then placed in a Parr high pressure vessel and subsequently filled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~atm})$. The vessel was placed on top of an IKA magnetic plate and stirred for 3 h before being removed. The resulting suspension was filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo. The afforded residue was then purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) provided alcohol $4.55(23 \mathrm{mg}, 0.046 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%)$ as a colorless solid. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.30$ ( $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.6,8.1$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.6,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.9,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-$ $1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.1,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.39-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-0.92(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 0.07 (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.18,109.71,84.30,83.38,68.54,62.38$, 58.27, 53.05, 52.55, 43.02, 41.81, 39.55, 33.68, 33.19, 28.07, 26.81, 24.98, 21.14, 20.99, 19.75, 19.48, 19.16, 16.07, -2.21, -3.19; IR (thin film) 3491, 2928, 2899, 2856, 1738, 1469, $1383 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+23.7\left(\mathrm{c}=1.4, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 521.3275, observed 521.3281.

## (+)-(4R,5S)-5-((R)-((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-

trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (4.56): The procedure for the preparation of 4.56 was a slight modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{25}$ To a solution of ester $4.55(61 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{DCE}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{SnOH}$ $(0.110 \mathrm{~g}, 0.608 \mathrm{mmol})$. The heterogeneous mixture was then heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , at which point TLC analysis confirmed full consumption of starting material. The reaction was cooled to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 M soln). The organic layer was washed with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(5 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 4 M soln) and brine ( $1 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) before being dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. Upon concentration in vacuo, acid 4.56 was obtained ( $57 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 96 \%$ yield) as a colorless solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.06(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{q}, J=11.0$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{~d}, J=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-$ $0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.07(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.34,109.87,84.43,82.63,68.77,62.49,58.03,52.28,42.99$, $41.73,39.53,33.62,33.18,27.99,26.80,24.95,21.09,21.00,19.77,19.58,19.17,16.07$, -$2.20,-3.11$; IR (thin film) $3454,2951,2927,2896,1734,1461 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+32.7(\mathrm{c}=$ $1.0, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 507.3118$, observed 507.3113.

(+)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-5-((R)-((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-
trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-
dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.61e/S4.62e): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.56 ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.067 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}^{\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}$ ( $1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME ( $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( 13 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol})$, and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:7.0 ratio of 4.61e:4.62e. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \%$

EtOAc in hexanes to $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield lactone 4.62e as a colorless oil (8 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 22 \%$ yield). Minor diastereomer 4.62e could not be isolated in pure form by column chromatography. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.20$ ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.62e ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.90$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.2,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.47(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.2,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.2,10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=18.1,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.9,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87(\operatorname{app} \mathrm{dd}, J=$ $8.3,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.06-0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, $0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.81-0.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.62e (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 176.46, 107.41, 105.93, 83.34, 81.17, 68.47, $65.19,58.51,56.66,53.15,44.36,43.14,41.82,40.00,33.70,33.21,29.19,26.82,26.51$, $25.86,21.11,20.97,19.85,19.18,19.16,16.48,-1.74,-2.83$; IR (thin film) 3473,2952 , 2927, 2855, 1781, 1462, $1384 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+11.7\left(\mathrm{c}=0.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 577.3536, observed 577.3541.


NOE for 4.62e (NOE in $\mathrm{d}^{4}-\mathrm{MeOH}$ )
trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylate (4.59): To a solution of 4.50 ( $0.117 \mathrm{~g}, 0.304$
 $\mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added 2,6-lutidine $(170 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $1.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by TBSOTf ( $260 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.91 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction was then allowed to warm to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 12 h before $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. Celite ( 3 g ) was then added to the heterogeneous mixture, and the suspension was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting crude residue suspending on Celite was then purified by flash column chromatography ( $0 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes to $4 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield ester 4.59 as a colorless oil ( 0.168 g , $0.274 \mathrm{mmol}, 90 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.60$ ( $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.27(\operatorname{app~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-2.02(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.1,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-$ $1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.16$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 172.71, $109.12,85.08,82.62,69.36,63.92,58.20,52.65,52.25,42.94,41.82,39.70,33.68,33.22$, $27.46,26.88,26.15,24.92,21.20,21.04,19.88,19.79,19.25,18.62,16.04,-1.96,-2.92,-$ 5.08, -5.23; IR (thin film) 2953, 2928, 2857, 1736, 1462, $1379 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+24.4(\mathrm{c}=$ 1.2, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{64} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 635.4139, observed 635.4146.
(+)-(4R,5S)-5-((R)-((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-
trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolane-4-carboxylic acid (4.60): The procedure for the preparation
 of $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ was a slight modification from the literature procedure. ${ }^{25}$ To a solution of ester $4.59(0.122 \mathrm{~g}, 0.199 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DCE (1.2 mL ) was added $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{SnOH}(0.252 \mathrm{~g}, 1.39 \mathrm{mmol})$. The heterogeneous mixture was then heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h , at which point TLC analysis confirmed full consumption of starting material. The reaction was cooled to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 M soln). The organic layer was washed with aq. $\mathrm{HCl}(5 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 1 M soln $)$ and brine $(1 \times 4 \mathrm{~mL})$ before being dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. Upon concentration in vacuo, acid 4.60 was obtained ( 0.109 g , $0.182 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%$ yield $)$ as a colorless foam. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05-3.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99(\operatorname{app~q}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.75(\mathrm{t}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.38-1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-0.94(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.08(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 171.92, 109.19, 84.96, 81.27, $69.22,64.08,57.73,51.90,42.79,41.65,39.78,33.47,33.13,27.72,26.74,25.85,24.90$, $21.03,20.97,19.77,19.74,19.16,18.35,15.95,-2.13,-2.98,-5.33,-5.36$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2928, 2857, 1717, 1462, $1381 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+31.6\left(\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{62} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 621.3983, observed 621.3972.


## (+)-(4S,5R)-4-((5S)-5-((R)-((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-

trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)-5-methoxydihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (4.61d/4.62d): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid 4.60 ( $40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.067 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME $(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and butenolide $4.3(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a $1: 8.2$ ratio of 4.61d:4.62d. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $0 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield an inseparable mixture of lactones $\mathbf{4 . 6 1 d}$ and 4.62 d as a colorless oil $(17 \mathrm{mg}, 0.025 \mathrm{mmol}$, $37 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.50$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer $\mathbf{4 . 6 2 d}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.9,9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.8,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.77(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.4,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.29$ (s, 3H), 1.07-0.94 (m, 4H), $0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}$,
$3 \mathrm{H}), 0.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.08(\mathrm{app} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.62d (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 176.91,106.72,106.21,84.12,83.65,68.60,68.09,57.98,56.57$, $51.80,43.43,42.96,41.81,39.62,33.57,33.22,29.46,26.84,26.29,26.23,25.81,21.05$, 21.01, 19.86, 19.23, 19.04, 18.65, 16.61, $-1.68,-2.79,-5.23,-5.43$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2930, 2857, 1794, 1471, 1385, $1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}:+10.2\left(\mathrm{c}=1.6, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{68} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})$ 691.4401, observed 691.4407.


NOE for 4.62d (NOE in $\mathrm{d}^{6}$-acetone)

(+)-Methyl 3-((4R,5S)-5-((R)-hydroxy((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(hydroxymethyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)propanoate
(S4.8): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid $4.51(26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.070 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol}) . \mathrm{Next}$, $\mathrm{DME}(0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M})$ was added, followed by water ( $13 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and methacrylate ( $6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed
and irradiated ( $2 \times 34 \mathrm{~W}$ blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a yellow oil. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes to $30 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to yield ester $\mathbf{S 4 . 8}$ as a colorless oil ( $22 \mathrm{mg}, 0.053 \mathrm{mmol}, 78 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.23$ ( $30 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70-3.68(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $3.36-3.33(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.52-2.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.64$ $(\mathrm{m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.42(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.93(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 176.60, 109.37, $84.81,84.27,70.90,64.66,60.62,56.64,53.05,44.12,43.38,41.89,34.92,34.89,31.19$, 30.46, 29.46, 27.91, 27.03, 22.33, 22.07, 21.62, 15.25; IR (thin film) 3434, 2925, 1741, 1438, $1051 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+20.5\left(\mathrm{c}=1.6, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}$ (M+Na) 435.2722, observed 435.2729.


NOE for $\mathbf{S} 4.8$
( NOE in $\mathrm{d}^{4}-\mathrm{MeOH}$ )

(+)-Methyl
3-((5S)-5-((R)-((Tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)((1S,3aS,7aS)-4,4,7a-trimethyloctahydro-1H-inden-1-yl)methyl)-4-(((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-4-yl)propanoate (S4.9/S4.10): A 4 mL scintillation vial equipped with a Teflon septum and magnetic stir bar was charged with carboxylic acid $4.60(40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.067 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\left.\operatorname{Ir}\left[\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)\right]_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}$ ( $1.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0014 \mathrm{mmol})$. Next, DME ( $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added, followed by water ( 13 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol})$, and methacrylate $(6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was degassed by sparging with argon for 15 min and the vial was sealed and irradiated (2 x 34 W blue LED lamps) for 24 h at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude residue displayed a 1:2.1 ratio of $\mathbf{S 4 . 9}$ :S4.10. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography ( $2 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes to $4 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to yield an inseparable mixture of esters S4.9 and $\mathbf{S 4 . 1 0}$ as a colorless oil ( $35 \mathrm{mg}, 0.055 \mathrm{mmol}, 82 \%$ yield). $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.5$ ( $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes; visualized with ceric ammonium molybdate). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR for major diastereomer S4.10 (500 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67-3.63$ (m, 4H), 3.53 (d, $J=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.05(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.21$ (m, 2H), 1.29 (s, 3H), 1.09-0.94 (m, 3H), 0.91 (s, 9H), 0.88 ( $\mathrm{s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87$ (s, 3H), 0.84 (s, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.07(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR for major diastereomer 4.10 ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.50,105.73,83.16,81.24,69.44,66.31,58.22,52.06,51.74$, $42.82,41.92,39.53,33.62,33.20,28.50,28.20,26.92,26.33,26.25,26.13,20.99,20.94$, 19.87, 19.27, 19.12, 18.58, 16.25, -1.91, $-3.24,-5.34,-5.41$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2857,

1744, 1463, 1379, $1252 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}: 30.8\left(\mathrm{c}=2.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{68} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}) 663.4452$, observed 663.4431.


NOE for $\mathbf{S 4 . 1 0}$

### 4.3.3 Computational Details

To model the reactive radical species, the Furche group developed a multi-level computational approach ${ }^{35}$ that included extensive sampling of conformational freedom, thermal corrections within the quasi rigid-rotor harmonic-oscillator approximation, ${ }^{36}$ geometry optimization using the TPSS-D3 functional, ${ }^{37}$ and single-point calculations at the random-phase approximation (RPA) level. RPA is comparable in computational cost to conventional second-order Møller-Plesset (MP2) theory but more reliable for weak interactions, ${ }^{38}$ especially for the radical species considered in these diastereoselectivity studies.

All force-field computations were performed using Maestro 2015 with the OPLS2005 force field. ${ }^{39,40}$ The relaxed potential energy surfaces (PES) were optimized using Orca 3.0.3 with additional settings "Grid4" and "TightSCF". ${ }^{41}$ Other computations were performed using Turbomole 7.0 with grid $m 4 .{ }^{42}$ All structures were optimized using the TPSS $^{43}$ functional with def2-SVP or def2-TZVP basis sets ${ }^{44}$ as described in the text in combination with the BJ-damped D3-dispersion correction, denoted-D3 in the following. ${ }^{45}$ The resolution-of-the-identity approximation for Coulomb term (RI-J) ${ }^{46}$ or multipoleaccelerated RI-J (MARI-J) ${ }^{47}$ were used with the corresponding auxiliary basis sets ${ }^{48}$ in Orca and Turbomole, respectively. Solvation effects were taken into account using the COSMO solvation model with a dielectric constant of 8.9 (dichloromethane). ${ }^{49}$ Pictures of the computed structures were generated using Cylview. ${ }^{50}$

The experimentally observed differences in the diastereoselectivities are raised by very small energy differences, e.g., $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ error in the computation is enough to change the selectivity from 2.3:1 to 1:2.3. Thus, we used TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP structures to further
compute single-point energies with TPSSh-D3 ${ }^{51}$ and resolution-of-identity random phase approximation (RI-RPA) ${ }^{52}$ with corresponding auxiliary basis sets. ${ }^{53}$ We also calculated single-point energies using the TPSS functional without dispersion corrections for comparison. For RPA, solvated $\mathrm{PBE}^{54}$ orbitals were used, and the core orbitals were kept frozen for computation of correlation energy.

Harmonic vibrational frequencies were computed numerically for all studied transition states (TS) at the level of optimization (TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP/COSMO). The chemical potentials (c.p.), which are needed to study the Gibbs free energies $(\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{E}(0)+$ c.p.), were then calculated using two variations: (i) the standard rigid-rotor harmonicoscillator (RRHO) approximation and (ii) the quasi-RRHO approach proposed by Grimme. ${ }^{55}$ In the quasi-RRHO approach the vibrational entropy is replaced by the freerotor entropy for all modes with frequencies less than $100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Method (ii) is considered more reliable for systems with many vibrational modes below $100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} .55$

We chose the TPSS functional for the optimizations because of its solid performance across the periodic table. ${ }^{56}$ TPSS can be combined efficiently with RIapproximation, which significantly sped up the computations (approx. by factor of 10) and enabled the use of triple- $\zeta$ basis set for large set of transition states. The hybrid variant of TPSS, TPSSh, was used for single-point energies. TPSSh contains $10 \%$ of Hartree-Fock exchange, which reduces the self-interaction error (SIE), and therefore we consider it to be more accurate to describe interaction between the nucleophilic acetonide radical and electron deficient olefin. These functionals were further coupled with the atom-pairwise D3 dispersion correction. RPA was chosen because it captures the non-pairwise-additive nature of long-range interactions accurately ${ }^{13}$ and from first principles. In our preliminary
study for radical 4.40d, we also employed MP2/def2-QZVP to study the selectivity. The wave-functions were, however, spin-contaminated at Hartree-Fock level (the total spin expectation value was $\sim 1$ instead of 0.75 ) and the norm of the $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ amplitudes was high ( $>1$ ). This suggested that the reliability of MP2 for these systems is questionable, and therefore MP2 was not used further. The basis-set convergence of RPA was tested for radicals 4.40a and 4.40c by extrapolating the correlation energy to the complete basis-set (CBS) limit using a two-point extrapolation scheme ${ }^{57}$ with Dunning's cc-pVXZ ${ }^{58}$ basis-sets, where $\mathrm{X}=3,4$ (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4. The RPA energy difference between TS-anti and TS-syn for different basis-sets in kcal/mol.

| Basis set | $\Delta \Delta \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{XX}-$ anti $-\mathrm{XXa}-\mathrm{syn})$ | $\Delta \Delta \mathrm{E}($ XXc-anti -XXc -syn) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| def2-TZVP | 0.12 | 3.26 |
| cc-pVTZ | -0.08 | 3.01 |
| cc-pVQZ | 0.13 | 3.24 |
| CBS(3,4) | 0.13 | 3.30 |

### 4.3.3.1 Protocol for Selectivities

To explain the experimentally observed selectivities, diastereoselectivities were computed to radicals $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 a}-4.40 f, 4.51,4.56,4.58$, and 4.60. The OBn and OTBS-groups were simplified to OMe and OTMS, respectively.

We started by studying the reaction profile for the radical addition for radical 4.40d. First, the lowest energy conformer of the addition products was located, and then the relaxed PES was optimized (Figure 4.11). The PES was studied for different values for
bond distance $r$ with TPSS-D3 and TPSSh-D3 using def2-SVP basis sets and in the gasphase.



Figure 4.11. The PES using different $r$ values to describe the $\mathbf{C - C}$ bond formation step for radical 4.40d.
$($ Solid lines $=$ TPSS-D3/def2-SVP; dashed lines $=$ TPSSh-D3/def2-SVP; black $=$ syn; red $=$ anti.)

The two functionals provided slightly different PESs: TPSS-D3 predicted lower activation energy barriers than TPSSh-D3, and the PES for syn-reaction was found to be barrierless, which might be an artifact due to SIE. However, both methods agreed that the interaction between radical and the olefin starts at approximately $r=2.5 \AA$; thus this distance was used in the conformational sampling of the transition states. The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond formation step is very exothermic (by $\sim 20-25 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, Figure 4.11 ) and was thus not considered reversible.

The selectivity was then studied using a multi-level protocol. First, the preliminary TSs were formed for all studied radicals by freezing $r$ at $2.5 \AA$ and optimizing the syn and anti TSs with TPSS-D3/def2-SVP in the gas-phase. Then, the lowest energy conformers were determined at this distance. For conformers within $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, the PES was studied
using TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP with COSMO for bond distances of $r=2.3-2.5 \AA$ in $0.05 \AA$ steps. These optimized structures were then used to compute the PES with TPSS, TPSSD3, TPSSh-D3 and RPA. All methods employed COSMO and def2-TZVP basis sets. The PES scan was extended up to $2.7 \AA$ if the PES was not converged at the RPA level.

The maximum of the PES was taken as the as the absolute energy of the TS and used to determine the selectivity. The PESs for different methods are shown in Figure 4.14. Thermal corrections were calculated for the transition states according to RPA, i.e., we chose the TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP optimized structure, which has the highest energy in the RPA PES.

### 4.3.3.2 Conformational Search

To perform a conformational search using molecular mechanics methods, the constrained TS structure was first optimized with TPSS-D3/def2-SVP to obtain the correct relative position for $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{C}^{2}$, which were set $2.5 \AA$ apart. In Maestro, a long bond of 2.5 $\AA$ was inserted between the respected atoms and the electrophile was modified to be an enolate anion instead of a radical (Figure 4.12A) because we did not have access to force field, which is parameterized for $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ carbon radicals. The Cartesian coordinates of $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{C}^{2}$ were kept frozen during the conformational search. Systematic torsional sampling was employed using the OPLS-2005 force field with the following settings: Torsion sampling options "Intermediate"; maximum number of steps " 2000 "; steps per rotatable bond " 4 "; energy window for saving structures " $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ".

b)


Figure 4.12. Maestro Computational Search.
a) In force field calculations, the system was modified to be an enolate anion; b) in quantum chemical computations, the system was treated as radical. In both cases, the bond distance $r$ was fixed at $2.5 \AA$.

All structures within $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ were then re-optimized using TPSS-D3/def2-SVP in gas-phase. The bond length was kept fixed at $2.5 \AA$, but unlike in the force field optimization, the relative orientation of $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{C}^{2}$ was allowed to relax freely instead of fixing the Cartesian coordinates. The system was treated as a radical instead of enolate anion (Figure 4.12B), which was not possible in the force field computations as explained above. The conformers below $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ where then visually inspected and taken to PES study if the structures differed from each other. Optimization of all conformers of radical 4.40d with COSMO and computing single-point energies with TPSSh-D3/def2-SVP leads to identical lowest energy conformer confirming the validity of our approach.

### 4.3.3.3 Correlation between Theory and Experiment

The computed energy difference between syn- and anti-TSs was used to calculate the diastereoselectivity using the Boltzmann distribution at 298 K . The correlation between experiment and theory was studied using three approaches:
(i) Selectivity was determined according to $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ values (Figure 4.15)
(ii) Thermal corrections were added to the $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ values using the RRHO-approximation (Figure 4.16)
(iii) Thermal corrections were added to the $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ values using the quasi-RRHO approach (Figure 4.17)

Approach (iii) was found to be most realistic for the following reasons: First, the selectivities arise from very small energy differences and thus the thermal corrections are important. Second, small errors in low-lying frequencies cause significant error in the vibrational entropy; for example, the syn-selectivity of radical $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ is underestimated using approach (ii) with RPA (experiment $89 \%$; theory $60 \%$ ) whereas with approach (iii) the correlation is quantitative with the experiment (experiment $89 \%$; theory 85\%). Approaches (i) and (ii) are only shown for comparison.

With approach (iii), the correlation between the experiment and theory is semiquantitative for most studied radicals when TPSS-D3, TPSSh-D3 or RPA is used, whereas the result is worse with non-dispersion corrected TPSS, which illustrates the importance of medium- and long-range non covalent interactions. The correlation is best for TPSSh-D3 and RPA. The anti-selectivity of radical 4.40a was not reproduced but this originates from very small energy error ( $1-2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) and is within the error margin of the methods used here. All methods except RPA also produce the anti-selectivity qualitatively correctly at $\Delta \mathrm{E}$-level. The syn-selectivity is overestimated slightly for most radicals with prefix $\mathbf{4 . 4 0}$, whereas the more complex radicals $(\mathbf{4 . 5 1}, 4.56,4.58,4.60)$ are computed with quantitative accuracy using TPSSh-D3 and RPA.

The effect of entropy on the selectivity can be assessed by comparing approaches (i) and (iii) (Figure 4.15 and Figure 4.17). In most cases, the correlation is still qualitative but not quantitative for approach (i). Thus, the effect of entropy on these results is significant. The standard RRHO-approximation predicts too high entropies especially for larger complexes $(\mathbf{4 . 5 1}, \mathbf{4 . 5 6}, 4.58,4.60)$ with more low-lying frequencies whereas the smaller complexes (4.40) are not affected much.

In summary, the selectivity of the radical addition can be computed with high accuracy if the following aspects are carefully taken into account: For large molecules, the conformational freedom causes much larger deviation to the energy than is needed to induce the selectivity. In addition, the computational method needs to accurately account for dispersive interactions between the different functional groups of the radical and between the radical and the approaching olefin. Especially for large complexes thermal effects should be computed with the quasi-RRHO-approximation.

### 4.3.3.4 Computational Tables and Transition State Figures



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.40b-anti | 4.40b-syn |
|  |  |
| 4.40c-anti | 4.40c-syn |
|  |  |
| 4.40d-anti | 4.40d-syn |
|  |  |
| 4.40e-anti | 4.40e-syn |

(2.56-anti


Figure 4.13. RPA/def2-TZVP/COSMO Transition State Structures Optimized Using TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP/COSMO.



Figure 4.14. The PES's for the studied radicals computed using different methods.

The geometries were relaxed at TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP/COSMO level and different methods were used for single-point energies with def2-TZVP basis set and COSMO. The red-triangles represent the anti-pathway and black diamonds represent the syn-pathway.

|  | TPSS |  | TPSS-D3 |  | TPSSh-D3 |  | RPA |  | Exp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radical | $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| 4.40a | -0.4 | 33 | -0.9 | 18 | -0.6 | 26 | 0.1 | 55 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 b}$ | 0.4 | 65 | -0.7 | 22 | -0.2 | 43 | 1.2 | 88 | 77 |
| 4.40c | 3.3 | 100 | 2.2 | 98 | 2.5 | 98 | 3.3 | 100 | 72 |
| 4.40d | -0.2 | 43 | -0.6 | 28 | 0.0 | 51 | 0.9 | 81 | 72 |
| 4.40e | 1.8 | 96 | 1.1 | 86 | 1.2 | 88 | 1.4 | 91 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 f}$ | 0.7 | 77 | 0.1 | 55 | 0.4 | 66 | 0.7 | 76 | 90 |
| 4.58 | -0.9 | 17 | -2.0 | 3 | -1.9 | 4 | -2.6 | 1 | 43 |
| 4.51 | -2.9 | 1 | -4.7 | 0 | -4.4 | 0 | -3.9 | 0 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 6}$ | 2.4 | 98 | -0.4 | 32 | -0.4 | 34 | -0.5 | 29 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ | -0.3 | 39 | 1.6 | 93 | 1.9 | 96 | 2.5 | 98 | 89 |

Figure 4.15. The energy difference ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ ) between TS-anti and TS-syn computed with several methods in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

The \%-values represent the computed amount of syn-product which is calculated from the $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ values using the Boltzmann distribution at 298 K .

|  | TPSS |  | TPSS-D3 |  | TPSSh-D3 |  | RPA |  | Exp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radical | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| 4.40a | 0.5 | 70 | 0.0 | 50 | 0.3 | 62 | 1.0 | 85 | 22 |
| 4.40b | 2.1 | 97 | 1.0 | 85 | 1.6 | 94 | 2.9 | 99 | 77 |
| 4.40c | 2.7 | 99 | 1.5 | 93 | 1.8 | 96 | 2.6 | 99 | 72 |
| 4.40d | 0.6 | 74 | 0.2 | 59 | 0.8 | 80 | 1.7 | 94 | 72 |
| 4.40e | 1.5 | 93 | 0.8 | 78 | 0.8 | 80 | 1.0 | 85 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 4 0 f}$ | 1.9 | 96 | 1.2 | 89 | 1.5 | 93 | 1.8 | 96 | 90 |
| 4.58 | 1.2 | 88 | 0.1 | 53 | 0.3 | 61 | -0.5 | 29 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ | -1.9 | 4 | -3.7 | 0 | -3.5 | 0 | -3.0 | 1 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 6}$ | 3.9 | 100 | 1.1 | 87 | 1.2 | 88 | 1.0 | 85 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ | -2.5 | 1 | -0.6 | 25 | -0.3 | 38 | 0.2 | 60 | 89 |

Figure 4.16. The energy difference ( $\Delta \mathrm{G} 298$ ) between TS-anti and TS-syn computed with several methods in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

The $\%$-values present the computed amount of syn-product, which is calculated from the $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ values using the Boltzmann distribution at 298 K . Thermal corrections are accounted using standard RRHO-approximation.

|  | TPSS |  | TPSS-D3 |  | TPSSh-D3 |  | RPA |  | Exp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Radical | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| 4.40a | 0.3 | 62 | -0.2 | 41 | 0.1 | 54 | 0.8 | 80 | 22 |
| 4.40b | 1.7 | 95 | 0.6 | 74 | 1.2 | 88 | 2.5 | 99 | 77 |
| 4.40c | 2.6 | 99 | 1.5 | 93 | 1.8 | 95 | 2.6 | 99 | 72 |
| 4.40d | 0.4 | 65 | 0 | 49 | 0.6 | 72 | 1.4 | 91 | 72 |
| 4.40e | 1.5 | 93 | 0.8 | 79 | 0.9 | 81 | 1.1 | 86 | 69 |
| 4.40f | 1.3 | 90 | 0.7 | 76 | 1 | 83 | 1.3 | 89 | 90 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 8}$ | 0.9 | 83 | -0.2 | 43 | 0 | 51 | -0.8 | 21 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ | -2.2 | 3 | -3.9 | 0 | -3.7 | 0 | -3.2 | 0 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 5 6}$ | 3.7 | 100 | 0.9 | 82 | 0.9 | 83 | 0.8 | 79 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 6 0}$ | -1.7 | 5 | 0.1 | 56 | 0.5 | 70 | 1 | 85 | 89 |

Figure 4.17. The energy difference ( $\Delta \mathrm{G} 298$ ) between TS-anti and TS-syn computed with several methods in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

The $\%$-values present the computed amount of syn-product, which is calculated from the $\Delta \mathrm{G}$ values using the Boltzmann distribution at 298 K . Thermal corrections are accounted using quasi-RRHO approach.

Table 4.5. Absolute energies for transition states in Hartrees.

|  | TPSS | TPSS-D3 | TPSSh-D3 | RPA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.40a-anti | -920.475563 | -920.525971 | -920.418546 | -919.972228 |
| 4.40a-syn | -920.474888 | -920.524515 | -920.41756 | -919.97242 |
| 4.40b-anti | -1035.07049 | -1035.13179 | -1035.01093 | -1034.51537 |
| 4.40b-syn | -1035.07107 | -1035.13062 | -1035.01065 | -1034.51726 |
| 4.40c-anti | -1074.3841 | -1074.45138 | -1074.32649 | -1073.81699 |
| 4.40c-syn | -1074.38939 | -1074.45488 | -1074.33043 | -1073.82218 |
| 4.40d-anti | -1035.07171 | -1035.13381 | -1035.01282 | -1034.51728 |
| 4.40d-syn | -1035.07145 | -1035.1329 | -1035.01287 | -1034.51866 |
| 4.40e-anti | -1813.36302 | -1813.46534 | -1813.31944 | -1811.93735 |
| 4.40e-syn | -1813.36596 | -1813.46708 | -1813.32131 | -1811.93955 |
| 4.40f-anti | -999.147161 | -999.210532 | -999.096534 | -998.624269 |
| 4.40f-syn | -999.14832 | -999.210717 | -999.097153 | -998.625353 |
| 4.58-anti | -1874.12141 | -1874.2673 | -1874.09605 | -1872.97609 |
| 4.58-syn | -1874.11993 | -1874.26405 | -1874.0931 | -1872.97188 |
| 4.51-anti | -1465.3137 | -1465.43771 | -1465.28123 | -1464.61189 |
| 4.51-syn | -1465.3091 | -1465.43028 | -1465.27423 | -1464.60567 |
| 4.56-anti | -1874.10962 | -1874.26208 | -1874.09122 | -1872.97076 |
| 4.56-syn | -1874.11339 | -1874.26139 | -1874.09059 | -1872.96991 |
| 4.60-anti | -2282.91775 | -2283.09017 | -2282.90445 | -2281.33148 |
| 4.60-syn | -2282.91731 | -2283.09269 | -2282.90754 | -2281.33541 |

Table 4.6. TPSS-D3/def2-TZVP/COSMO chemical potentials (c.p. in $\mathrm{kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ ).
All transition states calculated using RRHO and quasi-RRHO approximations and imaginary-frequencies $v_{\mathrm{im}}$ in $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

|  | c.p.(RRHO) $\mathrm{kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ | c.p.(quasi-RRHO) $\mathrm{kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ | $v_{\mathrm{im}}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.40a-anti | 656.93 | 663.44 | 91.03 |
| 4.40a-syn | 653.1 | 660.484 | 86.54 |
| 4.40b-anti | 736.35 | 743.378 | 122.91 |
| 4.40b-syn | 729 | 737.74 | - |
| 4.40c-anti | 800.13 | 807.942 | 129.47 |
| 4.40c-syn | 802.88 | 810.821 | 107.26 |
| 4.40d-anti | 736.93 | 743.257 | 66.41 |
| 4.40d-syn | 733.65 | 740.999 | 136.35 |
| 4.40e-anti | 1141.97 | 1158.31 | 74.16 |
| 4.40e-syn | 1143.42 | 1159.57 | 100.48 |
| 4.40f-anti | 788.59 | 797.36 | - |
| 4.40f-syn | 783.89 | 794.98 | - |
| 4.58-anti | 1635.21 | 1652.98 | 94.68 |
| 4.58-syn | 1626.38 | 1645.16 | 74.42 |
| 4.51-anti | 1400.76 | 1412.39 | 121.61 |
| 4.51-syn | 1396.82 | 1409.37 | 146.72 |
| 4.56-anti | 1645.36 | 1659.31 | 92.47 |
| 4.56-syn | 1638.8 | 1653.8 | 135.18 |
| 4.60-anti | 1866.89 | 1891.22 | 73.36 |
| 4.60-syn | 1876.19 | 1897.28 | 113.09 |

### 4.4 References and Notes
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${ }^{2}$ This reaction was done on a small scale, and $e e$ was not determined of bromobutenolide 4.4. The analogous reaction was performed with enantiopure menthol butenolide, which gave a single diastereomer, indicating these reaction conditions did not epimerize the $\gamma$ stereocenter. However, bromobutenolide 4.4 was never analyzed by HPLC analysis.
${ }^{3}$ Available for $\$ 1,080$ per gram at Accel Pharmtech as of $3 / 25 / 16$.
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## Appendix B: Chapter 2 NMR Spectra
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## Appendix C: Chapter 3 NMR Spectra
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## Appendix D: Chapter 4 NMR Spectra
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## Appendix E: X-Rau Crystal Structures of 3.28, 3.75, 3.78, 3.110, and

 4.42 f

3.28

Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for leo275 (3.28).

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions
leo275 (Daniel Tao)
$\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}$
508.75

88(2) K
0.71073 A

Orthorhombic
$P 2{ }_{1} 2_{1}{ }_{1}$
$\mathrm{a}=7.3379(4) \AA$
$\alpha=90^{\circ}$.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{c}=24.9121(14) \AA \quad \gamma=90^{\circ}$. |
| Volume | 2913.7(3) $\AA^{3}$ |
| Z | 4 |
| Density (calculated) | $1.160 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.118 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| F(000) | 1112 |
| Crystal color | colorless |
| Crystal size | $0.370 \times 0.322 \times 0.204 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |
| Theta range for data collection | 2.075 to $29.064^{\circ}$ |
| Index ranges | $-9 \leq h \leq 10,-21 \leq k \leq 21,-33 \leq l \leq 33$ |
| Reflections collected | 31275 |
| Independent reflections | $7346[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0239]$ |
| Completeness to theta $=25.242^{\circ}$ | 99.9 \% |
| Absorption correction | Semi-empirical from equivalents |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.8621 and 0.7592 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 7346 / 0 / 504 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.041 |
| Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=7039$ data $]$ | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0278, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0705$ |
| R indices (all data, 0.73 Å) | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0297, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0719$ |
| Absolute structure parameter | -0.02(2) |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.296 and -0.145 e. $\AA^{-3}$ |

Table 2. Atomic coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo275. $U(e q)$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $U^{i j}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | U(eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Si(26) | 8718(1) | 1958(1) | 7899(1) | 15(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 10182(1) | 1766(1) | 5134(1) | 15(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(10)$ | 10979(2) | 2839(1) | 4606(1) | 18(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)$ | 10129(1) | 774(1) | 5816(1) | 13(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 12403(2) | 3881(1) | 6513(1) | 18(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)$ | 12985(1) | 2551(1) | 6802(1) | 15(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)$ | 9683(2) | 2404(1) | 7370(1) | 18(1) |
| C(1) | 11641(2) | 2876(1) | 5570(1) | 13(1) |
| C(2) | 11587(2) | 2124(1) | 5961(1) | 12(1) |
| C(3) | 10015(2) | 1622(1) | 5719(1) | 12(1) |
| C(5) | 10947(2) | 2525(1) | 5047(1) | 14(1) |
| C(6) | 10334(2) | 3487(1) | 5832(1) | 14(1) |
| C(7) | 10738(2) | 3434(1) | 6425(1) | 14(1) |
| C(8) | 11275(2) | 2504(1) | 6528(1) | 12(1) |
| C(9) | 9008(2) | 3925(1) | 5604(1) | 19(1) |
| C(13) | 13499(2) | 3409(1) | 6876(1) | 16(1) |
| C(15) | 9923(2) | 2009(1) | 6865(1) | 16(1) |
| C(16) | 13145(3) | 3690(1) | 7449(1) | 23(1) |
| C(17) | 15473(2) | 3508(1) | 6708(1) | 27(1) |
| C(18) | 8449(2) | 334(1) | 5676(1) | 14(1) |
| C(19) | 7077(2) | 411(1) | 6134(1) | 16(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 5288(2) | -38(1) | 6006(1) | 18(1) |
| C(21) | 5690(2) | -955(1) | 5866(1) | 22(1) |
| C(22) | 7107(2) | -1034(1) | 5419(1) | 22(1) |
| C(23) | 8903(2) | -581(1) | 5555(1) | 16(1) |
| C(24) | 3936(2) | 46(1) | 6469(1) | 22(1) |
| C(27) | 10469(2) | 1355(1) | 8300(1) | 22(1) |
| C(28) | 6820(3) | 1266(1) | 7676(1) | 28(1) |
| C(29) | 7832(3) | 2853(1) | 8299(1) | 27(1) |
| C(30) | 11206(3) | 604(1) | 7984(1) | 40(1) |
| C(31) | 9585(3) | 1029(1) | 8819(1) | 31(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(32)$ | $12063(3)$ | $1938(2)$ | $8449(1)$ | $39(1)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)$ | $10404(2)$ | $-684(1)$ | $5126(1)$ | $19(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)$ | $10986(3)$ | $-1603(1)$ | $5068(1)$ | $29(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)$ | $9888(3)$ | $-325(1)$ | $4576(1)$ | $25(1)$ |

Table 3. Bond lengths [ $\AA$ ] and angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo275.

| $\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{O}(25)$ | 1.6587(11) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Si(26)-C(29) | 1.8568(17) |
| Si(26)-C(28) | 1.8614(18) |
| Si(26)-C(27) | 1.8888(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.3510(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | $1.4809(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.2069(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.3744(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | $1.4609(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $1.4245(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.4317(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.4307(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.4307(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.4170(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.5071(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 1.5150(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.5434(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.5284(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $1.5553(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.326(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.5091(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $1.5544(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.5198(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 1.516(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.519(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | $1.5265(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)$-C(19) | 1.528(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 1.530(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 1.528(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 1.530(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 1.530(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 1.541(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 1.545(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(30)$ | $1.532(2)$ |


| $\mathrm{C}(27)$ - $\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 1.537(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 1.538(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 1.532(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 1.532(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 104.25(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 109.60(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 110.68(9) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 110.37(7) |
| C(29)-Si(26)-C(27) | 110.22(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{Si}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 111.48(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 109.31(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 112.20(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 108.40(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 110.04(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{Si}(26)$ | 124.67(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 113.37(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 104.38(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 102.23(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 100.25(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 116.82(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 105.89(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 108.76(10) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 113.52(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 104.13(10) |
| $\mathrm{O}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 121.61(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 128.82(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 109.55(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 126.40(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 128.23(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 105.14(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 106.79(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 103.50(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 105.35(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 109.64(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 104.53(10) |


| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 114.86(11) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 108.98(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 113.32(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 105.01(10) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{O}(14)$ | 105.94(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 108.07(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 108.39(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 110.14(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 110.92(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 113.09(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(25)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 109.90(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 108.77(11) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 109.80(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 111.53(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 111.80(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 110.96(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 112.41(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 109.20(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 112.07(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 112.44(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 107.75(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 113.16(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 114.03(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 108.45(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 109.11(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 108.79(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{Si}(26)$ | 111.48(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{Si}(26)$ | 109.20(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{Si}(26)$ | 109.76(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 110.01(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 111.42(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 113.80(13) |

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo275. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[h^{2} a^{* 2} U^{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U^{12}\right]$

| $\mathrm{U}^{11}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{22}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{33}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{23}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{13}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{12}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Si(26)16(1) | 15(1) | 15(1) | -1(1) | 4(1) | 1(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4) 16(1)$ | 16(1) | 12(1) | 1(1) | -1(1) | -3(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(10) 17(1)$ | 25(1) | 14(1) | 4(1) | $0(1)$ | -3(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11) 13(1)$ | 10(1) | 18(1) | 0 (1) | -3(1) | -2(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12) 20(1)$ | 13(1) | 22(1) | 3(1) | -7(1) | -6(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(14) 15(1)$ | 13(1) | 19(1) | 1(1) | -6(1) | -2(1) |
| O(25)26(1) | 16(1) | 13(1) | -2(1) | 3(1) | -4(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1) 11$ (1) | 13(1) | 14(1) | 2(1) | $0(1)$ | -2(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2) 11(1)$ | 11(1) | 13(1) | $0(1)$ | -1(1) | -1(1) |
| C(3) 12(1) | 11(1) | 11(1) | 1(1) | -1(1) | -1(1) |
| C(5) 10(1) | 15(1) | 17(1) | $0(1)$ | 1(1) | $0(1)$ |
| C(6) 13(1) | 10(1) | 17(1) | 1(1) | $0(1)$ | -3(1) |
| C(7) 13(1) | 11(1) | 18(1) | $0(1)$ | -2(1) | -1(1) |
| C(8) 12(1) | 11(1) | 13(1) | $0(1)$ | -1(1) | -2(1) |
| C(9) 19(1) | 16(1) | 23(1) | 2(1) | -3(1) | 1(1) |
| C(13)18(1) | 12(1) | 18(1) | 1(1) | -4(1) | -4(1) |
| C(15)20(1) | 14(1) | 14(1) | $0(1)$ | 2(1) | -6(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16) 30$ (1) | 18(1) | 20(1) | -1(1) | -7(1) | -5(1) |
| C(17)18(1) | 31(1) | 33(1) | 2(1) | -3(1) | -8(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18) 13(1)$ | 13(1) | 16(1) | 1(1) | -3(1) | -3(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19) 15(1)$ | 14(1) | 18(1) | 2(1) | -2(1) | -2(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20) 15(1)$ | 19(1) | 20(1) | 6(1) | -4(1) | -4(1) |
| C(21)22(1) | 17(1) | 26(1) | 2(1) | -2(1) | $-9(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(22) 25(1)$ | 17(1) | 24(1) | -3(1) | -2(1) | -8(1) |
| C(23)20(1) | 12(1) | 17(1) | $0(1)$ | -3(1) | -2(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24) 14(1)$ | 23(1) | 28(1) | 8(1) | $0(1)$ | -1(1) |
| C(27)22(1) | 19(1) | 25(1) | 7(1) | 3(1) | 4(1) |
| C(28)25(1) | 31(1) | 27(1) | -1(1) | 5(1) | -10(1) |
| C(29)31(1) | 29(1) | 22(1) | -8(1) | 1(1) | 13(1) |
| C(30)46(1) | 33(1) | 40(1) | 7(1) | 10(1) | 24(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31) 35(1)$ | 30(1) | 28(1) | 11(1) | 5(1) | 4(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(32) 25(1)$ | $40(1)$ | $52(1)$ | $24(1)$ | $-14(1)$ | $-7(1)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(33) 20(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $22(1)$ | $-4(1)$ | $-2(1)$ | $-2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34) 35(1)$ | $19(1)$ | $32(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $4(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35) 28(1)$ | $27(1)$ | $21(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $-3(1)$ |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and isotropic displacement parameters ( $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo275.

|  | x | y | z | U(eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H(3A) | 8824 | 1844 | 5852 | 17 |
| H(1A) | 12760(30) | 3104(12) | 5543(7) | 15(4) |
| H(2A) | 12660(30) | 1794(11) | 5938(7) | 11(4) |
| H(7A) | 9810(30) | 3642(11) | 6677(7) | 11(4) |
| H(9A) | 8230(30) | 4282(13) | 5804(8) | 25(5) |
| H(9B) | 8800(30) | 3905(11) | 5222(7) | 14(4) |
| H(15A) | 8830(30) | 1973(13) | 6670(8) | 26(5) |
| H(15B) | 10350(30) | 1451(12) | 6896(7) | 14(4) |
| H(16A) | 11880(30) | 3639(13) | 7531(8) | 24(5) |
| H(16B) | 13470(30) | 4282(15) | 7488(8) | 34(6) |
| H(16C) | 13910(30) | 3386(14) | 7703(9) | 34(6) |
| H(17A) | 15620(30) | 3296(15) | 6328(10) | 40(6) |
| H(17B) | 16230(30) | 3207(15) | 6959(9) | 34(6) |
| H(17C) | 15770(30) | 4089(15) | 6705(8) | 32(6) |
| H(18A) | 7940(30) | 581(11) | 5360(7) | 13(4) |
| H(19A) | 6860(30) | 1007(12) | 6215(7) | 14(4) |
| H(19B) | 7620(30) | 170(11) | 6463(7) | 15(4) |
| H(20A) | 4690(30) | 274(11) | 5681(7) | 15(4) |
| H(21A) | 6100(30) | -1234(12) | 6185(8) | 20(5) |
| H(21B) | 4570(30) | -1240(13) | 5747(8) | 25(5) |
| H(22A) | 6640(30) | -787(13) | 5098(8) | 24(5) |
| H(22B) | $7370(30)$ | -1617(15) | 5349(8) | 32(6) |
| H(23A) | 9430(30) | -816(12) | 5885(8) | 19(5) |
| H(24A) | 3760(30) | 626(14) | 6572(9) | 32(6) |
| H(24B) | 4390(30) | -256(13) | 6795(8) | 25(5) |
| H(24C) | 2780(30) | -189(12) | 6374(8) | 20(5) |
| H(28A) | 5900(40) | 1589(17) | 7484(10) | 51(7) |
| H(28B) | 6260(40) | 1001(16) | 7977(9) | 41(6) |
| H(28C) | 7200(40) | 827(17) | 7425(10) | 52(8) |
| H(29A) | 7030(40) | 3186(17) | 8054(10) | 51(7) |


| $\mathrm{H}(29 \mathrm{~B})$ | $8760(40)$ | $3173(15)$ | $8433(10)$ | $41(6)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H}(29 \mathrm{C})$ | $7080(40)$ | $2651(17)$ | $8619(11)$ | $51(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(30 \mathrm{~A})$ | $12070(40)$ | $291(16)$ | $8197(10)$ | $49(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(30 \mathrm{~B})$ | $11830(40)$ | $766(15)$ | $7645(10)$ | $40(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(30 \mathrm{C})$ | $10250(40)$ | $224(18)$ | $7844(12)$ | $59(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | $10500(40)$ | $716(16)$ | $9057(10)$ | $46(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(31 \mathrm{~B})$ | $8570(40)$ | $618(15)$ | $8745(9)$ | $39(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(31 \mathrm{C})$ | $9090(40)$ | $1486(17)$ | $9028(10)$ | $45(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | $12970(40)$ | $1654(17)$ | $8643(11)$ | $54(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{~B})$ | $11630(40)$ | $2460(20)$ | $8622(12)$ | $62(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{C})$ | $12640(40)$ | $2149(16)$ | $8148(10)$ | $43(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | $11450(30)$ | $-398(13)$ | $5256(8)$ | $24(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(34 \mathrm{~A})$ | $12100(30)$ | $-1640(14)$ | $4834(9)$ | $33(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(34 \mathrm{~B})$ | $10090(40)$ | $-1911(16)$ | $4907(11)$ | $48(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(34 \mathrm{C})$ | $11250(30)$ | $-1850(14)$ | $5423(9)$ | $33(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | $10840(30)$ | $-395(14)$ | $4310(9)$ | $33(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 B)$ | $9660(30)$ | $276(15)$ | $4608(9)$ | $34(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 \mathrm{C})$ | $8840(40)$ | $-603(14)$ | $4427(9)$ | $34(6)$ |



Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for leo283 (3.75).

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions
leo283 (David Tao)
$\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{O}_{8}$
603.69

88(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Monoclinic
$P 21$
$\mathrm{a}=10.1766(4) \AA$
$\alpha=90^{\circ}$.

|  | $\mathrm{b}=12.5435(5) \AA$ | $\beta=97.7659(5)^{\circ}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{c}=12.7623(5) \AA$ | $\gamma=90^{\circ}$. |
| Volume | 1614.17(11) $\AA^{3}$ |  |
| Z | 2 |  |
| Density (calculated) | $1.242 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.088 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |  |
| F(000) | 644 |  |
| Crystal color | colorless |  |
| Crystal size | $0.417 \times 0.264 \times 0.112 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |  |
| Theta range for data collection | 1.610 to $27.484^{\circ}$ |  |
| Index ranges | $-13 \leq h \leq 13,-16 \leq k \leq 16,-1$ | $l \leq 16$ |
| Reflections collected | 19408 |  |
| Independent reflections | $7390[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0219]$ |  |
| Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$ | 100.0 \% |  |
| Absorption correction | Semi-empirical from equiva |  |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.8622 and 0.8148 |  |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on |  |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 7390 / 1 / 561 |  |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.034 |  |
| Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=6804$ data $]$ | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0330, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0750$ |  |
| R indices (all data, 0.77Å) | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0371, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0776$ |  |
| Absolute structure parameter | 0.1(3) |  |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.202 and -0.159 e. $\AA^{-3}$ |  |

Table 2. Atomic coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}$ ) for leo283. $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{ij}}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | U(eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)$ | 14562(1) | 9418(1) | 5002(1) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 11048(2) | 9622(1) | 2348(1) | 37(1) |
| C(3) | 14810(2) | 11656(2) | 3919(2) | 24(1) |
| C(4) | 14580(2) | 12575(2) | 3305(2) | 27(1) |
| C(5) | 13488(2) | 12657(2) | 2528(2) | 29(1) |
| C(6) | 12589(2) | 11820(2) | 2320(2) | 28(1) |
| C(7) | 13876(2) | 9793(2) | 4252(2) | 21(1) |
| C(8) | 13916(2) | 10833(2) | 3708(2) | 20(1) |
| C(9) | 12830(2) | 10909(2) | 2916(2) | 22(1) |
| C(10) | 12051(2) | 9902(2) | 2890(2) | 25(1) |
| N(11) | 12774(2) | 9287(1) | 3683(1) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 12451(1) | 8234(1) | 3875(1) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(13)$ | 11043(1) | 8901(1) | 4946(1) | 28(1) |
| C(14) | 11507(2) | 8155(2) | 4553(2) | 20(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)$ | 8309(1) | 6115(1) | 4939(1) | 21(1) |
| C(16) | 7293(3) | 9131(2) | 1128(2) | 34(1) |
| C(17) | 7967(2) | 8429(2) | 2036(2) | 26(1) |
| C(18) | 4233(3) | 8361(4) | 899(2) | 60(1) |
| C(19) | 4943(3) | 6960(3) | -275(2) | 50(1) |
| C(20) | 6473(2) | 8486(2) | 246(2) | 33(1) |
| C(21) | 5438(2) | 7736(2) | 623(2) | 37(1) |
| C(22) | 6063(3) | 8413(3) | 3109(2) | 42(1) |
| C(23) | 8470(2) | 6881(2) | 4152(1) | 18(1) |
| C(24) | 6577(2) | 5969(2) | 3010(2) | 38(1) |
| C(25) | 5557(3) | 6165(3) | 2055(2) | 50(1) |
| C(26) | 6201(2) | 7092(2) | 1532(2) | 31(1) |
| C(27) | 6943(2) | 7727(2) | 2476(2) | 24(1) |
| C(28) | 7398(2) | 6794(2) | 3212(2) | 23(1) |
| C(29) | 10876(2) | 6805(2) | 5809(2) | 22(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)$ | 12122(1) | 7008(1) | 6423(1) | 27(1) |
| C(31) | 11758(2) | 4430(2) | 4014(3) | 39(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(32)$ | $11914(3)$ | $5753(3)$ | $2539(2)$ | $43(1)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)$ | $12053(1)$ | $6293(1)$ | $4365(1)$ | $24(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)$ | $11079(2)$ | $7002(2)$ | $4660(2)$ | $19(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)$ | $9852(2)$ | $6790(2)$ | $3811(2)$ | $19(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)$ | $10053(1)$ | $5714(1)$ | $3539(1)$ | $22(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)$ | $11445(2)$ | $5540(2)$ | $3593(2)$ | $25(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)$ | $12144(2)$ | $6685(2)$ | $7495(2)$ | $30(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$ | $11557(2)$ | $7490(2)$ | $8184(2)$ | $30(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)$ | $11036(2)$ | $7156(2)$ | $9078(2)$ | $41(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $10597(3)$ | $7893(3)$ | $9764(2)$ | $51(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)$ | $10682(3)$ | $8976(3)$ | $9566(2)$ | $50(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)$ | $11177(3)$ | $9313(2)$ | $8671(2)$ | $48(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(44)$ | $11616(3)$ | $8579(2)$ | $7980(2)$ | $38(1)$ |

Table 3. Bond lengths $[\AA]$ and angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo283.

| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.201(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.205(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.379(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.396 (3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.389(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 1.394(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.377(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | 1.403(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.481(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.396 (3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.489(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | 1.399(3) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 1.390(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.381(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.189(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 1.523(3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 1.416(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 1.538(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 1.540(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 1.528(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 1.536(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)$-C(21) | 1.536(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 1.538(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 1.535(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 1.546(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 1.512(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 1.531(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)$-C(28) | 1.333(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)$-C(25) | 1.510(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)$-C(26) | 1.532(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 1.553(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 1.533(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{O}(30)$ | 1.420(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)$-C(34) | 1.528(3) |


| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | 1.424(3) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 1.512(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 1.510 (3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 1.419(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 1.443 (2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | $1.562(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 1.417(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | $1.425(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)$-C(39) | 1.514(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$-C(40) | 1.386 (3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$-C(44) | 1.393(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $1.388(4)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)$ | $1.386(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | 1.375 (4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(44)$ | 1.390 (4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 116.94(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 121.26(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 121.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 117.19(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | 125.01(18) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 131.93(19) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 103.06(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 121.79(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 128.86(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 109.32(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 121.40(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 129.63(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 108.95(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | 125.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 131.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 103.03(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 122.53(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 121.95(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 115.49(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | 112.32(14) |


| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 123.86(17) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 125.13(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 110.87(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 113.13(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 110.46(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 114.77(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 108.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 115.7(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 107.7(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 105.11(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 108.84(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 111.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 111.93(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 110.48(15) |
| C(28)-C(23)-C(35) | 111.13(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 112.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 100.80(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 121.76(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 104.09(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 117.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 120.06(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 110.1(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 104.64(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 107.16(16) |
| C(28)-C(27)-C(26) | 99.14(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 115.81(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 125.1(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 110.17(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 123.83(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 105.92(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | 112.08(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 109.93(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 110.66(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 110.08(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 108.47(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 103.36(14) |


| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | $108.10(15)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | $116.07(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | $108.02(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | $101.76(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | $117.98(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | $108.00(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(33)$ | $105.36(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | $111.21(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | $109.56(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | $108.54(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | $108.05(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | $113.7(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | $114.33(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(44)$ | $118.7(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | $120.1(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | $121.0(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $120.6(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(40)$ | $120.3(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $119.4(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(44)$ | $120.6(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | $120.4(3)$ |

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo283. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[h^{2} a^{* 2} U^{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U^{12}\right]$

| $\mathrm{U}^{11}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{22}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{33}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{23}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{13}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{12}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(1) 24(1)$ | 29(1) | 30(1) | 4(1) | 5(1) | 5(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2) 28(1)$ | 46(1) | 34(1) | -3(1) | -4(1) | -14(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3) 22(1)$ | 25(1) | 24(1) | -3(1) | 4(1) | -5(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4) 36(1)$ | $22(1)$ | 26(1) | -6(1) | 10(1) | -9(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5) 43(1)$ | 22(1) | 24(1) | 2(1) | 11(1) | 2(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6) 29(1)$ | 32(1) | 22(1) | 2(1) | 2(1) | 3(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7) 17(1)$ | $23(1)$ | 26(1) | -2(1) | 9(1) | 1(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8) 17(1)$ | $23(1)$ | 20(1) | 0(1) | 7(1) | $0(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9) 19(1)$ | 28(1) | 20(1) | -3(1) | 6(1) | -4(1) |
| C(10)22(1) | 32(1) | 23(1) | -1(1) | 5(1) | -4(1) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11) 25(1)$ | 22(1) | 33(1) | 3(1) | 4(1) | -7(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12) 28(1)$ | 17(1) | 39(1) | -2(1) | 14(1) | -4(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(13) 26(1)$ | 19(1) | 42(1) | -5(1) | 12(1) | -1(1) |
| C(14)13(1) | 20(1) | 24(1) | -1(1) | 0(1) | -1(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15) 21(1)$ | 20(1) | 24(1) | 2(1) | 8(1) | 0(1) |
| C(16)39(1) | 31(1) | 29(1) | 4(1) | -7(1) | 1(1) |
| C(17)25(1) | 25(1) | 25(1) | -1(1) | -5(1) | -2(1) |
| C(18)25(1) | 112(3) | 39(2) | 9(2) | -8(1) | 15(2) |
| C(19)44(2) | 74(2) | 29(1) | -1(1) | -9(1) | -26(2) |
| C(20)31(1) | 43(1) | 23(1) | 1(1) | -5(1) | -1(1) |
| C(21)24(1) | 58(2) | 26(1) | -1(1) | -4(1) | -6(1) |
| C(22)31(1) | 68(2) | 26(1) | -7(1) | -1(1) | 24(1) |
| C(23)18(1) | 18(1) | 20(1) | 0(1) | 4(1) | -2(1) |
| C(24)35(1) | 49(2) | 30(1) | 4(1) | 1(1) | -21(1) |
| $C(25) 40(2)$ | 72(2) | 34(1) | 7(1) | -6(1) | -33(1) |
| C(26)22(1) | 45(1) | 23(1) | -2(1) | -1(1) | -11(1) |
| C(27)16(1) | 34(1) | 21(1) | -3(1) | 0(1) | 3(1) |
| C(28)18(1) | 31(1) | 20(1) | -2(1) | 6(1) | -4(1) |
| C(29)17(1) | 24(1) | 24(1) | 2(1) | 0(1) | -1(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30) 20(1)$ | 33(1) | 25(1) | 1(1) | -4(1) | -2(1) |
| C(31)24(1) | 21(1) | 76(2) | -7(1) | 20(1) | -1(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(32) 32(1)$ | $59(2)$ | $41(1)$ | $-12(1)$ | $19(1)$ | $-12(1)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{O}(33) 19(1)$ | $19(1)$ | $34(1)$ | $-5(1)$ | $4(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34) 15(1)$ | $17(1)$ | $26(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $0(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35) 18(1)$ | $18(1)$ | $20(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $-3(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36) 20(1)$ | $20(1)$ | $28(1)$ | $-7(1)$ | $8(1)$ | $-4(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(37) 20(1)$ | $23(1)$ | $35(1)$ | $-8(1)$ | $11(1)$ | $-5(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38) 28(1)$ | $33(1)$ | $28(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $4(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(39) 21(1)$ | $40(1)$ | $26(1)$ | $2(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $3(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40) 28(1)$ | $53(2)$ | $42(1)$ | $9(1)$ | $4(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41) 33(1)$ | $86(2)$ | $37(1)$ | $5(1)$ | $9(1)$ | $13(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42) 41(1)$ | $70(2)$ | $35(1)$ | $-8(1)$ | $-4(1)$ | $26(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43) 54(2)$ | $48(2)$ | $38(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $18(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(44) 44(1)$ | $40(1)$ | $28(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $-2(1)$ | $9(1)$ |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and isotropic displacement parameters ( $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo283.

|  | x | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H(3A) | 15530(20) | 11558(18) | 4439(19) | 25(6) |
| H(4A) | 15160(30) | 13140(20) | 3430(20) | 35(7) |
| H(5A) | 13370(20) | 13320(20) | 2140(20) | 37(7) |
| H(6A) | 11830(30) | 11890(20) | 1810(20) | 39(7) |
| H(15) | 8590(20) | 5540(20) | 4758(19) | 28(6) |
| H(16A) | 6730(30) | 9650(20) | 1420(20) | 43(8) |
| H(16B) | 8010(30) | 9580(20) | 820(20) | 48(8) |
| H(17A) | 8640(20) | 7989(18) | 1755(18) | 22(6) |
| H(17B) | 8450(20) | 8880(20) | 2557(19) | 28(6) |
| H(18A) | 4520(40) | 9100(30) | 1410(30) | 77(11) |
| H(18B) | 3620(40) | 7890 (30) | 1270(30) | 76(11) |
| H(18C) | 3720(30) | 8610(30) | 270(30) | 66(10) |
| H(19A) | 5670(30) | 6460(30) | -440(20) | 55(9) |
| H(19B) | 4580(30) | 7400 (20) | -940(20) | 50(8) |
| H(19C) | 4230(30) | 6510(20) | -70(20) | 41(7) |
| H(20A) | 6050(30) | 8980(20) | -330(20) | 43(7) |
| H(20B) | 7090(20) | 8030(20) | -98(18) | 26(6) |
| H(22A) | 5180(30) | 8000(30) | 3200(30) | 59(9) |
| H(22B) | 5780(30) | 9130(30) | 2770(20) | 52(8) |
| H(22C) | 6560(30) | 8550(20) | 3830(20) | 50(8) |
| H(23A) | 8400(20) | 7563(18) | 4472(16) | 15(5) |
| H(24A) | 6590(30) | 5310(20) | 3450(20) | 44(7) |
| H(25A) | 4660(30) | 6380(30) | 2280(30) | 67(10) |
| H(25B) | 5410(30) | 5580(30) | 1580(30) | 58(9) |
| H(26A) | 6920(20) | 6720(20) | 1215(18) | 30(6) |
| H(29A) | 10190(20) | 7308(17) | 6024(16) | 15(5) |
| H(29B) | 10600(20) | 6080(20) | 5875(17) | 21(5) |
| H(31A) | 12690(30) | 4350(20) | 4100(20) | 39(7) |
| H(31B) | 11390(30) | 3930(30) | 3510(30) | 62(9) |
| H(31C) | 11350(30) | 4320(20) | 4690(20) | 51(8) |


| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | $12850(30)$ | $5650(20)$ | $2650(20)$ | $48(8)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{~B})$ | $11730(30)$ | $6480(30)$ | $2330(20)$ | $42(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{C})$ | $11510(30)$ | $5240(30)$ | $1980(30)$ | $64(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | $9933(19)$ | $7259(17)$ | $3192(16)$ | $12(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(38 \mathrm{~A})$ | $13080(30)$ | $6600(20)$ | $7760(20)$ | $39(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(38 B)$ | $11690(30)$ | $5980(20)$ | $7500(20)$ | $43(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(40 \mathrm{~A})$ | $10970(30)$ | $6440(20)$ | $9210(20)$ | $39(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | $10280(40)$ | $7670(30)$ | $10350(30)$ | $73(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(42 \mathrm{~A})$ | $10370(30)$ | $9480(30)$ | $10070(30)$ | $51(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(43 \mathrm{~A})$ | $11240(30)$ | $10110(30)$ | $8550(20)$ | $56(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{H}(44 \mathrm{~A})$ | $11970(30)$ | $8760(20)$ | $7290(20)$ | $44(7)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6. Torsion angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo283.

| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 0.9(3) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | -1.0(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -0.1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 0.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -177.36(18) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 2.0(3) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | -178.86(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -175.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 3.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 179.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | -1.3(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 176.73(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -179.51(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -1.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 1.2(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 179.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | -179.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)$ | -0.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 5.1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | -174.73(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -176.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 3.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | -6.9(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)$ | 173.87(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 174.99(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -4.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -86.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 96.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(13)$ | -1.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{N}(11)-\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 174.40(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | -54.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 53.6(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | -50.7(3) |


| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | -166.4(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 75.1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 17.4(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | -168.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | -33.1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | -57.3(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 63.5(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | -173.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 172.70(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | -66.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 56.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 166.70(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | -71.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 54.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 161.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | -60.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 36.1(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 173.88(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | -75.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 62.6(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 175.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 6.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | -14.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 109.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 153.74(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | -82.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | -142.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 93.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | -26.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 47.8(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(22)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | -76.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 163.76(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | -170.15(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -128.02(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 112.09(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | -12.50(19) |


| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)$ | -163.29(18) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)$ | 20.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | -42.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 141.72(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 84.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(12)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | -91.65(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)$ | 60.93(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -60.28(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 177.85(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 52.11(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -72.76(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | -62.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 172.69(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 28.31(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 145.65(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -92.29(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 146.25(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | -96.42(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 25.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | -159.41(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | -34.54(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(33)$ | 27.84(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | -90.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 143.37(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -8.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 111.7(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{O}(33)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | -123.87(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | -82.7(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)$ | 154.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(30)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(44)$ | -30.2(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | -0.9(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | 174.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)$ | -0.3(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | 1.4(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(44)$ | -1.3(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | 0.1(4) |


| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | $1.0(4)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(44)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | $-174.4(2)$ |



Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for leo282 (3.78).

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions
leo282 (Daniel Tao)
$\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{ClNO}_{7}$
622.13

133(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Monoclinic
$P 2{ }_{1}$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{a}=6.6266(14) \AA & \alpha=90^{\circ} . \\
\mathrm{b}=37.219(8) \AA & \beta=90.126(3)^{\circ} . \\
\mathrm{c}=12.785(3) \AA & \gamma=90^{\circ} .
\end{array}
$$

| Volume | $3153.1(11) \AA^{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Z | 4 |
| Density (calculated) | $1.311 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.172 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| $\mathrm{~F}(000)$ | 1320 |
| Crystal color | colorless |
| Crystal size | $0.314 \times 0.163 \times 0.102 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |
| Theta range for data collection | 1.593 to $25.350^{\circ}$ |
| Index ranges | $-7 \leq h \leq 7,-44 \leq k \leq 44,-15 \leq l \leq 15$ |
| Reflections collected | 28152 |
| Independent reflections | $11455[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0540]$ |
| Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$ | $98.4 \%$ |
| Absorption correction | $\mathrm{Semi}-\mathrm{empirical}$ from equivalents |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.8621 and 0.7805 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | $11455 / 1 / 799$ |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.087 |
| Final R indices [I>2sigma(I) = 10194 data | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0504$, wR2 $=0.0870$ |
| R indices (all data, $0.83 \AA)$ | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0600$, wR2 $=0.0902$ |
| Absolute structure parameter | $0.02(3)$ |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.486 and -0.420 e. $\AA^{-3}$ |

Table 2. Atomic coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo282. $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{ij}}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1)$ | 9589(3) | 3517(1) | -5872(1) | 33(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 5179(6) | 4531(1) | -3044(3) | 19(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 7977(6) | 4180(1) | -2945(3) | 20(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)$ | 4210(7) | 4680(1) | -5060(3) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)$ | 3464(7) | 4096(1) | -5383(3) | 19(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21)$ | -140(7) | 4472(1) | -5878(4) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)$ | 6061(7) | 4154(1) | -7112(4) | 31(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 3489(6) | 3935(1) | -2169(3) | 20(1) |
| N(10) | 2881(9) | 4208(1) | -6378(4) | 21(1) |
| C(1) | 6834(9) | 4024(2) | -3776(5) | 16(1) |
| C(2) | 4758(10) | 4233(2) | -3690(5) | 16(1) |
| C(4) | 7327(10) | 4537(2) | -2773(5) | 23(2) |
| C(6) | 7499(13) | 4616(2) | -1622(5) | 38(2) |
| C(7) | 8417(11) | 4797(2) | -3461(6) | 32(2) |
| C(8) | 3008(9) | 4022(2) | -3236(5) | 17(1) |
| C(9) | 4143(9) | 4378(2) | -4783(5) | 13(1) |
| C(12) | 4338(11) | 4260(2) | -7160(5) | 19(2) |
| C(13) | 3204(10) | 4454(2) | -8010(5) | 18(2) |
| C(14) | 1317(11) | 4545(2) | -7622(5) | 20(2) |
| C(15) | 1106(10) | 4417(2) | -6536(5) | 21(2) |
| C(16) | 3782(12) | 4539(2) | -8998(5) | 30(2) |
| C(17) | 2412(13) | 4726(2) | -9625(5) | 36(2) |
| C(18) | 508(14) | 4814(2) | -9268(5) | 33(2) |
| C(19) | -66(12) | 4728(2) | -8246(5) | 30(2) |
| C(23) | 6739(9) | 3630(2) | -3600(5) | 17(1) |
| C(24) | 3314(10) | 2360(2) | -5791(5) | 23(2) |
| C(25) | 6762(11) | 2179(2) | -5223(5) | 23(2) |
| C(26) | 9022(10) | 2833(2) | -4005(5) | 23(2) |
| C(27) | 6907(9) | 3362(2) | -4290(4) | 12(1) |
| C(28) | 7010(10) | 3392(2) | -5469(5) | 20(2) |
| C(29) | 6440(10) | 3017(2) | -5902(5) | 20(2) |


| C(39) | 4496(12) | 3541(2) | 899(5) | 26(2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C(30) | 5785(10) | 2865(2) | -2992(4) | 19(1) |
| C(31) | 6798(10) | 2967(2) | -4022(5) | 16(1) |
| C(32) | 5504(10) | 2833(2) | -4948(4) | 18(1) |
| C(33) | 4965(9) | 2430(2) | -4966(5) | 16(1) |
| C(34) | 4098(9) | 2338(2) | -3880(5) | 17(2) |
| C(35) | 5396(10) | 2463(2) | -2946(5) | 20(2) |
| C(37) | 2279(10) | 3697(2) | -537(5) | 20(2) |
| C(38) | 4202(11) | 3601(2) | -154(5) | 23(2) |
| C(43) | 1876(11) | 3743(2) | -1696(5) | 28(2) |
| C(40) | 2896(12) | 3568(2) | 1588(5) | 29(2) |
| C(41) | 1002(11) | 3666(2) | 1217(5) | 27(2) |
| C(42) | 720(11) | 3733(2) | 165(5) | 22(2) |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | -5544(3) | 1568(1) | 381(1) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})$ | -243(7) | 654(1) | 3040(3) | 21(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})$ | -2912(6) | 1034(1) | 3146(3) | 16(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})$ | 524(8) | 439(1) | 1037(4) | 30(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1118(6) | 1015(1) | 542(3) | 17(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})$ | -1423(7) | 933(1) | -1241(3) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})$ | 4793(7) | 647(1) | 138(3) | 28(1) |
| O(36A) | 1610(7) | 1294(1) | 3699(3) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1685(8) | 874(1) | -415(4) | 19(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | -1922(9) | 1145(2) | 2211(5) | 14(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 127(9) | 927(2) | 2303(5) | 16(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})$ | -2353(10) | 673(2) | 3343(5) | 19(2) |
| C(6A) | -2402(11) | 603(2) | 4507(5) | 26(2) |
| C(7A) | -3578(11) | 406(2) | 2710(6) | 31(2) |
| C(8A) | 1969(9) | 1151(2) | 2682(5) | 20(2) |
| C(9A) | 578(10) | 748(2) | 1262(5) | 20(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})$ | 276(11) | 832(2) | -1234(5) | 21(2) |
| C(13A) | 1486(10) | 632(2) | -2030(5) | 16(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3401(10) | 550(2) | -1630(5) | 17(1) |
| C(15A) | 3522(10) | 685(2) | -529(5) | 21(2) |
| C(16A) | 944(12) | 535(2) | -3049(5) | 25(2) |
| C(17A) | 2349(13) | 350(2) | -3631(5) | 33(2) |
| C (18A) | 4265(14) | 272(2) | -3226(6) | 35(2) |


| $\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})$ | $4794(12)$ | $371(2)$ | $-2219(5)$ | $26(2)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-1630(9)$ | $1541(2)$ | $2181(5)$ | $15(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A})$ | $706(11)$ | $2518(2)$ | $-1327(5)$ | $25(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-1882(11)$ | $2839(2)$ | $-282(5)$ | $23(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-3379(10)$ | $2360(2)$ | $1613(5)$ | $22(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-1973(9)$ | $1755(2)$ | $1363(4)$ | $14(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-2834(9)$ | $1653(2)$ | $295(5)$ | $15(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-2435(10)$ | $1971(2)$ | $-430(5)$ | $20(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})$ | $330(11)$ | $2281(2)$ | $2011(4)$ | $18(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-1459(9)$ | $2156(2)$ | $1315(5)$ | $14(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-840(9)$ | $2186(2)$ | $158(4)$ | $14(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | $-170(9)$ | $2562(2)$ | $-220(5)$ | $18(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1501(10)$ | $2688(2)$ | $523(5)$ | $21(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | $973(11)$ | $2660(2)$ | $1693(5)$ | $23(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})$ | $2496(10)$ | $1318(2)$ | $5521(5)$ | $22(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})$ | $647(10)$ | $1462(2)$ | $5776(5)$ | $21(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})$ | $313(11)$ | $1582(2)$ | $6798(5)$ | $27(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1794(12)$ | $1557(2)$ | $7556(5)$ | $29(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | $3661(11)$ | $1415(2)$ | $7300(5)$ | $24(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})$ | $4006(10)$ | $1299(2)$ | $6299(5)$ | $22(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})$ | $2932(11)$ | $1165(2)$ | $4455(5)$ | $31(2)$ |

Table 3. Bond lengths [ $\AA$ ] and angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo282.

| $\mathrm{Cl}(1)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 1.845(6) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.411(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.465(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.415(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 1.426(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.179(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.374(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | 1.392(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.198(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.209(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | 1.423(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.437(7) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.405(9) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.424(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 1.487(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.584(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.517(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.551(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.494(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 1.503(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.505(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.358(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.388(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 1.392(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.474(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | $1.395(10)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)$-C(18) | 1.382(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 1.399 (10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 1.335(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)$ - $\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 1.540 (8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)$-C(33) | $1.550(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 1.555(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)$ - $\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 1.512(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)$-C(31) | 1.513(8) |


| C(28)-C(29) | 1.548(9) |
| :---: | :---: |
| C(29)-C(32) | 1.533(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$-C(38) | 1.379(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$-C(40) | 1.384(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 1.519(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 1.528(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 1.543(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 1.540(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 1.543(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 1.541(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)$-C(42) | 1.376(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | 1.409(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | 1.515(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $1.388(10)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)$ | 1.382(9) |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.827(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.408(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.454(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.416(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.426 (7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.185(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.384(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.402(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.187(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1.205(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.388(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1.425(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$-C(12A) | 1.410(8) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$-C(15A) | 1.414(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.487(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.586(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.520(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.553(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(6 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.511(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(7 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.516(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1.495(9)$ |


| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.399(9) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.401(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.366(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.497(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.377(10) |
| C(17A)-C(18A) | 1.400 (11) |
| C(18A)-C(19A) | 1.384(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})$-C(27A) | 1.334(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A})$-C(33A) | 1.540(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.536(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.532(9) |
| C(27A)-C(28A) | 1.528(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.530(8) |
| C(28A)-C(29A) | 1.527(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$-C(32A) | 1.523(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.529(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.553(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.540(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.544(8) |
| C(33A)-C(34A) | 1.532(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.540(9) |
| C(37A)-C(38A) | 1.376(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.411(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.505(9) |
| C(38A)-C(39A) | 1.399(9) |
| C(39A)-C(40A) | 1.381(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.385(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})$ | $1.370(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 110.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 109.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | 111.9(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 110.6(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 120.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 121.4(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 113.1(5) |


| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 108.1(5) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 102.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 115.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 109.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 107.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 109.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 104.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 116.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 109.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 104.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 111.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 110.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 108.2(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 107.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 114.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 108.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)$ | 124.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 126.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 108.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | 124.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 131.5(7) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 103.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 122.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 129.9(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 107.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 120.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 110.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 129.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | 124.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 132.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 103.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 117.7(7) |
| C(18)-C(17)-C(16) | 121.4(6) |
| C(17)-C(18)-C(19) | 120.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 117.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 129.3(6) |


| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 127.3(5) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 124.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 107.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 106.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{Cl}(1)$ | 109.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{Cl}(1)$ | 110.6(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | 102.6(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)$ | 120.2(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 110.6(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(30)$ | 117.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 99.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 109.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 105.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 109.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 115.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 121.2(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 103.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 117.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 109.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 108.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 106.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 107.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 114.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 110.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 114.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 111.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(38)$ | 118.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(43)$ | 119.7(6) |
| C(38)-C(37)-C(43) | 121.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 120.4(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 110.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)$-C(40)-C(41) | 119.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(40)$ | 120.0(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | 121.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})$ | 108.2(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 107.7(4) |

```
N(10A)-O(20A)-C(9A) 112.4(4)
C(43A)-O(36A)-C(8A) 113.6(5)
O(20A)-N(10A)-C(12A) 121.2(5)
O(20A)-N(10A)-C(15A) 121.0(5)
C(12A)-N(10A)-C(15A) 116.0(5)
O(5A)-C(1A)-C(23A) 111.7(5)
O(5A)-C(1A)-C(2A) 100.7(4)
C(23A)-C(1A)-C(2A) 113.4(5)
O(3A)-C(2A)-C(9A) 107.6(5)
O(3A)-C(2A)-C(8A) 108.4(5)
C(9A)-C(2A)-C(8A) 110.7(5)
O(3A)-C(2A)-C(1A) 105.6(5)
C(9A)-C(2A)-C(1A) 109.2(5)
C(8A)-C(2A)-C(1A) 114.9(5)
O(5A)-C(4A)-O(3A) 104.5(5)
O(5A)-C(4A)-C(6A) 109.4(5)
O(3A)-C(4A)-C(6A) 106.1(5)
O(5A)-C(4A)-C(7A) 112.8(5)
O(3A)-C(4A)-C(7A) 109.8(5)
C(6A)-C(4A)-C(7A) 113.7(6)
O(36A)-C(8A)-C(2A) 110.6(5)
O(11A)-C(9A)-O(20A) 122.4(6)
O(11A)-C(9A)-C(2A) 129.2(6)
O(20A)-C(9A)-C(2A) 108.4(5)
O(22A)-C(12A)-N(10A) 126.7(6)
O(22A)-C(12A)-C(13A) 131.5(6)
N(10A)-C(12A)-C(13A) 101.8(6)
C(16A)-C(13A)-C(14A) 120.9(6)
C(16A)-C(13A)-C(12A) 128.8(6)
C(14A)-C(13A)-C(12A) 110.3(6)
C(19A)-C(14A)-C(13A) 121.3(6)
C(19A)-C(14A)-C(15A) 130.3(6)
C(13A)-C(14A)-C(15A) 108.4(6)
O(21A)-C(15A)-N(10A) 125.9(6)
O(21A)-C(15A)-C(14A) 131.4(6)
N(10A)-C(15A)-C(14A) 102.7(6)
```

```
C(17A)-C(16A)-C(13A) 117.4(7)
C(16A)-C(17A)-C(18A) 121.2(7)
C(19A)-C(18A)-C(17A) 121.1(7)
C(14A)-C(19A)-C(18A) 118.2(7)
C(27A)-C(23A)-C(1A) 126.2(6)
C(23A)-C(27A)-C(28A) 127.9(6)
C(23A)-C(27A)-C(31A) 125.2(6)
C(28A)-C(27A)-C(31A) 106.9(5)
C(29A)-C(28A)-C(27A) 106.5(5)
C(29A)-C(28A)-Cl(1A) 110.0(4)
C(27A)-C(28A)-Cl(1A) 110.7(4)
C(32A)-C(29A)-C(28A) 103.3(5)
C(35A)-C(30A)-C(31A) 109.7(5)
C(27A)-C(31A)-C(26A) 106.8(5)
C(27A)-C(31A)-C(32A) 99.8(5)
C(26A)-C(31A)-C(32A) 115.2(5)
C(27A)-C(31A)-C(30A) 116.1(5)
C(26A)-C(31A)-C(30A) 110.0(5)
C(32A)-C(31A)-C(30A) 108.9(5)
C(29A)-C(32A)-C(31A) 104.4(5)
C(29A)-C(32A)-C(33A) 121.4(5)
C(31A)-C(32A)-C(33A) 116.4(5)
C(34A)-C(33A)-C(25A) 111.0(5)
C(34A)-C(33A)-C(24A) 109.2(5)
C(25A)-C(33A)-C(24A) 107.6(5)
C(34A)-C(33A)-C(32A) 107.0(5)
C(25A)-C(33A)-C(32A) 114.4(5)
C(24A)-C(33A)-C(32A) 107.6(5)
C(33A)-C(34A)-C(35A) 114.6(5)
C(30A)-C(35A)-C(34A) 112.6(5)
C(38A)-C(37A)-C(42A) 118.9(6)
C(38A)-C(37A)-C(43A) 122.3(6)
C(42A)-C(37A)-C(43A) 118.8(6)
C(37A)-C(38A)-C(39A) 119.2(6)
C(40A)-C(39A)-C(38A) 121.4(7)
C(39A)-C(40A)-C(41A) 119.6(6)
```

$\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A}) 119.5(6)$
$\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A}) 121.5(6)$
$\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A}) 112.3(5)$

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo 282. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[h^{2} a^{* 2} U^{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U^{12}\right]$

| $\mathrm{U}^{11}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{22}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{33}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{23}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{13}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{12}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1) 36$ (1) | 32(1) | 32(1) | 2(1) | 15(1) | -9(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3) 15(2)$ | 21(2) | 20(2) | -3(2) | -1(2) | 1(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5) 13(2)$ | 23(2) | 24(3) | -6(2) | -9(2) | 0(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11) 33(3)$ | 19(2) | 24(2) | 8(2) | -9(2) | -7(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20) 25(3)$ | 19(2) | 13(2) | 4(2) | -5(2) | -2(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21) 24(3)$ | 35(3) | 22(2) | -2(2) | 0(2) | 5(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22) 19$ (3) | 39(3) | 36(3) | $0(2)$ | -7(2) | -5(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(36) 12(2)$ | 31(3) | 16(2) | 6(2) | 2(2) | -3(2) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10) 25(3)$ | 26(3) | 11(3) | 10(2) | -7(2) | 2(3) |
| C(1) 13(3) | 24(3) | 11(3) | -1(3) | -1(3) | -1(3) |
| C(2) 19(4) | 13(3) | 15(3) | -2(3) | $0(3)$ | 1(3) |
| C(4) 23(4) | 12(3) | 34(4) | -1(3) | -9(3) | 2(3) |
| C(6) 41(5) | 36(5) | 36(4) | -13(4) | -13(4) | -3(4) |
| C(7) 25(4) | 28(4) | 44(5) | -8(4) | 5(4) | -10(3) |
| C(8) 6(3) | 30(4) | 15(3) | 5(3) | 2(3) | 0(3) |
| C(9) 6(3) | 17(3) | 16(3) | 3(3) | 4(3) | 2(3) |
| C(12)23(4) | 21(3) | 12(3) | -6(3) | -7(3) | -9(3) |
| C(13)28(4) | 14(3) | 11(3) | 1(3) | -9(3) | -8(3) |
| C(14)38(5) | 13(3) | 10(3) | -2(3) | -11(3) | $0(3)$ |
| C(15)22(4) | 19(3) | 22(4) | -2(3) | -7(3) | $0(3)$ |
| C(16)47(5) | 28(4) | 13(3) | $0(3)$ | -8(3) | -9(4) |
| C(17)75(6) | 27(4) | 6 (3) | 9(3) | -13(4) | -14(4) |
| C(18)58(6) | 21(4) | 21(4) | -2(3) | -21(4) | 6(4) |
| C(19)46(5) | 26(4) | 17(3) | -7(3) | -11(3) | 9(4) |
| C(23)5(3) | 26(4) | 21(3) | 2(3) | 3(3) | 2(3) |
| C(24)21(4) | 24(4) | 23(4) | -3(3) | 1(3) | -1(3) |
| C(25)34(4) | 15(3) | 20(4) | 2(3) | 7(3) | 4(3) |
| C(26)25(4) | 24(4) | 20(4) | 4(3) | 2(3) | 1(3) |
| C(27)5(3) | 19(3) | 12(3) | 1(3) | 2(3) | 5(3) |
| C(28)16(4) | 18(3) | 27(4) | 6 (3) | 6(3) | 1(3) |
| C(29)21(4) | 23(3) | 15(3) | 4(3) | 4(3) | 4(3) |


| C(39)37(4) | 14(3) | 27(4) | 1(3) | -7(4) | -1(3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(30) 21$ (4) | 28(4) | 9(3) | 0(3) | 0 (3) | 8(3) |
| C(31)18(4) | 18(3) | 11(3) | -3(3) | 0 (3) | 6(3) |
| C(32)10(3) | 29(4) | 17(3) | 0(3) | 0 (3) | 3(3) |
| C(33)12(3) | 20(3) | 14(3) | 1(3) | -1(3) | 1(3) |
| C(34)17(4) | 15(3) | 21(3) | 0(3) | 3(3) | 2(3) |
| C(35)22(4) | 26(3) | 12(3) | 5(3) | 5(3) | 8(3) |
| C(37)21(4) | 19(3) | 21(4) | 5(3) | 4(3) | -1(3) |
| C(38)21(4) | 29(4) | 20(4) | 4(3) | 1(3) | 2(3) |
| C(43)19(4) | 33(4) | 30(4) | 7(3) | -3(3) | -4(3) |
| C(40)47(5) | 23(4) | 18(4) | -2(3) | 5(4) | -11(4) |
| C(41)30(5) | 23(4) | 28(4) | -5(3) | 13(3) | -6(3) |
| C(42)21(4) | 13(3) | 33(4) | 0(3) | -7(3) | -4(3) |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A}) 19(1)$ | 38(1) | 23(1) | 4(1) | -2(1) | -10(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A}) 17(2)$ | 27(2) | 20(2) | 11(2) | 7(2) | 7(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A}) 17(3)$ | 16(2) | 15(2) | 7(2) | 7(2) | 4(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A}) 39(3)$ | 21(3) | 30(3) | -2(2) | 11(3) | 4(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A}) 16$ (2) | 21(2) | 15(2) | -4(2) | 4(2) | -1(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A}) 16(3)$ | 34(3) | 27(3) | 0(2) | -2(2) | 0(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A}) 22(3)$ | 42(3) | 21(3) | 1(2) | 0 (2) | 5(2) |
| O(36A) 17(3) | 53(3) | 10(2) | -3(2) | 2(2) | 12(2) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A}) 20(3)$ | 31(3) | 5(2) | -3(2) | 1(2) | 3(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A}) 12$ (4) | 25(3) | 11(3) | 3(3) | 1(3) | 4(3) |
| C(4A)14(3) | 21(3) | 22(4) | 7(3) | 2(3) | 5(3) |
| C(6A)25(4) | 23(4) | 32(4) | 3(3) | 9(3) | 4(3) |
| C(7A)25(4) | 28(4) | 40(5) | 9(4) | -3(4) | -2(3) |
| C(8A)8(3) | 38(4) | 14(3) | 1(3) | -2(3) | 1(3) |
| C(9A)14(4) | 22(4) | 23(3) | 4(3) | 7(3) | 1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A}) 23$ (4) | 19(3) | 22(4) | 5(3) | 3(3) | -2(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A}) 23(4)$ | 13(3) | 13(3) | 6(3) | 4(3) | 1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A}) 27(4)$ | 13(3) | 11(3) | 1(3) | 2(3) | -3(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A}) 22(4)$ | 25(4) | 17(4) | 1(3) | 4(3) | -1(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A}) 41(5)$ | 22(4) | 14(3) | 1(3) | -6(3) | -9(3) |
| C(17A)60(6) | 24(4) | 14(4) | -5(3) | 1(4) | -4(4) |
| C(18A)58(6) | 17(4) | 29(4) | -2(3) | 15(4) | 0(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A}) 38(5)$ | 15(3) | 27(4) | 1(3) | 4(4) | 3(3) |


| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A}) 14(3)$ | $18(3)$ | $13(3)$ | $2(3)$ | $2(3)$ | $1(3)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A}) 32(4)$ | $21(4)$ | $21(4)$ | $7(3)$ | $0(3)$ | $-4(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A}) 31(4)$ | $19(3)$ | $19(4)$ | $6(3)$ | $-2(3)$ | $-1(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A}) 23(4)$ | $23(4)$ | $20(4)$ | $3(3)$ | $5(3)$ | $5(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A}) 9(3)$ | $22(3)$ | $10(3)$ | $-1(3)$ | $5(3)$ | $1(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A}) 8(3)$ | $19(3)$ | $18(3)$ | $-1(3)$ | $-1(3)$ | $1(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A}) 16(4)$ | $21(3)$ | $23(3)$ | $0(3)$ | $1(3)$ | $-1(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A}) 28(4)$ | $20(3)$ | $7(3)$ | $3(3)$ | $-7(3)$ | $-3(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A}) 12(3)$ | $18(3)$ | $13(3)$ | $0(3)$ | $-6(3)$ | $6(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A}) 9(3)$ | $18(3)$ | $15(3)$ | $-2(3)$ | $-2(3)$ | $3(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A}) 20(4)$ | $15(3)$ | $18(3)$ | $5(3)$ | $-5(3)$ | $0(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A}) 23(4)$ | $13(3)$ | $27(4)$ | $5(3)$ | $-4(3)$ | $-5(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A}) 28(4)$ | $19(3)$ | $23(4)$ | $0(3)$ | $-11(3)$ | $-3(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A}) 23(4)$ | $21(4)$ | $21(4)$ | $-2(3)$ | $-2(3)$ | $2(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A}) 20(4)$ | $20(3)$ | $22(3)$ | $1(3)$ | $2(3)$ | $3(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A}) 32(4)$ | $25(4)$ | $22(4)$ | $-1(3)$ | $5(3)$ | $-1(4)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A}) 55(5)$ | $15(3)$ | $18(4)$ | $-3(3)$ | $4(4)$ | $-2(4)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A}) 35(4)$ | $17(3)$ | $18(4)$ | $-1(3)$ | $-6(3)$ | $-5(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A}) 13(4)$ | $26(4)$ | $27(4)$ | $-1(3)$ | $-8(3)$ | $2(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A}) 23(4)$ | $45(5)$ | $25(4)$ | $-6(3)$ | $-2(3)$ | $10(3)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and isotropic displacement parameters ( $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo282.

|  | x | y | z | U(eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 7489 | 4077 | -4463 | 19 |
| H(6A) | 6970 | 4857 | -1480 | 56 |
| H(6B) | 8920 | 4604 | -1410 | 56 |
| $\mathrm{H}(6 \mathrm{C})$ | 6721 | 4438 | -1227 | 56 |
| H(7A) | 7815 | 5036 | -3387 | 48 |
| H(7B) | 8310 | 4719 | -4190 | 48 |
| H(7C) | 9842 | 4807 | -3256 | 48 |
| H(8A) | 1758 | 4168 | -3266 | 21 |
| H(8B) | 2788 | 3800 | -3644 | 21 |
| H(16A) | 5075 | 4473 | -9254 | 35 |
| H(17A) | 2797 | 4794 | -10312 | 43 |
| H(18A) | -416 | 4933 | -9719 | 40 |
| H(19A) | -1358 | 4793 | -7986 | 35 |
| H(23A) | 6529 | 3558 | -2896 | 21 |
| H(24A) | 2940 | 2105 | -5781 | 34 |
| H(24B) | 3825 | 2424 | -6486 | 34 |
| H(24C) | 2126 | 2507 | -5632 | 34 |
| H(25A) | 7691 | 2171 | -4626 | 34 |
| H(25B) | 7475 | 2270 | -5840 | 34 |
| H(25C) | 6257 | 1936 | -5367 | 34 |
| H(26A) | 9615 | 2863 | -4701 | 34 |
| H(26B) | 9057 | 2579 | -3807 | 34 |
| H(26C) | 9796 | 2974 | -3495 | 34 |
| H(28A) | 6024 | 3576 | -5722 | 24 |
| H(29A) | 5455 | 3037 | -6483 | 24 |
| H(29B) | 7648 | 2886 | -6150 | 24 |
| H(39A) | 5801 | 3480 | 1153 | 31 |
| H(30A) | 6664 | 2936 | -2400 | 23 |
| H(30B) | 4491 | 2996 | -2925 | 23 |
| H(32A) | 4177 | 2956 | -4854 | 22 |


| H(34A) | 2744 | 2448 | -3819 | 21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H(34B) | 3926 | 2074 | -3833 | 21 |
| H(35A) | 4696 | 2404 | -2285 | 24 |
| H(35B) | 6700 | 2333 | -2952 | 24 |
| H(38A) | 5302 | 3578 | -625 | 28 |
| H(43A) | 1739 | 3504 | -2030 | 33 |
| H(43B) | 596 | 3876 | -1799 | 33 |
| H(40A) | 3092 | 3521 | 2312 | 35 |
| H(41A) | -100 | 3685 | 1688 | 32 |
| H(42A) | -572 | 3806 | -79 | 27 |
| H(1AA) | -2703 | 1064 | 1584 | 17 |
| H(6AA) | -1874 | 362 | 4651 | 40 |
| H(6AB) | -3796 | 620 | 4757 | 40 |
| H(6AC) | -1569 | 782 | 4868 | 40 |
| H(7AA) | -3139 | 162 | 2877 | 47 |
| H(7AB) | -3377 | 452 | 1962 | 47 |
| H(7AC) | -5012 | 433 | 2880 | 47 |
| H(8AA) | 3184 | 996 | 2700 | 24 |
| H(8AB) | 2222 | 1350 | 2186 | 24 |
| H(16B) | -343 | 594 | -3329 | 30 |
| H(17B) | 2012 | 273 | -4318 | 39 |
| H(18B) | 5217 | 149 | -3650 | 42 |
| H(19B) | 6091 | 315 | -1944 | 32 |
| H(23B) | -1153 | 1652 | 2803 | 18 |
| H(24D) | 1364 | 2743 | -1538 | 37 |
| H(24E) | -385 | 2462 | -1819 | 37 |
| H(24F) | 1698 | 2323 | -1329 | 37 |
| H(25D) | -1452 | 3043 | -714 | 34 |
| H(25E) | -2206 | 2924 | 424 | 34 |
| H(25F) | -3080 | 2728 | -594 | 34 |
| H(26D) | -3857 | 2277 | 2296 | 33 |
| H(26E) | -4425 | 2317 | 1084 | 33 |
| H(26F) | -3085 | 2618 | 1650 | 33 |
| H(28B) | -2130 | 1434 | 24 | 18 |
| H(29C) | -1923 | 1889 | -1117 | 24 |
| H(29D) | -3675 | 2115 | -539 | 24 |


| $\mathrm{H}(30 \mathrm{C})$ | -82 | 2280 | 2755 | 22 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H}(30 \mathrm{D})$ | 1480 | 2114 | 1930 | 22 |
| $\mathrm{H}(32 \mathrm{~B})$ | 408 | 2036 | 105 | 17 |
| $\mathrm{H}(34 \mathrm{C})$ | 1826 | 2941 | 360 | 25 |
| $\mathrm{H}(34 \mathrm{D})$ | 2728 | 2544 | 389 | 25 |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 \mathrm{C})$ | 2163 | 2732 | 2113 | 28 |
| $\mathrm{H}(35 \mathrm{D})$ | -134 | 2830 | 1852 | 28 |
| $\mathrm{H}(38 B)$ | -389 | 1479 | 5264 | 25 |
| $\mathrm{H}(39 B)$ | -959 | 1682 | 6974 | 32 |
| $\mathrm{H}(40 B)$ | 1533 | 1636 | 8249 | 35 |
| $\mathrm{H}(41 B)$ | 4696 | 1400 | 7813 | 28 |
| $\mathrm{H}(42 B)$ | 5290 | 1202 | 6126 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{H}(43 \mathrm{C})$ | 4331 | 1228 | 4255 | 37 |
| $\mathrm{H}(43 \mathrm{D})$ | 2833 | 400 | 3785 |  |

Table 6. Torsion angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo282.

| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 81.5(6) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | -70.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | -151.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | -28.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 128.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -113.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 3.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 15.0(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 132.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | -105.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 11.5(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 130.4(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -112.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 31.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -87.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 146.0(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | -20.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 99.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | -135.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 178.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -54.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -171.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | $64.2(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(11)$ | 0.9(8) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 179.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(11)$ | 7.0(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(11)$ | 125.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(11)$ | -106.4(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)$ | -171.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)$ | -53.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{O}(20)$ | 74.6 (6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(22)$ | 14.2(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(22)$ | 168.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -167.8(5) |


| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -13.4(7) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 6.0(12) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | -171.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -174.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 8.0(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 0.0 (10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | -179.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 179.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | -0.4(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(21)$ | -10.3(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(21)$ | -164.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 167.2(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{N}(10)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 13.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(21)$ | 169.9(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(21)$ | -10.6(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | -7.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{N}(10)$ | 172.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 0.6 (10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | -179.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | -1.8(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 2.4(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 0.5(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | -178.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -1.7(10) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | -138.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 107.4(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)$ | -7.5(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | 179.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | -160.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 13.4(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{Cl}(1)$ | 80.0(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{Cl}(1)$ | -106.2(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 14.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1)-\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 134.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(30)$ | 20.3(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(30)$ | -153.8(6) |


| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 138.4(6) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | -35.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | -101.4(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 84.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ | 167.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)$ | 55.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | -72.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | -171.6(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28)-\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(31)$ | -37.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 45.0(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | 168.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(29)$ | -67.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | -178.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | -54.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)$ | 69.0(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | -63.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 167.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 179.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | 50.5(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 57.0(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | -71.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | -168.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | -50.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)$ | 74.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31)-\mathrm{C}(30)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(34)$ | -57.0(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33)-\mathrm{C}(34)-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(30)$ | 56.2(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | $0.9(10)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | 1.0(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)$ | -176.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{O}(36)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | -172.4(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | 139.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{O}(36)$ | -43.0(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | -1.5(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39)-\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)$ | $0.2(10)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(38)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | -2.3(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)-\mathrm{C}(37)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(41)$ | 174.9(6) |


| $\mathrm{C}(40)-\mathrm{C}(41)-\mathrm{C}(42)-\mathrm{C}(37)$ | 1.8(10) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})$ | 93.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})$ | -70.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})$ | -154.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | -33.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | -112.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | 127.4(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})$ | 17.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})$ | 137.3(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | 133.4(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | -107.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | -101.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | 17.9(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})$ | 37.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(6 \mathrm{~A})$ | 150.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(7 \mathrm{~A})$ | -81.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})$ | -24.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(6 \mathrm{~A})$ | -140.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(7 \mathrm{~A})$ | 96.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 116.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})$ | -57.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})$ | -175.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})$ | 60.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})$ | -3.7(9) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 176.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})$ | 4.7(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})$ | 123.0(8) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(11 \mathrm{~A})$ | -109.5(8) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})$ | -175.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})$ | -56.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(9 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})$ | 70.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})$ | 6.3(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})$ | 171.0(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})$ | -173.1(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})$ | -8.3(7) |


| $\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})$ | 5.6(12) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})$ | -175.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(22 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | -175.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.3(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})$ | -179.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})$ | -179.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.5(7) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})$ | -4.9(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})$ | -169.6(6) |
| $\mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | 174.0(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | 9.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})$ | -6.5(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(21 \mathrm{~A})$ | 172.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$ | 174.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{N}(10 \mathrm{~A})$ | -6.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.2(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})$ | 179.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(18 \mathrm{~A})$ | -1.8(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(18 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.6(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(18 \mathrm{~A})$ | 0.0(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(18 \mathrm{~A})$ | 179.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(18 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(19 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(14 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.6(10) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})$ | -135.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})$ | 111.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3.3(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | -173.4(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | -166.3(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | 10.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 74.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | -108.7(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | 16.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | 136.5(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})$ | -95.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})$ | 87.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | 144.2(6) |


| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | -33.1(6) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(23 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})$ | 27.4(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})$ | -149.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})$ | 166.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})$ | -71.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})$ | 55.2(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})$ | -37.9(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(28 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | -171.9(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | 43.8(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | -70.1(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})$ | 165.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(27 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | -179.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(26 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | 66.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})$ | -57.5(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})$ | -177.5(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})$ | 53.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A})$ | 59.2(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A})$ | -69.7(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(29 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A})$ | -60.3(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A})$ | 170.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | 74.8(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(24 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | -166.8(5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(32 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})$ | -50.6(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(31 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})$ | -55.5(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(33 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(34 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(35 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~A})$ | 55.1(7) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.5(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})$ | 176.7(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.4(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1.0(11) |
| $\mathrm{C}(39 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.7(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(40 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})$ | -0.2(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | 0.8(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(41 \mathrm{~A})$ | -176.5(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})$ | -179.2(6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(38 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})$ | 20.8(10) |
| $\mathrm{C}(42 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(37 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{C}(43 \mathrm{~A})-\mathrm{O}(36 \mathrm{~A})$ | -162.0(6) |



Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for leo287 (3.110).

| Identification code | leo287 (Daniel Tao) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Empirical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{9}$ |
| Formula weight | 492.55 |
| Temperature | $133(2) \mathrm{K}$ |
| Wavelength | $0.71073 \AA$ |
| Crystal system | Orthorhombic |
| Space group | $P 2{ }_{12} 2_{1}$ |



Table 2. Atomic coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}$ ) for leo287. $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{ij}}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)$ | 4746(1) | 6774(1) | 6848(1) | 32(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 4147(1) | 5212(1) | 6443(1) | 23(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 6125(1) | 4668(1) | 6527(1) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 7342(1) | 3247(1) | 6501(1) | 27(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 8745(1) | 2661(1) | 5684(1) | 29(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 6706(1) | 2429(1) | 4605(1) | 22(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(7)$ | 6506(1) | 1257(1) | 5544(1) | 31(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)$ | 7755(1) | 4150(1) | 4156(1) | 22(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(9)$ | 9070(1) | 5239(1) | 4704(1) | 44(1) |
| C(1) | 3516(2) | 6389(2) | 4786(1) | 32(1) |
| C(2) | 2412(2) | 6996(2) | 4514(1) | 42(1) |
| C(3) | 2772(2) | 7928(2) | 4039(1) | 42(1) |
| C(4) | 3552(2) | 7692(2) | 3327(1) | 34(1) |
| C(5) | 4589(2) | 7007(1) | 3608(1) | 26(1) |
| C(6) | 5518(2) | 6616(2) | 3033(1) | 31(1) |
| C(7) | 6276(2) | 5862(1) | 3520(1) | 24(1) |
| C(8) | 5699(2) | 4586(1) | 4601(1) | 18(1) |
| C(9) | 5578(2) | 5681(1) | 4290(1) | 19(1) |
| C(10) | 4281(2) | 6049(1) | 4094(1) | 21(1) |
| C(11) | 7753(2) | 2969(1) | 5790(1) | 23(1) |
| C(12) | 6779(2) | 3188(1) | 5195(1) | 20(1) |
| C(13) | 5627(2) | 3339(1) | 5663(1) | 20(1) |
| C(14) | 5037(2) | 4334(1) | 5366(1) | 18(1) |
| C(15) | 5255(2) | 5091(1) | 6031(1) | 21(1) |
| C(16) | 6118(2) | 3584(2) | 6466(1) | 24(1) |
| C(17) | 6976(2) | 4239(1) | 4806(1) | 19(1) |
| C(18) | 4088(3) | 8709(2) | 3037(2) | 55(1) |
| C(19) | 2783(2) | 7247(2) | 2673(1) | 46(1) |
| C(20) | 3631(2) | 5206(2) | 3642(1) | 28(1) |
| C(21) | 4000(2) | 6124(2) | 6819(1) | 24(1) |
| C(22) | 2779(2) | 6185(2) | 7167(2) | 44(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(23)$ | $8772(2)$ | $4727(2)$ | $4163(1)$ | $26(1)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(24)$ | $9413(2)$ | $4630(2)$ | $3410(1)$ | $37(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)$ | $6504(2)$ | $1461(1)$ | $4865(1)$ | $25(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(26)$ | $6291(2)$ | $734(2)$ | $4215(1)$ | $31(1)$ |

Table 3. Bond lengths [ $\AA$ ] and angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo287.

| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 1.191(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(21)$ | 1.366(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.435(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 1.409(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.421(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 1.362(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.436(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 1.191(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 1.361(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.426(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(7)-\mathrm{C}(25)$ | 1.205(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 1.362(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | $1.426(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(9)-\mathrm{C}(23)$ | 1.198(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.535(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.538(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.522(4) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.539(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 1.534(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 1.539(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.541(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 1.524(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.546 (3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.548(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | $1.560(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.534(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 1.536(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | $1.550(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.562(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 1.533(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.523(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.531(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 1.545(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.528(2) |


| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.545(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | $1.536(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 1.491(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 1.492(3) |
| C(25)-C(26) | 1.490(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 115.87(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 109.97(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 111.34(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 114.74(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 117.04(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 110.82(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 111.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 114.90(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 110.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 107.7(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | 107.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 115.61(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 106.71(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 108.23(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 119.90(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 103.56(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 118.39(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 103.32(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 106.69(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 115.99(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 117.12(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 100.51(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 113.38(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 116.44(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 103.37(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 110.06(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 114.13(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 108.26(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(20)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 109.07(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 115.80(15) |


| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 99.29(14) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 122.80(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 128.44(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 108.65(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 113.21(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 114.82(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 105.43(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 108.31(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 111.10(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 103.58(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 101.91(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 106.18(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 106.89(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 103.04(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 115.23(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 105.03(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 109.52(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 108.26(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 107.88(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 107.25(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 106.14(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 108.37(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 114.02(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 110.96(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 103.37(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 123.89(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 125.68(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | 110.42(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(9)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | 123.21(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(9)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 126.65(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | 110.13(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(7)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 121.89(18) |
| $\mathrm{O}(7)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 126.47(18) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ | 111.64(17) |

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo287. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[h^{2} a^{* 2} U^{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U^{12}\right]$

| $\mathrm{U}^{11}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{22}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{33}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{23}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{13}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{12}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(1) 34(1)$ | 29(1) | 33(1) | -10(1) | 3(1) | -2(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2) 23(1)$ | 24(1) | 22(1) | -4(1) | 5(1) | -1(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3) 27(1)$ | 30(1) | 22(1) | -5(1) | -5(1) | 4(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4) 26(1)$ | 35(1) | 21(1) | 3(1) | -3(1) | 7(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5) 22(1)$ | 32(1) | 32(1) | 2(1) | -2(1) | 6(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6) 26(1)$ | 18(1) | 22(1) | -2(1) | 1(1) | 3(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(7) 36(1)$ | 24(1) | 31(1) | 5(1) | -1(1) | 3(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(8) 21(1)$ | 26(1) | 19(1) | -1(1) | 4(1) | 1(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(9) 28(1)$ | 63(1) | 41(1) | -17(1) | 9(1) | -15(1) |
| C(1) 34(1) | 36(1) | 26(1) | 3(1) | 4(1) | 13(1) |
| C(2) 40(1) | 49(1) | 36(1) | 1(1) | 8(1) | 24(1) |
| C(3) 51(1) | 34(1) | 40(1) | -3(1) | -5(1) | 24(1) |
| C(4) 39(1) | 29(1) | 33(1) | 6(1) | -4(1) | 11(1) |
| C(5) 30(1) | 21(1) | 27(1) | 4(1) | -4(1) | 4(1) |
| C(6) 31(1) | 33(1) | 29(1) | 12(1) | 3(1) | 4(1) |
| C(7) 23(1) | 23(1) | 25(1) | 4(1) | 2(1) | 2(1) |
| C(8) 19(1) | 17(1) | 17(1) | -2(1) | $0(1)$ | 1(1) |
| C(9) 20(1) | 18(1) | 19(1) | -1(1) | -2(1) | 0(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10) 22(1)$ | 20(1) | 21(1) | $0(1)$ | -1(1) | 5(1) |
| C(11)25(1) | 22(1) | 23(1) | 4(1) | -1(1) | 2(1) |
| C(12)21(1) | 19(1) | 20(1) | $0(1)$ | 1(1) | 2(1) |
| C(13)21(1) | 19(1) | 20(1) | 2(1) | 1(1) | 1(1) |
| C(14)19(1) | 18(1) | 18(1) | -1(1) | $0(1)$ | 0(1) |
| C(15)21(1) | 22(1) | 18(1) | -2(1) | 2(1) | -1(1) |
| C(16)24(1) | 30(1) | 20(1) | 2(1) | 0(1) | 3(1) |
| C(17)19(1) | 20(1) | 17(1) | 1(1) | 1(1) | 1(1) |
| C(18)65(2) | 34(1) | 65(2) | 21(1) | -3(1) | 15(1) |
| C(19)49(1) | 56(2) | 33(1) | 1(1) | -12(1) | 24(1) |
| C(20)23(1) | 27(1) | 35(1) | -2(1) | -6(1) | 2(1) |
| C(21)28(1) | 27(1) | 18(1) | -2(1) | -1(1) | 4(1) |
| C(22)37(1) | 47(1) | 49(1) | -15(1) | 18(1) | 2(1) |


| $\mathrm{C}(23) 19(1)$ | $34(1)$ | $26(1)$ | $2(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{C}(24) 26(1)$ | $57(1)$ | $26(1)$ | $5(1)$ | $7(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(25) 22(1)$ | $20(1)$ | $32(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $4(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(26) 34(1)$ | $22(1)$ | $36(1)$ | $-5(1)$ | $2(1)$ | $3(1)$ |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and isotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo287.

|  | X | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H(1A) | 4005 | 6821 | 5135 | 39 |
| H(1B) | 3251 | 5779 | 5080 | 39 |
| $\mathrm{H}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1893 | 6547 | 4198 | 50 |
| H(2B) | 1945 | 7222 | 4970 | 50 |
| H(3A) | 3215 | 8408 | 4378 | 50 |
| H(3B) | 2035 | 8280 | 3864 | 50 |
| H(5A) | 5055 | 7453 | 3969 | 31 |
| H(6A) | 6017 | 7184 | 2833 | 37 |
| H(6B) | 5129 | 6262 | 2593 | 37 |
| H(7A) | 7077 | 6156 | 3628 | 29 |
| H(7B) | 6384 | 5208 | 3239 | 29 |
| H(8A) | 5387 | 4111 | 4195 | 21 |
| H(9A) | 5914 | 6156 | 4687 | 23 |
| H(13A) | 5080 | 2733 | 5652 | 24 |
| H(14A) | 4159 | 4233 | 5274 | 22 |
| H(15A) | 5534 | 5764 | 5824 | 25 |
| H(16A) | 5621 | 3263 | 6883 | 29 |
| H(17A) | 7332 | 4725 | 5189 | 22 |
| H(18A) | 3441 | 9203 | 2949 | 82 |
| H(18B) | 4521 | 8590 | 2552 | 82 |
| H(18C) | 4642 | 8980 | 3426 | 82 |
| H(19A) | 2243 | 7778 | 2475 | 69 |
| H(19B) | 2309 | 6673 | 2872 | 69 |
| H(19C) | 3304 | 7006 | 2255 | 69 |
| H(20A) | 2829 | 5445 | 3496 | 42 |
| H(20B) | 3560 | 4593 | 3965 | 42 |
| H(20C) | 4088 | 5041 | 3174 | 42 |
| $\mathrm{H}(22 \mathrm{~A})$ | 2801 | 6630 | 7623 | 66 |
| H(22B) | 2515 | 5499 | 7320 | 66 |
| H (22C) | 2217 | 6467 | 6787 | 66 |


| $\mathrm{H}(24 \mathrm{~A})$ | 10168 | 5012 | 3433 | 55 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H}(24 \mathrm{~B})$ | 8910 | 4908 | 2995 | 55 |
| $\mathrm{H}(24 \mathrm{C})$ | 9582 | 3907 | 3306 | 55 |
| $\mathrm{H}(26 \mathrm{~A})$ | 6123 | 52 | 4423 | 46 |
| $\mathrm{H}(26 \mathrm{~B})$ | 7006 | 705 | 3886 | 46 |
| $\mathrm{H}(26 \mathrm{C})$ | 5605 | 968 | 3909 | 46 |

Table 6. Torsion angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo287.

| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | -57.6(3) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 56.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(19)$ | 76.4(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(18)$ | -166.1(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | -50.0(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 55.5(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 178.72(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | -65.4(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(19)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -72.7(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 50.5(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(18)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 166.43(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -172.85(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -38.20(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 12.1(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 61.36(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 179.89(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -178.88(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -60.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 144.84(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 17.87(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | -71.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 54.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 164.72(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | -66.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 68.6(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 170.20(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | -54.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 48.98(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -175.53(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | -45.4(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(20)$ | 79.58(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 79.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | -155.65(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | -165.09(14) |


| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | -40.08(17) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | -179.69(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 4.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 57.77(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -63.39(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | -178.57(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 41.8(3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | -142.13(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 168.11(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -15.82(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | -80.3(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)$ | 95.75(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 145.42(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 20.11(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | -96.69(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -103.37(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 131.31(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 14.51(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 0.75(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | -107.47(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 121.77(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 13.55(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | -50.0(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | 76.55(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -162.65(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -36.08(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 91.82(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -25.57(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 89.18(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | -153.20(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 14.34(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | -99.45(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | -104.09(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 142.12(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 141.23(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 25.55(19) |


| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $-104.54(17)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $9.7(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $96.43(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $-15.32(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | $-18.49(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | $-130.24(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $121.55(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $-122.23(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $-66.63(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $166.05(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $172.80(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $45.49(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $-37.93(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $87.00(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $-160.25(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $84.70(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $-150.38(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | $-37.63(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{O}(1)$ | $-3.5(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(21)-\mathrm{C}(22)$ | $175.32(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{O}(9)$ | $5.2(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{C}(23)-\mathrm{C}(24)$ | $-173.91(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{O}(7)$ |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(25)-\mathrm{C}(26)$ |  |



Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for leo288 (4.42f).

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions
leo288 (Daniel Tao)
$\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{6}$
288.33

133(2) K
0.71073 A

Orthorhombic
$P 2{ }^{2} \mathbf{2 1}_{1} 1$
$a=7.8890(5) \AA \quad \alpha=90^{\circ}$.

|  | $\mathrm{b}=8.7473(5) \AA \quad \beta=90^{\circ}$. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Volume | 1506.06(15) $\AA^{3}$ |
| Z | 4 |
| Density (calculated) | $1.272 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.099 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| F(000) | 624 |
| Crystal color | colorless |
| Crystal size | $0.294 \times 0.162 \times 0.120 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |
| Theta range for data collection | 1.866 to $28.767^{\circ}$ |
| Index ranges | $-10 \leq h \leq 10,-11 \leq k \leq 11,-29 \leq l \leq 27$ |
| Reflections collected | 16761 |
| Independent reflections | $3671[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0295]$ |
| Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$ | 100.0\% |
| Absorption correction | Semi-empirical from equivalents |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.8621 and 0.8225 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 3671 / 0 / 277 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.036 |
| Final R indices $[\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=3323$ data] | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0323, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0720$ |
| R indices (all data, $0.74 \AA$ ) | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0387, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0748$ |
| Absolute structure parameter | -0.3(3) |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.240 and -0.203 e. $\AA^{-3}$ |

Table 2. Atomic coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}$ ) for leo288. $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $U^{i j}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)$ | 6661(2) | 7242(2) | 8202(1) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)$ | 7866(2) | $6115(1)$ | 7397(1) | 18(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 7574(2) | 3721(1) | 6954(1) | 18(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 5964(2) | 8225(1) | 6522(1) | 17(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 7446(2) | 7445(1) | 5686(1) | 18(1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 6596(2) | 4998(1) | 4830(1) | 22(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 6902(3) | 3496(2) | 4612(1) | 26(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 6197(2) | 4997(2) | 5463(1) | 17(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 5872(2) | 6633(2) | 5658(1) | 17(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 5082(2) | 6884(2) | 6304(1) | 15(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 7167(2) | 8736(2) | 6072(1) | 20(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 6426(3) | 10082(2) | 5716(1) | 32(1) |
| C(7) | 8813(3) | 9130(2) | 6386(1) | 28(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 3190(2) | 7259(2) | 6252(1) | 20(1) |
| C(9) | 2115(3) | 5982(3) | 5983(1) | 31(1) |
| C(10) | 5439(2) | 5598(2) | 6768(1) | 14(1) |
| C(11) | 7340(2) | 5281(2) | 6856(1) | 14(1) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 6495(2) | 6543(2) | 7731(1) | 18(1) |
| C(13) | 4901(2) | 6009(2) | 7425(1) | 17(1) |
| C(14) | 9328(3) | 3298(3) | 6971(1) | 27(1) |

Table 3. Bond lengths [ $\AA$ ] and angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo288.

| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.203(2) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 1.357(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 1.4493(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 1.393(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.433(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.437(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.445(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.427(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.432(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.4159(19) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 1.418(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.514(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 1.556(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.532(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.540(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 1.508(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | $1.526(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 1.520(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.536(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 1.537(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.499(3) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 110.43(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 112.64(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 110.17(12) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 106.46(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 111.40(13) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 108.14(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 109.50(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 103.85(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 117.11(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 108.63(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 106.71(13) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 112.53(14) |


| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | $102.75(13)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | $110.69(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | $114.81(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | $105.05(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | $108.40(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | $109.25(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | $111.69(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | $109.56(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(7)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | $112.60(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | $114.51(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | $101.30(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | $113.11(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | $113.09(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $109.27(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | $108.98(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | $106.84(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $120.85(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $129.12(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $110.03(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | $104.91(14)$ |

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo 288. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[h^{2} a^{* 2} U^{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U^{12}\right]$

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{U}^{11}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{22}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{33}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{23}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{13}$ | $\mathrm{U}^{12}$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(1) 36(1)$ | $25(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $7(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(2) 19(1)$ | $19(1)$ | $17(1)$ | $-4(1)$ | $-3(1)$ | $0(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3) 16(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $23(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(4) 24(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $15(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $5(1)$ | $-1(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5) 24(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $17(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $6(1)$ | $-2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(6) 36(1)$ | $18(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $4(1)$ | $5(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(1) 36(1)$ | $22(1)$ | $19(1)$ | $-5(1)$ | $5(1)$ | $4(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(2) 22(1)$ | $17(1)$ | $12(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $2(1)$ | $0(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(3) 20(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $2(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(4) 18(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(5) 32(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $7(1)$ | $-1(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(6) 56(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $24(1)$ | $4(1)$ | $12(1)$ | $5(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(7) 34(1)$ | $23(1)$ | $28(1)$ | $-6(1)$ | $8(1)$ | $-11(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(8) 20(1)$ | $25(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $8(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(9) 18(1)$ | $40(1)$ | $34(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $-5(1)$ | $3(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(10) 15(1)$ | $11(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $-1(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $-1(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11) 16(1)$ | $14(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $0(1)$ | $1(1)$ | $-2(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12) 25(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $16(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $-2(1)$ | $3(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13) 21(1)$ | $17(1)$ | $13(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $3(1)$ | $1(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14) 20(1)$ | $23(1)$ | $38(1)$ | $-4(1)$ | $-7(1)$ | $6(1)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates ( $\times 10^{4}$ ) and isotropic displacement parameters $\left(\AA^{2} \times 10^{3}\right)$ for leo288.

|  | x | y | z | U(eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 7120(30) | 3540(30) | 4184(12) | 35(6) |
| H(1B) | 5880(30) | 2850(30) | 4657(10) | 32(6) |
| H(1C) | 7890(30) | 3060(30) | 4842(12) | 41(7) |
| $\mathrm{H}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | 7100(30) | 4540(20) | 5694(9) | 14(5) |
| $\mathrm{H}(2 \mathrm{~B})$ | 5200(30) | 4360(20) | 5535(9) | 19(5) |
| H(3A) | 5160(30) | 7080(20) | 5338(9) | 18(5) |
| H(6A) | 5420(30) | 9750(30) | 5479(11) | 32(6) |
| H(6B) | 7330(30) | 10480(30) | 5420(12) | 48(7) |
| $\mathrm{H}(6 \mathrm{C})$ | 6090(30) | 10910(30) | 5996(11) | 35(6) |
| H(7A) | 9230(30) | 8250(30) | 6642(10) | 29(6) |
| H(7B) | 8640(30) | 9990(30) | 6648(10) | 34(6) |
| H(7C) | 9690(30) | 9370(30) | 6078(11) | 34(6) |
| H(8A) | 2780(30) | $7550(20)$ | 6656(10) | 18(5) |
| H(8B) | 3080(30) | 8080(30) | 5995(10) | 24(5) |
| H(9A) | 930(30) | 6340(30) | 5947(11) | 36(6) |
| H(9B) | 2240(30) | 5070(30) | 6237(12) | 50(7) |
| H(9C) | 2510(30) | 5730(30) | 5548(13) | 43(7) |
| H(10A) | 4990(20) | 4690(20) | 6643(8) | 9(4) |
| H(11A) | 8050(20) | 5680(20) | 6529(9) | 12(5) |
| H(13A) | 4100(30) | 6830(30) | 7458(10) | 24(5) |
| H(13B) | 4490(30) | 5120(30) | 7661(10) | 29(6) |
| H(14A) | 9380(30) | 2280(30) | 7156(10) | 34(6) |
| H(14B) | 9900(30) | 3940(30) | 7249(10) | 29(6) |
| H(14C) | 9770(30) | 3360(30) | 6557(12) | 43(7) |

Table 6. Torsion angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for leo288.

| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | -179.47(16) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | -159.32(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | -33.51(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | -73.40(17) |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 168.79(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | -117.87(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 120.56(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | -0.58(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 20.53(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 141.35(15) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 136.36(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | -102.82(18) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | -94.89(16) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 25.9(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 33.55 (17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 150.25(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | -85.14(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | -19.76(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | -135.88(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 100.34(16) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 175.88(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | -66.2(2) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(9)$ | 63.8(2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 57.18(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | -61.88(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 170.29(14) |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | -57.24(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | -176.30(14) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 55.88(19) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | -70.23(18) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 173.36(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | -101.62(15) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 16.14(17) |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 93.64(15) |


| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $-145.01(13)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $-24.31(16)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $97.03(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{O}(1)$ | $179.53(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $-0.15(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | $164.61(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | $-15.75(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $23.65(17)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $-97.68(16)$ |
|  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{22}$ Schnermann, M. J.; Beaudry, C. M.; Egorova, A. V.; Polishchuk, R. S.; Sütterlin, C.; Overman, L. E. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 2010, 107, 6158-6163.

