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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION<br>An Enantiospecific Formal Synthesis of (+)-7,20-Diisocyanoadociane<br>By<br>Philipp Christopher Roosen<br>Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry<br>University of California, Irvine, 2016<br>Professor Christopher D. Vanderwal, Chair

Described in this dissertation work are the paths, dead-ends and detours involved in eventually securing an enantiospecific formal synthesis of (+)-7,20-diisocyanoadociane (DICA) via Corey's dione, a project spanning early 2012 to early 2016. Highlighted is the isolation and biological background to DICA and isocyanoterpenes in general, in addition to the prior synthetic art for the preparation of cycloamphilectane and isocycloamphilectanes. Initial attempts at an entry into the DICA framework included a polyene cyclization, Diels-Alder/aldol condensation and reductive enone coupling strategy. Although these routes were unsuccessful they served as essential evolutionary precursors to the eventual completion of Corey's dione. Efforts to utilize Swaminathans oxy-Cope/transannular Michael cascade to construct the perhydropyrene scaffold of DICA led to a structural reassignment. Further mechanistic investigations into this reaction elucidated that the transannular Michael reaction was in fact under kinetic control. A phenanthrenone reduction route led to an unexpected stereochemical outcome that could be useful for predictive control of either cis or trans outcomes. An enantiospecific formal synthesis of DICA was eventually secured through a dihydronaphthalene reduction. A general approach to multiple C7-isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectanes is also discussed.

## CHAPTER 1:

## BACKGROUND TO (+)-7,20-DIISOCYANOADOCIANE

### 1.1 Introduction

$(+)-7,20-$ Diisocyanoadociane ${ }^{1}$ (1.1, DICA) is a polycyclic marine isocyanoterpene (ICT) with potent antiplasmodial activity that has attracted synthetic interest for over 30 years. Its trans-fused perhydropyrene ring system and salient isonitriles are marked challenges that have yet to be both addressed by the same synthetic design. In addition to a synthetic allure, the biology of DICA and ICTs more generally has further elevated interest in this family.

Figure 1.1 The structure of (+)-DICA.

1.1: (+)-7,20-diisocyanoadociane (DICA)

X-ray Structure ${ }^{1}$

1.1: (+)-7,20-diisocyanoadociane (DICA); reprinted with permission from the American Chemical Society
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### 1.2 Isolation and Structure Determination

The marine sponges Cymbastella hooperi (ex. Adocia sp.) and Amphimedon terpenensis are native to the Great Barrier Reef, Australia and are identified by their cupped morphology and by their secondary metabolites. ${ }^{2}$ Controversy surrounds whether these isolated sponges are identical species or two similar organisms that are both miscategorized. ${ }^{3}$ DICA was isolated in the early 1970s from a collection of Adocia sp., now identified as C. hooperi, ${ }^{2}$ in $2 \%$ yield by
cold petroleum ether extraction of the milled freeze-dried sponge. ${ }^{1}$ Its optical rotation was measured at $[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+47.4^{\circ}\left(c 0.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. High-resolution mass spectrometry obtained $\mathrm{e} / \mathrm{z}=$ 324.2565, suggesting the molecular formula of $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$. The IR spectrum showed peaks at 2130 and $2140 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (s), indicating the presence of isonitrile functionalities. A $100-\mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum revealed two methyl signals at $\delta 1.37$ and 1.29 and two methyl doublets at $\delta 1.06$ $(J=6 \mathrm{~Hz})$ and $0.88(J=6 \mathrm{~Hz})$, with no other resonances identifiable. Full high field ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and 2D NMR analysis was published two decades later. ${ }^{4}$ The presence of two isonitriles was further confirmed by hydrolysis with mild acid to generate a structure with molecular formula $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$, bearing appropriate ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data for a bis-secondary formamide molecule. Double recrystallization of the original isolate from hexane afforded crystals in the orthorhombic space group, $P 22_{1} 2_{1} 2_{1}$ with $\mathrm{a}=7.086 \pm 0.004 \AA, \mathrm{~b}=21.630 \pm 0.011 \AA, \mathrm{c}=13.104 \pm 0.007 \AA, \mathrm{Z}=4, d_{\mathrm{c}}$ $=d_{\mathrm{m}}=1.079 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ and solved as structure $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ (Figure 1.1).

The absolute stereochemistry of DICA was assigned first by synthesis (see Scheme 1.1). ${ }^{5}$ Corey's use of chiral-auxiliary-based Michael addition onto methyl crotonate was used to set the $\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 4$ bond in a relative and absolute sense (Scheme 1.1B). ${ }^{6,7}$ Although diastereocontrol in the simple propionate $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ case is excellent, it erodes for the substrate required for synthesis. Improved diastereocontrol on $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}$ is observed for the (-)-phenmenthol auxiliary at $-100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over the (-)-menthol based auxiliary at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; however, for the purposes of synthesis, the menthol auxiliary was chosen for cost effectiveness. Even with a $60 \%$ ee, this preparation of DICA enabled the absolute stereochemical assignment as dextrorotatory.

Shortly after Corey's assignment of (+)-DICA, a crystal structure of benzoate derivative 1.15 was reported and was in agreement with the absolute stereochemistry established by synthesis. ${ }^{8}$

Scheme 1.1 Assignment of the absolute stereochemistry of (+)-DICA.
A. Diastereoselective lithium enolate conjugate addition


## B. Enantiocontrol in Corey's synthesis of (+)-DICA



## C. X-ray crystal structure of a benzoate derivative of (+)-DICA




Reprinted with permission from the Royal Chemical Society

1.15: 47\%

### 1.3 Biosynthesis

The complex relationship between sponges and the flora and fauna in their environment greatly challenges the delineation of the biosynthesis of their isolated secondary metabolites. Nonetheless, the origin and synthesis of DICA's carbon skeleton and isonitrile units has gathered significant attention.

DICA is comprised of a C20 skeleton and hence classified as a diterpene. There are several options for housing four isoprene units in the methylated pyrene structure, recognizing a single C16-methyl shift (Figure 1.2A). ${ }^{1,9}$ Garson has elegantly confirmed DICA is associated with the sponge and not a symbiotic or closely associated organism, for example cyanobacteria. ${ }^{10}$ The difficulty comes in determining the source of the C20 fragment, since it was shown that sodium $\left[2-{ }^{14} \mathrm{C}\right]$ acetate is not a carbon-source for DICA. ${ }^{11}$ Typical terpene precursors like acetate, mevalonate, glucose and leucine are generally not incorporated into sponge terpenes as determined by feeding studies. ${ }^{8,11,12}$ This result indicates that either the marine sponges de novo terpene synthesis requires other building blocks or more elaborated hydrocarbon fragments are obtained from external sources. Incorporation of $\left[2-{ }^{14} \mathrm{C}\right]$ acetate into carotenoids known to arise from blue-green algae symbiosis during feeding studies of other sponges supports the latter proposal. ${ }^{13}$ Still, by examining the isolated natural products of C. hooperi a biosynthetic relationship between ICT diterpenes has been proposed (Figure 1.2B). ${ }^{14}$ The cyclization of geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate $\mathbf{1 . 1 9}$ affords the cavernane scaffold $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$, a main branching point to ICT diterpenes. Further cyclization of $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ via amphilectane $\mathbf{1 . 2 1}$ and cycloamphilectane $\mathbf{1 . 2 2}$ sets up a methyl shift to the isocycloamphilectane $\mathbf{1 . 2 3}$ scaffold. Based on the proposed biosynthetic relationship between ICT sub-classes, the four isoprene units required to generate DICA are most likely arranged as depicted in $\mathbf{1 . 1 8}$, Form C. The exact source of carbon, the
location in the sponge where cyclization is performed and the manner in which folding occurs remains unconfirmed for DICA, and ICTs more broadly.

Figure 1.2 Isoprene units of the cycloamphilectane skeleton and C16 to C20 methyl shift to access the isocycloamphilectane skeleton.


* indicates the location of nitrogenous functional groups: isonitrile, isocyanate, isothiocyanate, formamide, amine

Arguably more interesting than terpene biosynthesis is the inclusion of cyanide into marine ICTs. Radiolabelling studies feeding $\mathrm{Na}\left[{ }^{14} \mathrm{C}\right] \mathrm{N}$ to $A$. terpenensis followed by isolation of DICA showed incorporation of ${ }^{14} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{11}$ Radiolabelling was retained upon hydrolysis of DICA to the bis-formamide. Upon cleavage of one formamide to the amine, $49 \%$ radioactivity remained and upon double deformylation only trace background activity was observed. This sequence
shows that the carbon of exogenous cyanide is incorporated into the isonitriles of DICA. A variety of other marine ICT natural products also show integration of radiolabeled cyanide during feeding studies. ${ }^{14}$ Additionally, feeding of doubly labeled cyanide, $\mathrm{Na}\left[{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right]\left[{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}\right]$, confirmed that both carbon and nitrogen of free cyanide are incorporated into the isonitrile goup of the related ICT 9-isocyanoneopupukeanane. ${ }^{15}$ Although the doubly labeled cyanide feeding study has not been performed for DICA to date, the example of 9-isocyanoneopupukeanane is likely representative for all ICTs.

Scheme 1.2 Established biosynthetic relationship between cyanide, thiocyanate and their respective terpene derivatives.


1.1: DICA
1.29: $\left[{ }^{14} \mathrm{C}\right]_{2}-7,20-$ diisothiocyanatoadociane

Studies were undertaken to detect the origin of inorganic cyanide available to the organism and the manifold by which the isocyanate, isothiocyanate, formamide and amine functionalities are born out. By observations and labeling studies of cyanide and axisonitrile-3 1.27, it was found that cyanide and thiocyanate are interconverted at an inorganic level (Scheme 1.2). ${ }^{16}$ Additionally, isonitrile $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ and isothiocyanate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ are each interconverted, and importantly, without expulsion of either isonitrile or isothiocyanate. These experiments were also performed in part on DICA and showed that radiolabelled isothiocyanate is also biosynthetically
introduced into DICA via cyanide and that the organism is capable of desulfurizing the nonnatural product $\left[{ }^{14} \mathrm{C}\right]_{2}-7,20$-diisothiocyanatoadociane $1.29 .{ }^{17}$ Inclusion of cyanide into ICTs and the interconversion of isocyano- and isothiocyanatoterpenes have both been shown to be enzyme-mediated processes. ${ }^{14,15}$ The occurrence of isocyanate, formamide and free amine derivatives has not been deeply studied but could be reasonably explained from hydrolysis of the isothiocyanate and isonitrile natural products.

Further investigation into the origin of the carbon and nitrogen in cyanide used by marine sponges is warranted. As determined by the significant production of ICTs, these sponges require significant quantities of the otherwise toxic cyanide. The seawater ecosystem home to ICTproducing sponges most likely contains minimal if any free cyanide, suggesting that cyanide is produced biosynthetically. ${ }^{14}$ Labeling studies have indicated that the cyanide used to produce DICA is not of amino acid origin. ${ }^{8}$ Although not experimentally determined, the biosynthetic origin of cyanide may involve microbial symbionts, as documented for other secondary metabolites. ${ }^{14}$

### 1.4 Function and Ecology

The abundance of ICTs in sponges of marine origin begs the question of their function and ecology. A wide variety of proposals exist for the various sesqui- and diterpenes, including structural, defense and symbiotic. ${ }^{14}$ For the purposes of this dissertation, only information relevant to DICA will be presented.

Marine sponges generate DICA in significant quantities; it is obtained in $2 \%$ of the dry weight of collected sponge. ${ }^{1}$ The production of DICA does not vary significantly with season or geography. ${ }^{13}$ Upon dissection of $A$. terpenensis, DICA is found in both superficial ectosome and
deeper choanosome sponge tissue. ${ }^{10}$ Higher concentrations of DICA relative to sterols were observed in larger nucleolated cells compared to small non-nucleated cells; the concentration of sterols in larger nucleolated cells was negligible. Further study revealed DICA to be associated with the sponge cell membrane; however, in vitro analysis using conventional phospholipids showed that DICA was not integral. ${ }^{18}$ Amphimedon sp. phospholipids are unconventional by virtue of their significant quantities of unusual, brominated fatty acids. ${ }^{19,20}$ Studies examining DICA in this lipid system have not been disclosed. The location and quantities of DICA available to the sponge suggest a structural role. ${ }^{18}$ Further study on the precise roles of DICA and other ICTs are warranted.

### 1.5 Biological Activity

### 1.5.1 Introduction

A distinctive characteristic of ICTs is not only their structural diversity, but also their biological profile. This class of molecules, which encompasses both sesqui- and diterpenes, has a vast array of biological activity that for the purposes of this dissertation will focus on DICA.

DICA was first shown to exhibit in vitro antimicrobial activity against gram-positive bacteria although no precise detail was provided. ${ }^{21}$ DICA was also shown to have vasodilative properties on isolated guinea pig hearts $\left(\mathrm{EC}_{50}=22 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{heart}\right)$, although no follow-up studies have been disclosed. ${ }^{22}$ Significant interest in ICTs came out of an early evaluation of antiplasmodial activity. In collaborative work between the Angerhofer and König groups, ICTs 1.27, $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ and 1.30-1.32 were screened against chloroquine-sensitive D6 and chloroquine-resistant W 2 strains of Plasmodium falciparum, a malaria-causing parasite (Table 1.1). ${ }^{23}$ The isonitrile $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ was markedly more potent than the isothiocyanates screened. These preliminary results led to a larger
screening program, in which DICA was also involved. ${ }^{24,25}$

Table 1.1 Initial evaluation of antiplasmodial activity and cytotoxicity of ICTs.

${ }^{\text {a }} \mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values in nM ; all ICT $I C_{50}$ values of human KB cell cytotoxicity were $>75,000 \mathrm{nM}$

Table 1.2 Evaluation of isocycloamphilectane ICTs against $P$. falciparum.

${ }^{\text {a }} \mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values in $n \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{IC} \mathrm{S}_{50}$ values of human KB cells cytotoxicity in nM

DICA exhibited significant in vitro activity against both D6 and W2 strains of $P$. falciparum, while also maintaining high selectivity for the parasite over human cells (Table 1.2). DICA derivatives $\mathbf{1 . 3 3}-\mathbf{1 . 3 6}$, bearing isothiocyanate or cyanate functionality and also isolated from C. hooperi show dramatic differences in activity. The position of the isocyanate is critically linked to biological activity as shown in $\mathbf{1 . 3 3}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 3 4}$. C 7 isothiocyanate $\mathbf{1 . 3 4}$ and isocyanate 1.35 show a $10-20$ fold drop in activity, while a C20 isocyanate increases potency. Isocycloamphilectane 1.36, containing only a single isonitrile, also showed a significant drop in
activity compared to DICA. The scope is too small to deduce structure-activity relationships, although the isonitriles are clearly critical for antiplasmodial activity.

The strong antiplasmodial activity inspired more biological evaluation of ICTs. Wright and coworkers approached with this opportunity, screened DICA and other ICTs against various targets. ${ }^{26}$ The experiments were performed with $50 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ disk $^{-1}$ and the inhibition was measured in millimeters from the edge of the disk. DICA was examined for antibacterial activity against Gram-negative Escherichia coli ( 1 mm ) and Vibrio harveyi $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right.$ of $\left.2,500 \mathrm{nM}\right)$ and Grampositive Bacillus megaterium ( 3 mm ), with success. Antifungal activity was found against Eurotium repens ( 3 mm ) and Mycotypha microspore ( 4 mm ) but none against Fusarium oxysporum. Antialgal activity was assessed also by using $50 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ disk $^{-1}$ against Chlorella fusca (2 $\mathrm{mm})$. Photosynthesis could be reduced by DICA by $36.9 \%$ at a test concentration of $0.2 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-}$ ${ }^{1}$. DICAs antitubercular activity against Mycobacterium tuberculosis had an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value of 8,000 nM . Although DICA has a broad-ranging biological profile, the most potent and arguably most interesting phenotype is its antiplasmodial activity.

### 1.5.2 Studies on Antiplasmodial Activity

Malaria afflicts millions of people and causes approximately 1 million deaths annually, mostly in developing countries. ${ }^{27}$ The current frontline treatment of artemisinin combination therapies has revolutionized the management of this illness; however, malaria-causing parasites are continuously evolving and have already begun showing signs of artemisinin resistance. ${ }^{28}$ This is an early warning that new antimalarial medicines are needed, especially those containing novel pharmacophores or mechanisms of action. The current pipeline offers only more of the same medicinal derivatives, making a major conceptual leap in antimalarial therapeutics greatly
desired. ${ }^{29}$ ICTs precisely fill this requirement as a potential lead since the isonitrile functional group constitutes a new warhead for exploration. DICA's potent activity against drug-resistant $P$. falciparum has elevated the molecule to further detailed study.

During erythrocyte infection, the parasite actively feeds on hemoglobin, thereby releasing toxic heme and hydrogen peroxide. ${ }^{30}$ These molecules require neutralizing to avoid parasite selfdestruction. This process is performed by the biocrystallization of heme into hemozoin and by various peroxidative pathways. ${ }^{31}$ Interruption of these processes is proposed to be a major antiplasmodial mechanism of action for current antimalarial medicines and is a logical starting point for studying ICT-parasite interaction. ${ }^{32}$ Wright and coworkers have performed initial studies, but the mechanism of action for DICA's potent biological activity is yet to be elucidated. ${ }^{24,33}$

A dual computational and experimental approach evaluated DICAs coordination to heme and subsequent inhibition of hemozoin formation as an explanation for antiplasmodial activity. The combination of 3D-QSAR and receptor modeling methodologies determined that the parasite target requires a hydrophobic pocket and is capable of forming electrostatic interactions. ${ }^{33}$ There is a positive correlation between the structural homology of other ICTs and DICA to their antiplasmodial activity. This correlation was also observed experimentally as DICA showed strong coordination to heme by UV-vis, while less active ICTs showed subdued coordination. Experimental observations that DICA inhibited peroxidase-like activity of heme, oxidative heme decomposition and glutathione-dependent heme decomposition were also noted. Further studies revealed DICA inhibited the in vitro formation of $\beta$-hematin (the synthetic equivalent to hemazoin) from free heme. ${ }^{34}$ These computational and experimental data were interpreted as key evidence that antiplasmodial activity is integrally related to interrupting
detoxification processes. These exciting results justify a continued pursuit in explaining DICAs strong potency.

### 1.6 Previous Syntheses of Cycloamphiletanes and Isocycloamphilectanes

### 1.6.1 Corey's Synthesis of (+)-7,20-Diisocyanoadociane (1987)

Corey and Magriotis reported the first synthesis of an isocycloamphilectane ICT by completing the synthesis of $(+)$-DICA. ${ }^{5}$ Motivation for this synthetic effort was the unusual perhydropyrene structure, unprecedented biosynthesis and unknown absolute configuration. The Corey group disconnected DICA at the isonitrile carbons back to dione intermediate $\mathbf{1 . 3 7}$ (Corey's dione). Two elegant Diels-Alder disconnections take 1.37 back to the hypothetical molecule 1.40. Of beauty is how one Diels-Alder sets up for the next, thereby generating five stereodefined centers of the perhydropyrene scaffold from the initially set C3-C4 connection.

Scheme 1.3 Corey's retrosynthetic analysis of (+)-DICA via double Diels-Alder reaction.


The synthesis began with establishing the C3-C4 stereochemical relationship via Corey's auxiliary-controlled asymmetric enolate conjugate addition (see Scheme 1.1). ${ }^{6}$ Functional group interconversions led to Diels-Alder precursor 1.42. Thermal cycloaddition afforded $\mathbf{1 . 4 3}$ in $90 \%$ yield as a single trans-decalin. Revealing the masked C 1 aldehyde by TBAF deprotection and PDC oxidation enabled installation of the remaining skeletal carbons at the alkene oxidation states of $\mathbf{1 . 4 4}$. Cycloaddition of ester $\mathbf{1 . 4 4}$ was unable to provide the correct stereochemistry;
reduction, benzyl protection and thermal cycloaddition generated $\mathbf{1 . 4 5}$, which bore the correct C1-C12 trans-relationship. Oxidative removal of the superfluous carbon was accomplished by $\mathrm{RuO}_{4}$ cleavage of the corresponding exocyclic enamine to afford $\mathbf{1 . 4 6}$. After C 17 methyl installation, the stereochemistry needed to be adjusted to the all-trans 1.37. Double methyllithium addition afforded $\mathbf{1 . 4 7}$ as the diaxial diol. Trifluoroacetylation and ionization of the bistrifluoroacetates with $\mathrm{TiCl}_{4}$ and capture with TMSCN generated (+)-DICA and three more diastereomers. Purification by silica gel chromatography afforded a mixture of (+)-DICA and 1.50 in $55 \%$ yield. (+)-DICA was isolated upon further purification by HPLC; however, the final yield remained unreported.

This first synthetic preparation of $(+)$-DICA confirmed the absolute stereochemistry of the natural product. The double Diels-Alder approach is an elegant solution to the construction of a perhydropyrene scaffold in which one Diels-Alder sets up for the next. Although the natural product synthesis was successful, certain elements could still be improved. First, while beautiful in design, the synthesis relies on several redox and protecting group manipulations to generate DICA in a total of 31 steps and a longest linear of 29 steps from commercial material. A concise, efficient and stereoselective synthesis of (+)-DICA or dione precursor 1.37 would be a worthwhile contribution. Second, stereocontrol of the second Diels-Alder to generate the perhydropyrene scaffold was sufficient for completion of the synthesis, but the $1.5: 1$ reaction selectivity could still be improved. When examining this synthesis, still the most pressing issue is the nonselective isonitrile installation. Ionization of the trifluoroacetates creates competitive axial and equatorial attack of TMSCN. One solution to this problem uses $\operatorname{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ as described by Shenvi, which promotes a mostly stereoinvertive-isonitrile displacement. ${ }^{35,36}$ Additional efforts in the realm of direct isonitrile installations are however still warranted.

Scheme 1.4 Corey's synthesis of (+)-DICA.


### 1.6.2 Piers's Synthesis of (+)-8-Isocyano-10-Cycloamphilectene (1998)

The only reported preparation of a cycloamphilectane ICT was completed by Piers and Schindeler and published only in a thesis. ${ }^{9}$ The Piers lab's interest in methodology-inspired natural product synthesis drove the ICT syntheses of $\mathbf{1 . 5 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$. ${ }^{37-39}$ The synthesis of $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ was initiated to further highlight the versatility of $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$, an intermediate scaffold obtained by an intramolecular Piers-Stille annulation and Diels-Alder reaction, and to determine the absolute configuration of $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ (Scheme 1.5). The synthetic branching point $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ contains three key functionalities: (1) a C8 ester as an isonitrile precursor, (2) a C11 ketone to control the alkene
functionality or ring closure to the cycloamphilectane target and (3) a C1 silyloxymethyl unit for diversification of the side chain. ${ }^{7}$

Scheme 1.5 Piers's retrosynthetic analysis of (+)-8-isocyano-10-cycloamphilectene based on a Piers-Stille annulation and previous amphilectane syntheses.


The first objective for a synthesis of $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ was improving the preparation of $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ for three reasons: (1) the earlier amphilectane syntheses were racemic, (2) the Diels-Alder reaction provided low facial selectivity and (3) an enone reduction to set the internal stereocenter of $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ was capricious. Piers and Schindeler addressed the first problem by starting from chiral pool material $(R)-(+)$-pulegone. The absolute stereochemistry of several amphilectanes and DICA was established with uniformity at the time of Piers and Schindeler's synthetic work, therefore it is unclear why the use of $(R)-(+)$-pulegone was chosen as it would generate the unnatural enantiomer. (S)-(-)-pulegone is significantly more expensive, but still readily prepared from $(S)$ -(-)-citronellal. Upon alkylation of $\mathbf{1 . 5 7}$ with $\mathbf{1 . 5 8}$ and palladium-mediate cross coupling, the Diels-Alder reaction of 1.59 with methyl 1-bromoacrylate proceeded with complete facial selectivity. Sequential protodehalogenation and methyl ester reduction generated 1.62, which was oxidized to the enone with $\mathrm{CrO}_{3} \cdot 3,5$-dimethylpyrazole and then reduced selectively via
hydrogenation in a strongly basic medium to afford the branching intermediate $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ in significantly optimized form as a single enantiomer.

Annulation of the fourth ring became the next challenge. The C11 ketone was derivatized to an unsaturated aldehyde and the C 1 silyloxymethyl to a methyl ketone which upon exposure to base, cyclized to a dienone. Selective reduction of the disubstituted alkene followed by gemdimethyl installation generated structure 1.65. A Barton-McCombie radical deoxygenation was chosen to remove the C 14 ketone, leaving only conversion of the ester into the C 8 isonitrile to finish the synthesis of $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$.

Scheme 1.6 Piers's synthesis of (+)-8-isocyano-10-cycloamphilectene.


The Piers and Schindeler synthesis of $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ is an extension of earlier work from the Piers laboratory. A Piers-Stille annulation/Diels-Alder strategy enabled access to not only tricyclic amphilectane ICTs but also tetracyclic congeners. This synthesis addressed some of the shortcomings of earlier amphilectane syntheses, most notably the enantiospecific entry into ICTs by using chiral pool starting material, fashioning a highly facially selective Diels-Alder reaction, and optimizing for a robust enone reduction with excellent stereocontrol. To date, it is the only reported synthesis of a cycloamphilectane. The main drawback of this design is the step count, with a total of 46 steps and a longest linear of 36 steps from commercial material.

### 1.6.3 Mander's Formal Synthesis of (土)-7,20-Diisocyanoadociane (2006)

The selective installation of tertiary isonitriles has been a formidable challenge in the context of ICT syntheses. ${ }^{40}$ At the outset of Mander's interest in DICA, which started in the 1980's, ${ }^{41}$ the most substantive solution was the Curtius rearrangement, formylation and dehydration first applied to ICTs by Piers. ${ }^{9,37-39}$ With this method at hand, the most logical synthesis of the ester precursors is by stereoselective alkylation (Scheme 1.7). Alkylation under steric control was proposed to install the equatorial methyl at C 20 , while stereoelectronic control using a $\beta$-ketoester would provide axial methyl approach at $\mathrm{C} 7 .{ }^{42}$ The Curtius rearrangement's stereoretentive nature ensures that the configuration of the ester is relayed to the amine. Inspiration for construction of the perhydropyrene skeleton came from Mander's strong interest in using polyaromatics in natural product synthesis (Scheme 1.7). ${ }^{43,44}$

Scheme 1.7 Mander's impetus and inspiration for the synthesis of DICA.


Phenanthrene 1.74, generated by precedented Birch reduction/Friedel-Crafts condensation, became the unsaturated building block for Mander's stereoselective synthesis of DICA. An asymmetric manifold is only alluded to as potentially possible from diastereoselective Birch alkylation using a chiral benzamide. ${ }^{45}$ From 1.74, acylation and enone reduction with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ afforded 1.75. Curiously the stereochemistry of reduction is cis (see Chapter 4 for discussion of similar reactivity). Further functional group manipulation and stereochemical correction sets the stage for the first methyl installation at C20. Although direct alkylation failed, cyclopropanation and acid-mediated ring opening afforded carboxylic acid 1.78. Reduction of the aromatic and significant functional group manipulations generated $\mathbf{1 . 8 0}$, ready for C 7 alkylation. Deprotonation and alkylation of the corresponding $\beta$-ketoester produced axially methylated product $\mathbf{1 . 8 1}$. The final ring was closed by intramolecular Michael addition of the revealed ethyl ketone and fused cyclohexenone. Barton-McCombie deoxygenation of $\mathbf{1 . 8 2}$ and functional group manipulation afforded diacid 1.83. In a sequence analogous to the work by Piers, the diacid $\mathbf{1 . 8 3}$ was converted into free diamine $\mathbf{1 . 8 4}$, a target readily transformed to DICA
via known means. ${ }^{16}$

Scheme 1.8 Mander's formal synthesis of ( $\pm$ )-DICA.


Mander's synthesis of DICA is the first and only synthesis with stereocontrol of the isonitrile moieties. It is designed around well-established enolate alkylation methods to control for equatorial and axial methylation. The obtained diester is transformed to the diamine via stereoretentive Curtius rearrangement, thereby completing a formal synthesis. The approach generates all stereocenters with excellent diastereocontrol and the diamine is completed in 48 total steps and 42 steps longest linear from commercial materials; an additional two steps are required to complete DICA.

Miyaoka's formal synthesis of (+)-DICA follows almost the identical path as Corey's, 24 years prior (see Section 1.6.1). ${ }^{5,46}$ The key C-C forming strategy also involved two Diels-Alder reactions to generate all stereocenters except C3 and C4 (Scheme 1.9). Distinct from Corey, Miyaoka sets the C3 and C4 stereocenters by alkylation of chiral lactone $(S)-(-) \mathbf{- 1 . 8 8}$ (Scheme 1.10).

Scheme 1.9 Miyaoka's double Diels-Alder strategy to Corey's dione.


Miyaoka's synthesis began with a known synthesis of $(S)-(-)-\mathbf{1 . 8 8}$, via an esterase catalyzed desymmetrization. ${ }^{47}$ Ester enolate allylation secured the trans relationship between C3 and C4, a vital control element for the subsequent Diels-Alder reactions (Scheme 1.10). Redox and protecting group manipulations afforded homoallylic alcohol 1.90. Tosylation and elimination generated the diene, while silyl deprotection, oxidation and vinyl Grignard addition set up the alkenes for an oxidation triggered Diels-Alder (an observation also made by Corey in the context of DICA). ${ }^{5}$ The remaining carbons were introduced via Horner-WadsworthEmmons (HWE) reaction of the corresponding 1.92 C1 aldehyde. Conversion of the unsaturated ester to the protected alcohol and oxidation of the C 7 alcohol to the ketone afforded triene $\mathbf{1 . 9 4}$. The next cycloaddition was performed with added DBU to ensure epimerization of the cisdecalin. Treatment of $\mathbf{1 . 9 4}$ at high temperatures afforded cycloaddition in $5: 6 \mathrm{dr}$ favoring an undesired endo diastereomer. Deprotection of the trityl group ensured clean isolation of the
desired diastereomer 1.95. Oxidation to the skipped enal and unusual TBAF mediated oxidative deformylation ${ }^{48}$ followed by hydrogenation and epimerization provided Corey's dione $\mathbf{1 . 3 7}$ in enantioenriched form to claim a formal synthesis of (+)-DICA.

Scheme 1.10 Miyaoka's formal synthesis of (+)-DICA.


The purpose of Miyaoka's DICA synthesis is unclear as the main double Diels-Alder strategy is identical to Corey's (see Section 1.6.1). ${ }^{5}$ Speculatively, Miyaoka's DICA synthesis was to fit with a broader approach to ICTs since an amphilectane ${ }^{49}$ and several kalihinanes ${ }^{50-52}$ were prepared by a similar Diels-Alder cycloaddition. There are only small differences compared to Corey's previously published work. First, the C3-C4 stereochemical relationship in Diels-Alder triene precursor $\mathbf{1 . 9 1}$ arises from substrate-controlled alkylation of lactone (S)-(-)-
1.88 instead of auxiliary controlled Michael addition. Second, the C17 methyl is incorporated into the HWE reagent instead of later installation via alkylation. And lastly, oxidative
demethylation of the extraneous carbon in $\mathbf{1 . 9 5}$ was accomplished via unique TBAF method ${ }^{53}$ instead of oxidative cleavage of an enamine. Miyaoka's preparation of Corey's dione takes a total of 39 steps and 35 steps longest linear from commercial material, and requires another three steps to DICA. ${ }^{54}$

### 1.7 Goals for the Synthesis of (+)-Diisocyanoadociane

ICTs, and specifically DICA, have attracted synthetic chemists with their unique structures and rich biological activity. ${ }^{55}$ The widespread affliction of malaria and its negative impact on societies, especially for developing nations, requires continuous and persistent effort in building new methods of combat. In addition, the fundamental science revolving around antiplasmodial agents and the biology of this parasitic disease continues to be of interest. In this vein, the Vanderwal group initiated a research program to prepare and study ICTs. Synthetic studies towards (+)-DICA have been a cornerstone in this program since early 2012.

As DICA has already been prepared on multiple occasions, scaling the mountain of synthesis to this molecule again needs strong justification. First, DICA remains a structural terrain that has yet to succumb to concise synthesis and the construction of the all-trans perhydropyrene scaffold could still benefit from strategic chemical exercise. Second, the selective installation of the two isonitriles has been accomplished only by a single effort via a rather long sequence. Alternatives to the Curtius rearrangement have yet to be explored in the context of DICA. The need to install both an axial and equatorial isonitrile for DICA elevates this challenge. Overall, the structural, chemical and biological potential of DICA make it an attractive target.
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## CHAPTER 2:

## INITIAL EFFORTS TOWARDS 7,20-DIISOCYANOADOCIANE

### 2.1 Introduction

7,20-Diisocyanoadociane (2.1, DICA) was chosen as a synthetic target for its complex tetracyclic structure, unusual incorporation of isonitriles and because so far it has not succumbed to a concise and efficient synthesis. ${ }^{1-3}$ This synthetic program was not initiated because of a specific methodology or targeted post-synthetic study and thereby provided a freedom in ideas and execution. This autonomy offered both a great opportunity to explore reactivity and designs, but also at times became a challenge when prioritizing multiple avenues. Described here are the initial pursuits to DICA.

### 2.2 A Polyene Imino-Pinacol Coupling Approach

The first synthetic idea for tackling DICA was a proposed radical polyene cyclization. ${ }^{4}$ The framework of DICA would be constructed by single electron reduction of an imine in $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ to the radical anion, two six-endo cyclizations and a six-exo termination onto the second imine followed by final reduction with a second equivalent of reductant (Scheme 2.1). The resulting bis-amine could be elaborated into DICA. Overall, the desired transformation can be classified as a polyene imino-pinacol coupling, ${ }^{5}$ a currently unknown transformation. The stereochemical outcome of this reaction was not considered, but the C17 methyl group could potentially induce some stereocontrol. Synthetically, the first objective was to prepare 2.5, a desmethyl analog to diketone 2.4. Among the various ideas proposed, a bis-anionic oxy-Cope reaction was attractive for its use of symmetry.

Scheme 2.1 An initial polyene imino-pinacol coupling idea.


Scheme 2.2 An attempted bis-oxy-Cope rearrangement.


The approach was initiated by the preparation of vinyl bromide 2.8 via $\beta$-ketoester alkylation, decarboxylation and ketal protection. Lithium/halogen exchange with t-BuLi and addition to 2-(trimethylsiloxy)cyclohex-2-enone afforded $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ following TBAF desilylation. A second vinyllithium addition afforded trans-diol 2.6. Unfortunately using KHMDS, KOt-Bu, $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, or NaH in THF up to reflux and in the microwave in DMF and DCB, no product suggestive of 2.10 was observed. Literature precedent indicates that after a bis-oxy-Cope reaction, the substrates are well established to undergo transannular aldol reactions. ${ }^{6-8}$ This
reactivity could also be imagined complicating the outcome of the attempted bis-oxy-Cope rearrangements of 2.6.

### 2.3 A Diels-Alder/Aldol Condensation Pursuit

The polyene cyclization idea was set aside in favor of an anionic oxy-Cope/Michael approach inspired by a literature reaction (see Chapter 3). Upon recognizing and explaining the unexpected stereochemical complexities, ${ }^{9}$ the targeted intermediate $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ was still attractive for another attempt (Scheme 2.3). Two ideas were conceived: (1) a conjugate addition to 2.12, and (2) a conjugate reduction of $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$. The synthesis of both enones $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$ was disconnected via a Diels-Alder/aldol condensation cascade. The construction of aldehyde $\mathbf{2 . 1 3}$ was considered easier and therefore pursued first.

Scheme 2.3 A Diels-Alder/aldol condensation proposal to DICA.


The route began with a ketal protection of melonal 2.16, ${ }^{10}$ followed by an ozonolysis and Robinson annulation to generate 2.18 (Scheme 2.4). A ketal-protecting group was chosen because a one step deprotection and aldol condensation was envisioned to forge the third ring. Unfortunately, the ketal caused significant problems during the Diels-Alder reaction. Lewis acid
mediated cyclization did not provide cycloadduct $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$, most likely because of competitive ionization of the ketal (2.20). Heating a neat mixture of 2-(trimethylsiloxy)butadiene ${ }^{11}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ was also unsuccessful. Good reactivity was found when neat Rawal's diene ${ }^{12}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ were heated at slightly elevated temperature. Disappointingly, the deprotection and installation of the enone was not successful. In retrospect, running the reaction in an HF soluble solvent such as MeCN would have been a wiser decision than $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and could have led to success. Still, small quantities of $\mathbf{2 . 2 2}$ were obtained, which when heated in the presence of aqueous HCl generated a single diastereomer of an alcohol-bearing aldol product. Unfortunately, the structure was not determined, but is likely to be $\mathbf{2 . 2 3}, \mathbf{2 . 2 4}$ or $\mathbf{2 . 2 5}$. To better understand this reactivity, a more reliable route to $\mathbf{2 . 2 2}$ was sought.

Scheme 2.4 Initial success of the Diels-Alder/aldol condensation idea.


2.22: unreliable, 1 : 1 dr

2.23

2.21: good conversion

2.24
or

2.25

To improve the material throughput to $\mathbf{2 . 2 2}$, a dienophile-activating group was introduced (Scheme 2.5). The ester unit on 2.26 was installed using Mander's reagent followed by selenylation and selenoxide elimination. Deslongchamps annulation ${ }^{13,14}$ using Nazarov reagent ${ }^{15}$ 2.26 under acidic, basic or neutral conditions in numerous solvents did not afford 2.27. The Deslongchamps annulation has been used extensively in total synthesis, but a unifying feature is that all examples feature a $\beta$-substituted Nazarov reagent. A control reaction using such a $\beta$ substituted Nazarov reagent was not attempted, but would give good indication on whether $\mathbf{2 . 2 6}$ is a competent coupling partner. Thermal conditions using 2-(trimethylsilyloxy)butadiene only returned starting material. ${ }^{16}$ In the wake of semi-success at the Diels-Alder/aldol condensation idea, elimination of the problematic ketal in $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ was pursued.

Scheme 2.5 Attempted Diels-Alder reaction via dienophile activation.


Instead of using a ketal as the masked aldehyde, which complicated Lewis acid activation of the dienophile for Diels-Alder reactivity, $\mathbf{2 . 2 9}$ could be converted into TIPS protected alcohol 2.30 (Scheme 2.6). Oxidative cleavage of the alkene then set up for another Robinson annulation. Standard diethylaminotrimethylsilane-catalyzed conjugate addition conditions were retained, but homogenous LiOH-mediated aldol condensation conditions ${ }^{17}$ were implemented to furnish $\mathbf{2 . 3 1}$ instead, as biphasic conditions were unsuccessful in generating 2.18. Diels-Alder with 2 -
(trimethylsiloxy)butadiene in the presence of two equivalents of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{AlCl}$ led to good conversion to 2.32. The last aldol condensation was not attempted on this system because at this point the general approach was considered too close to an ICT synthesis reported concurrently by Shenvi (Scheme 2.7). ${ }^{18}$

Scheme 2.6 Incomplete efforts towards a Diels-Alder/aldol condensation sequence.



Scheme 2.7 An ICT synthesis by Shenvi.


### 2.4 The Methylenation/Reductive Ring Closure Approach

### 2.4.1 Application of Danishefsky's trans-Diels-Alder Paradigm

The next set of ideas revolved around a complete redesign of a synthesis of DICA (Scheme 2.8). Corey's dione $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$ was disconnected between C9-C10 back to bis-enone $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$. The last ring closure would occur by a two-electron reductive coupling of bis-enone 2.40. ${ }^{19}$ The
pseudo-symmetric 2.40 was further disconnected to bis-enoxysilane 2.41. Danishefsky's trans-Diels-Alder reaction was considered advantageous for gaining entry into the required transstereochemistry of decalin 2.42. ${ }^{20}$

Scheme 2.8 General proposal for a final reductive ring closure.


The synthesis of $\mathbf{2 . 4 3}$ was performed in an analogous manner to a Corey procedure (Scheme 2.9). ${ }^{21}$ Cyclohexenone 2.48 was smoothly epoxidized under basic conditions and then treated with hydroxylamine to generate oxime $\mathbf{2 . 5 0}$. Trifluoroperoxyacetic acid oxidized the oxime to a nitro functional group, which triggered opening of the epoxide. After oxidation of the alcohol, the doubly activated alkene $\mathbf{2 . 5 2}$ was subjected to Diels-Alder reaction with dienoxysilane $\mathbf{2 . 5 3}$ to generate $\mathbf{2 . 4 3}$ in $3: 1 \mathrm{dr}$. The stereochemistry depicted was assigned based on an analogous literature reaction. ${ }^{22}$ Tributyltin hydride radical denitration successfully afforded 2.42, although significant elimination product $\mathbf{2 . 5 4}$ was also observed. Alternatively, the nitro could be eliminated with DBU to afford 2.54. Conjugate reduction with Stryker's reagent afforded only tetralone 2.55. Birch reduction of $\mathbf{2 . 5 4}$ generated $\mathbf{2 . 4 2}$, however in low yields.

After a more critical examination of this route, the undesired alkene-orientation of $\mathbf{2 . 4 2}$ and the fairly involved sequence of steps made a different approach more appealing.

Scheme 2.9. Diels-Alder reactivity of an activated nitroalkene.


### 2.4.2 Efforts Towards a trans-Selective Conjugate Hydrosilylation Approach

The previous approach was changed because of perceived complications in having the enoxysilane enolized in the incorrect direction (Scheme 2.10). The basic idea of a reductive enone coupling idea was still exciting, but correct orientation of the C20 enoxysilane in 2.41 was considered important. In a second-generation approach, 2.41 was disconnected back to enone

### 2.57.

Scheme 2.10 Tracing tricyclic bis-enoxysilane 2.41 back to a simple octalone starting material.


Scheme 2.11 Initial success of a trans-selective conjugate hydrosilylation.


The octalone 2.57 was constructed by Robinson annulation onto 4-methylcyclohexenone 2.58 (Scheme 2.11). Alkylation of the cross-conjugated dienolate with MeI installed the C17 methyl group in excellent diastereoselectivity. A direct allylic oxidation with selenium dioxide did not afford any $\mathbf{2 . 6 0}$ and therefore a two-step protocol was implemented instead. Generation of the conjugated dienoxy acetate was accomplished under a variety of conditions; however, epimerization of the C17 methyl group was consistently observed. The use of LDA with HMPA
and $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was eventually successful in affording $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ as a single diastereomer. Oxidation of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ with in situ generated DMDO was successful in generating $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 6 3}$; however, low yields and a messy reaction profile were reason to switch to mCPBA. Conjugate reduction of $\mathbf{2 . 6 3}$ with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ only caused elimination of the gamma-hydroxide. Conjugate hydrosilylation was accomplished with Wilkinson's catalyst in triethylsilane at elevated temperatures to afford $\mathbf{2 . 6 4}$ bearing a cis-ring fusion. Installing a bulky trimethylsilyl group on the alcohol was designed to block the cis-face of the enone and direct to a more trans-selective hydrosilylation. Delightfully, this design was successful! The reduction of $\mathbf{2 . 6 5}$ with Wilkinson's catalyst afforded a $1: 1$ mixture of cis- and trans-ring fusions. Unfortunately, 1,2-reduction of the enone was also observed. The next step was to improve the $1: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ by using larger alcohol protecting groups and evaluating different catalysts.

Several combinations of alcohol protecting group and catalyst were examined (Table 2.1). A general reactivity screen narrowed the catalysts to those providing clean conjugate reduction. Pivaloyl protecting the alcohol of $\mathbf{2 . 6 3}$ enhanced the selectivity from cis-conjugate silylation to an approximately $1: 1$ mixture. Karstedt's catalyst was determined to be the most reliable in affording 1,4 over 1,2-reductions (entry 6). Other platinum sources such as $\operatorname{Pt}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$ and $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ provided similar diastereoselectivity, but were much less active than Karstedt's catalyst or competitively conducted 1,2-reduction (entries 8,9 ).

Table 2.1 Consolidation of conjugate hydrosilylation reactions.



With a relatively acceptable $1.1: 1$ trans-selective hydrosilylation established, the route was continued (Scheme 2.12). Deprotection of the pivaloyl group with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ generated separable alcohols 2.77 and $\mathbf{2 . 7 8}$, both of which were readily handled, stable to silica gel and storable at room temperature. Upon oxidation of $\mathbf{2 . 7 7}$ to ketone $\mathbf{2 . 7 9}$, the material became much more unstable and needed to be used without purification within an hour. The first attempted Robinson annulation used the Stork-Ganem reagent. ${ }^{23}$ However, enolizing 2.79 with LDA and attempting conjugate addition did not furnish any product reminiscent of $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$. The
enoxytrimethylsilane $\mathbf{2 . 8 1}$ could be generated cleanly by action of LDA, indicating that enolization occurs as expected. Attempts to reveal the enolate with MeLi were unsuccessful, leading to only decomposition, even upon simple aqueous quench. Standard Claisen condensation conditions of treating 2.79 with base, such as $\mathrm{KOt}-\mathrm{Bu}, \mathrm{NaH}$ or LDA and ethyl formate did not provide any 2.82. The only conditions successful at generating the desired $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond involved treating 2.79 with LDA and ethyl formate, followed by quenching with methanol and excess methyl vinyl ketone. An additional compound, proposed to be $\mathbf{2 . 8 4}$ was also isolated. The low yield and unreliable preparation of $\mathbf{2 . 8 3}$ led to a reevaluation of strategy.

Scheme 2.12 Exploring a Robinson annulation onto 2.79.


### 2.4.3 A Reductive Stork Alkylation

A more robust approach was attempted owing to the difficulty in executing a Robinson
annulation onto 2.79. An inspiration for the next attempt was Stork's reduction of enedione $\mathbf{2 . 8 5}$ to the dienolate $\mathbf{2 . 8 6}$ and subsequent alkylation (Scheme 2.13 A ). ${ }^{24}$ This procedure has found extensive utility in steroid chemistry ${ }^{25-28}$ and other total syntheses, ${ }^{29,30}$ making it reliable enough to commit towards DICA. Reductive alkylation of $\mathbf{2 . 8 9}$ would generate $\mathbf{2 . 9 0}$ after epimerization of the three enolizable positions (Scheme 2.13B). A Robinson annulation onto $\mathbf{2 . 9 0}$ via activation through the keto-aldehyde would ensure selective enolization. A final ring closure would then prepare Corey's dione $\mathbf{2 . 3 9}$.

Scheme 2.13 Allylation and subsequent ring closures based on a reductive Stork alkylation.

## A. Stork reduction and alkylation of an endione


B. Proposal to incorporate the Stork alkylation methodology towards DICA


Scheme 2.14 A reductive Stork alkylation towards DICA.


The undesired minor diastereomer from the hydrosilylation approach, $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ was oxidized to enedione 2.89 (Scheme 2.14). Addition of 2.89 to a solution of $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and quenching with allyl bromide generated a mixture of compounds that could be converged to two mono-allylated products 2.93 and $\mathbf{2 . 9 0}$ upon equilibration with base. Di-allylated products were also observed, but not quantified or characterized. The undesired mono-allyl product $\mathbf{2 . 9 3}$ arose from alkylation at the ring fusion. The cis-alkylation was assigned because equilibrating conditions after alkylation did not change the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum and this could only be possible if the $\beta$-methyl group is already in an equatorial orientation as in $\mathbf{2 . 9 3}$. The desired allylation product was equilibrated to the all-equatorially oriented $\mathbf{2 . 9 0}$ and then subjected to Robinson annulation. Activation of the C 4 position as the keto-aldehyde set up for a selective Michael addition and ring closure. This procedure produced a mixture of compounds, but by mass spectrometry both 2.95 and the fully condensed 2.94 were observed, indicating feasibility of the original plan. The route however, fell out of favor owing to the irreproducibility and low yield of the enolate
alkylation and conception of a more robust entry to molecules similar to $\mathbf{2 . 9 4}$ (Chapter 4). In retrospect, the complications experienced during the reductive alkylation are most likely due to the inexperience in handling dissolving metal reductions.

### 2.5 Conclusions

The project of synthesizing 7,20-diisocyanoadociane was initiated with the goal of contributing a short and selective synthesis. The synthetic journey started with a bold radical cascade idea. Although it was never attempted, a ketyl or amine radical anion polyene cyclization could still be an interesting methodology to investigate. This early work was essential in probing possible avenues for a synthetic program. Retrospectively, these early explorations had fatal flaws, were discontinued due to inexperience or were simply supplanted by "better" ideas. A continuous evolution in ideas and change in strategy continuously sharpened the trajectory towards a synthesis of DICA and were directly continued in Chapter 4.

### 2.6 Experimental Procedures

## Purifications -

Solvents: Dry tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$, dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, toluene, benzene $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$, dimethylformamide (DMF), acetonitrile ( MeCN ), methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$ were obtained by passing commercially available formulations through activated alumina columns. tert-Butyl alcohol (t-BuOH) was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Amines: Triethylamine $\left(\mathrm{NEt}_{3}\right)$, $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$ '-dimethylpropylene urea (DMPU) hexamethylphosphoramide (HMPA), pyridine (py) was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Halides: Trimethylsilyl chloride was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.
Miscellaneous: Tributyltin hydride was purified by distillation. Melonal was obtained from Sigma-Aldrich and purified by column chromatography (100:1 hexanes/EtOAc). Methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) was purified by distillation. Acetic anhydride was purified by fractional distillation. Allyl bromide was purified by distillation and stored over copper beads at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Trifluoroacetic anhydride was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Titrations - Alkyllithium reagents were titrated using 2,6-di-(tert-butyl)-4-methylphenol (BHT) as the sacrificial proton source and fluorene as an indicator in THF or using diphenylacetic acid in THF. Grignard reagents were titrated using salicylaldehyde phenylhydrazone in THF. ${ }^{31}$

Reaction Setup - All reactions were carried out under an argon atmosphere with dry solvents under anhydrous conditions, unless otherwise noted. Argon balloons were the sole inert
atmosphere used. Reactions run at an ambient temperature of $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are designated as room temperature. Microwave reactions were performed in an Anton Paar Microwave. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated.

Analysis - Thin layer chromatography was performed on 0.25 mm EMD glass-backed TLC plates impregnated with a fluorescent dye and visualized with UV light and $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} / \mathrm{NaOH} /$ water or $p$-anisaldehyde in ethanol/aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ and heat as a developing agent. Forced flow (flash) chromatography was performed on EMD Silica 60, mesh 0.04-0.063 silica gel. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz instrument, obtained at 298 K unless otherwise noted and calibrated to residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm with the following abbreviations to explain multiplicities: $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{q}=$ quartet, $q u i n=$ quintuplet, sext $=$ setet, sep $=$ septet, $\mathrm{bs}=$ broad signal, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. All coupling constants are apparent $J$ values measured at the indicated field strengths. FT-IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer spectrum RX1 spectrometer. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a H2Os LCT Premier spectrometer using ESI-TOF (electrospray ionization-time of flight). Melting points were measured on a MEL-TEMP II capillary apparatus and stand uncorrected.

## Vinyl Bromide 2.8



To a stirring suspension of $1.1 \mathrm{~g}(27 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ in mineral oil $)$ in 30 mL THF cooled in an ice bath, was added $3.2 \mathrm{~mL}(30 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.7$ before the addition of $2.1 \mathrm{~mL}(22 \mathrm{mmol}) 2,3-$ dibromopropene. ${ }^{32}$ The reaction was warmed to room temperature, fitted with a reflux condenser and heated at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour. After cooling the reaction to room temperature, 60 mL water, an additional 30 mL THF and $2.52 \mathrm{~g}(60 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ were added and the reaction heated at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 23 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and 6 M aq. HCl was added until bubbling subsided. The solution was extracted thrice with EtOAc. All organic layers were collected, washed thrice with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and brine before being dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and stripped of all volatiles. The oil was dissolved in $60 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and refluxed under a Dean-Stark apparatus with $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.26 \mathrm{mmol}) p-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $1.7 \mathrm{~mL}(30 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethylene glycol. After cooling to room temperature, the organic layer was washed thrice with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, then water and brine before being dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The material was purified by column chromatography ( $30: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $2.41 \mathrm{~g}(50 \%$ over 3 steps) 2.8 as a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.39$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=1.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.99-3.92(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-2.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 134.3,116.3,109.2,64.8,37.7,36.2,24.0$; IR (thin film) 2982, 2881, 1630, $1055 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 221.0177$ found 221.0181.

## Hydroxyketone 2.9



A solution of 0.82 g ( 7.3 mmol ) 1,2-cyclohexanedione, $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(15.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TMSCl}$ and 20 mL $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was treated with $3 \mathrm{~mL}(21.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ at room temperature. After 5 minutes, the solution was filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The remaining solid was filtered through a fine frit with hexanes and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford 2.A. A solution of $1.95 \mathrm{~g}(8.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2} .8$ in 20 mL THF was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then treated with $13 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuLi}(19.5$ mmol, 1.5 M in pentane). After 10 minutes 2.A in 6 mL THF was slowly added with a 2 mL THF wash. After 2 hours at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, warmed to room temperature and extracted thrice with EtOAc. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was dissolved in 20 mL THF, cooled in an ice bath and diluted with 15 mL TBAF ( $15 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in THF). The reaction was warmed to room temperature over 20 minutes, diluted with water and extracted thrice with EtOAc. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the crude oil purified by column chromatography ( $5: 1 \rightarrow 4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.04 \mathrm{~g}(56 \%) 2.9$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.14(\mathrm{t}, J=1.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.91$ (m, 4H), $2.64(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.9,3.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59-2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.87-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.9,3.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 213.4,147.7,113.0,109.6,81.2,64.6,39.0,38.5,37.6,28.2,25.2$, 23.9, 23.0; IR (thin film) $3457,2938,2870,1711,1641,1055 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 277.1416$ found 277.1410.

## Diol 2.6



A solution of $495 \mathrm{mg}(2.24 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 8} \mathrm{in} 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then treated with 3.3 mL t -BuLi ( $4.95 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{M}$ in pentane). The reaction was stirred for 10 minutes then 150 mg ( 0.59 mmol ) 2.9 in 1 mL THF with 0.4 mL THF wash was slowly added. The reaction was warmed to room temperature over 17 hours. Sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the reaction extracted thrice with EtOAc. The organic layers were collected, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the crude oil purified by column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $130 \mathrm{mg}(55 \%) \mathbf{2 . 6}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.01(\mathrm{~s}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.85$ $(\mathrm{td}, J=12.5,4.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 154.6,110.6,110.0,77.2,64.6,38.6,33.5,27.8,23.7$, 20.6; IR (thin film) $3475,3092,2980,2930,2881,1630,1058 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{6}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 419.2410$ found 419.2403.

Ketal $\mathbf{2} \mathbf{. 1 7}$ [Adapted from the literature.] ${ }^{33}$


In a glove box, $101 \mathrm{mg}(0.25 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{WCl}_{6}$ was weighed into a round bottom flask, the flask sealed with a rubber septum and moved into a fume hood. To this flask was added 3.60 g (25.7 mmol) 2.16 and $10.7 \mathrm{~mL}(64.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl orthoformate. The reaction was stirred for 3 hours after which 15 mL 1 M NaOH was added and the contents extracted twice with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with water, then brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Distillation $\left(90{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 3.5 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ afforded $3.4 \mathrm{~g}(61 \%) 2.17$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.17(\mathrm{tdt}, \mathrm{J}=7.1,2.7,1.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=11.2,9.4,7.0,2 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=9.3,7.1,2.3,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.08(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.82-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.1,3 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.27(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.1,1.7,6 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.977(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8,3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 131.3,124.7,106.9,62.0,36.0,32.0,25.7,25.4,17.6,15.3,14.4$.

## Cyclohexenone 2.18



A solution of $2.30 \mathrm{~g}(10.7 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.17$ in $90 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was ozonoloyzed at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After excess ozone was purged from the solution, $5.60 \mathrm{~g}(21.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ triphenylphosphine was added and the reaction warmed to room temperature. After stirring for 2 hours all volatiles were
removed in vacuo. The solid was stirred with 30 mL pentane at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was heated at $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $0.5 \mathrm{~mL}(2.7 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{NTMS}$ and $1.3 \mathrm{~mL}(16.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$ in 60 mL MeCN . After 38 hours all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The crude material was heated at $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with 300 mg ( 5.35 mmol ) $\mathrm{KOH}, 0.8 \mathrm{~mL} 40 \% \mathrm{aq}$. $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NOH}$ in 63 mL THF/Et $\mathrm{t}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1:4:4) mixture. After 5 hours the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted twice with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, washed twice with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and purified by column chromatograph (10:1 $\rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.40 \mathrm{~g}(54 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ as colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.90-6.87(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.84-6.82(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 5.98(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.1,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.72-3.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.54-3.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 2.55-2.48 (m, 2H), 2.41-2.32 (m, 1H), 2.15-2.07 (m, 1H), 1.93-1.85 (m, 1H), $1.72(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.5$, $9.2,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.0,9.6,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.25-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 6.5 \mathrm{H})$, $0.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ 200.0, 199.9, 156.0, 154.5, 128.9, 128.8, 107.0, 63.0, 62.7, 62.4, 37.0, 36.7, 36.6, 36.3, 34.1, $33.9,33.6,33.4,29.8,28.0,15.34,15.32,15.2,14.6$; IR (thin film) 2973, 2874, 1680, 1450, 1114, $1059 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{3}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 258.2069$ found 258.2076.

## Cyclohexanone 2.B



A solution of $305 \mathrm{mg}(1.27 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 1 8} \mathrm{in} 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc was stirred over $13 \mathrm{mg}(0.4 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Pd})$ $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ ( $55 \%$ wetted) under a hydrogen balloon at room temperature. After 7 hours celite was added and the reaction filtered through a pad of celite to afford $302 \mathrm{mg}(98 \%)$ ketone as a
colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 4.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67(\mathrm{dqd}, J=$ 9.4, 7.0, $4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.53-3.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.28(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.80(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{dtd}, J=14.9,10.5,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.0,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.21(\mathrm{td}, J=7.0,2.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.9,9.6,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 212.4,107.2,62.5,62.4,40.9,40.7,37.4,34.1,34.0,33.2,31.7,15.3,14.9 ;$ IR (thin film) 2923, 1716, 1113, $1060 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{3}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$ 260.2226 found 260.2237 .

## Cyclohexenone 2.26



To $0.5 \mathrm{~mL}(0.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ LiHMDS ( 1.0 M in THF) cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.21 \mathrm{mmol})$ 2.B in 0.3 mL THF and washed with $0.2+0.2 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF. After 30 minutes, $23 \mathrm{mg}(0.27 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl cyanoformate in 0.3 mL THF was added. The reaction was stirred for 10 minutes, the cold bath removed and stirring continued. After 2 hours, sat. aq. NaCl was added and the aqueous layer extracted twice with EtOAc. The organic layers were collected dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the crude material taken on to the next step. To an ice cold solution of $55 \mathrm{mg}(0.23 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PhSeBr}$ in $0.3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.5 M in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) pyridine. After 5 minutes, crude $\beta$-ketoester was added with $0.6 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The reaction was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 minutes then room temperature for 1.5 hours. The organic layer was washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and brine, then dried over MgSO , filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. This material was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled
to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with aq. $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ until complete conversion by TLC. The organic layer was washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and brine then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford 57 mg ( $90 \%$ over 3 steps) of crude $\mathbf{2 . 2 6}$ with good purity ( $>90 \%$ ). The obtained material was found to be incompatible with silica gel, even when treated with $2 \% \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and Florisil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 194.7,165.33,165.25,161.6,160.3,131.8,131.7,106.93,106.87,63.4$, $63.0,62.5,52.2,37.8,37.5,36.3,36.0,34.4,34.2,34.1,34.0,29.0,27.4,15.4,15.35,15.33$, 14.7; IR (thin film) 2973, 1745, 1691, 1721, 1113, $1060 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

Melonol 2.29 [Adapted from the literature.] ${ }^{34}$


To 30 mL EtOH were added $580 \mathrm{mg}(15.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 15 minutes, $2.14 \mathrm{~g}(15.3$ mmol) 2.16 was added dropwise. The reaction was stirred for 10 minutes at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before being diluted with EtOAc and quenched slowly with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. After warming up to room temperature and ensuring all solids were dissolved by the addition of water, the layers were separated and the aqueous layer extracted thrice with EtOAc. All organic layers were collected, solid NaCl was added, the layers separated. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 7: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $2.01 \mathrm{~g}(93 \%) \mathbf{2 . 2 9}$ as a colorless liquid. The spectral data matched the literature. ${ }^{34}$

## Silylether 2.30



A solution of $2.00 \mathrm{~g}(14.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 1 8}, 4.4 \mathrm{~mL}(21.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TIPSCl}, 3.3 \mathrm{~mL}(23.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $171 \mathrm{mg}(1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP in $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was heated at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 hours. After the allotted time, 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 40 mL EtOAc were added and transferred to a seperatory funnel. The flask was rinsed with 20 mL ( $1: 1 \mathrm{sat}$. aq. $\mathrm{NH} 4 \mathrm{Cl} / \mathrm{EtOAc}$ ), 10 mL EtOAc and 10 mL water. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed once with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, water and brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The material was purified by column chromatography (hexanes) to afford $3.72 \mathrm{~g}(89 \%) \mathbf{2 . 3 0}$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.12(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.5,5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.47(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.5,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.07-1.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 22 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 131.1,125.0,68.5,35.6,33.3,25.7,25.6,18.1,17.6,16.8,12.0$; IR (thin film) 2942, 2865, $1653 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{OSi}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 299.2770$ found 299.2775.

## Enone 2.31



A solution of $3.70 \mathrm{~g}(12.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 3 0}$ in $60 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was ozonolyzed at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the excess ozone was purged from the solution, $7.25 \mathrm{~g}(27.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ triphenylphosphine were added and the reaction warmed to room temperature. After stirring for 2 hours all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The solid was stirred with 30 mL hexanes at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, filtered, washed in 3 portions with 40 mL ice cold hexanes and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was heated at $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $0.6 \mathrm{~mL}(3.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{NTMS}$ and $1.5 \mathrm{~mL}(18.6 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$ in 30 mL MeCN. After 15 hours all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The crude material was heated at 55 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $50 \mathrm{mg}(1.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiOH}$ in 30 mL i- PrOH . After 3 hours all volatiles were removed in vacuo and the crude oil separated between EtOAc and sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The layers were separated and the organic layer then washed once with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, twice with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and purified by column chromatography (20:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 1.9 g $(48 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 3 1}$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.90-6.85(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 5.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-2.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 2.41-2.32 (m, 1H), 2.17-2.11 (m, 1H), 1.83-1.77 (m, 1H), 1.74-1.56 (m, 2H), 1.33-1.26 (m, 1H), $1.23-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 200.04,199.97,155.9,155.1,128.82,128.78,68.7,68.4$, $38.6,38.3,36.9,36.7,33.7,33.6,33.3,29.5,28.5,18.0,17.7,17.3,16.6,12.0$; IR (thin film) 2942, 2865, 1685, 1462, $1101 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 347.2382$ found 347.2381 .

## Epoxide 2.49



To a solution of $2.86 \mathrm{~g}(26.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 4 8} \mathrm{in} 25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeOH}$ cooled in an ice bath, was added 7.8 $\mathrm{mL}(77.9 \mathrm{mmol}) 30 \%$ aq. $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$. The reaction was initiated with $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.5 \mathrm{mmol}) 5 \mathrm{M}$ aq. NaOH . The internal temperature rose to $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and kept at $10-15{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with the dropwise addition of an additional $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.5 \mathrm{mmol}) 5 \mathrm{M}$ aq. NaOH . The reaction was stirred for a total time of 30 minutes then poured into 60 mL brine and 40 g ice. The aqueous solution was extracted with 60 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ then 4 times with $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined and washed with 40 mL 1:1 sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ solution, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by distillation ( $98{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 25 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ) to afford 2.54 g $(78 \%) 2.49$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 3.56(\mathrm{dd}, J=4.6,1.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.0,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26-2.16$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.0,11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.8,10.7,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 205.5,54.9,54.3,44.8,31.4,22.6,21.1$; IR (thin film) 2958, $1711 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 144.1024$ found 144.1017.

## Oxime 2.50



To a solution of $2.53 \mathrm{~g}(20.0 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.49 \mathrm{in} 15 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeOH}$ was added $3.59 \mathrm{~g}(43.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ NaOAc and $1.52 \mathrm{~g}(21.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NH}_{2} \mathrm{OH} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ sequentially at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1.5 hours at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the reaction was poured into 60 mL brine and 40 g ice. The aqueous solution was extracted with 60 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ then 4 times $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined and washed with 50 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $2: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) and recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes to afford $1.78 \mathrm{~g}(62 \%) \mathbf{2 . 5 0}$ as a white solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) mixture of oxime diastereomers $\delta 8.32-8.29(\mathrm{~m}), 8.15-8.06(\mathrm{~m}), 4.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.52(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.6,3.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 3.44(\mathrm{t}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.83-2.78(\mathrm{~m}), 2.36(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.9,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.27(\mathrm{dt}, J=15.0,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $1.84-1.80(\mathrm{~m}), 1.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.9,11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.9,10.2,1.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta$ 154.6, 53.0, 44.1, 35.0, $32.8,23.6,21.2$, minor 155.3, 53.2, 51.7, 32.2, 30.0, 21.3, 20.9; IR (thin film) 3246, 2954, 1654, 1457, $971 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{NO}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-} 140.0712$ found 140.0715 .

## Nitroalkene 2.51



Trifluoroperoxyacetic acid was prepared by the dropwise addition of $5.7 \mathrm{~mL}(40.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ trifluoroacetic anhydride in 10 mL MeCN to $4.57 \mathrm{~g}(48.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ urea hydrogen peroxide in 50
mL MeCN at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This solution was added dropwise via teflon canula to a stirring mixture of $1.96 \mathrm{~g}(13.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 0}$ and $7.09 \mathrm{~g}(84.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ in 30 mL MeCN at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After a total time of 2 hours at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was carefully quenched with 25 mL sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and 25 mL water then 80 mL of volatiles removed in vacuo. The aqueous phase was diluted with 20 mL water and extracted 7 times with 50 mL EtOAc (until no oxime was observed by TLC, 2:1 hexanes/EtOAc, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.36$ ). The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.42 \mathrm{~g}(65 \%) \mathbf{2 . 5 1}$ as yellow sheets. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 7.21-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.83(\mathrm{q}, J=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{t}, J=16.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.51-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 151.8,131.0,63.8,38.0,32.1,24.1,20.7$; IR (thin film) 3368 , 2956, 1521, $1337 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-} 156.0661$ found 156.0667.

## Nitroenone 2.52



A flask was charged with $1.41 \mathrm{~g}(8.97 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 1}, 52 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 9.7 g Celite. To the reaction was added 4.83 g ( 22.4 mmol ) PCC portionwise and the contents stirred for 4 hours. The reaction was concentrated to $25 \%$ volume, filtered through silica gel with $500 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.19 \mathrm{~g}(85 \%) \mathbf{2 . 5 2}$ as a yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm) $\delta 6.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.8,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.4,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.51$ (m, 1H), 2.41-2.35 (m, 1H), 2.21 (dd, $J=16.3,12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; IR (thin
film) $2960,1694,1531,1343,1324,754,714 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{NO}_{3}$ [M-$\mathrm{H}]^{-} 154.0504$ found 154.0502 .

Diene 2.53 [Adapted from the literature.] ${ }^{35}$


To a solution of LDA, prepared from $5.5 \mathrm{~mL}(14.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.60 \mathrm{M} /$ hexanes $) \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi}$ and 2.1 mL ( 15.0 mmol ) diisopropylamine in 15 mL THF was added $1.10 \mathrm{~g}(13.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl isopropenyl ketone in 1 mL THF at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 minutes, 3.5 mL ( 28.9 mmol ) DMPU was added neat. The reaction was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes then treated with $1.95 \mathrm{~g}(13.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSCl}$ in 1 mL THF and stirred for 10 minutes before the cold bath was removed. After 50 minutes the reaction was quenched with the addition of 60 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was extracted with 75 mL hexanes and the organic phase washed with 40 mL water, 20 mL brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatrography ( $200: 1$ hexanes $/ \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ) to afford $1.50 \mathrm{~g}(58 \%) \mathbf{2 . 5 3}$ as a colorless liquid. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{35}$

## Cycloadduct 2.43



A microwave vial was charged with $107 \mathrm{mg}(0.69 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 2}$ and $255 \mathrm{mg}(1.28 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 3}$, placed under argon and set into an oil bath at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 7 hours the reaction was cooled and
purified by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $145 \mathrm{mg}(59 \%, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 4 3}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) major $\delta 204.8,140.4,105.9,91.2,50.7,48.0,44.2,34.0,29.8,25.8,25.7,25.3,21.9,16.1$, 3.9, 4.2; IR (thin film) 2923, 1722, 1542, 1257, $1194 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 376.1920$ found 376.1918 .

## Decalin 2.42



A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.14 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.43,0.13 \mathrm{~mL}(0.47 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ and $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ then the reaction was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. AIBN was added portionwise until complete conversion by TLC. The mixture was concentrated in vacuo and purified by column chromatography (20:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $18 \mathrm{mg}(41 \%) 2.42$ and 9 mg (20\%) 2.54. 2.42: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 2.41-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, $1.21-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 14 \mathrm{H}), 0.24-0.07(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 211.3,141.9$, $110.0,50.5,49.8,40.9,39.2,38.4,33.5,29.4,26.0,25.8,22.4,16.0,-3.7,-3.9$; IR (thin film) 2927, 2853, 1712, 1686, $1176 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 331.2069$ found 331.2060. 2.54: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 2.86(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.51-2.47(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~s}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.15(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 198.6,153.0,141.5,129.3,106.3,45.7,39.5,38.4,29.7$, 28.6, 25.8, 21.3, 15.1, -3.7 ; IR (thin film) 2954, $1670 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 329.1913$ found 329.1912 .

## Cyclohexadiene 2.54



To a solution of $53 \mathrm{mg}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.43 \mathrm{in} 0.4 \mathrm{~mL}$ toluene was added $27 \mathrm{mg}(0.18 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DBU}$ in 0.3 mL toluene at room temperature. After 30 minutes the solution was loaded onto a column and eluted (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $42 \mathrm{mg}(93 \%) 2.54$ as a white solid.

Enone 2.57


To 100 mL ice cold $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, under a purging argon atmosphere was added $1.2 \mathrm{~g}(52.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Na}$ metal cut and flattened then concomitantly $5.00 \mathrm{~g}(44.6 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 8}$ and $5.3 \mathrm{~mL}(66.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate via syringe. The reaction was initiated with 0.3 mL EtOH and stirred for 1 hour at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during which the reaction precipitated a thick orange solid. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 9 hours. A single portion of 50 mL water was added slowly, the layers separated and the aqueous phase washed twice with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The aqueous layer was acidified with 20 mL 6 M HCl and extracted twice with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To crude $\beta$-ketoaldehyde and $8.5 \mathrm{~mL}(102 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl vinyl ketone was added 200 mg ( 3.56 mmol ) powdered KOH in 50 mg portion at room temperature until the reaction produced an exotherm. After 45 min , the contents were diluted with 50 mL EtOAc and 50 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, the contents transferred to a seperatory funnel and the flask rinsed twice with 25 mL EtOAc and

10 mL water. The layers were separated, then the organic layer washed with 20 mL water, 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To crude tricarbonyl dissolved in 150 mL THF and cooled in an ice bath was added dropwise an ice cold solution of $11.2 \mathrm{~g}(200 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{KOH}$ in 150 mL water. After the addition over 0.5 hour, the ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred for an additional 16.5 hours before 120 mL volatiles were removed in vacuo. The remaining solution was extracted with 100 mL and two times 50 mL EtOAc, then the organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL water, 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography ( $8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $4.72 \mathrm{~g}(67 \%$ over 3 steps, $8: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 2.57$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 5.82(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-2.23(\mathrm{~m}$, $5 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=13.7,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $0.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 200.1,166.9,124.3,42.9$, 37.5, 36.6, 35.3, 35.0, 31.9, 29.2, 21.9; IR (thin film) 2923, 2865, 1668, 1620, $1455 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 182.1545$ found 182.1552 .

## Enone 2.59



To a solution of LDA, prepared from $12.7 \mathrm{~mL}(35.8 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.61 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi} /$ hexanes and 5.5 mL (39.2 mmol) diisopropylamine in 30 mL THF at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, was added at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 4.90 \mathrm{~g}(29.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ 2.57 with 30 mL THF. After 30 minutes, 6.3 mL ( 36.2 mmol ) HMPA was added neat. The reaction was kept at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes, then treated with $5.6 \mathrm{~mL}(90.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl iodide neat and stirred for 10 minutes before the cold bath was removed. After 50 minutes the reaction
was quenched with the addition of 150 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and 40 mL of volatiles were removed in vacuo. The mixture was poured into a seperatory funnel and the flask rinsed with 150 mL EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic phase washed with 50 mL water and 30 mL brine. All aqueous layers were collected and extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. This organic layer was washed with 10 mL brine, combined with the previous organic phase, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography ( $12: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $4.71 \mathrm{~g}(88 \%) \mathbf{2 . 5 9}$ as a light yellow liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.74(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.23(\mathrm{td}, J=13.6,4.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-185(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{t}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.94$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ 203.1, 166.2, 122.4, 42.6, 38.6, $35.9,35.9,35.5,35.4,32.3,21.8,15.8$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 179.1442$ found 179.1436 .

## Dienol Acetate 2.61



A solution of $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.28 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 9} \mathrm{in} 3.7 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{AcCl}(2.6: 1)$ was heated at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour. The reaction was cooled and all volatiles removed in vacuo then taken up in 20 mL EtOAc and washed thrice with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine and dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered. All volatiles were removed and the crude material purified by column chromatography ( $20: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $49 \mathrm{mg}(80 \%, 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ acetate as a colorless oil.

## Dienol acetate 2.61



To a solution of $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.28 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 9} \mathrm{in} 1.4 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added sequentially $128 \mathrm{mg}(0.86$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaI}$ then $0.11 \mathrm{~mL}(0.86 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TMSCl}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 2 hours in the ice bath, $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ were added. The reaction was further diluted with 20 mL EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with $10 \mathrm{~mL} 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Purification of the crude material by column chromatography ( $30: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) provided $41 \mathrm{mg}(66 \%, 1.2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ as a colorless oil.

## Dienol Acetate 2.61



A solution of $14.5 \mathrm{~mL}(7.25 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KHMDS} /$ toluene in 10 mL THF was treated with 1.00 $\mathrm{g}(5.60 \mathrm{mmol})$ enone dissolved in 20 mL THF at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 minutes the solution was canula transferred to a stirring mixture of $1.6 \mathrm{~mL}(7.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in 20 mL THF cooled to -78 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The cold bath was removed and stirring continued for 1 h as the reaction warmed to room temperature. The reaction was quenched with 100 mL water, volatiles removed in vacuo and the remaining liquid extracted with 60 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 50 mL water, 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Purification of the
residue by column chromatrography ( $100: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) provided $298 \mathrm{mg}(24 \%)$ dienol acetate as a colorless oil.

## Dienol acetate 2.61



LDA was prepared from $4.8 \mathrm{~mL}(34.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NH}, 12.0 \mathrm{~mL}(31.3 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.61 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{n}-$ $\mathrm{BuLi} /$ hexanes in 40 mL THF at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $12.0 \mathrm{~mL}(69.0$ mmol) HMPA. After 20 minutes, $4.65 \mathrm{~g}(26.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 5 9}$ was added with 30 mL THF. After 20 minutes the solution was canula transferred into a solution of $7.4 \mathrm{~mL}(78.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in 50 mL THF stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Cooling was continued for 10 minutes before the bath was removed. After an additional 50 minutes, 100 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added, approximatly 80 mL volatiles removed in vacuo and the remaining liquid partioned between an additional 100 mL water and 150 mL EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed with 100 mL water, 50 mL water and 30 mL brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatrography ( $30: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $4.92 \mathrm{~g}(85 \%) 2.61$ as a light yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.47(\mathrm{t}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.45(\mathrm{t}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.37-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20-2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-$ $1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02-0.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 169.4,152.3,134.8,124.4,117.1,38.7,36.7,34.7,31.8,30.1$, 29.2, 22.4, 21.2, 18.4; IR (thin film) 2926, 2871, $1742 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 221.1542$ found 221.1534.

## Alcohols 2.62 and 2.63



To 8.55 g ( $38.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \%$ purity) mCPBA in 80 mL EtOH cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added 4.92 g ( 22.3 mmol ) 2.61 in 40 mL EtOH . The ice bath was removed and stirred for 1 hour before slowly quenching with 150 mL equal parts sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} /$ sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3} /$ water at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Approximately 100 mL volatiles were removed in vacuo and the mixture extracted with 150 mL EtOAc. The organic phase was washed with 60 mL equal parts sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{sat}$. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3} /$ water, 60 mL water and 30 mL brine. All aqueous washings were combined and extracted thrice with 50 mL EtOAc. These organic layers were combined, washed with 30 mL brine and combined with the previous organic solution. After drying over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, the solution was filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatograph ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide 2.25 $\mathrm{g}(51 \%,>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 6 3}$ as a white solid, recyrstallization from EtOAc/hexanes afforded colorless prisms ( $\mathrm{mp}=51-53{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The column was flushed with EtOAc and the remainder purified by column chromatrography ( $2: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.04 \mathrm{~g}(23 \%, 5: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ as a light yellow oil. 2.62: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 6.10(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.24(\mathrm{dd}, J=5.9,5.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.44(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{dq}, J=12.6,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.98-1.77(\mathrm{~m}$, $5 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 202.7,167.1,118.5,71.3,45.4,41.8,38.1,35.6,30.9,30.3,21.3,15.4$; IR (thin film) $3412,2953,2925,2869,1664,1457,1065 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 212.1651$ found $212.1650 .2 .63:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.82(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.5,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.49-2.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21-2.16(\mathrm{~m}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{dq}, J=14.4,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.8,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{td}$, $J=13.2,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 203.5,165.1,122.7,72.2,42.6,42.1,38.3,35.5,30.9$, 26.0, 21.5, 25.4; IR (thin film) $3412,2951,2923,2870,1667 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 217.1205$ found 217.1204.

## Silyl Ether 2.65



A solution of $37 \mathrm{mg}(0.19 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 6 3}$ and $45 \mathrm{mg}(0.66 \mathrm{mmol})$ imidazole in $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.040 \mathrm{~mL}(0.32 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TMSCl}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred for 7 hours. After being recooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was quenched with 10 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and partioned with 10 mL EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed with 3 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatrography ( $40: 2: 1$ hexanes $/ E t O A c / \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ) to afford 45 mg $(89 \%) 2.65$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.5,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{td}, J=6.4,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.09(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 203.2,166.4,121.6,72.7,44.3,42.0$, 37.8, 35.9, 31.4, 26.0, 21.5, 15.2, 0.1; IR (thin film) 2954, 2924, 2872, $1680 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 289.1600$ found 289.1597.

## Benzoate 2.C



A vial containing $20 \mathrm{mg}(0.104 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 6 3}, 1.2 \mathrm{mg}(0.010 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP, $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.36 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{NEt} 3,0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(2.48 \mathrm{mmol})$ pyridine and $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}(0.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ benzoyl chloride in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was stirred at room temperature for 16 hours. The reaction was partitioned between sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic phase washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (8:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $27 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%) \mathbf{2 . 6 8 B z}$ as a white solid ( $\mathrm{mp}=93-$ $\left.95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 8.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.59(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.46(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.04(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.65(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=12.0,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51-$ $2.44(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=13.8,10.2,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=13.9,4.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 202.5,165.3,159.7,133.2,130.2,129.6,128.5$, $124.9,74.6,41.7,40.6,38.1,35.4,32.3,27.2,21.5,15.2$; IR (thin film) 2954, 2924, 1719, 1679, $1268 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 321.1467$ found 321.1462.

## Pivalate 2.75



A flask was charged with $2.10 \mathrm{~g}(10.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 6 3}, 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ pyridine, $3.0 \mathrm{~mL}\left(21.5 \mathrm{mmol}^{2}\right) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$, $130 \mathrm{mg}(1.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP and $5.3 \mathrm{~mL}(43.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ trimethylacetyl chloride then stirred at 70
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 18 hours the reaction was cooled, volatiles removed in vacuo and the contents partitioned between 150 mL EtOAc and 150 mL water. The layers were separated and the organic phase washed twice with 100 mL 3 M HCl and 50 mL water. The aqueous phases were combined and extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. This organic layer was washed with 20 mL water and combined with the previous organic layer, then washed with 50 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography ( $8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $2.33 \mathrm{~g}(77 \%) \mathbf{2 . 7 5}$ as a light yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.7,5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.49-2.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.7,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.97-1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.8,5.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{t}, J=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 202.7,177.1,159.6,124.7,73.6,41.8$, $40.3,38.9,38.3,35.3,31.8,27.1,26.9,21.5,15.3$; IR (thin film) 2957, 2927,2871, 1730, 1681, $1150 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 301.1780$ found 301.1783.

## Enoxysilane 2.76



A flask was charged with $206 \mathrm{mg}(0.74 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 7 5}, 36 \mathrm{mg}(\sim 2 \% \mathrm{Pt}$ in xylenes, 0.0037 mmol$)$ Karstedt's Complex and $1.0 \mathrm{~mL}(6.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{SiH}$, then heated at $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 hours. The reaction was cooled, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the remaining crude material purified by column chromatography ( $50: 1: 1$ hexanes $/ E t O A c / \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ) to afford $251 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%, 1.2: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) enoxysilane as a colorless oil. Mixture of diastereomers: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27
ppm) mixture of diastereomers $\delta 5.04(\mathrm{~s}), 4.83(\mathrm{~s}), 4.48$ (s), $4.40(\mathrm{~s}), 2.49(\mathrm{~s}), 2.21-2.18$ (m), 2.13 $(\mathrm{t}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.01-1.98(\mathrm{~m}), 1.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.86-1.73(\mathrm{~m}), 1.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.53$ $(\mathrm{td}, J=12.7,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.39-1.32(\mathrm{~m}), 1.21(\mathrm{~s}), 1.19(\mathrm{~s}), 1.12-1.03(\mathrm{~m}), 1.02-$ $0.92(\mathrm{~m}), 0.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=19.6,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.74-0.60(\mathrm{~m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ $178.1,177.8,155.7,154.5,103.0,102.1,74.2,71.9,44.8,41.3,39.0,38.9,38.8,37.8,37.3,34.2$, $34.0,33.8,30.5,30.1,28.6,27.7,27.3,27.2,26.1,22.5,22.3,19.7,18.6,6.8,6.7,5.1,4.9$; IR (thin film) 2955, 2912, 2876, 1727, 1656, $1164 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 395.2982$ found 395.2984 .

## Trans-Decalin 2.77 and Cis-Decalin 2.78



To a slurry of $49 \mathrm{mg}(1.29 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in $3.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added $123 \mathrm{mg}(0.312 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 7 6}$ in $1.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred for 30 minutes. Quenching was performed at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by sequential addition of 0.1 mL EtOAc, 0.05 mL water, 0.05 mL 5 M NaOH and 0.15 mL water, then stirring rapidly for 30 minutes at room temperature. After the addition of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, the mixture was filtered over Celite, washed through with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (50:5:1 hexanes/EtOAc/ $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ) to afford $41 \mathrm{mg}(42 \%) 2.77$ as a colorless oil and 35 mg (36\%) $\mathbf{2 . 7 8}$ as a white solid, recrystallization from EtOAc afford a white solid ( $\mathrm{mp}=68-70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). 2.77: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 4.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.89(\mathrm{dt}, J=23.4,9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.8$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.13-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.03(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.68$ $(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ 158.2, 103.7, 70.1, 46.3, 41.3, 40.6, 37.1, $34.0,27.6,27.0,22.3,19.6,6.7,5.1$; IR (thin film) $3449,2953,2911,2875,1656$, 1200, $1172 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 333.2226$ found 333.2224 . 2.78: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 4.38(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21-$ $2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{td}, J=8.1,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.4,6.0,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.17-1.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{t}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.68(\mathrm{q}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 154.1,103.3,72.3,42.0,37.9,37.0,34.4,30.7,29.4,25.2,22.5,18.6$, 6.8, 5.1; IR (thin film) $3344,2952,2912,2875,1655,1196 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 311.2406$ found 311.2403 .

## Ketone 2.79



To a solution of $39 \mathrm{mg}(0.126 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.77 \mathrm{in} 0.6 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $32 \mathrm{mg}(0.381 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 75 mg (0.177) Dess-Martin Periodinane at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was immediately removed and the contents stirred for 30 minute2s. The reaction was poured into 3 mL stirring hexanes, filtered through a cotton filter with hexanes, then washed with $10 \mathrm{~mL} 1: 1$ sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3} /$ sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford $\mathbf{2 . 7 9}$ as a colorless oil that decomposed upon purification by chromatography. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19(\mathrm{t}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.64-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-$ $0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.70(\mathrm{q}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 209.8,155.4$, 98.6, 52.9, 49.2, 40.7, 37.8, 35.7, 34.3, 34.0, 22.4, 19.5, 6.8, 5.0; IR (thin film) 2954, 2913, 2874, 1714, 1657, $1195 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 331.2069$ found 331.2064.

## Enedione 2.89



A 50 mL round bottom flask was charged with $840 \mathrm{mg}(4.32 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 6 2}, 20 \mathrm{mLCH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 4 g Celite. To the reaction was added $1.55 \mathrm{~g}(7.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ and the contents stirred for 2 hours. After the addition of another $0.50 \mathrm{~g}(2.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ and 3 hours of stirring, the reaction was diluted with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, filtered through silica gel with $350 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $740 \mathrm{mg}(89 \%) \mathbf{2 . 8 9}$ as a yellow wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.40(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.86-2.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.8,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.24(\mathrm{t}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 203.3,200.7,153.4,126.6,49.1$, 40.3, 39.5, 36.7, 33.1, 30.0, 22.0, 15.7.

## Allyl Diketone 2.90 and 2.93



A 25 mL round bottom flask was charged with $9 \mathrm{mg}(1.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal and ammonia at $78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the stirring blue solution was slowly added $60 \mathrm{mg}(0.31 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{2 . 8 9}$. After complete addition isoprene and $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.58 \mathrm{mmol})$ allyl bromide were added. The reaction was stirred 10 minutes before solid NH 4 Cl was added and the mixture warmed to room temperature. The mixture was partitioned between water and EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was dissolved in 3 mL methanol and $0.3 \mathrm{~mL} 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH} / \mathrm{methanol}$. The reaction was heated to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 hours then cooled, partitioned between aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $18 \mathrm{mg}(25 \%) 2.90$ and $14 \mathrm{mg}(19 \%)$ 2.93. 2.90: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.81-$ $5.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=21.5,12.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.74(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.44-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-$ $1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 212.4,209.5,136.9,116.4,58.4,49.9,47.6,44.1,43.1,42.5$, 41.1, 35.3, 30.9, 22.3, 14.4; 2.93: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.59(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=15.9$, $10.5,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=16.5,8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.9,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.64(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38-2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.29-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, 1.10-1.01 (m, 7H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 210.0,209.8,133.6,117.9,55.4$, 46.1, 45.7, 40.4, 37.2, 37.0, 36.5, 36.1, 32.0, 22.3, 14.3.
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## CHAPTER 3:

# AN OXY-COPE/TRANSANNULAR MICHAEL APPROACH TOWARDS 7,20-DIISOCYANOADOCIANE 

### 3.1 Background on the Electronic Reorganization of 3-Oxy-1,5-Hexadiene Systems (the oxy-Cope Rearrangement)

Pericyclic reactions have enabled the construction of a myriad of complex structures because of their ability to perform difficult $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming transformations and the facility of their coupling in tandem with a host of other reactions. ${ }^{1}$ Among these, the oxy-Cope rearrangement (Scheme 3.1A) has been widely adopted for its mild conditions, predictable outcome and ease of starting material synthesis. ${ }^{2-4}$

One of the earliest investigators of oxy-Cope systems was Swaminathan with the groundwork laid by rearrangement of 1,5-hexadiene $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ in the presence of catalytic amounts of KOH (Scheme 3.1B). ${ }^{5}$ This first report of a base-catalyzed reorganization of an oxyCope system was reported ${ }^{6}$ before the term "oxy-Cope" was coined ${ }^{7}$ and over a decade prior to the classic disclosure of significant rate increase using potassium alkoxide by Evans and Golob. ${ }^{8}$ Several mechanistic pathways have been proposed for the transformation (Scheme 3.2). The original report suggests the product arises via a vinylogous retro-aldol/conjugate addition/isomerization cascade (Scheme 3.2A); however, after description of the oxy-Cope reaction, ${ }^{7}$ an alternative oxy-Cope reaction/isomerization was also suggested (Scheme 3.2B). ${ }^{9}$

Scheme 3.1 Rearrangement of the 3-oxy-1,5-hexadiene system.


Scheme 3.2 The two proposed mechanisms to explain the conversion of $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 5}$.
A. The vinylogous retro-aldol /conjugate addition /isomerization pathway

B. The anonic oxy-Cope /isomerization pathway


Significant effort was put into probing whether the mechanism of this transformation proceeded via Scheme 3.2A or 3.2B. ${ }^{5}$ Three initial results attest to favoring the retro-aldol mechanism (Scheme 3.3). First, the alcohol epimer of 3.4 in basic methanol still affords 3.5. Second, running the reaction more dilute at a lower temperature with less base enabled the isolation of 3.9, which arises from the vinylogous retro-aldol/aldol addition/isomerization reaction of 3.4. Upon heating to $>60^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 3.9$ cleanly converted to 3.5. Finally, 3.10, which has the
enone replaced with an electron neutral alkene is thermally stable up to $240^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the absence of base. Contrarily, enone $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ provides $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ when refluxed in ethylene glycol., ${ }^{9,10}$

Although these experiments may imply the relevance of the vinylogous retro-aldol mechanism, they are not completely conclusive. First, the equatorial vinyl-subsituted $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ may operate under a different mechanism than the axial vinyl-substituted 3.4. Second, under the more mild reaction conditions in which 3.9 was isolated, there is no mention of the quantities of $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ obtained. This lack of information severely undermines the formation of $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ as mechanistic evidence since intermediate $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ does not afford $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ until heated to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Thus, it is not clear how $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ is originally formed. Third, no experiments on exposing $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ to the standard conditions of base at elevated temperatures were reported. The absence of this experiment makes it difficult to gauge the influence of anionic rate acceleration.

Scheme 3.3 Initial mechanistic implications for a vinylogous retro-aldol mechanism.

## A. Isolation and reactivity of an aldol intermediate


B. Attempted oxy-Cope of a desoxygenated analog


Not until 22 years after the initial disclosure was more light shed on the mechanism in an elegantly designed set of experiments. ${ }^{11}$ To distinguish between the two mechanisms, the retention (or erosion) of enantioenrichment in $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ was evaluated (Scheme 3.4). If the retro-aldol
mechanism were operable, any enantioenrichment of $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ would be erased as the intermediate dienolate $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ is achiral. If, however, the oxy-Cope mechanism were operable, then the enantiopurity of the starting material would be transferred to the ring-expanded product. The last enone isomerization step needs to be eliminated to unequivocally use optical purity as a mechanistic probe. This was accomplished by using the tetra-substituted enone 3.12.

When (+)-3.12 was exposed to basic methanol, the isolated product $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ had no optical rotation. This result implies the reaction operates via a vinylogous retro-aldol fragmentation. Interestingly, when $(+)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ was reacted with KH in THF at room temperature, product $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ did have significant optical rotation, implying a concerted oxy-Cope mechanism! ${ }^{12}$ These results suggest that the mechanism is dependent upon the reaction conditions. Disappointingly, a control experiment ensuring that $(+) \mathbf{- 3 . 1 5}$ does not racemize under standard methoxide conditions was not mentioned. To the best of the presented evidence the rearrangement of $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ with basic methanol follows a fragmentation/recombination pathway.

Swaminathan and coworkers are not the only group to have observed a difference in reaction progression between aprotic and protic rearrangement conditions of oxy-Cope systems. Heathcock ${ }^{13}$ observed an interesting divergence of reactivity when bicycle $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ was treated with either KH or KOH in methanol (Scheme 3.5).

Scheme 3.4 Determining the mechanism for the rearrangement of $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ with the optically active tetrasubstituted alkene surrogate (+)-3.12.

B. The anonic oxy-Cope /isomerization pathway

prepared stereochemical information

Scheme 3.5 Heathcock's alternative reaction mechanisms depending on reaction conditions.

3.2 Literature Precedent of an oxy-Cope Rearrangement with Relevance To 7,20Diisocyanoadociane

Among the explored base-induced rearrangements related to $\mathbf{3 . 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 5}$, one directly addresses our interest in synthetic work towards the marine isocyanoterpene 7,20diisocyanoadociane (DICA, 3.21). In the presence of base, spirocycle 3.19 was reported to yield the perhydropyrene scaffold $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ (Equation 3.1). ${ }^{14}$ The proposed all-trans stereochemistry and location of functional groups map directly onto the core structure of DICA.

This transformation was proposed to operate by a retro-vinylogous aldol/double Michael addition, as this fragmentation pathway appears to be related to mechanistic study on the system 3.4. No experimental evidence for either mechanism was reported. The rearrangement of several other similar spirocyclic structures have also been disclosed (Equations 3.2-3.4). ${ }^{14-16}$ The reaction of acetate $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ with base most reasonably caused deprotection followed by a retrovinylogous aldol and recombination to $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}$. Consistent with the conversion of $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$, alkyne $\mathbf{3 . 2 4}$ rearranges to enone $\mathbf{3 . 2 5}$. Bromoalkyne $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ also proceeds similarily to $\mathbf{3 . 2 4}$, but undergoes halogen displacement with methoxide to provide vinylogous ester 3.27.





With this inspiration, a synthetic approach to DICA was devised (Scheme 3.6); a summary of the work presented in this chapter was published. ${ }^{17}$ Corey's intermediate dione $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$ was initially targeted. ${ }^{18}$ The last ring would be annulated via a McMurry coupling and a hydroboration/oxidation sequence, leading back to the oxy-Cope rearrangement product, perhydrophenalene 3.29. The spirocyclic substrate $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ bears an additional methyl and butenyl
chain required for further elaboration. Spirocycle $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ could be constructed in a similar fashion to the literature precedent from Swaminathan. ${ }^{14,19,20}$

Scheme 3.6 Retrosynthetic analysis of DICA back to a spiro-fused oxy-Cope system.


### 3.3 Synthetic Efforts to Realize the oxy-Cope/Michael Cascade Towards 7,20-

## Diisocyanoadociane

Application of the oxy-Cope/Michael reaction towards DICA was initiated because its application would contribute a vastly lower step count than previous syntheses and would provide an interesting and strategically different disconnection. Syntheses of polycyclic molecules, and the previous approaches to DICA specifically, ${ }^{18,21,22}$ typically progress via the sequential annulation of rings. The oxy-Cope/Michael cascade generates three rings in a single reaction from a spirocycle without conservation of any original rings: a unique and unusual feature in synthetic planning.

Table 3.1 Evaluation of copper mediated conjugate additions into 3.31.

${ }^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{dr}$ was determined by NMR or GC-FID ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}{ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
The synthesis of spirocycle $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ commenced with a conjugate addition to enone $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$. Although the reaction should have been a straightforward transformation to 3.32, optimization to avoid 1,2-addition and to improve trans diastereoselectivity was required (Table 3.1). Of the copper salts screened, $\mathrm{CuBr} \bullet \mathrm{DMS}$ enabled the cleanest formation of alkylcopper reagents, as determined by homogeneity of the reaction mixture. Lewis acids, such as TMSCl and $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}$ did not have a beneficial effect and led to relatively low diastereoselectivity (entries 1-4). The copper source (COD) $\mathrm{CuBr}^{23,24}$ was evaluated for being a stable copper source that requires only one equivalent of nucleophile. While it afforded an improved 12:1 dr, the stoichiometric COD made this copper source unappealing. Mixed cuprates, ${ }^{25}$ such as Posner's heteroatom cuprates, ${ }^{26,27}$ Bertz's TMSM-cuprate ${ }^{28}$ and Saegusa's Mes-cuprate ${ }^{29}$ afforded excellent trans diastereoselectivity. In situ-generated copper phenoxide afforded $>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}$; however, isolation
was complicated by the difficult separation of stoichiometric phenol (entry 6). All mixed cuprates required the pregeneration of an active copper species, an inconvenience in reaction setup. Additionally, t - Bu and Mes transferred competitively with the desired butenyl group (entries 8, 10). Although the TMSM-cuprate was found to provide superior diastereoselectivity and reactivity, its expense mitigated further implementation (entry 9). Ultimately the most userfriendly and reliable conditions were using the basic Gilman cuprate, generated from two equivalents of butenylmagnesium bromide, one equivalent $\mathrm{CuBr} \bullet \mathrm{DMS}$ and without Lewis acid. These simple conditions afforded excellent diastereoselectivity, as well as selectivity for conjugate addition over 1,2-carbonyl addition, and provided material of sufficient quality to continue without purification.

With practical conjugate addition conditions available, the spirocyclic Robinson annulation was performed to afford $\mathbf{3 . 3 5}$ as a single diastereomer (Scheme 3.7). Silylation of enone $\mathbf{3 . 3 5}$ ensured vinylmagnesium bromide addition occurred solely into the ketone, affording 3.36 as a $1.6: 1$ mixture of equatorial and axial alcohols. Desilylation of $\mathbf{3 . 3 6}$ with TBAF generated the separable enones $\mathbf{3 . 3 7}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$. Structure determination was accomplished by Xray analysis of $\mathbf{3 . 3 7}$.

Scheme 3.7 Generation of spirocyclic hydroxyenones $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ and 3.37.


The desired anionic oxy-Cope/Michael reactivity was explored using both diastereomeric enones $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 3 7}$ (Scheme 3.8). To our surprise and disappointment, exposing either alcohol diastereomer to the standard conditions of KOH in methanol afforded an intractable mixture of compounds. Further evaluation via kaliation did not lead to any success (Scheme 3.8A). Metalmediated reactions using $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})^{30}$ or $\mathrm{Hg}(\mathrm{II})$ also proved unsuccessful (Scheme 3.8B)..$^{31,32}$

Although the anionic version of the oxy-Cope is the standard rearrangement of 3-oxy-1,5-hexadiene systems, a neutral variant is also available. In contrast to the experiments under basic conditions, simply heating diene $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ in an inert solvent led to a clean reaction; however, instead of isolating the expected oxy-Cope product [7.3.1]-bicycle $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$, tricycle $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ was the only observed product (Scheme 3.8 C ). Although 3.41 is not the desired compound, this experiment validated that the oxy-Cope rearrangement of $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ can occur! Not unsurprisingly, upon oxy-Cope and enol tautomerization, the cyclodecenone $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ is well positioned to undergo a transannular carbonyl-ene reaction to afford $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ as a single diastereomer.

Scheme 3.8 Attempting an oxy-Cope/Michael cascade.

## A. Desired oxy-Cope / Michael cascade



## B. Metal-catalyzed attempts at a rearrangement


C. Thermal rearrangement of oxy-Cope system 3.30


Figure 3.1 Kempane and rippertane structures.

3.42: (+)-kempene 1

3.43: (+)-3-epi-kempene 1

3.44: (+)-kempene 2


45: (?)-3 $\beta$-hydroxy- $7 \beta$ -kemp-8(9)-en-6-one

3.46: (?)-rippertol

The tricyclic ring system of $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ is reminiscent of the kempane and rippertane core
(Figure 3.1) and an approach using this tandem thermal reaction could be imagined. ${ }^{33,34}$

Currently no efforts using an oxy-Cope/carbonyl-ene reaction towards these molecules have been reported, though other natural products have been prepared using this tandem methodology. ${ }^{35,36}$ The synthesis of these natural products still holds exciting challenges.

Starting from (S)-(-)-carvone, $3.47, \mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ reduction of the enone and capture of the resultant enolate with a group capable of reforming the alkene ( $\mathrm{SPh}, \mathrm{SePh}$, etc.) followed by spirocyclic Robinson annulation-MVK would arrive trans to the isopropenyl-could generate the ketone precursor to $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$. The sequence of enone silylation, Grignard reagent addition and deprotection would generate decorated spirocyclic enone 3.48. Exposing this substrate to thermal conditions could trigger the desired oxy-Cope/carbonyl-ene rearrangement to the core kempane structure (Scheme 3.9). The 1,5-diene of $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ highlighted in red would selectively undergo oxyCope rearrangement and upon carbonyl-ene, generate a tertiary alcohol for elimination. The isopropenyl substituent could be elaborated via hydroformylation to address annulation of the southern ring and a cyclopropanation/fragmentation to introduce the remaining methyl group.

Scheme 3.9 An envisioned oxy-Cope/carbonyl-ene approach to kempane natural products.


Although the anionic oxy-Cope transformation of enones $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 3 7}$ had failed, the success of a thermal oxy-Cope encouraged a sustained effort. In this vein, masking the enone functionality was evaluated next (Scheme 3.10). Attempted enoxysilane formation of $\mathbf{3 . 3 7}$ with TBSOTf led to [2.2.2]-oxabicycle 3.49. Oxy-Cope rearrangement of this molecule was
unsuccessful, most likely because of the strain and frailty of $\mathbf{3 . 5 0}$ generated upon [3,3]rearrangement, so silylation of the other allylic acohol diastereomer was pursued.

Treating enone $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ with TBSOTf smoothly afforded siloxydiene 3.36. Deprotonating the alcohol with KH and DMSO at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and warming the reaction to room temperature led to formation of a single product by TLC analysis. Upon quenching with ethanol the two products 3.53 and 3.54 were isolated. Both compounds were generated via [3,3]-rearrangement, and could be funneled to the skipped enone $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ upon deprotecting enoxysilane $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ with acid.

Scheme 3.10 Silylation of spirocyclic enones in efforts towards an oxy-Cope rearrangement.



With a basic synthetic outline to obtain oxy-Cope product 3.54 established, a more streamlined preparation was sought. As the synthesis outlined in Scheme 3.7 and 3.10 proceeds through enoxysilane $\mathbf{3 . 3 6}$ as a mixture of alcohol diastereomers, the anionic oxy-Cope could be attempted at this stage. Two outcomes were envisioned: 1. only the axial-alcohol diastereomer undergoes rearrangement or 2 . both diastereomers could rearrange leading to better material throughput. Gratifyingly, when 3.36 was deprotonated with KH and warmed to room temperature, a single compound was obtained; both diastereomers of $\mathbf{3 . 3 6}$ cleanly underwent ring
expansion (Scheme 3.11). Treating the crude cyclohexadiene with cold TBAF afforded 3.54. Although the sigmatropic rearrangement is high yielding, the relatively low isolated yield of $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ is due to decomposition during desilylation. Still, this consolidated approach allows for a rapid build up of material when compared to the previous sequence.

Scheme 3.11 Improved synthesis of [7.3.1]-bicycle 3.54 via an anionic oxy-Cope rearrangement and subsequent transannular Michael reaction.


With the oxy-Cope ring expansion reaction completed, transannular cyclization of bicycle 3.54 was examined. Treating 3.54 with hot, basic methanol afforded two products. The desired pathway would isomerize the skipped enone into conjugation to 3.55, and be followed by trans-selective cyclization to $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ as precedented by Swaminathan (Equation 3.1). ${ }^{14}$ Instead, the two products formed arose from indiscriminant protonation of the extended enolate $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ at the
gamma position, followed by a cis-selective cyclization to generate $\mathbf{3 . 5 7}$ and 3.58. No desired trans ring-closure was observed. This disappointing result brought into question the original literature report.

### 3.4 A Literature Reevaluation of the Transannular Michael Stereochemistry

The original Swaminathan report of the oxy-Cope/Michael cascade of $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ reported the product perhydrophenalene to be in the all-trans configuration (Equation 3.1, Figure 3.2). ${ }^{14}$ When this reaction sequence was adapted towards DICA, the transannular Michael reaction provided two products via a cis-selective ring closure (Scheme 3.11). These two contradicting results and the lack of rigorous stereochemical determination originally performed by Swaminathan (Figure 3.2), made a reinvestigation prudent.

Figure 3.2 Stereochemical determination of oxy-Cope/Michael reaction product by Swaminathan. "Dione 6" refers to structure 3.20. ${ }^{14}$

> Since the rearrangement is being carried out under equilibrating conditions, the dione 6 may be expected to take up the most stable conformation viz. the all trans conformation 6a.

A synthetic sequence similar to the approach for DICA was initiated for the simple unsubstituted literature system (Scheme 3.12). Spirocyclic Robinson annulation on cyclohexanone $\mathbf{3 . 5 9}$ and silylation afforded silyloxydiene 3.61. Vinylmagnesium bromide addition followed by deprotonation with KH and deprotection with TBAF generated the ring expanded 3.63. Treatment of $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ with potassium hydroxide in methanol triggered the transannular Michael addition and afforded a major compound with identical ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR
data as reported by Swaminathan ${ }^{14}$ who assigned structure 3.20. X-Ray crystallography was chosen as the most rigorous means of structural determination. Instead of the expected all-trans 3.20, analysis revealed the stereochemistry was 3.64. The structure reported by Swaminathan was thus misassigned and was thereby corrected to $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$, a compound obtained from a cisselective Michael addition (the bond highlight in red). A second compound (3.65) was isolated as a minor component and clearly arises via epimerization of the $\alpha$-carbons. The structural reassignment of $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ requires that caution be exercised with the other reported structures obtained via such cascades (Equations 3.2-3.4). ${ }^{14-16}$

Scheme 3.12 Reevaluation of the original oxy-Cope/Michael cascade.


### 3.5 Evaluating the Reversibility of the Transannular Michael Reaction

Swaminathan's assertion that the oxy-Cope/Michael reaction of $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ should provide a perhydrophenalendione in an all-trans relationship because of the equilibrating conditions, even though incorrect, is still interesting (Figure 3.2). The reaction of $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ with basic methanol to afford $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ could simply be the outcome of a kinetic conjugate addition. Under thermodynamic control, the ring closure would be reversible and therefore could still equilibrate to the more stable all-trans $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ (Scheme 3.13). Computations have already established the alltrans, all-chair conformation of unsubstituted perhydrophenalene $\mathbf{3 . 6 9}$ to be most thermodynamically stable (Scheme 3.13). ${ }^{37}$ The known reversibility of Michael reactions lends credence to the possible equilibration of $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$. ${ }^{38,39}$ Disappointingly, exposing $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ to higher temperatures in methanol or basic ethylene glycol did not lead to any change in product distributions. Also, if the retro-Michael were to have occured, at elevated temperatures, a carbonyl-ene product similar to 3.41 could also be imagined; however, such a product was never observed.

Scheme 3.13 Proposed pathway for the equilibration of a perhydrophenalenedione system via a retro-Michael/transannular Michael sequence and calculations of perhydrophenalene stability. ${ }^{37}$


Figure 3.3 NMR study in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ to determine the reversibility of the Michael reaction.
A. Tricycle 3.64; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta 49.15$

B. Standard reaction conditions; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta 49.15$

C. Extended reaction conditions; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta 49.15$

D. [7.3.1] Bicycle 3.63; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta 49.15$

E. Assignment of the C 1 resonance; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta 49.15$


Because the equilibration of $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ relies on a retro-Michael reaction, a detailed investigation into the feasibility of the retro-transannular Michael reaction was initiated to better understand the failed equilibration. Two possibilities exist for the observed lack of equilibration: 1. the retro-Michael reaction may not be occurring under the experimental conditions or 2 . the retro-Michael may be facile, but the transannular ring closure is only cis-selective. Deuterium labeling studies were devised to distinguish between the two possibilities.

Tracking the incorporation of deuterium provided insight into the reversibility of the transannular Michael reaction (Figure 3.3). Treating $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ with $\mathrm{KOCD}_{3} / \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ under typical cyclization conditions incorporated deuterium at all enolizable positions to afford 3.64- $d_{6}$ (Figure 3.3A-B). No deuterium incorporation was observed at the gamma-position, C1. ${ }^{40}$ Extended heating of 3.64- $d_{6}$ afforded only a mixture of $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}-d_{6}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}-d_{6}$; still, no incorporation of deuterium at C 1 was observed (Figure 3.3B-C). To assign the residual methine carbons $\delta 51.4$ and 37.1, the cyclodecenone 3.63 was closed in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ (Figure 3.3D-E). The C 1 position was deuterated upon enone isomerization to enable the cyclization to $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}-d_{7}$. The peak at $\delta 37.1$ was assigned to C 1 as $\delta 51.4$ remained protiated. Based on these reactivity studies, the transannular Michael reaction, which is necessary for conversion of $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ is irreversible in basic methanol (Scheme 3.13).

### 3.6 Outlook for the oxy-Cope/Michael Reaction in Natural Product Synthesis

Swaminathan's oxy-Cope/Michael cascade proceeded smoothly to construct the perhydrophenalene $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds; however, in the context of DICA, not with the desired stereochemical outcome. The ease of starting material synthesis and rapid construction of molecular complexity makes the oxy-Cope/Michael reaction a powerful method of polycyclic
assembly. The attempted implementation of this strategy towards DICA supported this point, but because of a stereochemical misassignment, DICA ended up as the wrong target for this reaction.

Figure 3.4 Pseudopterosin aglycones.

(-)-3.70: pseudopterosin A-F, Z aglycone

(+)-3.71: pseudopterosin K-L aglycone

(+)-3.72: pseudopterosin
G-J, M-Y aglycone

Although disappointing that the designed strategy towards DICA did not bear fruit, Swaminathan's transformation to the perhydrophenalene scaffold could still be useful for natural product synthesis. Of the phenalene containing natural products, the pseudopterosins may be most readily accessed (Figure 3.4). ${ }^{41-43}$ This class of molecules consists of numerous members with variation in glycosylation pattern of a substituted phenalene core. The cores can be divided into one set of enantiomers, $(-)-\mathbf{3 . 7 0}$ and $(+)-\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$, and into the side chain epimer, $(+)-\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$. The pseudopterosin aglycones have been prepared synthetically on 15 occasions, with the latest by Sherburn in 2015. ${ }^{44,45}$

Scheme 3.14 Proposed approach to all pseudopterosine aglycones.


An approach using the oxy-Cope/Michael rearrangement could start from simple spirocycle $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ (Scheme 3.14). In an optimized sense, taking $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ to $\mathbf{3 . 8 0}$ could mirror Swaminathan's two-step alkyne addition and basic rearrangement; however, based on previous successes, a stepwise transformation through siloxydiene $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ may be initially more successful. Isomerizing the skipped enone $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$ into conjugation would set the single stereocenter of interest at C4. Although this isomerization may be unselective, molecular models indicate that the transannular Michael would arise only from the desired epimer 3.77 and not the undesired 3.78. The overlap between enolate and enone of $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ places the C 18 methyl inside the ten-membered
ring, directly into the seven-carbon tether. The stereocenters generated at C8, C12 and C13 ${ }^{46}$ are inconsequential, as the cyclohexenone ring would be immediately oxidized to phenol 3.79, an intermediate prepared previously. ${ }^{43,47-49}$ The remaining functionalizations include an aromatic hydroxylation, followed by the installation of the side chain. Implementation of Fu's enantioselective cross-coupling technology ${ }^{50,51}$ could enable the selective synthesis of all pseudopterosin aglycones (-)-3.70, (+)-3.71 and (+)-3.72, a feat not achieved by any of the 15 currently published total synthesis strategies. ${ }^{45}$

Use of the oxy-Cope/Michael rearrangement towards the pseudopterosins would contribute an entirely new synthetic design for a popular target. All approaches, except for the recent Sherburn synthesis, rely either on a terpene or aromatic starting material as a scaffold to construct subsequent rings: termed "structure-goal strategy." ${ }^{44}$ An oxy-Cope/Michael strategy originating from a spirocycle starting material would be the only synthesis to construct all three rings simultaneously and also deviates from the previously relied on "structure-goal strategy". It would also reprise a strategy that was unsuccessful in the context of DICA to another natural product system.

### 3.7 Conclusions

The oxy-Cope/transannular Michael cascade of spirocyclic enones was uncovered in the literature and evaluated in the interest of a synthesis of DICA. The course of the reaction generated the desired carbocyclic framework required for the proposed synthesis, but upon examining the products in detail, an undesired cis ring-fusion was observed. This turned our attention to reevaluating the literature report's proposed claims. A structural misassignment of the literature compound was uncovered by X-ray analysis. As previously noticed in an
application towards DICA, the transannular Michael undergoes only a cis-selective addition. Further deuterium studies confirmed a suspicion that the conjugate addition is irreversible in refluxing basic methanol, counter to Swaminathan's assertions. Although the oxy-Cope/Michael reaction strategy towards DICA was unsuccessful, the reaction could still have a bright future in natural product synthesis; accessing the pseudopterosins is one example.

### 3.8 Experimental Procedures

## Purifications -

Solvents: Dry tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$, dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, toluene, benzene $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$, dimethylformamide (DMF), methanol (MeOH) were obtained by passing commercially available formulations through activated alumina columns Amines: Triethylamine $\left(\mathrm{NEt}_{3}\right)$ was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$. Triflates: tert-Butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate (TBSOTf) was purified by distillation over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Metals: Copper(I) iodide (CuI) was purified by Soxhlet extraction with THF followed by drying of the solid under high vacuum. (COD) CuBr was prepared according to the literature. ${ }^{24}$

Miscellaneous: Methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) was purified by distillation. $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}$ was purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2} . \mathrm{KOCD}_{3}$ was prepared by addition of $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ to a suspention of KH in toluene, removing all volatiles in vacuo and washing the remaining solid with pentane.

Titrations - Alkyllithium reagents were titrated using 2,6-di-(tert-butyl)-4-methylphenol (BHT) as the sacrificial proton source and fluorene as an indicator in THF or using diphenylacetic acid in THF. Grignard reagents were titrated using salicylaldehyde phenylhydrazone in THF. ${ }^{52}$

Reaction Setup - All reactions were carried out under an argon atmosphere with dry solvents under anhydrous conditions, unless otherwise noted. Argon balloons were the sole inert atmosphere used. Reactions run at an ambient temperature of $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are designated as room
temperature. Microwave reactions were performed in an Anton Paar Microwave. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated.

Analysis - Thin layer chromatography was performed on 0.25 mm EMD glass-backed TLC plates impregnated with a fluorescent dye and visualized with UV light and $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} / \mathrm{NaOH} /$ water or $p$-anisaldehyde in ethanol/aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ and heat as a developing agent. Forced flow (flash) chromatography was performed on EMD Silica 60, mesh 0.04-0.063 silica gel. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz instrument, obtained at 298 K unless otherwise noted and calibrated to residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm with the following abbreviations to explain multiplicities: $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{q}=$ quartet, $q u i n=$ quintuplet, sext $=$ setet, sep $=$ septet, $\mathrm{bs}=$ broad signal, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. All coupling constants are apparent $J$ values measured at the indicated field strengths. FT-IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer spectrum RX1 spectrometer. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a H2Os LCT Premier spectrometer using ESI-TOF (electrospray ionization-time of flight). Melting points were measured on a MEL-TEMP II capillary apparatus and stand uncorrected.

2-Bromo-4-methyl cyclohexanone [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{53}$


A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with $20.0 \mathrm{~g}(0.178 \mathrm{~mol})$ 4-methylcyclohexanone and 60 mL water and placed in an empty crystallizing dish. The rapidly stirring solution was treated dropwise with $8.4 \mathrm{~mL}(0.164 \mathrm{~mol})$ bromine over the course of 30 minutes, keeping an internal reaction temperature between $30-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by adding ice to the crystallizing dish. After stirring for an additional 1.5 hours the reaction turned colorless, then diluted with 20 mL sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and 40 mL water, partioned with 200 mL EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic phase was washed twice with 50 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 50 mL brine. All aqueous layers were collected and back extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. This organic layer was washed twice with 20 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine and combined with the previously obtained organic phase, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the crude material distilled $\left(60-73{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 0.6\right.$ $\mathrm{mmHg})$ to afford $24.2 \mathrm{~g}(77 \%, 2: 1 \mathrm{dr})$ 2-bromo-4-methyl cyclohexanone as a colorless liquid. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{54}$

4-Methylcyclohex-2-en-1-one $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$ [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{55}$


A three neck 1 L flask was fitted with a mechanical stirrer, a rubber septum and a reflux condenser, and flushed with argon. The flask was charged with $24.1 \mathrm{~g}(0.127 \mathrm{~mol})$ 2-bromo-4methyl cyclohexanone, 250 mL DMF, $23.5 \mathrm{~g}(0.318 \mathrm{~mol}) \mathrm{Li}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ and $27.8 \mathrm{~g}(0.320 \mathrm{~mol}) \mathrm{LiBr}$,
the septum replaced with a glass stopper and the reaction placed in an oil bath set to $130{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature, diluted with 250 mL EtOAc and filtered through Celite. The filter cake was washed four times with 250 mL EtOAc portions. Five seperatory funnels were set up in tandem, the first loaded with the filtrate solution and the other four with 250 mL fresh EtOAc each. To the first funnel was added 1 L water and after vigorous shaking, the aqueous layer drained and poured into the second funnel. After vigorous shaking, the aqueous layer was drained and poured into the third funnel, shaken and continued with the fourth and fifth seperatory funnel. This process was repeated three additional times with 750 and twice with 500 mL water portions. The first seperatory funnel was washed with 150 mL brine, the other four with 50 mL brine, then all organic layers collected, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was distilled $\left(48-52^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 4.5 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ to afford $8.62 \mathrm{~g}(62 \%, \sim 3 \%$ DMF contamination) 3.31 as a colorless liquid. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{54}$

## Michael Adduct 3.34



A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with $70 \mathrm{~mL}(25.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ freshly prepared 0.37 M butenylmagnesium bromide/THF. The reaction was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then treated with 2.67 g $(13.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuBr} \bullet$ DMS. The cuprate was aged 45 minutes before $1.19 \mathrm{~g}(10.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ in 15 mL THF was added over the course of 15 minutes. After stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for a total of 3 hours, the reaction was quenched with 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and filtered through Celite with the assistance
of 150 mL EtOAc. All volatiles were removed, the residue dissolved in 150 mL EtOAc, washed thrice with 50 mL portions 2:1 $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH} / \mathrm{sat}$. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ then 30 mL brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Crude ketone ( $>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) was of sufficient purity to move forward. To an ice cooled 50 mL round bottom flask containing 20 mL $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added $300 \mathrm{mg}(13 \mathrm{~mol}) \mathrm{Na}$ metal cut and flattened, then crude ketone from above in 5 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $1.3 \mathrm{~mL}(16.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate were added. The reaction was initiated with 0.1 mL EtOH and the ice bath allowed to melt over the course of 5 hours. The contents were stirred for 10 minutes after the addition of 6 mL 0.5 M NaOH , diluted with 24 mL 0.5 M NaOH and the layers seperated. The aqueous layer was washed twice with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined and back extracted twice with 20 mL 0.5 M NaOH . The aqueous phases were collected, acidified with 20 mL 6 M HCl then extracted with 40 mL and thrice with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. These organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL water, 10 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10$ mL brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a ketoaldehyde of sufficient purity to proceed. A 50 mL round bottom flask was charged with crude ketoaldehyde, $1.3 \mathrm{~mL}(16.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl vinyl ketone and $33 \mathrm{mg}(0.59 \mathrm{mmol})$ powdered KOH at room temperature (exotherm). After stirring for 30 minutes, the contents were diluted with $60 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and washed twice with 10 mL water then 10 mL brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.92 \mathrm{~g}(66 \%$ over 3 steps, $5.2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 3.34$ as a light yellow oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 9.61$ (s, 1H), 9.41 (s, 1H), 5.76 (dddd, J = 16.1, $11.9,8.6,4.1,1 H), 5.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.62-2.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.12$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.62(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.8,3.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-$ $1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.4,3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm )
major $\delta 212.3,207.3,200.9,137.9,115.1,62.3,43.7,43.5,39.5,38.1,32.5,30.9,30.0,29.9$, 25.1, 18.8; IR (thin film) 2926, 2854, 2740, 1718, $1639 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$287.1623 found 287.1621.

## Spiro Enone 3.35



An azeotropically dried solution of $70 \mathrm{mg}(0.37 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in 40 mL benzene was added to $1.90 \mathrm{~g}(7.19 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 3 4} \mathrm{in}$ a 100 mL round bottom flask and refluxed over a Hickman still. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature, diluted with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, washed twice with 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, 10 mL brine then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) then recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes to afford 902 mg $(50 \%) 3.35$ as fluffy white needles $\left(\mathrm{mp}=42-44{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta$ $6.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.79(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9,10.2,6.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.05(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.1$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.52-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.37-2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.81$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=13.3,6.7,3.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=13.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=$ 13.7, 9.1, 4.8, 1H), $1.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.4,3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 211.5,198.3$, $152.5,138.0,129.5,115.1,50.9,44.3,44.2,42.7,33.3,32.7,31.5,30.4,29.9,18.8$; IR (thin film) 2919, 1702, 1684, 1450, $1227 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 269.1518$ found 269.1518 .

## Siloxydienes 3.36



To a solution of $303 \mathrm{mg}(1.23 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 3 5} \mathrm{in} 13 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.60 \mathrm{~mL}(4.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $0.32 \mathrm{~mL}(1.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSOTf}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 hours of stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the reaction was diluted with 10 mL hexanes and poured into a separatory funnel containing 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The flask was rinsed twice with 10 mL pentane, the organic layer washed with 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a compound of sufficient purity to proceed. The crude material from the previous step in 7 mL THF was treated with $7.0 \mathrm{~mL}(5.0 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.71 \mathrm{M}$ vinylmagnesium bromide/THF at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 8 hours. The reaction was quenched at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with 20 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, diluted with 30 mL EtOAc and the phases separated. The organic layer was washed with 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and 10 mL brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (160:4:1 hexanes/EtOAc/ $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ) to afford $373 \mathrm{mg}(78 \%$ over two steps, $1: 1.6 \mathrm{dr}$ ) 3.36 as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 6.39(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.9$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.86-5.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.71(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,2.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.44(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.42(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.0$, $1.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.83(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=4.7,2.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.86(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.6,4.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.0$, $4.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.49(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=12.7,1 \mathrm{H})$, minor $\delta 6.06(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,10.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.86-5.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.65$ $(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,2.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.67-4.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})($ mixed $) 5.20-5.08(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.04-4.92(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-$ $2.22(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-$ $1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.95-0.90(\mathrm{~m}, 24 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) combined $\delta 147.2,146.7,143.9,141.3,139.2,138.9,134.7,134.1,127.0$,
$125.6,114.3,114.2,113.9,112.7,101.9,100.4,77.9,76.1,42.2,42.1,41.7,39.9,39.8,39.0$, $37.7,37.6,32.8,32.3,30.9,30.52,30.47,29.1,27.6,25.7,25.7,19.6,19.5,18.0,18.0,-4.4,-$ $4.45,-4.48$; IR (thin film) $2928,1654,1252,1201 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 411.2695$ found 411.2693 .

## Spirocyclic Enones 3.30 and 3.37



To a solution of $0.99 \mathrm{~g}(2.54 \mathrm{mmol}) 3.36 \mathrm{in} 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was added 4 mL TBAF ( 1 M in THF) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 2 minutes at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and poured into EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed twice with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $201 \mathrm{mg}(28 \%) 3.30$ as a colorless oil and $394 \mathrm{mg}(56 \%) 3.37$ as a white solid. 3.30: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.21$ $(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.4,1.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.93(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,10.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.82(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0$, $10.3,6.7,1 H), 5.25(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,0.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.03(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.6,1 \mathrm{H})$, 4.98-4.95 (m, 1H), 2.49-2.41 (m, 1H), 2.35 (dt, J = 17.4, 4.5, 1H), 2.20-2.12 (m, 1H), 2.08-1.88 $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.38(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 199.4,156.1,142.6,138.9,128.7,114.7,114.4$, $75.1,43.3,37.47,37.46,37.2,33.6,32.2,31.7,30.5,27.0,19.6$; IR (thin film) $3435,2924,1664$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1830. 3.37: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.68(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.50(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,10.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.97(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$
$=10.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.78(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.3,6.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.40(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.28(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.9$, $1.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,0.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.2,7.1,5.3$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,9.4,4.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.2,9.7,5.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.01-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.6,3.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.45(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=12.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.19(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=13.7,9.1,4.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 200.0,155.3,141.0,138.6,130.0,114.63$, $114.58,77.3,43.4,41.7,41.1,40.0,34.4,32.7,31.6,30.4,26.5,19.5$; IR (thin film) 3433, 2920, 1663, $1450 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1829. XRay quality crystals were grown from pentane $/ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\left(\mathrm{mp}=123-125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.

## Tricycle 3.41



A microwave vial was charged with $18.8 \mathrm{mg}(0.0685 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ and 1 mL chlorobenzene, sealed and heated at $190^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a microwave for 4 hours +4 hours. All volatiles were removed in vacuo and the crude material purified by column chromatography ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $15.0 \mathrm{mg}(80 \%) \mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ as a white solid, which partially isomerized upon attempted recrystallization. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.81-5.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.64(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=21.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82-2.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-$ $2.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=14.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.02-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 209.4,138.8,136.7,121.5,114.5,82.2,57.3$,
$48.6,43.7,41.8,40.4,39.7,39.2,39.0,34.6,31.8,22.9,21.6$; IR (thin film) $3467,2917,2850$, 1708, $1459 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1834.

## [2.2.2] Bicycle 3.51



To a solution of $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.036 \mathrm{mmol}) 42 \mathrm{in} 0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(1.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}(0.22 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSOTf}$ in $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1 hours of stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and poured into a separatory funnel containing sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The flask was rinsed twice with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and the organic layer washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography to afford $7 \mathrm{mg}(50 \%) 44$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm) $\delta 6.12-6.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.86(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.80(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.3,6.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $17.0,2.3,1 H), 5.04-4.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.29(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=12.6,9.8,2.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-$ $2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,7.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.46(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 1.23-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=12.5,4.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.6,3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.19(\mathrm{~s}$, 3H), $0.15(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 141.7,139.1,137.0,136.1,115.1$, $114.3,97.6,79.8,40.11,39.9,39.62,39.56,34.6,33.1,31.6,30.6,25.9,25.7,20.0,17.9,-2.4,-$ 2.7; IR (thin film) 2928, 1684, 1640, $1212 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 411.2695$ found 411.2667

## Dienoxysilane 3.36



To a solution of $52 \mathrm{mg}(0.19 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 3 0} \mathrm{in} 4 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.4 \mathrm{~mL}(2.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.44 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSOTf}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1 hours of stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and poured into a separatory funnel containing sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The flask was rinsed twice with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and the organic layer washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (hexanes $\rightarrow 20: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $62 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%) \mathbf{3 . 3 6}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.06(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,10.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.83-5.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.81$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,2.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,1.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.10(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.9,1.3$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,2.3,1.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.67-4.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}$ $=17.2,3.9,1 H), 2.25(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.3,5.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.93(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.64$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.6,3.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.49(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=12.7,2 H), 1.44-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.18(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 0.94-0.90(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ $147.2,143.9,139.2,134.7,125.6,114.2,112.7,100.4,76.1,41.7,39.0,37.7,37.6,32.3,30.54$, 30.52, 29.1, 25.7, 19.7, 18.0, $-4.4,-4.5$; IR (thin film) $3435,2928,2856,1652 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 411.2695$ found 411.2693 .

## Enoxysilane 3.53 and Skipped Enone 3.54



To a stirring solution of oil free KH in 0.5 mL THF was added $20 \mathrm{mg}(0.26 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DMSO}$ in 0.5 mL THF at room temperature, followed by $50 \mathrm{mg}(0.13 \mathrm{mmol}) 3.36$ in 0.6 mL THF with 0.4 mL and 0.5 mL THF rinses at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed after 10 minutes and the reaction stirred for 35 minutes. The reaction was quenched with 10 drops EtOH , then sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The aqueous phase was extracted twice with EtOAc. The organic phases were combined, washd with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (hexanes $\rightarrow 40: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $20 \mathrm{mg}(40 \%)$ $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ as a waxy solid and $11 \mathrm{mg}(31 \%) \mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ as a waxy solid. 3.53: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 5.83(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.3,6.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.03-4.92(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.05-3.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.79(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.69-2.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=13.2,1.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.97-$ $1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 0.17(\mathrm{~s}$, $6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 212.4,149.1,139.1,134.4,129.0,114.1,101.5$, $50.4,48.0,40.3,37.9,37.8,34.8,34.3,31.6,29.7,25.7,21.4,18.1,-4.4,-4.5$; IR (thin film) 2854, 2927, 2856, 1705, 1658, $1203 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 411.2695 found 411.2687 . 3.54: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta$ (major) 5.80 (ddt, J $=16.9,10.2,6.7,1 H), 5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.69-2.47 (m, 5H), 2.38-2.33 (m, 1H), 2.25-1.87 (m, 9H), 1.63-1.55 (m, 1H), 1.53-1.47 (m, 1H), 1.42-1.34 (m, 1H), $0.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ (major) $212.0,211.1,138.8,138.5,130.1,114.3,51.0,48.9,47.6,39.4,39.3,37.8,35.0,34.2,30.22$,
29.4, 28.7, 21.6; IR (thin film) 2955, 2924, 2914, 1706, $1436 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1831.

## Skipped Enone 3.54



A solution of $18 \mathrm{mg}(0.046 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 5 3} \mathrm{in} 0.8 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was treated with $1.6 \mathrm{~mL} 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{aq} . \mathrm{HCl}$. After stirring overnight, 6 M aq. HCl was added until most starting material had disappeared and new polar spots appeared. After 14 h the reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (hexanes $\rightarrow 30: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1 \rightarrow 1: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $3 \mathrm{mg}(17 \%)$ recovered 3.53, $6.5 \mathrm{mg}(51 \%)$ 3.54 as a waxy solid and 2 mg of two unknown compounds. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm) major $\delta 5.80(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9,10.2,6.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.69-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.38-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.55(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 212.0,211.1,138.8,138.5,130.1,114.3,51.0,48.9,47.6,39.4,39.3$, $37.8,35.0,34.2,30.22,29.4,28.7,21.6$; IR (thin film) 2955, 2924, 2914, $1706,1436 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1831.

## Skipped Enone 3.54



To a slurry of $152 \mathrm{mg}(3.79 \mathrm{mmol})$ oil free potassium hydride in 7 mL THF was added 0.13 mL ( 1.8 mmol ) DMSO at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After stirring for 10 minutes, $363 \mathrm{mg}(0.933 \mathrm{mmol}) 3.36$ in 3 mL THF was added at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 1 hour before being cooled back to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with 0.25 mL AcOH . The reaction was partioned between 45 mL third sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed twice with 10 mL water, then 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed to afford a crude residue. The crude material was dissolved in 8.5 mL THF , cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with 2.3 $\mathrm{mL}(2.3 \mathrm{mmol}) 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAF} / \mathrm{THF}$. After 10 minutes, 30 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 40 mL EtOAc was added and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with 10 mL water, 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $130 \mathrm{mg}(51 \%$ over 2 steps, 4.6:1 dr) $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$)$ major $\delta 5.80(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=$ $16.9,10.2,6.7,1 H), 5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.69-2.47 (m, 5H), 2.38-2.33 (m, 1H), 2.25-1.87 (m, 9H), 1.63-1.55 (m, 1H), 1.53-1.47 (m, 1H), 1.42-1.34 (m, 1H), $0.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR} \mathrm{(126} \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta$ $212.0,211.1,138.8,138.5,130.1,114.3,51.0,48.9,47.6,39.4,39.3,37.8,35.0,34.2,30.22$, 29.4, 28.7, 21.6; IR (thin film) 2955, 2924, 2914, 1706, $1436 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1831.

## Perhydrophenalenediones 3.57 and 3.58



A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with $42.0 \mathrm{mg}(0.153 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 5 3}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mL}(0.11 \mathrm{mmol})$ $0.054 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{MeOH}$, fitted with a reflux condenser and heated at $75{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under rigorous exclusion of oxygen. The reaction was cooled to room temperature after 3 hours, all volatiles removed in vacuo and the residue dissolved in $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layer was washed with 5 mL water, 4 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 3 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a mixture of $\mathbf{3 . 5 7}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 5 8}$ in $>80 \%$ crude yield. The crude oil purified by column chromatography $\left(100: 1 \rightarrow 40: 1 \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6} / \mathrm{EtOAc}\right)$ to afford $12.1 \mathrm{mg}(29 \%) \mathbf{3 . 5 8}$ as a white solid which was recrystalized from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} /$ pentane to afford colorless needles ( $\mathrm{mp}=$ $111-113^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and $15.1 \mathrm{mg}(36 \%) 3.57$ as a colorless oil. 3.57: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 $\mathrm{ppm}) \delta 5.74(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9,10.2,6.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71-2.65$ (m, 2H), $2.57(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.3,6.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51-2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.30(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.21(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.9$, $4.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.16-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}$ $=12.7,3.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2,3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ 213.6, 211.2, $139.3,113.9,51.6,50.4,48.7,41.01,41.00,40.1,39.0,36.1,30.1,30.0,28.5,27.3,27.0,20.2$; IR (thin film) 2927, 1710, $1443 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1840. 3.58: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.75(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9,10.2,6.7$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=12.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-2.40(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-$ $2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=12.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.55-1.50(m, 1H), 1.26-1.18(m, 3H), $1.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.3,3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77
ppm) $\delta 212.9,211.4,138.7,114.6,56.7,47.9,43.8,39.3,37.7,37.4,34.9,34.8,34.7,32.0,28.1$, 27.9, 26.2, 19.9; IR (thin film) 2921, $1709 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 297.1830 found 297.1838 .

2-Hydroxymethylenecyclohexanone $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}$ [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{56}$


To an ice cooled solution of $1.11 \mathrm{~g}(48.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Na}$ metal cut and flattened in $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added $4.6 \mathrm{~mL}(44.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ cyclohexanone, $5.3 \mathrm{~mL}(65.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate, and 0.2 mL EtOH. The ice bath was allowed to melt over the course of 2 hours, during which time the reaction turned into a thick orange mass. The contents were stirred for an additional 2 hours, quenched with 50 mL water, the phases seperated and the aqueous phase washed twice with 50 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The aqueous layer was acidified with 10 mL 6 M HCl and extracted twice with 50 mL $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. These organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL water, 10 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The yellow oil was distilled $\left(63-65{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 3.5 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ to afford $2.64 \mathrm{~g}(47 \%) 3.60$ as a colorless liquid. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{57}$

## Silyloxydiene 3.61



A flask was charged with $2.63 \mathrm{~g}(20.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 6 0}, 4.3 \mathrm{~mL}(52.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl vinyl ketone and $75 \mathrm{mg}(1.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ powdered KOH at room temperature (exotherm). After stirring for 9 hours the contents were diluted with EtOAc , washed twice with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, once with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ then brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a yellow oil. The crude oil was dissolved in 100 mL benzene and refluxed over DeanStark with $200 \mathrm{mg}(1.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. After 3 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and washed thrice with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, then brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The dark oil was purified by column chromatography $(6: 1 \rightarrow 4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford 1.73 g of an impure product. To 1.65 g impure enone in 50 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $5.2 \mathrm{~mL}(37 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $2.1 \mathrm{~mL}(9.26 \mathrm{mmol})$ TBSOTf sequentially. After 3 hours the flask was removed from the cold bath, diluted with 25 mL pentane and poured into stirring sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The flask was rinsed with an additional 50 mL pentane. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed once with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, water and brine, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The yellow oil was purified by column $(50: 1 \rightarrow 20: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.96 \mathrm{~g}(32 \%$ over 3 steps $) \mathbf{3 . 6 1}$ as a colorless wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.73(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $10.0,2.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78-4.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.0,4.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.0,8.7,5.4,1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.33 (ddd, $J=13.5,7.8,5.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19$ (dd, $J=17.0,5.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$, $0.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 212.3,144.9,130.8,126.6$,
$100.5,49.8,38.4,36.8,29.9,27.8,25.6,20.8,18.0,-4.58,-4.63$; IR (thin film) 3046, 2931, 2894, 2857, 1708, 1653, 1254, 1225, 1212, 1182, $1127 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 315.1756$ found 315.1751 .

## Allylic Alcohols 3.62



To a solution of 1.92 g ( 6.56 mmol ) 3.61 in 30 mL THF was added 27 mL ( 27 mmol ) 1.0 M vinylmagnesium bromide/THF at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 minutes the cold bath was removed and the contents stirred for 6 hours. The reaction was quenched at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with 1 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 5 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, then passed through a pad of Celite with $300 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layer was washed once with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, water, brine then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The oil was purified by column chromatography (20:1 $\rightarrow 10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.69 \mathrm{~g}(80 \%, 5.4: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 3.62$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$)$ major $\delta 6.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,10.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $10.3,2.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.26(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,1.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.11(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.9,1.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{dt}, J=5.9,2.9$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,3.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,6.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.61(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 1.58-1.44 (m, 4H), $1.41(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.13(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm})$ major $\delta 146.3,144.3,133.8,126.0,112.3,101.4,76.4,41.1,34.5,32.6,29.9,25.7,21.5$, 21.1, 18.0, $-4.49,-4.51$; IR (thin film) 3482, 2931, 2858, 1654, 1252, 1223, $1190 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 321.2250$ found 321.2239 .

## Skipped Enone 3.63



To slurry of $87 \mathrm{mg}(2.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ oil free potassium hydride in 3 mL THF was added $0.09 \mathrm{~mL}(1.27$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DMSO}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After stirring for 10 minutes, $205 \mathrm{mg}(0.639 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ in 1.5 mL THF was added at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 1 hour before being cooled back to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with 0.15 mL AcOH. The reaction was partioned between 20 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 20 mL EtOAc. The layers were separated and the organic phase washed with 5 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed. The crude material was dissolved in 6 mL THF , cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(1.9 \mathrm{mmol}) 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAF} / \mathrm{THF}$. After 10 minutes, 30 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 20 mL EtOAc was added, the layers separated and the aqueous phase washed with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL water, 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 102 mg ( $77 \%$ over 2 steps) $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ as a white solid, which was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes to afford white needles $\left(\mathrm{mp}=50-51^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.20(\mathrm{~m}$, $5 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 212.2,212.1,138.5,127.8,47.5,43.8,39.8,39.3,37.1,29.5$, 28.8, 24.7, 22.4; IR (thin film) 2926, 1704, $1437 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 229.1205$ found 229.1206.

## Tricycles $\mathbf{3 . 6 4} \boldsymbol{\&} \mathbf{3 . 6 5}$



A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with $41.6 \mathrm{mg}(0.202 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ and $2 \mathrm{~mL}(0.14$ mmol) $0.07 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ before being fitted with a reflux condenser and heated at $75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under rigorous exclusion of oxygen. The reaction was cooled to room temperature after 2 hours, partitioned between 5 mL EtOAc and 5 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The aqueous layer was extracted twice with 3 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, the volatiles removed in vacuo and the crude oil purified by column chromatography ( $8: 1 \rightarrow 3: 2$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $25.6 \mathrm{mg}(62 \%) \mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ as a white solid, which was recrystallized from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ /pentane to afford a single colorless prism ( $\mathrm{mp}=91-93{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and $10.2 \mathrm{mg}(24 \%) 3.65$ as a colorless oil. 3.64: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 2.70-2.63$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.545-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26-2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$ $=13.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 212.6,211.2,49.7,48.1,46.3,41.0,38.4,35.8,30.1,26.7$, 25.4, 25.3, 19.7; IR (thin film) 2917, 2848, $1709 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 229.1205$ found 229.1206. 3.65: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 2.93(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ $12.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.42(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=12.7,4.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=13.2$, $2.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=12.8,3.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.51-1.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 213.0,211.6,52.8,46.2,43.1,37.4,36.9,34.6,32.4$, 25.4, 25.2, 25.0, 24.6; IR (thin film) 2927, 2860, $1706 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 229.1205$ found 229.1206.

## Deuteration Experiments on 3.64



A J-Young tube was charged with a solution of $6.0 \mathrm{mg}(0.029 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 6 4} \mathrm{in} 0.6 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ and analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and DEPT-Q NMR. Then $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.02 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KOCD}_{3} / \mathrm{DOCD}_{3}$ (prepared from potassium hydride and $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ in toluene, followed by removal of all volatiles and washing with pentane) was added and placed in an oil bath preheated to $75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and reacted for 2 hours. Analysis was performed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR; 3.64- $d_{6}$ was observed. After 4 days at $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{a} \sim 2: 1$ mixture 3.64- $d_{6}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}-d_{6}$ was observed by ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR.

## Deuteration Experiments on 3.63



A J-Young tube was charged with a solution of $17.0 \mathrm{mg}(0.0824 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{3 . 6 3} \mathrm{in} 0.6 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CD} 3 \mathrm{OD}$ and analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and DEPT-Q NMR. Then $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.055 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.1 \mathrm{M}$ $\mathrm{KOCD}_{3} / \mathrm{DOCD}_{3}$ (prepared from potassium hydride and $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ in toluene, followed by removal of all volatiles and washing with pentane) was added and sonicated for a half hour and analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR; 3.63- $d_{7}$ was observed. The reaction was quenched with $0.1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{D}$, diluted with 3 mL water and extracted thrice with $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 1 mL water, 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was taken up in $0.6 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ and treated with with $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.055 \mathrm{mmol})$
$\mathrm{KOCD}_{3} / \mathrm{DOCD}_{3}$ and the NMR tube placed in an oil bath preheated to $75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and reacted for 2 hours. Analysis was performed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR; 3.64- $d_{7}$ was observed.
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## CHAPTER 4:

## EXPLORING A PHENANTHRENONE REDUCTION APPROACH TO 7,20-DIISOCYANOADOCIANE

### 4.1 Introduction

The goal of efficient access to 7,20-diisocyanoadociane (4.5, DICA) continued to drive the project. An allylic oxidation/hydrosilylation/Robinson annulation design, which intended to establish all the functionality for succinct ring closure, was not successfully executed (Scheme 4.1, see Chapter 2 for more detail), but became the foundation for a new idea. Several rounds of evolution were realized during the following phenanthrenone-based Birch reduction approach towards DICA. A study on the Birch reduction of phenanthrenone substrates, with particular attention paid to stereochemistry is described.

### 4.2 Entry into a Phenanthrenone Reduction Route

Robinson annulation onto decalone 4.1 into tricyclic enone 4.2 was intended to lead to bis-enone 4.3. This bis-enone, upon two electron reduction, ${ }^{1}$ would create Corey's dione 4.4, a direct precursor to DICA. ${ }^{2}$ Problems executing the Robinson annulation led to a reevaluation of strategy. Tricyclic enone of the type 4.3 was still considered an attractive target, but the fragile triethylenoxysilane moiety needed replacing. Thus, the synthetically equivalent molecule 4.6, bearing instead a protected alcohol, was considered. The same reductive coupling of bis-enone 4.3 to 4.4 was still intended as a final ring closure. Although the proposed elaboration of protected alcohol 4.6 to enoxysilane 4.7 would most likely require more steps than directly having the enoxysilane, as in 4.2, this substrate opened up a highly attractive Birch reduction
approach from phenanthrenone 4.8 .

Scheme 4.1 Origin of the phenanthrenone reduction idea.


Scheme 4.2 Proposed reaction course for the Birch reduction of a phenanthrenone system relevant to DICA.


A first approach to the system $\mathbf{4 . 1 3}$ was designed around a dissolving metal reduction of phenanthrenone 4.9 (Scheme 4.2). Conjugated phenanthrenones such as 4.9 are readily prepared from a tetralone and an alkyl vinyl ketone via Robinson annulation. The phenanthrenone 4.9 has
within it, an enone and aromatic functionality, both of which can be reduced under dissolving metal conditions. With excess metal in ammonia and alcohol, the enone is predicted to reduce to enolate 4.10. ${ }^{3,4}$ Subsequent protonation and ketone reduction affords equatorial alcohol 4.11. ${ }^{5}$ The anisole moiety is then cleaved and isomerized to enone $\mathbf{4 . 1 3}$ in classic Birch reduction fashion. ${ }^{6,7}$

With the general course of the reaction rationalized, the issue of stereochemistry needed to be addressed. The literature revealed four conflicting reports on the stereochemical outcomes of conjugated phenanthrenone reductions with dissolving metals. Two reports of a phenanthrenone enone-reduction claim trans-selectivity, ${ }^{8,9}$ while the other two claim a cisselective reduction (Scheme 4.3A). ${ }^{10,11}$ Either small differences in $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ reduction conditions change the selectivity between cis and trans, or two groups are correct in their stereochemical assignment, while the other two are not. Interestingly, both Jacquesy ${ }^{10}$ and Eisenbraun ${ }^{8}$ reduce the identical, unsubstituted phenanthrenone 4.14 and reported different results under essentially identical conditions; one group claims to have performed a trans-reduction, the other group claims a cis-reduction. Support for the groups claiming a trans-reduction can be found in the reduction of octalone 4.21 to $\mathbf{4 . 2 2}$ or well precedented steroid $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$ ring reductions both of which give excellent trans-selectivity (Scheme 4.3B). ${ }^{3,12}$ Faced with these literature discrepancies, the best course forward was to evaluate the desired system on route to DICA and determine the stereochemistry independently.

Scheme 4.3 The stereochemical course of phenanthrenone Birch reductions.

## A. Conflicting literature results of phenanthrenone dissolving metal reductions

Jacquesy, 1977


Robinson, 1957

4.16

4.17: 50\% trans;" [cis and trans] could be separated by hand-picking [crystals]"

Eisenbraun, 1988


Chatterjee, 1982

B. Well-established stereocontrol of a dissolving metal reduction


### 4.3 Results from a Phenanthrenone Reduction Approach

### 4.3.1 Phenanthrenone Synthesis and Confirmation of Basic Birch Reactivity

Phenanthrenones are typically accessed from a tetralone precursor, and the preparation of 4.28 was no different. Although shorter and more elegant syntheses of tetralone 4.26 could be
imagined, a literature report sufficed for exploratory chemistry. ${ }^{13}$ Starting from anisole, a sixstep sequence was completed to afford multi-gram quantities of tetralone $\mathbf{4 . 2 6}$ on a first pass (Scheme 4.4). A Robinson annulation of 4.26 with methyl isopropenyl ketone was implemented to generate the desired phenanthrenone bearing the required C 17 methyl group. ${ }^{14}$ Experimentally, the corresponding $\beta$-ketoaldehyde of 4.26 performed poorly in a conjugate addition with methyl isopropenyl ketone. Although incomplete conversion was observed, the crude product was treated with aqueous base to trigger the subsequent cyclization. Disappointingly, the obtained phenanthrenone 4.28 was isolated as a mixture of diastereomers, both at the ring fusion and at the C15 methyl-bearing stereogenic center. To better understand this system the C17 des-methyl analog of 4.28, 4.29 was targeted (Scheme 4.5).

Scheme 4.4 A tetralone synthesis and first phenanthrenone derivative.


The Robinson annulation of 4.26 with methyl vinyl ketone performed better than with methyl isopropenyl ketone and generated phenanthrenone 4.29 in good yield; however, it too lacked stereocontrol (Scheme 4.5). Regardless, it was anticipated that the correct diastereomer could be separated at a later stage. Treating 4.29 with excess $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ accomplished the desired reduction
to 4.30. Therefore the proposed one-pot enone and aromatic reduction was successful! Although the desired reduction was accomplished, stereocontrol was problematic. The original $1: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ in 4.29 was further aggravated to a $2: 2: 1: 1$ mixture. This route could have been pursued further, but an approach more strongly emphasizing stereocontrol was prioritized.

Scheme 4.5 A successuful phenanthrenone Birch reduction.


While stereocontrol in the synthesis of $\mathbf{4 . 3 0}$ was lacking, its reactivity to produce a structure of type $\mathbf{4 . 3 1}$ was not in doubt (Scheme 4.6A), but the poor diasterocontrol obtained by Robinson annulation and from the Birch reduction triggered reevaluation. Better control in the Robinson annulation was imagined if the two stereocenters were vicinal, as in 4.33. Literature precedent supported this proposal as 4.39 could be prepared as a single diastereomer (Scheme 4.6B). ${ }^{15}$ Subsequent Birch reduction of 4.33 would lead to intermediate 4.32 , a synthetically similar molecule to the originally targeted 4.31. In a forward sense, however, cyclohexenone 4.34 was expected to be problematic. At a stage in which the C 7 enoxysilane ${ }^{14}$ would be installed, such as on 4.34, correct regiochemical enolization would be unfavored, barring chiral base deprotonation. ${ }^{16}$ This problem of selectivity could be addressed by changing the fourth ring closure to an alkylation proceeding through enolate 4.36. This second evolution meant an elaborated vinyl ketone would be needed to generate 4.37 by Robinson annulation.

Scheme 4.6. A redesigned phenanthrenone Birch reduction route.

## A. The evolution of a phenanthrenone based Birch reduction


B. Stereochemical precedence for a Robinson annulation


### 4.3.2 A Reworked Phenanthrenone Approach Emphasizing Stereocontrol

The synthesis of a phenanthrenone of the type 4.37 and evaluation of the subsequent Birch reduction became the next objective. A synthesis of its tetralone precursor was conceived
of de novo, and started by opening of propene oxide with aromatic Grignard reagent 4.40, followed by mesylation (Scheme 4.7). A malonic ester synthesis and carboxylic acid cyclization of $\mathbf{4 . 4 2}$ to $\mathbf{4 . 3 0}$ required optimization, but eventually led to significant quantities of tetralone 4.43. An asymmetric synthesis of tetralone 4.43 would simply require enantioenriched propylene oxide. ${ }^{17}$ Formylation of 4.43 was complicated by aromatization if not monitored. Michael addition of 4.44 with 4.45 proceeded smoothly. Disappointingly the ring closing aldol condensation was problematic and cyclization was not observed. The only products were those of deformylation under basic conditions and recovered starting material.

Scheme 4.7 First pass at the new phenanthrenone-based synthesis of DICA.


Although it was attractive to bring all carbons in early with vinyl ketone 4.45, the problem of phenanthrenone reduction stereochemistry and reactivity still needed addressing. At this point, the elaborated 4.45 was replaced with methyl vinyl ketone, the product of which underwent the Robinson annulation efficiently to afford 4.49 (Scheme 4.8A). Birch reduction of
4.49 with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ in the presence of excess t - BuOH provided only reduction of the enone to ketone 4.50; a curiosity when compared to the earlier reduction successes of 4.29 (Scheme 4.5). The advantage at this point was that the relative stereochemistry of enone reduction could be obtained. Analysis of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR determined that the major species in an $8: 1$ mixture of $\mathbf{4 . 5 0}$ bore the trans-ring junction (Scheme 4.8B).

Scheme 4.8 A selective phenanthrenone reduction with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$.

## A. Robinson annulation with MVK and subsequent Birch reduction


B. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of 4.50 bearing a proposed trans-ring fusion; $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}=7.27 \mathrm{ppm}$


In stark contrast to the previously run Birch reduction (Scheme 4.5), several attempts at reducing the aromatic 4.49 were not successful. Even under the influence of a large excess of Li and $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$, neither the ketone nor the aromatic was reduced. In addition to t - BuOH , isopropanol and ethanol were also screened as proton sources for attempted aromatic cleavage. Both ethanol and isopropanol reduced the ketone, but still did not reduce the aromatic. Phenanthrenone 4.49's limited solubility in THF, insolubility in diethyl ether and insolubility in ammonia made evaluating this reaction difficult. The lack of solubility may have also
contributed to the absence of reactivity. A further screen of Mg in methanol and hydrogenation were screened to possibly improve setting the C13 stereocenter, and unsurprisingly did not reduce the aromatic ring. The lack of aromatic reduction in 4.49 is difficult to explain because the literature contains many examples of Birch reductions of 1,2,4,5-tetrasubstituted anisoles; select examples are provided in equations 4.1-4.3. ${ }^{18-20}$ The issue of difficult aromatic reductions has been addressed before, most notably by the procedures of Benkeser using alkylamine solvent. ${ }^{21}$ These conditions have the added advantage of being performed above the boiling point of ammonia at $-33^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{22}$

Table 4.1 Small screen of reduction conditions in attempting to fully reduce 4.49.

a as proposed initally by NMR data (see Table 4.3 for more information)

## Yamato, 1965


van Tamelen, 1980


Bohlmann, 1982


Stronger and higher temperature reducing agents were evaluated for the recalcitrant reduction of 4.49. Classic Benkeser reductions in methylamine and ethylamine were not pursued because these controlled substances are inconvenient to obtain. Alternative Benkeser reductions were tried instead. Using Ca in ethylene diamine, propylamine, and THF provided only starting material. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Li}$ or Na in neat HMPA caused decomposition of material. ${ }^{24}$ Modified ethylenediamine based conditions eventually were successful in reducing the aromatic ring (Scheme 4.9). Several literature reports include propylamine as a solvent; however, it was found not necessary for effective reduction. ${ }^{25,26}$ Although the aromatic moiety was reduced, the ketone was not! Presumably, ethylenediamine condensed either onto the enone or the transiently generated ketone, thereby masking the carbonyl reduction.

Scheme 4.9 Successful ethylene diamine based reduction of phenanthrenone 4.49.


Having successfully reduced the aromatic, the next step was hydrolysis and isomerization to the conjugated enone 4.63 (Scheme 4.9). Standard conditions of aqueous HCl in methanol failed. Hydrolysis of the vinyl ether to the corresponding ketone was achieved with mild acid, but attempts at isomerizing the skipped enone into conjugation under acid or basic conditions were once again unsuccessful. Complexity in the lack of reduction of the aromatic under standard Birch conditions, problems with low mass recovery in the ethylene diamine-based reductions, and difficulties in enone isomerization were all attributed to the C 17 methyl group. ${ }^{14}$ An approach that installs this methyl later was therefore pursued.

### 4.3.3 Identifying a Conflicting Stereochemical Outcome

To examine whether the singular C17 methyl group may inhibit aromatic reduction, the des-methyl analog of 4.49 was prepared (Scheme 4.10). The TMEDA-ligated pmethoxybenzylcopper reagent was added to ethyl crotonate and the corresponding ester treated with polyphosphoric acid to generate tetralone 4.65 via a slightly modified literature procedure. ${ }^{27}$ Robinson annulation with methyl vinyl ketone generated 4.33, and in analogy to 4.49, also as a single diastereomer. Treatment of this phenanthrenone with excess $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$, in the presence of excess methanol in THF, cleanly reduced the system down to alcohol 4.66. Although the hydrolysis and enone isomerization to 4.67 was difficult, it could be accomplished with aqueous acid while carefully monitoring by TLC. The obtained $2: 1$ mixture of diastereomers was
silylated and then methylated via the cross-conjugated dienolate. Two sets of fractions were separated, one consisted of a mixture of diastereomers and assigned as structure 4.69 and one was highly enriched in the major diastereomer. As judged by NMR analysis, the major diastereomer was consistent with structure 4.70, bearing a cis-ring fusion. This ring fusion came from reduction of phenanthrenone 4.33 using $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and is in direct contradiction to the previously proposed stereochemistry of reduction (Scheme 4.8)! It is impossible for the assignment of both $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ and $\mathbf{4 . 7 0}$ to be correct. This discrepancy required further clarification.

Scheme 4.10 A des-methyl phenanthrenone undergoes successful Birch reduction.


### 4.3.4 Settling the Phenanthrenone Birch Reduction Stereochemical Conundrum

An empirically guided approach to determining the stereochemical course of phenanthrenone Birch reductions was sought. Phenanthrenone $\mathbf{4 . 3 3}$ was chosen as the substrate to evaluate since large quantities were available at the time and $\mathbf{4 . 4 9}$ was not. The C 17 methyl ${ }^{14}$ group was considered too distal to be considered relevant to the herein described experiments. Ketalization of $\mathbf{4 . 3 3}$ migrated the double bond out of its original position to afford 4.71 (Scheme 4.11A). Hydrogenation of alkene 4.71 over $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ provided a $4: 1$ mixture of diastereomers. Since surface catalysts strongly enforce cis-reduction, the two diastereomers obtained arose from hydrogen delivery to the face opposite of the methyl and to the same face as the methyl. Acidic ketal deprotection yielded two separable ketones. The major constituent was identified as structure 4.72. The minor isomer was therefore structure 4.73. This material had an almost identical ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum to the major product obtained from Birch reduction of 4.49 (Scheme 4.5). The major isomer upon reduction of $\mathbf{4 . 4 9}$ was thus corrected to $\mathbf{4 . 5 2}$ (Scheme 4.11B).

Scheme 4.11 Alkene hydrogenation to determine the stereochemical course of the Birch reduction in conjugated phenanthrenones.
A. Using cis-selective hydrogenation to tackle a stereochemical problem

B. Stereochemical correction of a previous Birch reaction (Scheme 4.8)


Scheme 4.12 Proposed difficulties isomerizing a skipped enone into conjugation.

B. Proposed mechanistic support for a C-C bond migration triggered by enone isomerization


The stereochemical correction of $\mathbf{4 . 5 1}$ to $\mathbf{4 . 5 2}$ allows for a reflection on the conflicting literature reports (Scheme 4.3A). Based on the results described, the stereochemistry of all four reports is highly likely cis. Caution should be applied when using the Jacquesy ${ }^{8}$ and Robinson ${ }^{9}$ examples as precedent since their stereochemical assignment is questionable. In addition, the observed cis stereochemistry explains the difficulty experienced in isomerizing enones $\mathbf{4 . 6 2}$ and 4.66 into conjugation (Scheme 4.9 and 4.10). For representative example 4.66, under acidic conditions, carbonyl protononation may cause $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond migration to cation 4.74, an intermediate with the ability to decompose further (Scheme 4.12A). The migrating bond has good overlap with the enone, and could explain why careful monitoring of the isomerization was essential. A probe for this decomposition pathway could shed light onto its existence. If
migration of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond is occurring, then the alcohol epimer $\mathbf{4 . 8 1}$ may possibly trap the formed cation and generate tetrahydrofuran 4.84 (Scheme 4.12B). Basic isomerization attempts of 4.75, which was generated with mild acid from 4.66, afforded among other compounds, a ketone containing product. Isolation and full characterization was not performed, but NMR of the crude reaction mixture and TLC analysis suggests 4.77 as a possibility. If this tetrahydrofuran formation is occurring, then an oxy-Michael reaction could be envisioned for preparing natural products $\mathbf{4 . 7 9}^{28}$ and $\mathbf{4 . 8 0} .{ }^{29}$

### 4.4 Phenanthrenone Birch Reduction Optimization Attempts

Since the relative stereochemistry of phenanthrenone Birch reductions has now been established as cis, altering the selectivity was attempted. An inspiration for this possibility was that the reduction of 4.49 with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$ provided 4.50 in $8: 1 \mathrm{dr}$, while the literature examples using EtOH provided 2-3: 1 cis/trans selectivity.

Using phenanthrenone 4.33, a small screen of alcoholic additives displayed a clear trend between alcohol sterics and cis/trans selectivity upon reduction. While methanol provided a $3: 1$ mixture of cis/trans, the selectivity for cis-reduction increased in correlation with alcohol bulk up to $8: 1$ cis/trans with t-BuOH (Table 4.2 and 4.3). This trend can be rationalized by comparing both the cis- and trans-protonation states (Figure 4.1). Although trans-reduction of enones is electronically favored for dissolving metal reductions, ${ }^{3,4}$ it is likely that the allylic strain present in trans-protonation state $\mathbf{4 . 8 8}$ actually switches inherent favorability to the cis-protonation state 4.89 (Figure 4.1A). An additional contribution is that the cis-face of the enone is sterically more available (Figure 4.1B). Bulky alcohols push an already cis-selective reduction further to 4.91 because of a steric preference to approach from the more open enone face.

Table 4.2 Impact of alcohol additive on stereochemistry.

${ }^{\text {a }}$ ratios obtained by crude ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ MeOH quench

Table 4.3 Correcting the stereochemical outcome described in Table 4.1.

a ratios obtained by crude ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2 . \mathrm{DMP}, \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$
Because of the correction in stereochemical assignment (Scheme 4.3.4), the reduction attempts on 4.49, initially presented in Table 4.1, also require correcting (Table 4.3). Curiously, Mg in methanol provided the best trans-selectivity via a single electron reduction pathway providing an almost 1:1 cis/trans ratio. Hydrogenation catalysts afford the trans-isomer as the major product. These hydrogenation conditions were not pursued further towards DICA because of the relatively low selectivity in both enone reduction and subsequent ketone reduction and requirement for an additional aromatic reduction. The ideal of reducing an aromatic substrate in
a single step was still a main objective.

Figure 4.1 Rationalizing the phenanthrenone reduction stereochemistry.

## A. Electronic preference for stereochemical control


4.88: 1,3-allylic strain
4.89: reduced allylic strain
B. Selectivity in proton approach based on sterics


Although it was discouraging that changing alcohol additives in these Birch reductions did not afford the trans isomer as the major product, this screen holds interesting insight in a broader sense. The literature on dissolving metal reductions of enones suggest each substrate has an innate selectivity that is solely dependent on its structure and not reaction conditions. ${ }^{3}$ The experiments just presented fully contradict these claims. ${ }^{30}$ Further collaborative investigation using experimental and computational methods could elucidate this curious trend in stereoselectivity, and perhaps lead to greater selectivity in one direction or another. Obvious evaluation of reaction conditions such as metal, temperature, cosolvents and additives were not performed, but are expected, as already shown with Mg in methanol, to have significant impact on diastereoselectivity. Overall, this inquiry would be interesting from a fundamental reactivity standpoint and expand on 50 years of dissolving metal trans-reduction dogma.

### 4.5 Conclusions

A rationally derived phenanthrenone Birch reduction was conceived to address problems of the all-trans stereochemistry required for a synthetic preparation of DICA. With the literature split on the outcome of such a reduction, an independent evaluation was important not only as a direct entry into perhydrophenanthrene systems, but also as a contribution to clear up ambiguity in the literature. An initial trans stereochemical assignment inspired continued efforts in this area. After a successful evolution in approaches addressing the lack of aromatic reduction, the major observed product was found to have a cis-ring fusion! Stereochemical assignment obtained by hydrogenation was found to support a cis-ring fusion, thereby correcting the previously assigned trans stereochemistry and indicating which literature precedent is correct in their assignment. In attempts to switch the stereochemical reduction to trans, a positive correlation between alcohol size and improved cis-selectivity were observed. The phenanthrenone reduction approach could still be continued using a mostly trans-selective hydrogenation, but was replaced by a better approach to DICA (see Chapter 5).

### 4.6 Experimental Procedures

## Purifications -

Solvents: Dry tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$, dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, toluene, benzene $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$ and methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$ were obtained by passing commercially available formulations through activated alumina columns. tert-Butyl alcohol ( $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$ ) was purified by distillation over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Amines: Diisopropylamine (i- $\left.\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NH}\right)$, triethylamine $\left(\mathrm{NEt}_{3}\right)$, $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$ '-dimethylpropylene urea (DMPU), propylamine ( $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}$ ), $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$ ', N '-tetramethylethylene-1,2-diamine (TMEDA) and hexamethylphosphoramide (HMPA) were purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$. Ethylenediamine (EDA) was purified by distillation from sodium metal.

Chlorides: Acetyl chloride (AcCl) was purified by distillation from phosphorus pentachloride.

Metals: Copper(I) cyanide (CuCN) was purified by refluxing in degassed water, filtering, washing with ethanol, diethyl ether and drying under high vacuum. Copper(I) iodide (CuI) was purified by Soxlet extractor with THF then drying the solid under high vacuum.

Miscellaneous: Methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) and ( $\pm$ )-propylene oxide were purified by distillation.

Titrations - Alkyllithium reagents were titrated using 2,6-di-(tert-butyl)-4-methylphenol (BHT) as the sacrificial proton source and fluorene as an indicator in THF or using diphenylacetic acid in THF. Grignard reagents were titrated using salicylaldehyde phenylhydrazone in THF. ${ }^{31}$

Reaction Setup - All reactions were carried out under an argon atmosphere with dry solvents under anhydrous conditions, unless otherwise noted. Argon balloons were the sole inert atmosphere used. Reactions run at an ambient temperature of $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are designated as room temperature. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated.

Analysis - Thin layer chromatography was performed on 0.25 mm EMD glass-backed TLC plates impregnated with a fluorescent dye and visualized with UV light and $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} / \mathrm{NaOH} /$ water or $p$-anisaldehyde in ethanol/aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ and heat as a developing agent. Forced flow (flash) chromatography was performed on EMD Silica 60, mesh 0.04-0.063 silica gel. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz instrument, obtained at 298 K unless otherwise noted and calibrated to residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm with the following abbreviations to explain multiplicities: $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{q}=$ quartet, quin $=$ quintuplet, sext $=$ setet, sep $=$ septet, $\mathrm{bs}=$ broad signal, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. All coupling constants are apparent $J$ values measured at the indicated field strengths. FT-IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer spectrum RX1 spectrometer. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a H2Os LCT Premier spectrometer using ESI-TOF (electrospray ionization-time of flight). Melting points were measured on a MEL-TEMP II capillary apparatus and stand uncorrected.

Carboxylic Acid 4.24 [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{32}$


A 500 mL 3-neck round bottom flask, fitted with an overhead stirrer, a septum and a pressure release tube submerged in an aqueous NaOH trap, was charged with $75 \mathrm{~mL}(0.690 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.23$, $10.2 \mathrm{~g}(0.102 \mathrm{mmol})$ succinic anhydride and cooled in an ice bath. In one portion $27.0 \mathrm{~g}(0.202$ mmol) $\mathrm{AlCl}_{3}$ was added. The reaction was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours then the bath was removed. After 2 hours the contents were poured into 250 mL conc. HCl cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under overhead stirring. The pink solution was stirred at room temperature for 1 hour, filtered over a fritted funnel and the contents washed with 200 mL water and thrice with 100 mL water. The solid was azeotropically dried with toluene then crystallized from 300 mL toluene and recrystallized from 100 mL toluene to afford $13.4 \mathrm{~g}(62 \%)$ 4.24. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{33}$

Ester 4.25 [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{13}$


A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with 13.13 g ( 63.1 mmol ) $4.24,150 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeOH}$ and $5.0 \mathrm{~mL}(70.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ acetyl chloride. After stirring for 18 hours at room temperature, 80 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and 60 mL volatiles removed in vacuo. The solution was diluted with 80 mL water and extracted with $200 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic phase was washed with 50 mL water. All aqueous phases were combined and extracted with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic phase was washed
with 20 mL water and combined with the previous organic phase. This process was repeated a total of four times. The combined organic layer was washed with 25 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 1 L round bottom flask containing crude keto-ester, $33 \mathrm{~g}(81 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyltriphenylphosphonium iodide and 150 mL THF was cooled in an ice bath and fitted with an addition funnel. A solution of $8.5 \mathrm{~g}(76 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}$-BuOK in 60 mL THF was added dropwise over the course of 15 minutes, the addition funnel washed with 50 mL THF and the reaction stirred for 30 minutes at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then 30 minutes after removing the cold bath. After the addition of 100 mL water, 200 mL volatiles were removed and the solution extracted with $200 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, then thrice with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, washed with 30 mL third sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, 25 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude solid was triturated with 50 mL portions of hexanes and filtered over celite for a total of $\sim 800 \mathrm{~mL}$ hexanes. All washings were combined and the volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatograph (8:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 7.39 g ( $53 \%$ over 2 steps $) 4.25$ as a yellow wax.

Tetralone 4.26 [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{13}$


A 500 mL round bottom flask was charged with $7.39 \mathrm{~g}(33.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{4 . 2 5}, 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc, 1.04 g $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ and stirred under a hydrogen balloon. After 15 hours, 5 g Celite was added and the contents filtered over a celite plug with the assistance of fresh EtOAc. All volatiles were removed in vacuo. A 500 mL round bottom flask containing crude ester was stirred with 100 mL

THF/MeOH/water $(2: 1: 1)$ and $2.58 \mathrm{~g}(61.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1 hour the reaction was quenched with 40 mL 3 M HCl , and extracted with 100 mL , then thrice with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Polyphosphoric acid ( $70 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and $60 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}, 100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 9 \mathrm{~h}$ ) was added to crude acid and heated at $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours in a 500 mL round bottom flask. The reaction was partially cooled and 300 g ice added slowly. The solution was extracted 8 times with 50 mL portions $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined and washed with 100 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The black residue was purified by column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 9: 1$ hexanes $/ E t O A c$ ) to afford $4.62 \mathrm{~g}(70 \%$ over 3 steps) 4.26 as a yellow oil. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{13}$

Phenanthrenone 4.29


A 25 mL round bottom flask containing $201 \mathrm{mg}(1.06 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.26$ and $0.15 \mathrm{~mL}(1.86 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate in 5 mL THF was cooled in an ice bath and treated with $1.3 \mathrm{~mL}(1.3 \mathrm{mmol}) 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{t}$ $\mathrm{BuOK} / \mathrm{THF}$. The ice bath was removed upon complete addition and stirring continued for 1 hour. The reaction was treated with 2 mL 6 M HCl and 8 mL water, then extracted 3 times with 5 mL $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL half sat. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude mixture in a 10 mL round bottom flask was stirred with $0.30 \mathrm{~mL}(3.60 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$ and $7 \mathrm{mg}(0.18 \mathrm{mmol})$ powdered NaOH (exotherm). After 20 minutes the reaction was diluted with 5 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted twice
with $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 25 mL round bottom flask containing the crude material in 4 mL THF was treated with $210 \mathrm{mg}(5.25 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaOH}$ in 4 mL water at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was immediately removed and stirring continued for 36 hours. The reaction was quenched with 10 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted twice with $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles were removed. The residue was purified by column chromatography ( $5: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $195 \mathrm{mg}(74 \%$ over 3 steps, $1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.29$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.25(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ 8.7, $2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.61(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.09(\mathrm{qt}$, $J=7.2,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 2.97 (dquintet, $J=12.0,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92-2.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.62-2.54 (m, 2H), 2.53-2.42(m, 2H), 2.23-2.12 (m, 3H), $2.04(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.9,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-$ $1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 200.4,200.3,159.1,158.3,158.0,157.9,137.4,137.0,132.1$, $131.3,130.5,128.1,120.6,120.3,118.5,118.2,108.7,108.3,55.3$ (2 C), 40.2, 37.5, 37.2, 36.9, $36.8,32.4,32.1,31.0,30.4,30.1,22.7,21.1$; IR (thin film) $2927,2856,1660,1611,1589,1493$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 265.1205$ found 265.1210 .

## Birch Reduction to 4.30



A 25 mL round bottom flask was charged with 8 mL ammonia, $34 \mathrm{mg}(0.14 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.29 \mathrm{in} 1.4$ mL THF and $0.25 \mathrm{~mL}(6.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MeOH}$. Slow, portionwise addition of $43 \mathrm{mg}(6.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was conducted at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete addition of metal, $450 \mathrm{mg}(8.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added, the ammonia evaporated, water and EtOAc added. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford $\mathbf{4 . 3 0}$ as a mixture of diastereomers (2:2:1:1 dr).

## Mesylate 4.41



A 100 mL round bottom flask containing $720 \mathrm{mg}(29.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal was flamedried, layered with 5 mL THF (rigorously degassed solvent was used during this procedure), treated with a couple drops of dibromoethane and heated to $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of $5.00 \mathrm{~g}(24.9$ mmol) 4-bromo-2-methylanisole in 25 mL THF was added dropwise as to maintain a gentle reflux. After complete addition the reaction was stirred at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ another hour then cooled to -30 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the addition of $70 \mathrm{mg}(0.80 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuCN}$ and $2.0 \mathrm{~mL}(28.6 \mathrm{mmol})(\mathrm{rac})$-propylene oxide the reaction was stirred for 1 hour with gradual warming to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then stirred an additional half hour at room temperature. The reaction was quenched with 100 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and
extracted with 100 mL EtOAc. The aqueous layer was separated and back extracted with 20 mL EtOAc. Both organic layers were combined, washed with 50 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ third sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was used for the next without purification. To a 250 mL round bottom flask containing crude alcohol, was added $80 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $15 \mathrm{~mL}(108 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$. After the dropwise addition of 3.0 mL ( 38.8 mmol ) methanesulfonyl chloride at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours. To the stirring mixture was added 150 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and vigorous stirring continued without external cooling for 20 minutes. Layers were separated and the aqueous layer washed with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 40 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) then recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ pentane to afford 5.24 g ( $81 \%$ over 2 steps) 4.41 as white crystals $\left(\mathrm{mp}=60-62{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm) $\delta 7.03-6.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{ttd}, J=6.6,6.4,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.1,8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.0,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54-2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-$ $2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 156.8,131.8$, 128.3, 127.7, 126.8, 109.9, 81.8, 55.3, 42.1, 37.8, 21.4, 16.2; IR (thin film) 2935, 2836, 1612, 1505, 1346, 1253, $1172 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 281.0833$ found 281.0823.

## Tetralone 4.43



A 100 mL round bottom flask containing 24 mL DME and $0.970 \mathrm{~g}(24.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaH} 60 \%$ in mineral oil was cooled in an ice bath and 2.7 mL ( 23.6 mmol ) dimethylmalonate added dropwise. After the reaction was warmed to room temperature $3.00 \mathrm{~g}(11.6 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.41$ was added in one portion, the flask fitted with a good reflux condenser and the reaction placed in a $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 20 hours, the reaction was cooled, the volatiles stripped in vacuo and the solid mass dissolved in 60 mL two-thirds sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 60 mL EtOAc. The aqueous layer was washed with an additional 20 mL EtOAc. The combined organic phases were washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was taken forward. The crude diester was placed into a 250 mL round bottom flask, diluted with 60 mL 1:1:1 $\mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{MeOH} /$ water and treated with $4.64 \mathrm{~g}(116 \mathrm{mmol})$ powdered NaOH . The flask was placed into a $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 1.5 hours, the reaction was cooled, the volatiles stripped in vacuo and crude material taken up in 120 mL water. The aqueous solution was washed with two portions of $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, then 40 mL conc. HCl added and the aqueous phase extracted twice with $60 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The solid was subjected to the next reaction crude. Crude diacid in a 100 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in 35 mL diglyme and placed in a $170^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath for 1 hour. The reaction was cooled and all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The obtained oil was treated to the next reaction crude. Crude acid in a 100 mL round bottom flask was treated with 38 g polyphosphoric acid (prepared from $25 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ and $15 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ ) and
heated at $90{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 hours. External heating was removed and the reaction treated slowly with 150 g ice, then 20 mL 5 M NaOH and the resulting aqueous solution extracted with two portions of $60 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were collected, washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude solid was dissolved in 20 mL hexanes, filtered over Celite, concentrated to approximately half volume and crystallized in a freezer overnight. The solvent was removed via cannula, the crystals washed twice with 2 mL portions of hexanes then the remaining solvent removed in vacuo to afford $1.44 \mathrm{~g}(60 \%$ over 4 steps) 4.43 as a white solid $\left(\mathrm{mp}=68-69^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.44(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.9,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.1,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.59(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.9,10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.26-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 198.5,156.6,136.4,133.9,130.9,130.9,106.6,55.5$, $46.9,37.2,30.9,21.4,16.6$; IR (thin film) $2951,1678,1510,1496,1302,1210 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 205.1228$ found 205.1221.

1-Benzyloxy-4-pentene [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{34}$


A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with 70 mL THF and $5.2 \mathrm{~mL}(50.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ 4-penten1 -ol and treated portionwise with $2.1 \mathrm{~g}(52.5 \mathrm{mmol}) 60 \% \mathrm{NaH}$ in mineral oil at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was warmed to room temperature and 6.4 mL ( 55.6 mmol ) benzyl chloride and 185 mg $(0.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ tetrabutylammonium iodide were added. The reaction was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an oil bath for 18 hours. After cooling to room temperature, 50 mL 1 M HCl were added, most volatiles removed in vacuo and the contents partitioned with $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The aqueous phase was
removed and back extracted with $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Both organic layers were combined, washed twice with 25 mL water, 25 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a liquid that was distilled ( $75-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 0.5 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ) to afford 7.10 g ( $80 \%$ ) 1-benzyloxy-4pentene as a colorless liquid. Spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{34}$

## 6-Benzyloxyhex-1-en-3-ol



A 50 mL round bottom flask containing 563 mg ( 3.19 mmol ) 1-benzyloxy-4-pentene in 20 mL $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was bubbled a stream of ozone until a blue color persisted. The contents were treated with $1.10 \mathrm{~g}(4.19 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ and the reaction warmed to room temperature. After all ozonide was quenched the reaction was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude aldehyde in a 100 mL round bottom flask was diluted with 15 mL THF, cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $4.5 \mathrm{~mL}(4.5 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ vinylmagnesium bromide/THF was added dropwise. After 15 minutes the cold bath was removed. After 8 hours of stirring 10 mL 3 M HCl and 25 mL EtOAc was added. The layers were separated and the organic layer washed twice with 10 mL 3 M HCl . The aqueous washings were collected, back extracted twice with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 5 mL water, 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $285 \mathrm{mg}(43 \%$ over 2 steps) 6-benzyloxyhex-1-en-3-ol as a colorless oil and 131 mg (23\% over 2 steps) 4-benzyloxy-1-butanol. ${ }^{35}$ The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{36}$

## 6-(Benzyloxy)hex-1-en-3-one 4.45



A 20 mL scintillation vial was charged with 270 mg ( 1.31 mmol ) 6-benzyloxyhex-1-en-3-ol, 5 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 1.2 \mathrm{~g}$ celite and $588 \mathrm{mg}(2.73 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$. After 2 hours the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and filtered over $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford $128 \mathrm{mg}(48 \%) 4.45$ as a colorless liquid. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{37}$

## Michael Adduct 4.46



A 1 dram vial containing $14 \mathrm{mg}(0.35 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaH}\left(60 \%\right.$ in mineral oil) in $0.7 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was cooled in an ice bath and treated sequentially with $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.62 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate, 30 mg $(0.145 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.43$ and 1 drop ethanol. Stirring was continued at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 minutes before the bath was removed. After an additional hour and 40 minutes 1 M NaOH was added and the solution extracted thrice with Et2O. The aqueous layer was back extracted with 1 M NaOH . The aqueous layer was acidified with 6 M HCl and extracted trice with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude vinylogous acid in a 1 dram vial was dissolved in $0.3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 0.2 mL ( 1.43 $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ at room temperature and treated with $45 \mathrm{mg}(0.22 \mathrm{mmol})$ enone. After 30 hours the reaction wash treated with 1 M HCl , extracted with EtOAc , dried over MgSO 4 and all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (5:1
hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 41 mg ( $65 \%$ over 2 steps, single diastereomer) 4.46 as a colorless oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 9.98(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{~s}$, 1H), $4.41(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.40(\mathrm{t}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.14(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.1,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{dd}$, $J=17.1,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.32-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.81 (quintet, $J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) \cdot ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 209.1,203.6,197.1,156.8,138.3,135.2,133.6,131.3,129.6,128.3,127.6,127.5,106.8,72.8$, 69.2, 62.4, 55.4, 39.4, 37.0, 35.3, 32.7, 24.7, 23.8, 16.7, 16.1.

## Phenanthrenone 4.49



A 50 mL round bottom flask containing $304 \mathrm{mg}(7.60 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ in mineral oil) in 15 mL $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was cooled in an ice bath and treated sequentially with $0.95 \mathrm{~mL}(11.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate, $602 \mathrm{mg}(2.95 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.43$ and $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.86 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethanol. Stirring was continued at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 minutes before the bath was removed. After an additional hour and 40 minutes 40 mL 0.25 M NaOH was added, the layers separated and the aqueous phase extracted twice with $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The aqueous layer was acidified with 10 mL 6 M HCl and extracted with 40 mL and 10 mL $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude vinylogous acid in a 100 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $3 \mathrm{~mL}\left(21.5 \mathrm{mmol}\right.$ ) $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ at room temperature and treated with 0.75 mL ( 9.00 mmol ) MVK. All volatiles were removed in vacuo after 13 hours at room temperature. The crude solid was dissolved in 8 mL THF, cooled ot $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated by the
dropwise addition of $980 \mathrm{mg}(17.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{KOH}$ in 8 mL water. After complete addition the cold bath was removed and the reaction stirred for 5 days. Volatiles were removed in vacuo and the remaining solution partitioned between 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 30 mL EtOAc and the layers separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The combined organic layers were washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was resubjected to the same conditions as described above for an additional 4 days. Work up consisted of the above procedure. Crystallization from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ /hexanes afford $501 \mathrm{mg}\left(66 \%\right.$, single diastereomer) $4.49\left(\mathrm{mp}=188-190^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ as an off-white crystalline solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.15(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.64(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.79(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.3,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.54(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ $200.3,158.8,156.4,132.4,131.2,130.9,129.5,119.8,105.1,55.3,43.3,38.3,37.2,35.3,27.0$, 19.5, 16.2; IR (thin film) 2949, 2913, 1654, $1205 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 257.1541$ found 257.1529 .

## Anisole 4.50



A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with excess lithium metal and ammomia at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.039 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.49$ and $58 \mathrm{mg}(0.78 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$ in 0.5 mL THF was added dropwise. After 30 min another portion of $58 \mathrm{mg}(0.78 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$ in 0.2 mL THF was addd. The reaction was quenched with solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, warmed to room temperature, diluted with water
and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed. The crude solid was puriifed by column chromatography ( $8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.0 \mathrm{mg}(80 \%, 8: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.50$ as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 6.87(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.50(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{td}, J=8.6,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.09(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.1,3.7$, $2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.86(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.3,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.47-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.19(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.86(\mathrm{ddq}, J=14.1,9.2,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) major $\delta 211.5,156.0,137.5,130.9,127.0,125.0,109.0,55.3,47.6,42.4,39.0,37.3,29.7$, 27.3, 26.3, 19.2, 15.8; IR (thin film) 2919, 2853, $1710 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 276.1964$ found 276.1967.

## Cyclohexadiene 4.62



To a 25 mL round bottom flask was added $20 \mathrm{mg}(0.080 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.49,0.38 \mathrm{~mL}(4.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}$ $\mathrm{BuOH}, 0.8 \mathrm{~mL}$ ethylenediamine, 0.8 mL THF and a vigorously stirring glass stir bar. At room temperature $25 \mathrm{mg}(3.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added over the course of 2 hours. After stirring overnight the mixture was diluted with 5 mL THF and cannula transferred into a stirring mixture of 10 mL water and $15 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The layers were separated and the aqueous solution extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford 4.62 (3:1 dr).

PCR 3.225-227 [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{27}$


A 50 mL 2 neck round bottom flask filled with $2.29 \mathrm{~g}(94.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal was flamedried under vacuum, allowed to cool, flushed with argon, fitted with a thermometer and an addition funnel, then layered with 9 mL THF. To the vigorously stirring mixture was added 0.05 mL 1,2-dibromoethane, then $3.2 \mathrm{~mL}(23.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ p-methoxybenzyl chloride in 6 mL THF was added from the addition funnel to maintain an internal temperature of $60-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete addition the solution was stirred for an additional 2 hours. A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with $3.62 \mathrm{~g}(19.0 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuI}, 80 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and $3.1 \mathrm{~mL}(21.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ TMEDA at room temperature and stirred until a homogeneous solution was obtained. The flask was fitted with an addition funnel and cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The freshly prepared Grignard reagent was loaded to the addition funnel and added dropwise. After stirring for 30 minutes at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ a new addition funnel was fitted and loaded with $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(15.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl trans-2-butenoate, $4.9 \mathrm{~mL}(38.6$ mmol) TMSCl and 20 mL THF. After dropwise addition of this mixture, the reaction was warmed to $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 18 hours stirring at $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was poured into 125 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl} / 75 \mathrm{~mL}$ sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}$ and partitioned with $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The layers were separated, the aqueous layer extracted with $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and all organic layers combined. The ethereal phase was washed twice with 50 mL water, 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was swirled with 40 mL hexanes, filtered and washed with thrice with 10 mL hexanes. The hexanes washes were concentrated and the crude material carried on to the next step. The crude ester was treated with 30 g PPA and heated at $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for
1.5 hour. The heating source was removed and 100 g ice water was added. The aqueous solution was extracted twice with 40 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, washed with 30 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, stirred vigorously with 6 g charcoal overnight, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by crystallization from hexanes to afford $1.47 \mathrm{~g}(51 \%) 4.65$ as small, off-white needles $\left(\mathrm{mp}=43-44{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{27}$

## Phenanthrenone 4.33



A 100 mL round bottom flask containing $750 \mathrm{mg}(18.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ in mineral oil) in 50 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was cooled in an ice bath. Sequentially, $2.4 \mathrm{~mL}(30 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl formate, $1.42 \mathrm{~g}(7.46$ mmol) 4.65 and $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(1.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethanol was added. Stirring was continued at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 minutes before the bath was removed. After 6 hours stirring, 30 mL water was added, the layers separated and the aqueous phase extracted twice with $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The ethereal layers were washed twice with 10 mL 1 M NaOH . The aqueous layers were combined, acidified with 10 mL 6 M HCl and extracted with 30 mL and $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude vinylogous acid in a 200 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 5.2 mL ( 37 $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ at room temperature and treated with $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(23 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$. All volatiles were removed in vacuo after 25 hours at room temperature. The crude solid was dissolved in 35 mL THF, cooled ot $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated by the dropwise addition of $2.1 \mathrm{~g}(37 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{KOH}$ in 35 mL
water. After complete addition the cold bath was removed and the reaction stirred for 2 days. All volatiles were removed in vacuo and the remaining solution partitioned between 20 mL sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 40 mL EtOAc and the layers separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The combined organic layers were washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Crystallization from EtOAc afforded 1.12 g (61\%) $4.33(\mathrm{mp}$ $=143-145{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) as an off-white crystalline solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.25$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.84(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.3,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.64-2.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-$ $2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) $\delta 200.3,158.3,158.1,132.5,132.1,130.2,120.8,118.2,108.3,55.4,43.3,38.4,37.2,35.2$, 27.0, 19.5; IR (thin film) 2946, 2907, 1655, $1498 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 243.1385$ found 243.1376 .

## Enone 4.67



A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with 50 mL ammonia, $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{THF}, 5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeOH}$ and 500 mg ( 2.06 mmol ) 4.33. Slow, portionwise addition of $470 \mathrm{mg}(68 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was conducted at $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete addition of metal, 1 g NH 44 Cl was added, the ammonia evaporated, 30 mL water and 50 mL EtOAc added. The organic layer was washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil in a 25 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in 15 mL MeOH , treated with 1.5 mL 6 M HCl . After 24 hours
th reaction was poured into 40 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 40 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purifed by column chromatography ( $1: 1 \rightarrow 1: 2$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 280 $\mathrm{mg}(58 \%, 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.67$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$)$ combined $\delta$ $5.83(\mathrm{~s}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 5.81(\mathrm{~s}, 0.3 \mathrm{H}), 3.71-3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.47(\mathrm{dt}, J=11.3,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16-1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.00(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 0.98-0.86 (m, 4H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 200.5,170.3,124.1$, $70.6,45.9,43.4,42.0,38.1,36.7,34.4,29.4,29.3,27.1,25.3,19.0, \operatorname{minor} \delta 200.3,168.6,121.0$, $70.5,48.9,45.2,43.4,38.0,37.4,36.8,35.5,34.9,29.3,28.4,19.2$; IR (thin film) 3405,2927 , 2859, 1665, $1451 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 235.1698$ found 235.1688.

## Silyl Ether 4.68



To a 25 mL round bottom flask was added $268 \mathrm{mg}(1.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.67,10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 150$ $\mathrm{mg}(2.20 \mathrm{mmol})$ imidazole, $9 \mathrm{mg}(0.07 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP and $220 \mathrm{mg}(1.46 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSCl}$ at room temperature. After 36 hours, 30 mL EtOAc was added and the solution washed with 20 mL water and 10 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The aqueous layers were combined and extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. Both organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by column (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $370 \mathrm{mg}(91 \%, 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.68$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) mixture $\delta 5.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{qt}, J=8.1,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59-2.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$,
2.16-1.82 (m, 4H), 1.72-1.53(m, 3H), 1.41-1.09(m, 3H), 1.05-0.74(m, 14H), 0.07(s, 6H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 200.5,170.6,124.0,71.5,46.1,43.5,42.1,38.7$, $36.8,34.5,30.0,29.4,27.1,25.9,25.6,25.5,18.9,4.65$, minor $\delta 200.3,168.8,121.1,71.3,48.9$, $45.3,43.5,38.1,37.7,36.8,35.6,35.4,29.4,28.5,25.9,19.2,18.2,4.6$; IR (thin film) 2930, 2856, 1676, 1618, 1253, $1089 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 349.2563$ found major diastereomer 349.2558, minor diastereomer 349.2574.

## Alkylated 4.69 and 4.70



LDA was prepared in a 25 mL round bottom flask by addition of $0.45 \mathrm{~mL}(1.2 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.7 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{n}$ $\mathrm{BuLi} /$ hexanes to $0.20 \mathrm{~mL}(1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ diisopropylamine in 4 mL THF at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the stirring LDA solution at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $346 \mathrm{mg}(0.99 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.68$ with the assistance of 2 mL THF. After 10 minutes, $0.22 \mathrm{~mL}(1.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ HMPA was added neat followed by $0.18 \mathrm{~mL}(2.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl iodide. The cold bath was removed after an additional 10 minutes and the reaction stirred for 1 hour before 10 mL half sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and 20 mL EtOAc was added. The organic layer was separated, washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by column chromatography ( $40: 1 \rightarrow 30: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $28 \mathrm{mg}(26 \%, 5: 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.69$ and $194 \mathrm{mg}(54 \%,>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 4.70$ as a colorless oil. 4.70: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.0,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.67-2.63$ (m, 1H), 2.43 (dt, $J=12.4,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.07-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.82$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$,
$3 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.92-0.88(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 203.7,169.3,122.1,71.5,46.2,43.2,42.7,39.1,37.9,35.7,31.2,30.1,27.6$, 25.9, 25.6, 19.0, 18.2, 16.1, 4.6; IR (thin film) 2929, 2856, 1675, 1622, 1460, 1255, $1090 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 363.2719$ found 363.2728.

## Ketal 4.71



A 10 mL round bottom flask containing $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethylene glycol and $8 \mathrm{mg}(0.04$ mmol) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in 5 mL benzene was refluxed under a Hickman still for 20 minutes. The solution was cooled, $100 \mathrm{mg}(0.413 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.33$ added and the reaction refluxed under a Hickman still. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with 10 mL EtOAc, washed with 3 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purfied by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 110 $\mathrm{mg}(93 \%) 4.71$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.70-6.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.08-4.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.1,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=16.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.44(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.80(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 158.2,138.3,136.3$, $128.5,125.8,123.4,110.5,108.5,107.7,64.4,55.2,35.7,34.7,32.7,31.2,28.0,16.9$; IR (thin film) 2953, 2883, 2830, 1605, 1574, 1493, 1210, $1039 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 287.1647$ found 287.1640.

## Ketone 4.72 and 4.73



To a 10 mL round bottom flask was added $31 \mathrm{mg}(0.11 \mathrm{mmol}) 4.71,1.2 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc, $5 \mathrm{mg} 10 \%$ $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was stirred under a hydrogen balloon for 20 hours at room temperature. Celite was added and th reaction was filtered over Celite, washing with EtOAc to afford ~95\% conversion to a 4:1 mixture of diastereomers. The crude mixture was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} 5: 1$ acetone/water then catalytic $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ added. After 4 days at room temperature 3 mL water and 2 mL sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and the solution extracted with 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude was purified by column chromatography ( $8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 6 mg 4.73 as an impure oil and $16 \mathrm{mg}(62 \%) 4.72$ as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to provide white fluffy needles $\left(\mathrm{mp}=140-142{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The minor diastereomer 1 H NMR spectrum significantly matched that of 4.50. 4.72: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=14.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.77-2.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{t}, J=14.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.34(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.6,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.27$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{t}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.0,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 210.9,158.0,136.9,130.0,128.1$, $112.3,112.1,55.3,44.6,42.4,40.5,40.2,33.4,32.3,20.2,19.7$; IR (thin film) 2952, 1701, 1495, 1239, $1040 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 267.1361$ found 267.1357.
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## CHAPTER 5:

## A FORMAL SYNTHESIS OF (+)-7,20-DIISOCYANOADOCIANE

### 5.1 Introduction

A synthesis of 7,20-diisocyanoadociane (5.5, DICA) via reduction of an unsaturated polycyclic intermediate was considered highly attractive both because unsaturated molecules can be rapidly constructed and can provide multiple options in controlling stereochemistry. Previously, Birch reduction of a phenanthrenone substrate successfully generated a tricyclic scaffold relevant to DICA in short order, but failed due to an undesired stereochemical outcome (see Chapter 4). Described here is a revised approach that successfully secured an enantiospecific formal synthesis of (+)-DICA and could serve as a platform to access more 7isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectanes.

### 5.2 A New Design to Control the All-trans Stereochemistry

Initial studies concerning the reduction of phenanthrenones towards DICA showed an undesirable tendency for cis-reduction (Scheme 5.1). Attempts at switching selectivity to the trans-ring fusion using hydrogenation were modestly promising, but a synthetic redesign to substantially improve stereocontrol was preferred. The minor diastereomer obtained by phenanthrenone reduction, $\mathbf{5 . 2}$, was still a desirable target and considered a key intermediate. If a synthesis of $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ could be secured in an elegant manner, then a single ring closure to Corey's dione 5.4 would be the only operation remaining. ${ }^{1}$ Rapidly generating phenanthrenone 5.1 highlights the advantage aromatic starting materials may have in synthetic design; ${ }^{2,3}$ therefore the enone of $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ was still retrosynthetically traced back to an anisole, such as 5.6. Based on previous
experience, the challenge of setting the trans-ring fusion was to be tackled directly by a robust and stereochemically assured method. A cuprate conjugate addition would be suited to the task.

Scheme 5.1 A previous attempt and a revision in using a Birch reduction approach to DICA.


5.5: DICA


### 5.3 The C8-C9 Ring Closing Strategy

### 5.3.1 Successes in Generating trans-Ring Fusions

A Robinson annulation to generate 5.7 was devised, surmising that application of a chiral organocatalyst to the Michael addition step would render the route highly enantioselective. ${ }^{4-6}$ The synthesis began with a Claisen rearrangement of crotyl alcohol (5.9) by intermediacy of the vinyl enol ether (Scheme 5.2). Palladium-mediated conditions were originally used, but suffered from incomplete conversion and difficulty in purification. ${ }^{7}$ Diethyltrimethylsilylamine facilitated
a Michael addition to methyl vinyl ketone to provide the adduct in excellent yield; however, aldol ring closure under literature ${ }^{8}$ conditions, previously successful in a slightly different context (see Chapter 2), afforded 5.7 in low yield. Although this three-step sequence of generating 5.7 was sufficient for the exploratory stage, optimization quickly became a priority. Returning to classic $\mathrm{Hg}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Claisen rearrangement afforded $\mathbf{5 . 1 0}$ in a reliable and scalable manner. ${ }^{9}$ No change was made to the Michael addition; however, a screen of various reactions was performed to improve the aldol condensation. The most effective conditions were TsOH in acetonitrile, meaning that TsOH could simply be added upon complete Michael addition to afford 5.7. This three-step/two-pot process prepared enough $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ to fuel studies.

Scheme 5.2 A Robinson annulation entry towards dihydronaphthalene studies of DICA.

## A. Initial access to cyclohexenone ( $\pm$ )-5.7


B. Optimized procedure to cyclohexenone ( $\pm$ )-5.7


The dihydronaphthalene Birch reduction idea was continued via cuprate addition to $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ (Scheme 5.3). Initial stoichiometric cuprate conditions with CuI afforded 5.11 in $\sim 50 \%$ yield with tedious workup. Employing catalytic quantities of the soluble Reetz $\mathrm{CuI} \cdot 2 \mathrm{LiCl}$ not only improved the yield, but also the ease of reaction setup and workup. ${ }^{10}$ Ozonolysis and FriedelCrafts cyclodehydration afforded dihydronaphthalene 5.13. Treating $\mathbf{5 . 1 3}$ with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and
excess methanol followed by aqueous HCl furnished $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ without issue as a single diastereomer on the first attempt. The synthesis of a scaffold bearing four desired stereocenters reminiscent of DICA in an all trans-arrangement was finally successful.

Scheme 5.3 Efficient preparation of $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ by dihydrophthalene reduction.




Tricycle 5.2 needs to be stitched together with an appropriate two-carbon unit to intercept Corey's dione (Scheme 5.4). The first step requires introducing a proton at the beta carbon of enone 5.2 in an axial orientation by well precedented $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ reduction. ${ }^{11,12}$ The herebygenerated enolate could then be alkylated with a 1,2-difunctionalized ethane to provide 5.14. The last $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond could then be formed by enolate alkylation to generate Corey's dione 5.4.

Scheme 5.4 Proposed path forward to Corey's dione.


Scheme 5.5 Early developments installing the two-carbon bridge.

B. Proposed conformational flexibility in 5.17


As a first pass, the free C 7 alcohol ${ }^{13}$ of $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ was not protected and submitted directly to $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ (Scheme 5.5A). Upon reduction, the enolate was allylated to afford the three products 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18. The des-allyl 5.16 was isolated as a single diastereomer, indicating that the $\beta$-position had exclusively protonated axially. The desired compound $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ was purified as a $3: 1$ mixture of diastereomers at the allyl position. The diastereoselectivity could not be improved in the desired direction by epimerization, because the thermodynamic preference of the allyl is not the expected equatorial orientation, but is axial instead. Syn-pentane interactions in the chair conformation are believed to cause this discrepency (Scheme 5.5B). The bis-allylated $\mathbf{5 . 1 8}$ was also separated and arose from allylation of the enolate of 5.17, which was generated by deprotonation with lithium amide. Next, the alkene of $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ needed to be dehomologated and converted into a leaving group. Disappointingly, cleavage by ozonolysis or $\mathrm{OsO}_{4}$ led to heavy
mixtures of compounds that were unable to be carried forward, even in crude form through the aldol condensation.

### 5.3.2 Considering a $\operatorname{Sc}(O T f)_{3}$-Mediated Isonitrile Installation to 7,20-Diisocyanoadociane

Concurrent with the success in generating all-trans ring fusions (Scheme 5.5), the endgame isonitrile installation began to be considered. At the outset of this project, a path through Corey's dione was sought; however, during the course of these studies, Shenvi ${ }^{14,15}$ disclosed an invertive displacement of tertiary trifluoroacetates with TMSCN using $\operatorname{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ as an elegant and selective advancement to the originally used $\mathrm{TiCl}_{4}{ }^{1,16}$ (Scheme 5.6 A ). This methodology was applied to the synthesis of 7-isocyano-11(20),14-epiamphilectadiene by Shenvi, ${ }^{15}$ and its implementation to DICA quickly became a goal. The selective synthesis of 5.26, bearing both an axial and an equatorial alcohol is required for this approach (Scheme 5.6B). This challenge could be addressed either by derivatizing Corey's dione $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ to $\mathbf{5 . 2 6}$, or by controlling the axial or equatorial configuration of the tertiary alcohols independently.

For the current approach, intermediate $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ would be appropriate to begin derivatization to diol 5.26 as the C7 and C20 positions are already differentiated (Scheme 5.7). After a screen of MAD, ${ }^{17} \mathrm{AlMe}_{3},{ }^{18}$ organomanganese reagents, ${ }^{19}$ methylmagnesium halide and methyllithium, a clean methyl addition to $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ to afford $\mathbf{5 . 2 7}$ was found with methylmagnesium chloride $/ \mathrm{CeCl}_{3}$ complex. The unusual axial selectivity presumably arose from the equilibrium between $\mathbf{5 . 1 7} \mathbf{a}$ and 5.17b favoring the boat conformation and thereby presenting only a "convex" face for nucleophile addition (Scheme 5.5B).

Scheme 5.6 Use of an invertive isonitrile synthesis towards DICA.

## A. Shenvi's $\mathrm{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ mediated isonitrile installation


B. Requirements for an invertive isonitrile installation


Although this nucleophilic methyl addition conveniently generates the desired C20 tertiary alcohol, the C17 methyl group in $\mathbf{5 . 2 7}$ is absent and still needs to be installed. Overall, correctly placing this equatorial methyl group is complicated (Scheme 5.7). Alkylation of $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ could install the methyl group; however, it would be introduced axial. While equilibrating conditions would reasonably epimerize the methyl group to the equatorial orientation, these same conditions would also epimerize the allyl group axial to form 5.30 (Scheme 5.7B). The stereochemical arrangement of $\mathbf{5 . 3 0}$ precludes methyl addition to the ketone, as there is no manner of correcting the allyl moiety. A proposed solution to this problem could be the incorporation of the C17 methyl group earlier. Although at equilibrium the methyl enone is predicted to arrive at $\sim 2: 1 \mathrm{dr}$, the mixture could be advanced through the reductive allylation and methyl addition to generate the stereotriad of 5.35 (Scheme 5.7C). Even though the reduction of 1,2,4,5-tetrasubstituted anisoles was previously problematic (Chapter 4), this idea was still pursued.

Scheme 5.7 Exploring options for a selective diol synthesis.
A. Selective methyl addition to set C20 alcohol

B. Stereochemical complications between kinetic ad thermodynamic control

C. Proposed solution to the methyl/allyl stereochemical problem


Cuprate addition into enone 5.7 using Cahiez organomanganate ${ }^{19}$ conditions afforded cleaner conversion to $\mathbf{5 . 3 6}$ than previously under Reetz ${ }^{10}$ conditions and was advantageous in carrying 5.36 forward without purification (Scheme 5.8). Ozonolysis and quench by zinc reduction also facilitated in moving the aldehyde through the Friedel-Crafts cyclodehydration in crude form. Dihydronaphthalene $\mathbf{5 . 3 2}$ was thus generated in $67 \%$ yield over three steps with a single purification, an advantage over the three purifications previously required. At this point, dissolving metal reduction using $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and methanol once again failed to reduce the aromatic moiety as had been previously observed with the cis-diastereomer of $\mathbf{5 . 3 2}$ (see Chapter 4). The ethylene diamine conditions ${ }^{20}$ adapted in Chapter 4 performed just as expected and reduced the dihydronaphthalene successfully, but not the ketone of 5.32. Depending on the workup
conditions, either the cyclohexadiene $\mathbf{5 . 3 8}$ (using aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ ) or the skipped enone $\mathbf{5 . 3 9}$ (using aqueous HCl ) could be isolated, although both in relatively low yields. A short screen of acidic and basic conditions did not effectively provide the desired conjugated enone and therefore attention was turned to methyl group installation by enone alkylation.

Scheme 5.8 Efforts to install the C17 methyl group from the aromatic Grignard reagent.


The alcohol of 5.2 was protected and the methyl group was installed by action of LDA and methyl iodide (Scheme 5.9). At this point, no effort was made in addressing the strategy of targeting diol 5.26 for the $\mathrm{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ mediated TMSCN displacement methodology (Scheme 5.7C); instead, the C20 ketone was maintained for another charge to Corey's dione 5.4. Enone reduction with carefully measured equivalents of Li followed by allylation afforded $\mathbf{5 . 4 3}$ with excellent diastereocontrol.

Scheme 5.9 C17 Methyl installation by alkylation and subsequent ring closure strategies.


Tricycle 5.43 became the platform for numerous ring closure attempts. Epoxidation with mCPBA, DMDO or trifluoroperoxyacetic acid led only to multiple unidentifiable products. Under standard ketal protection conditions (TsOH in refluxing benzene), $\mathbf{5 . 4 3}$ was recovered unchanged, while toluene at reflux afforded several unidentified compounds. Similarly to the previous attempts on $\mathbf{5 . 2 0}$, ozonolysis or dihydroxylation and diol cleavage of $\mathbf{5 . 4 3}$ also formed multiple unidentified products.

A reaction that functioned surprisingly well in this context was radical alkene nitration. Several conditions ${ }^{21-24}$ were tried but the most successful procedure ${ }^{25}$ involved heating a sealed vial without rigorous exclusion of air or moisture, containing substrate, excess $\mathrm{AgNO}_{2}$, excess TEMPO, molecular sieves and DCE at $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 hours. At this point deprotection of the tert-
butyldimethylsilyl group failed using TBAF, aqueous HCl , TsOH or HF . The sensitive nitroalkene most likely complicated this operation. Luckily, in situ generated trimethylsilyl chlorochromate ${ }^{26}$ was successful in direct deprotection and oxidation to 5.47. Only one conjugate addition was attempted with the small quantities of material obtained. Addition of pyrrolidine to 5.48 in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ led to almost immediate disappearance of the alkene resonances by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR to afford a single diastereomer of an enamine-containing compound of unknown structure. Although this result was likely a first success in forging the tetracyclic scaffold of DICA, at this point a broader analysis of the ICT family ${ }^{27}$ was performed and a slightly modified, more global approach was given attention.

### 5.4 A Global Approach to 7,20-Diisocyanoadociane and Other (Iso)Cycloamphilectanes

### 5.4.1 The Evolution to a C10-C11 Ring Closing Strategy

The close structural similarity in ICT natural products provides an opportunity not just to synthesize a single member, but instead to develop a more general approach. A number of cycloamphilectanes and isocycloamphilectanes exhibit a conserved C7 region and a diversified C20 region (Scheme 5.10A). A general approach would rest on a common advanced intermediate, from which $\mathbf{5 . 5}, \mathbf{5 . 5 0} \mathbf{- 5 . 5 3}$ are accessed. The current $\mathrm{C} 8-\mathrm{C} 9$ ring closing approach to DICA requires a late stage manipulation of both the C 7 and C 20 regions to access (iso)cycloamphilectanes since a ketone at C 7 is essential for ring closure (Scheme 5.10B). Ideally, an advanced common intermediate should contain a conserved C7 isonitrile precursor and appropriate functionality to diversify the C20 region (Scheme 5.10C). A C7 axial tertiary alcohol would be ideal as an isonitrile precursor since $\mathrm{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ and TMSCN could readily install the equatorial isonitrile. ${ }^{14,15}$ A possible structure that meets these requirements is $\mathbf{5 . 5 6}$.

Scheme 5.10 Cycloamphilectane and isocycloamphilectanes with a conserved C7 and diverse C20 region.

## A. 7-isocyano-(iso)cycloamphilectanes



C. Proposed general approach to 7-isocyano-(iso)cycloamphilectanes


Using a tertiary alcohol at C7 has several advantages (Scheme 5.10C). First, this idea requires revising the ring closing location to the $\mathrm{C} 10-\mathrm{C} 11$ bond, suggesting the key dihydronaphthalene intermediate $\mathbf{5 . 5 6}$ could be obtained via a vicinal difunctionalization of 5.7. Also, the C 7 tertiary alcohol locks the all-trans stereotriad generated by vicinal difunctionalization and enables selective manipulation of the C 20 region to $\mathbf{5 . 5}, \mathbf{5 . 5 0}-\mathbf{5 . 5 3}$. A first proof-of-principle synthesis to determine the feasibility of this approach would be access to Corey's dione 5.4.
5.4.2 A Proof-of-Principle Preparation of a Perhydropyrene Relevant to 7,20Diisocyanoadociane

A unified approach to (iso)cycloamphilectane was initiated by examining the vicinal difunctionalization of 5.7 (Scheme 5.11). The enoxysilane generated upon cuprate addition could be retained with careful workup and purification using Florisil ${ }^{\circledR}$ silica gel column chromatography. Revealing the free enolate of $\mathbf{5 . 5 8}$ was accomplished with MeLi and alkylation with ethyl bromoacetate accessed 5.59 in $>20: 1$ selectivity for the all-trans stereotriad. Ozonolysis and acid-mediated cyclodehydration generated the required carbon skeleton of 5.61, but in $1.5: 1 \mathrm{dr}$. The acidic conditions caused epimerization of the C 8 position ${ }^{13}$ to avoid negative steric interaction between the aromatic and ester side chain. This epimerization issue was resolved by reducing $\mathbf{5 . 5 9}$ to diol $\mathbf{5 . 6 2}$. Ozonolysis of $\mathbf{5 . 6 2}$ led to a complex mixture of products that could be taken on in crude form to the Friedel-Crafts cyclodehydration. However, instead of obtaining the expected dihydronaphthalene bearing a diol, $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ was isolated; the diol had condensed to a THF ring. Trying to avoid this acid mediated cyclization, the primary alcohol of $\mathbf{5 . 6 2}$ was TBS protected. Mono-TBS ether $\mathbf{5 . 6 5}$ was taken through the sequence, but was also found to cyclize to THF 5.64. Although other protecting group schemes could be devised, the diol's propensity to cyclize indicated a path forward.

Scheme 5.11 Exploring the reactivity after a vicinal difunctionalization.


Capitalizing on the inherent reactivity of the molecule, the diol was intentionally condensed into a THF ring. This diol masking strategy enabled a smooth transformation through the Birch reduction phase (Scheme 5.12). Tosylation of the primary alcohol and intramolecular displacement generated the trans-perhydrobenzofuran 5.67. Ozonolysis of this compound provided the desired aldehyde $\mathbf{5 . 6 8}$, but contaminated with an unknown oxidation product. Retrospectively, this could be the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidized $\mathbf{5 . 6 9}$ (see Section 5.4 .3 for more details). Cyclodehydration of $\mathbf{5 . 6 8}$ in the usual way generated dihydronaphthalene $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ that was subjected to Birch reduction and isomerization to readily afford $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ in excellent diastereocontrol. X-ray crystallographic analysis confirmed the structure of $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$. With the general reactivity established, but seeking to avoid the tedious intermediacy of enoxysilane 5.58, the procedure was optimized
(Scheme 5.13).

Scheme 5.12 An initial procedure through a successful Birch reduction.



Conjugate addition of 3-methoxymagnesium bromide operated effectively without added TMSCl (Scheme 5.13A). The obtained enolate was alkylated with ethyl bromoacetate, but required 30 hours at room temperature for satisfactory conversion. Reduction of the crude reaction product with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ provided diol $\mathbf{5 . 6 2}$ in an improved 7:1 dr, most likely because of the residual HMPA. At this point two options exist for generating 5.70. The first involved enriching the major diastereomer over the course of multiple steps to eventually arrive at $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ as a single diastereomer (Scheme 5.13B). Since for this first foray of targeting Corey's dione $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ the C 7 alcohol ${ }^{13}$ epimer is inconsequential, both diastereomers can also be carried through to 5.70 (Scheme 5.13C).

Scheme 5.13 An optimized vicinal difunctionalization and subsequent synthetic elaboration.
A. A reliable vicinal difunctionalization and reduction

B. Procedure to obtain 5.70 as a single diastereomer


## C. Procedure carrying a mixture of inconsequential diastereomers through


5.62

1. TsCl , pyridine $\left(40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ 2. cat. $\mathrm{OsO}_{4}, \mathrm{NMO}$ aq. acetone
2. $\mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$, aq. THF 4. cat. TsOH toluene (reflux)

5.64: 80\% over 4 steps, 6: 1 dr
 from only 5 g 5.7

Scheme 5.14 Another unexpected stereochemical outcome from a dissolving metal reduction.
A. Classic dissolving metal reduction to set a trans-ring fusion from an enone

5.71
5.72
B. A surprising stereochemical outcome upon dissolving metal reduction


The next step of reducing enone $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ was expected to be accomplished with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$, as it is widely used to generate trans-decalin ring junctions (Scheme 5.14A). ${ }^{11,12,28}$ Surprisingly, treating $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ with $\mathrm{Li} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ afforded a $2: 1$ mixture of ketones, favoring the cis-ring junction $\mathbf{5 . 7 4}$ (Scheme 5.14B). Further exploring the reducing metal did not change the selectivity dramatically (Table 5.1, entries 1-2), while adding a bulky proton source simply improved cis-selectivity (entry 3). Selecting for the trans-ring fusion proved challenging in this case, most likely due to the syn-pentane interaction present in the key reduction intermediate (Figure 5.1). Homogeneous hydride reagents such as Karstedt's catalyst ${ }^{29}$ and $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuCu} / \mathrm{DIBAl}$ enhanced the cis-selectivity, even though the latter is exceptional in providing trans-selectivity in other decalin systems ${ }^{30}$ and the Hajos-Parrish ketone ${ }^{31}$ (entries 5-6). Fortunately, heterogeneous reducing agents provided mixtures significantly enriched in the trans product 5.73 (entries 7-9). A small screen of hydrogenation catalysts led to the discovery that reductions with $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}$ were highly transselective (15 : 1 dr ). High-pressure reductions with $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{Ru} / \mathrm{C}$ fared poorly, giving trace reaction or the allylic alcohol 5.75.

Since the trans-reduction of $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ using $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}$ provided high selectivity, only two more
transformations are required: (1) THF ring opening and alkylation and (2) installation of the C17 methyl group by alkylation (Scheme 5.15).

Table 5.1 Optimizing for a trans-reduction of enone 5.70.

a Yield of purified material after column chromatography ${ }^{\text {b }} 2$. PCC, Celite, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$

Figure 5.1 Comparison of protonation events to explain the preference for cis-reduction.


Scheme 5.15 Remaining requirements to complete Corey's dione.


The planned THF ring opening was to be facilitated by a Lewis acid/nucleophile combination. ${ }^{32-41}$ Only a couple conditions were screened, and were unsuccessful in opening the THF ring of $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ (Equation 5.1). Evaluating select conditions on 2-methyltetrahydrofuran (5.79) showed success only at concentrations of 1 Molar and on greater than 0.5 mmol scale (Equation 5.2). At the time, large quantities of $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ were not available and the material on hand was considered too precious to commit. A nucleophilic ring opening, a $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation and reductive ring opening advancement was pursued instead.


One of the first $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation reactions transforming $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ to lactone $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ was successful (Scheme 5.16). Stirring $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ in the presence of a slight excess of $\mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ in aqueous acetic acid (Fieser's reagent) afforded 5.81. ${ }^{42}$ The C20 ketone ${ }^{13}$ was protected and the lactone opened with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ to generate diol 5.82. At this point the secondary diol needed to be protected. A scheme involving double protection followed by deprotection of the primary alcohol was envisioned. Silylation of the primary alcohol followed by benzyl protection smoothly generated 5.83. It was discovered after continuing with the sequence that the TBS group migrated to the secondary
alcohol during benzyl protection. Deprotection of $\mathbf{5 . 8 3}$ with buffered acid and oxidation afforded a ketone and not an aldehyde carbonyl.

The successful sequence started with a trityl protection of $\mathbf{5 . 8 2}$, followed by benzyl protection. Then, acidic conditions deprotected both the trityl and ketal groups to afford 5.87. The fourth ring was cyclized by alcohol oxidation and then aldol condensation between the C20 ketone and C10 aldehyde to afford enone $\mathbf{5 . 8 9}$ in sub-milligram quantities. ${ }^{13}$ This marks the preparation of all four rings of DICA in the all-trans relationship by means of a dihydronaphthalene reduction route.

Scheme 5.16 A successful fourth ring closure.


### 5.4.3 Improving the THF C-H Oxidation to a Butyrolactone

The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation to lactone $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ was a low yielding reaction with $\mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ and required improvement. ${ }^{43}$ A standard method of THF to lactone oxidation is the use of $\mathrm{RuO}_{4}{ }^{4,45} \mathrm{~A}$ number of different conditions were tried, but unfortunately none was more effective than Fieser's reagent (Table 5.2). Although all reactions supposedly generate $\mathrm{RuO}_{4}$, each set of conditions provided a different product profile. In addition to lactone 5.81, competitive oxidation provided lactol 5.90 and three other oxidation products in variable quantities. A general trend showed that more polar organic reaction media favored formation of $\mathbf{5 . 9 0}$, while the less polar $\mathrm{CCl}_{4}$ generated parity between $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ and $\mathbf{5 . 9 0}$ without preference. Inexplicably, co-oxidant $\mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{IO}_{6}$ led to complete formation of lactone $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$; however, heavy side oxidation was problematic (entry 6). Overall, the choice of co-oxidant impacted not only product distribution but also side product formation. These results are a curious anomaly since all reagent combinations should form the same " $\mathrm{RuO}_{4}$ " and would be predicted to react identically.

Table 5.2 Screening $\mathrm{RuO}_{4}$ mediated THF C-H Oxidations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | overoxidation decomposition |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Conditions | SM ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5.81 | 5.90 | 5.81 |  | 5.90 | Unidentified Products A, B \& C |  |  |
| EtOAc, MeCN aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2}$ EDTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, oxone | 20\% | 15\% | 50\% | 1 |  | 3.3 |  |  | 15\% |
| 2 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ | 8\% | 21\% | 71\% | 1 |  | 3.4 |  |  | trace |
|  | $\mathrm{CCl}_{4}$, aq. MeCN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, oxone | 45\% | 13\% | 32\% | 1 |  | 2.5 |  |  | 10\% |
| 4 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ | 10\% | 33\% | 33\% | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 24\% |
| 5 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaOCl}$ |  | 33\% | 67\% | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | trace |
| 6 | $\mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ |  | 16\% |  | >20 |  | 1 | 26\% | 57\% |  |
| 7 | $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ <br> aq. acetone | 59\% | 7\% | 34\% | 1 |  | 4.9 |  |  |  |
| 8 | $\mathrm{Pb}(\mathrm{OAc})_{4}$, aq. AcOH | 46\% |  |  |  |  |  | 18\% | 36\% |  |

a Percentages were obtained by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR integration without internal standard

Early successes with Fieser's reagent guided the exploration of more Cr-based $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation conditions. ${ }^{46}$ Lactone $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ was frequently observed during these studies (Table 5.3), but disappointingly, these reactions were also contaminated with unidentified overoxidation products and general decomposition. From this compilation of oxidations three interesting results are of further note. Jones reagent $\left(\mathrm{CrO}_{3}\right.$ in aqueous sulfuric acid) was highly selective in providing only 5.81 without side oxidations. Unfortunately, the reaction was plagued by low conversions and low mass recovery. Only trace reactivity was observed in the absence of sulfuric acid. The Fuchs reagent (chromyl peroxide " $\mathrm{CrO}_{4}$ ") selectively and cleanly provided only lactol 5.91 with recovered starting material (Equation 5.3). ${ }^{47}$ No other oxidation products or decomposition was observed. Alternatively, concentrated Fieser's reagent dissolved in $\mathrm{MeNO}_{2}$ improved the yield of $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ to $38 \%$ (Equation 5.4). The increased yield is most likely to due to the ease with which $\mathrm{MeNO}_{2}$ is worked up rather than improvement in the course of the oxidation.

Table 5.3 A Cr-based screen for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation.



Table 5.4 Miscellaneous C-H oxidation attempts to install a lactone functionality.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Conditions | Results |  |
| 1 | $\mathrm{Pb}(\mathrm{OAc})_{4}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ (reflux) | NR |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4} / \mathrm{CuSO}_{4} \cdot 5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ w/ and w/out alumina $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, DCE, neat (up to reflux) | $\begin{gathered} 1: 2 \text { to } 1: 15.81 / 5.90 \\ O, D \end{gathered}$ | among others: Zhao, D.; Lee, D. G. Synthesis 1994, 910 |
| 3 | $\mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ | 5.81, O, D | Cohen, Z.; Keinan, E.; Mazur, Y.; Varkony, T. H. <br> J. Org. Chem. 1975, 40, 2141 |
| 4 | $\underset{\text { DME (reflux) }}{\mathrm{CoCl}_{2} \text { or } \mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{acac})_{3}, \mathrm{O}_{2}}$ | NR | Reetz, M. T.; Töllner, K. Tetrahedron Lett. 1995, 36, 9461 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}, \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuO}_{2} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{MeNO}_{2}$ | D | Zhao, Y.; Ang, J. Q. L.; Ng, A. W. T.; Yeung, Y.-Y. RSC Adv. 2013, 3, 19765 |
| 6 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ca}(\mathrm{OCl})_{2} \\ \mathrm{AcOH}, \mathrm{MeCNN} \end{gathered}$ | D | Nwaukwa, S. O. ; Keehn, P. M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1982, 23, 35 |
| 7 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{KBrO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4} \\ \text { aq. } \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \end{gathered}$ | NR | Metsger, L.; Bittner, S. Tetrahedron 2000, 56, 1905 |
| 8 | TFDO, aq. $\mathrm{MeCN}\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 5.90, D | Curci, R.; D'Accolti, L.; Fiorentino, M.; Fusco, C.; Adam, W.; González-Nuñez, M. E.; Mello, R. Tetrahedron Lett. 1992, 33, 4225 |

A variety of conditions that are not Ru or Cr-based are also known to provide THF oxidation (Table 5.4). A handful of these were screened in the context of 5.73. Strong oxidants like $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ once again competitively underwent $3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation to lactol 5.91 (Entry 2). In situ generated TFDO oxidized $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ to only $\mathbf{5 . 9 1}$, although not as cleanly as with $\mathrm{CrO}_{4}$ (Equation 5.3). After having spent effort evaluating a wide variety of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation reactions, $\mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ in acetic acid and $\mathrm{MeNO}_{2}$ could be considered as the currently optimal conditions.

### 5.4.4 Finishing the Synthesis of Corey's Dione

An improved preparation of $\mathbf{5 . 8 9}$ and completion of Corey's intermediate was pursued next (Scheme 5.17). The first improvement was the conversion of $\mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ to $\mathbf{5 . 8 7}$ without intermediate purification. The alcohol oxidation and acid-mediated aldol condensation afforded
enone $\mathbf{5 . 8 9}$ efficiently. The cross-conjugated dienolate derived from enone $\mathbf{5 . 8 9}$ was methylated with a moderate axial preference; after enone hydrogenation/benzyl ether hydrogenolysis and oxidation of the C 7 alcohol, base-mediated equilibration afforded Corey's dione 5.4. Access to this target, completed a formal synthesis of racemic DICA.

Corey's intermediate was prepared in a total of 24 steps and a longest linear sequence of 24 steps from commercially available crotyl alcohol and tri(ethyleneglycol) divinyl ether. Highlights of this synthesis include the telescoping of several steps and the high degree of stereocontrol. Corey's dione 5.4 was prepared using only two distillations and eight chromatographic purifications. Excellent relative stereochemical control at all eight centers of the perhydropyrene scaffold was obtained; all stereocenters were introduced with $>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}$, except C12 which was installed in $15: 1 \mathrm{dr}$. The $1.7 \%$ overall yield from commercial material is unoptimized. To date this report is the shortest and most selective synthesis of DICA. Introduction of the isonitriles has not been attempted, but was described by Corey. ${ }^{1}$ This synthesis affirms that the general design in Scheme 5.10 C is useful in preparing the isocycloamphilectane scaffold.

This proof-of-principle synthesis opens several directions for future effort. A top priority was rendering the synthesis enantioselective. Additionally, accessing Corey's dione currently does not selectively generate DICA since the isonitrile installation is not stereorcontrolled. A second-generation synthesis needs to address selective installation of these salient isonitriles. During the next charge, the redox and protecting group steps of the current iteration will need to be reworked. And lastly, the dihydronaphthalene Birch reduction design needs to be applied to other isocycloamphilectanes and cycloamphilectanes.

Scheme 5.17 End game to Corey's Dione.


### 5.5 An Asymmetric Formal Synthesis of (+)-7,20-Diisocyanoadociane

### 5.5.1 The Asymmetric Robinson Annulation Reaction

From the outset, the synthesis of DICA was intended to be asymmetric. The attractiveness of generating cyclohexenone $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ via Robinson annulation was that its preparation could be rapidly adapted asymmetric via chiral catalysis. ${ }^{4,8,48-51}$ Starting from racemic 5.10, an asymmetric conjugate addition using Gellman's catalyst ${ }^{4}$ would set the C 4 stereocenter (Scheme 5.18). The complicated part of the annulation is retaining the aldehyde stereocenter while enolizing the methyl ketone for aldol condensation. Several reports indicate that this is a surmountable challenge. ${ }^{6,8,48,49}$

Scheme 5.18 General approach to enantioenriched 5.7.


A goal for beginning this synthesis was the scalability and operational ease for at least the early steps. This was accomplished for the racemic synthesis of cyclohexenone $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ and consisted of two straightforward distillations. The prolinol catalyzed conjugate addition of aldehydes onto vinyl ketones requires significant quantities of catechol additives under the literature conditions. This additional reagent requires removal by column chromatography and was therefore avoided. With this intended divergence from literature conditions, the enantioselectivity of the conjugate addition needed evaluating (Table 5.5).

Table 5.5 Screening the asymmetric conjugate addition reaction.


| Entry | Solvent a | Conditions a | Yield <br> of $\mathbf{5 . 9 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | neat | RT | $7 \%$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | RT | $7 \%$ |
| 3 | MeOH | RT | $24 \%$ |
| 4 | neat | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $40 \%$ |
| 5 | MeOH | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $77 \%$ |


| dr <br> (d1 : d2) $^{\mathbf{b}}$ | Diastereomer 1 <br> (\%ee) $^{\mathbf{b}}$ | Diastereomer 2 <br> (\%ee) $^{\mathbf{b}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c | c | c |
| $52: 48$ | 81 | 84 |
| c | c | c |
| $51: 49$ | 88 | 89 |
| $49: 51$ | 81 | 80 |

a MeCN, toluene, EtOAc (RT) gave $<3 \%$ yield
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Analyzed by chiral HPLC
c Chiral HPLC analysis was inconclusive

Since removing the catechol significantly suppressed reactivity (Table 5.5, entry 1 ), a solvent and temperature screen was performed. A spectrum of solvents ranging from non-polar
(toluene), medium polarity $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{EtOAc}\right)$ to polar $(\mathrm{MeCN})$ and polar protic (methanol) was evaluated. Methanol provided the best reactivity, affording diol 5.94 in $77 \%$ yield over 2 steps after immediate $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ reduction (entry 5). Derivatization to the primary benzoylated product 5.95 and chiral HPLC analysis showed both diastereomers to have $\sim 80 \%$ ee. Although the enantiomeric excess was not ideal, a fluorinated version of prolinol catalyst $\mathbf{5 . 9 2}$ has been shown to catalyze conjugate additions to methyl vinyl ketone in $95 \%$ ee without catechol additive and could be used instead. ${ }^{51}$ At the time, this prolinol catalyst was simply not considered worth the effort to prepare.

With an enantioselective conjugate addition available, the next consideration became retention of the newly forged stereocenter during the intramolecular aldol addition. A number of conditions were tried (Table 5.6). Literature precedent of using catalytic LiOH in isopropanol ${ }^{8}$ or phase-transfer conditions of $\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NOH}$ in aqueous $\mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}^{49}$ afforded $<15 \%$ yields and mostly decomposition. Literature conditions of using DBU provided almost complete racemization (entries 1-2). ${ }^{48}$ The more basic and nucleophilic TBD slightly improved retention of stereochemistry, but still only provided maximum $46 \%$ ee (entries $4-8$ ). The McQuade catalyst was most successful since a good yield of 5.7 was obtained (entry 9), but a $66 \%$ ee and an enantiospecificity of $83 \%$ was still not satisfactory. The best conservation of stereochemical information was obtained with LDA, but the low yield precluded its further implementation (entry 10 ).

Although the asymmetric Robinson annulation did not render the synthesis highly enantioselective, this reaction still provided material that was moderately enantioenriched. A more effective asymmetric entry to DICA and thereby the general family of 7isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectane was still desired.

Table 5.6 Conditions to effect the aldol condensation of enantioenriched Michael adduct 5.93.

a Yields reflect material after silica-gel column chromatography
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Analyzed by chiral HPLC; es $=\left[\left(\% \mathrm{ee}_{5.7}\right) /\left(\% \mathrm{ee}_{5.95}\right)\right] \times 100$; dr $\sim 1: 1$ for all reactions
c 27\% Michael adduct isolated

### 5.5.2 A Perillaldehyde-Based Formal Synthesis

After attempts at improving a less than ideal asymmetric Robinson annulation, a new enantiocontrolled entry was required. Inspiration for a new starting point came from analysis of the synthesis in hand. While the preparation of dihydronaphthalene $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ requires an oxidative
cleavage of the alkene, this intermediate aldehyde could instead arise from a dehomologated alkene via oxidation. This insight identified the known cyclohexenone (-)-5.97, available in enantiopure form, ${ }^{52,53}$ as an attractive starting material. The inexpensive terpene $(-)-$ perillaldehyde's conversion to cyclohexenone (-)-5.97 on gram scale has been previously reported, ${ }^{53}$ however, purification by distillation was preferable to improve throughput (Scheme 5.19).

Scheme 5.19 An enantiospecific formal synthesis of (+)-DICA from (-)-perillaldehyde.


In an unoptimized sequence, conjugate addition and alkylation selectively installed the three stereogenic centers with desired diastereoselectivity as seen in $(+)-\mathbf{5 . 9 9}$, in a similar manner previously shown to make 5.62. Condensation of diol (+)-5.99 via the tosylate furnished transfused THF (+)-5.100. Alkene epoxidation was followed by heating at reflux with acid, which presumably triggered epoxide rearrangement to the aldehyde followed by in situ cyclodehydration to dihydronaphthalene (-)-5.64. This sequence intersects the racemic synthesis of DICA described earlier (Section 5.4), permitting access to all later intermediates in enantiopure form. Because of the desire to improve several aspects of the overall synthesis, the
formal synthesis of DICA using this optically active material was not revisited, though it is clear that this chiral pool approach is suitable for doing so with respect both to control of absolute configuration and material throughput concerns. In its current form, this route is still 24 steps in longest linear sequence and total steps from perillaldehyde with only 10 purifications in an unoptimized form.

### 5.6 Outlook Towards the Synthesis of 7-Isocyano-(Iso)Cycloamphilectanes

Having accomplished the formal synthesis of DICA in asymmetric form, two directions can be envisioned for this project: (1) adapt the knowledge gained about stereocontrol to a concise synthesis of DICA that includes introduction of the salient isonitriles, and (2) showcase the generality of this approach to other (iso)cycloamphilectane ICTs (Figure 5.2). ${ }^{27}$

Figure 5.2 A collection of (iso)cycloamphilectane natural products.

B. Collection of other isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectanes

5.101: (?)-8-isocyanocyclo-amphilect-11-ene; X-ray

5.102: (+)-8-isocyanocyclo-amphilect-1(12)-ene; X-ray of formamide derivative

5.103: (-)-8-isocyanocyclo-amphilect-10-ene; X-ray

5.104: (-)-7-isocyanocyclo-amphilect-1-ene; X-ray

To improve the synthesis of DICA, several aspects of the current formal synthesis need to be addressed, mainly the drawback of forming the THF ring. Ideally, the functionality at C10 should be directly amenable to ring closure and not require extensive redox and protecting group manipulations. Additionally, to address selective introduction of the isonitriles, the current state-of-the-art $\mathrm{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$-mediated invertive isonitrile installation would be most attractive. In a forward sense, the stereocontrol elements used in the formal synthesis would be applied to a second-generation synthesis. The synthesis could start from the same perillaldehyde derived enone 5.97 (Scheme 5.20). Several routes could be imagined, but the following idea would address several of the required improvements. A conjugate addition/Michael reaction would set the required stereocenters trans. Selective methyl addition into the ketone from the equatorial face would close the lactone to 5.105. ${ }^{19,54-57}$ Enone $\mathbf{5 . 1 0 6}$ would be formed by the previously used acid-induced cyclization and Birch reduction. Hydrogenation would generate the last internal stereocenter and sets up $\mathbf{5 . 1 0 7}$ for a photoinduced $\beta$-fragmentation of an alkoxy radical to generate alkyl iodide 5.108. ${ }^{58,59}$ Alkylation and methylation would generate the appropriate diol for an invertive isonitrile displacement.

Scheme 5.20 Proposed access to diol $\mathbf{5 . 2 6}$ utilizing reductive stereocontrol elements.


The formation of the perhydropyrene scaffold via alkylation and reduction previously used to access DICA could also be implemented to prepare other 7isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectanes (Scheme 5.21). A conjugate addition of 4methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide puts the oxidation state in a more favorable position in comparison to 3-methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide. The oxygen radical fragmentation may directly add into the C11-C20 electron deficient alkene of $\mathbf{5 . 1 1 1}$ or be trapped with $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ and set up for an anionic conjugate addition. Alternatively, $\mathrm{SmI}_{2}$ combined with the Suárez photofragmentation may allow for nucleophilic conjugate addition in the presence of the radical fragmentation. The enoxysilane $\mathbf{5 . 1 1 3}$ bears all the handles necessary to prepare $\mathbf{5 . 1 1 4} \mathbf{- 5 . 1 1 7}$, the direct precursors to their respective ICTs (Figure 5.2).

Scheme 5.21 General approach to 7-isocyano(iso)cycloamphilectanes.


### 5.7 Conclusions

The formal synthesis of DICA was accomplished by a continuous evolution of ideas. The failures of previous routes led to both subtle and dramatic changes in strategies that culminated in a highly stereoselective perhydropyrene synthesis using a tandem vicinal difunctionalization, dissolving metal reduction and hydrogenation reactions. When examining the synthesis as a whole, it becomes clear how overwhelmingly important the carbonyl group was in this effort. A carbonyl was used in every productive $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond constructing step, using either its natural electrophilic reactivity, nucleophilic tendency in the forms of the enolate, or activating ability as an electron withdrawing group. The main takeaway from this adventure has been the development of excellent stereocontrol strategies with the power to address a variety of perhydropyrene ICT (iso)cycloamphilectanes.

### 5.8 Experimental Procedures

## Purifications -

Solvents: Dry tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$, dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, toluene, benzene $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$, acetonitrile (MeCN), dimethylformamide (DMF) and methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$ were obtained by passing commercially available formulations through activated alumina columns. tert-Butyl alcohol (t-BuOH) was purified by distillation over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Amines: Diisopropylamine ( $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NH}$ ), triethylamine $\left(\mathrm{NEt}_{3}\right)$, pyridine (py), and hexamethylphosphoramide (HMPA) were purified by distillation from $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$. Ethylene diamine (EDA) was purified by distillation from sodium metal.

Chlorides and Triflates: tert-Butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate (TBSOTf), trimethylsilyl chloride (TMSCl), and benzyl chloride $(\mathrm{BnCl})$ were purified by distillation over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$.

Metals: Copper(I) iodide (CuI) was purified by Soxlet extractor with THF then drying the solid under high vacuum. Copper(I) chloride $(\mathrm{CuCl})$ was purified by dissolving in conc. HCl then adding water until all material precipitated. The material was collected by filtration, washed generously with water, ethanol then ether and dried in vacuo. Manganese(II) chloride tetrahydrate was azeotropically dried with toluene under a DeanStark apparatus, then concentrated in vacuo.

Miscellaneous: Methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) was purified by distillation. Allyl iodide was purified by distillation and stored over copper beads at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ethyl bromoacetate was purified by washing thrice with $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, twice with brine, drying over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtering and distillation.

Titrations - Alkyllithium reagents were titrated using 2,6-di-(tert-butyl)-4-methylphenol (BHT) as the sacrificial proton source and fluorene as an indicator in THF or using diphenylacetic acid in THF. Grignard reagents were titrated using salicylaldehyde phenylhydrazone in THF. ${ }^{60}$

Reaction Setup - All reactions were carried out under an argon atmosphere with dry solvents under anhydrous conditions, unless otherwise noted. Argon balloons were the sole inert atmosphere used. Reactions run at an ambient temperature of $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are designated as room temperature. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated.

Analysis - Thin layer chromatography was performed on 0.25 mm EMD glass-backed TLC plates impregnated with a fluorescent dye and visualized with UV light and $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} / \mathrm{NaOH} /$ water or $p$-anisaldehyde in ethanol/aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ and heat as a developing agent. Forced flow (flash) chromatography was performed on EMD Silica 60, mesh 0.04-0.063 silica gel. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz instrument, obtained at 298 K unless otherwise noted and calibrated to residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm with the following abbreviations to explain multiplicities: $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{q}=$ quartet, quin $=$ quintuplet, sext $=$ setet, sep $=$ septet, $\mathrm{bs}=$ broad signal, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. All coupling constants are apparent $J$ values measured at the indicated field strengths. FT-IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer spectrum RX1 spectrometer. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a H2Os LCT Premier spectrometer using ESI-TOF (electrospray ionization-time of flight). Melting points were measured on a MEL-TEMP II capillary apparatus and stand uncorrected. Optical rotations were
measured with a Jasco P-1010 polarimeter operating on the sodium D-line ( 589 nm ) using a 50 mm path-length cell and are reported as: $[\alpha]^{\mathrm{T}}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ (concentration in $\mathrm{g} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, solvent). Analytical chiral HPLC was performed with an Agilent 110 Series HPLC using a Chiralpak AS-H column ( $0.46 \mathrm{~cm} \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) obtained from Daicel Chemical Industries Ltd. and Chiralpak AD-H ( 0.46 cm x 25 cm ) obtained from Daicel Chemical Industries Ltd. with visualization at the mentioned wavelength.

3-Methyl-4-pentenal $\mathbf{5 . 1 0}$ [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{7,9}$


A 500 mL round bottom flask was charged with a stir bar, $90 \mathrm{~g}(1.25 \mathrm{~mol}) \mathbf{5 . 9}, 250 \mathrm{~mL}(1.25$ mol) tri(ethylene glycol) divinyl ether and $2.01 \mathrm{~g}(6.35 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Hg}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$. An excellent reflux condenser was greased ${ }^{61}$ and fitted, then the flask immersed in a $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath for 8 hours. The reaction was cooled to room temperature and an additional $1.98 \mathrm{~g}(6.21 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Hg}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ was added before the reaction was reheated to $140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 hours the reaction was cooled, the reflux condenser replaced for a simple distillation head and distilled $\left(80^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 200 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ directly into an iced receiving flask to afford $95 \mathrm{~g}(77 \%) \mathbf{5 . 1 0}$ as a colorless liquid. Spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{7}$ Note: The general procedure for Wei et al. ${ }^{7}$ palladium catalyzed transvinylation/Claisen rearrangement was inferior in our hands to the procedure described above using mercury. Although mercury is highly toxic, this procedure was more reliable in advancing material. All glassware was washed with concentrated nitric acid after use, then diluted with water.

## Cyclohexenone (土)-5.7



A 1 L round bottom flask was charged with $9.80 \mathrm{~g}(99.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 0}, 280 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeCN}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ( 123 mmol ) MVK and $3.5 \mathrm{~mL}(18.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{NTMS}$. The flask was fitted with a reflux
condenser and immersed into a $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath for 21 hours. The reaction was cooled to room temperature and $38 \mathrm{~g}(200 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ added. After 8 hours the reaction was cooled in an ice bath and 120 mL 1 M NaOH added, followed by 120 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, ensuring the temperature remained below $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Approximately 280 mL of volatiles were removed in vacuo and the remaining liquid diluted with 90 mL water and $200 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The phases were separated and the aqueous phase extracted twice with $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, washed twice with 75 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and back extracted with $30 \mathrm{mLEt} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 50 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by distillation ( $77-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 1.0 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ) to afford $10.0 \mathrm{~g}(66 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.7$ as a colorless liquid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta$ $6.94(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.91(\mathrm{ddd}, J=10.3,2.3,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.02(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.3,2.6$, $0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.02(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.3,2.6,0.5 \mathrm{H}), 5.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09-5.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{t}, J=4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H})$, $2.50(\mathrm{t}, J=4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 2.47-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 199.89,199.87,153.5,153.4,141.2,141.0$, 129.8, 129.7, 115.4, 114.9, 41.7, 41.2, 41.1, 40.9, 37.4, 37.2, 26.1, 26.0, 17.2, 16.4; IR (thin film) 3077, 2963, 2871, $1682 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 173.0942$ found 173.0950.

## Cyclohexanone 5.11



3-Methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide was prepared by addition of 3.0 mL ( 23.7 mmol ) 3bromoanisole in 3.0 mL THF to $0.865 \mathrm{~g}(35.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal in 12 mL THF activated by dibromoethane, maintaining reflux. To a 250 mL round bottom flask charged with 2.00 g ( 13.3 mmol$) 5.7,0.255 \mathrm{~g}(0.133 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuI}, 0.125 \mathrm{~g}(2.95 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiCl}$ and $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(15.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ TMSCl in 80 mL THF , cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $13.5 \mathrm{~mL}(16.2 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{3-}$ methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide dropwise over 30 minutes. The reaction was stirred for an additional hour then quenched at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by addition of 50 mL 1 M HCl and warmed to room temperature. The mixture was extracted with 50 mL and $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layer was washed with $40 \mathrm{~mL} 3 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, $40 \mathrm{~mL} 3: 1 \mathrm{sat}$. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl} / 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatopraphy (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $2.67 \mathrm{~g}(78 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 1}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.28-7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.79(\mathrm{td}, J=15.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $6 \mathrm{H}), 5.81(\mathrm{ddd}, J=17.0,10.7,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.67(\mathrm{dt}, J=17.8,8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.88(\mathrm{td}, J=20.4,11.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.59-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 2.22-2.09(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.55$ (quintetd, $J=12.9,4.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) $\delta 210.69,210.66,159.9,159.8,145.0,144.8,143.3,138.8,129.9,129.8,119.8,119.5$, $115.7,113.6,113.5,113.4,111.5,111.5,55.2,49.7,49.5,48.2,47.7,46.4,45.7,41.1,41.0,37.2$,
36.2, 25.3, 25.1, 18.9, 11.5; IR (thin film) $2959,1714,1600,1487,1263,1046 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 281.1518$ found 281.1511 .

## Aldehyde 5.12



A 250 mL round bottom flask containing $2.67 \mathrm{~g}(10.3 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 1}$ in $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was treated with ozone at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After a persistent blue color, the color was discharged by bubbling oxygen and $3.22 \mathrm{~g}(12.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ added. The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature over several hours. All volatiles were removed and the residue purified by column chromatography (3:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $2.40 \mathrm{~g}(88 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 2}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 9.59(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 9.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.28(\mathrm{q}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.79$ $(\mathrm{td}, J=17.7,7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{q}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.88(\mathrm{td}, J=11.5$, $5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.64-2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 2.41-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{qd}, J=7.2,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20-2.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{dtd}, J=16.7,11.3,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ 209.50, 209.47, $205.5,203.2,160.1,160.0,143.72,143.69,130.3,130.1,119.6,119.3,113.6,113.3,112.2$, $112.0,55.2,49.4,49.2,47.4,47.2,47.0,46.7,44.8,41.0,41.1,40.2,27.9,26.2,11.2,7.1 ;$ IR (thin film) 2943, 2719, 1716, 1600, 1488, 1263, $1046 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 283.1310$ found 283.1307.

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.13



A 100 mL round bottom flask containing $2.36 \mathrm{~g}(9.07 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 2}, 86 \mathrm{mg}(0.45 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and 70 mL toluene was refluxed under a Dean-Stark trap. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with $100 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, washed with 20 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purfied by column chromatography ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.78 \mathrm{~g}(81 \%) \mathbf{5 . 1 3}$ as a white solid that was crystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford a single cubic crystal $\left(\mathrm{mp}=132-134{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(500$ $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.72-6.67(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.29(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.87(\mathrm{t}, J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58-2.39(\mathrm{~m}$, $5 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{t}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 210.5$, $158.5,138.1,136.0,127.7,126.3,124.1,110.8,110.1,55.2,43.8,42.2,40.9,40.7,28.7,20.6$; IR (thin film) 2918, 2849, 1713, 1606, 1571, 1242, $1159 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 265.1205$ found 265.1210.

## Independent Analysis of Birch Reduction Stereochemistry



To a 10 mL round bottom flask charged with a glass stir bar was condensed 2 mL ammonia followed by the addition of $12 \mathrm{mg}(0.050 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 3} \mathrm{in} 0.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and 0.2 mL MeOH . Slowly, $12 \mathrm{mg}(1.73 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete addition, ammonia was evaporated and the residue then taken up in EtOAc and water. The organic layer was separated and washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing crude cyclohexadiene was added $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}(0.13 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DBU}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $14 \mathrm{mg}(0.079$ mmol) NBS. After 20 minutes at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, water and EtOAc was added. The layers were separated and the organic layer was washed with water and brine. All aqueous washings were combined, back extracted with EtOAc and all organic layers combined. The EtOAc layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing crude alcohol was added $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 40 \mathrm{mg}(0.48 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 32 \mathrm{mg}(0.075 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMP. The ice bath was removed. After overnight stirring EtOAc was added and the reaction filtered over Celite. Sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and water were added, the layers separated and the organic phase washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The EtOAc layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $5.0 \mathrm{mg}(41 \%$, single diastereomer) 5.A as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford white needles (mp $\left.=111-113{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.73(\mathrm{dd}, J$
$=8.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.08(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.2,4.0,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.85-2.81 (m, 2H), 2.57-2.51 (m, 2H), 2.43-2.32 (m, 3H), 1.74-1.64 (m, 1H), 1.51-1.40(m, 2H), $1.11(\mathrm{t}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 211.2,157.9,139.4,129.7$, $128.8,112.2,110.4,55.3,46.5,45.1,43.8,41.1,38.4,33.5,29.4,19.6$; IR (thin film) 2950, 2920, 1709, 1606, 1501, 1239, $1038 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 267.1361$ found 267.1371.

## Enone 5.2



To a 1 L 3-neck round bottom flask fitted with a low-temperature thermometer, was charged with a glass stir bar, $1.77 \mathrm{~g}(7.30 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 3} \mathrm{in} 75 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and 230 mL ammonia and 15 mL (370 mmol) MeOH at $-60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Slowly, $2.50 \mathrm{~g}(260 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the blue color discharged, $20 \mathrm{~g}(374 \mathrm{mmol})$ solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the ammonia evaporated overnight. The white residue taken up in 50 mL water and extracted with $100 \mathrm{~mL}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ and 25 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 300 mL flask containing crude material was added 75 mL MeOH followed by 7.5 mL 6 M HCl . After 8 hours 100 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and after 1 hour of stirring $\sim 60 \mathrm{~mL}$ volatiles were removed in vacuo. The remaining solution was extracted with $75 \mathrm{~mL}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ and twice with 25 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, washed with 30 mL brine and back extracted with 25 mL EtOAc, then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude
material was purified by column chromatography ( $1: 1 \rightarrow 1: 3$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 1.20 g $(70 \%) 5.2$ as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford colorless prisms $(\mathrm{mp}=$ $\left.139-140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.3,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38(\mathrm{dddt}, J=$ $12.5,9.4,6.3,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.09(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.07-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{t}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90-$ $0.85(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.78(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.9,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 200.6$, $169.0,121.0,70.5,48.9,45.2,43.4,38.1,37.4,36.8,35.5,34.9,29.3,28.5,19.3$; IR (thin film) 3392, 2926, 2857, 1658, $1057 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 257.1518$ found 257.1521 .

## Allylation to 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18



To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing a glass stir bar and $7.7 \mathrm{mg}(1.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was condensed 7 mL ammonia and 1.5 mL THF added. At $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 76 \mathrm{mg}(0.32 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 2}$ in 1.5 mL THF was added. The reaction was cooled to -7 $^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then treated with 0.1 mL isoprene and stirred until all lithium was discharged. To the white slurry was added $69 \mathrm{mg}(0.41 \mathrm{mmol})$ allyl iodide at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was stirred for 2.5 hours before 3 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added slowly and warmed to room temperature. The mixture was partitioned between 5 mL water and 15 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(4: 1 \rightarrow 1: 2$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford $17 \mathrm{mg}(22 \%,>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.16$ as a white solid which was
recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford white crystals $\left(\mathrm{mp}=139-140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, $38 \mathrm{mg}(43 \%, 4: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ as a white wax and $20 \mathrm{mg}(20 \%, 8: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 8}$ as a white solid which was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford a single diastereomer as white needles $\left(\mathrm{mp}=118-120{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .5 .16:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 3.57-3.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.0,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 2.08-2.00 (m, 3H), $1.96(\mathrm{ddt}, J=13.1,6.2,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{t}, J=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.72(\mathrm{dt}, J=$ $13.1,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{qt}, J=11.6,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.6,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.25-1.15(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.77(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.59(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.8,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 211.9,70.7,47.4,47.3,46.1,45.1,41.8,41.3,40.9,38.8,36.5,35.3$, 33.2, 28.3, 19.9; IR (thin film) 3400, 2921, 2855, 1711, 1455, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 259.1674$ found 259.1674. 5.17: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 5.71-5.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.12-4.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.54(\mathrm{t}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{td}, J=15.7$, $8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.32-2.22(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $1.32-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.75(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.61(\mathrm{q}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm})$ major $\delta 216.0,134.9,117.2,70,7,53.2,50.9,48.0,46.6,42.6,39.9,39.8,39.4,37.2$, $36.5,35.5,28.8,28.3,20.0$, minor $\delta 214.4,134.9,116.6,70.6,51.3,50.2,47.3,42.4,40.8,38.1$, $38.0,36.3,35.4,34.4,34.2,30.4,28.4,19.9$; IR (thin film) $3388,2923,2858,1702,1444,1051$, $1023 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 299.1987$ found 299.1994. 5.18: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta$ 5.78-5.63 (m, 2H), 5.05-4.98 (m, 4H), 3.57-3.52 (m, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.61-2.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.52-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.75(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.76(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.59(\mathrm{dt}, J=18.4,9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 216.2,136.4,135.0,116.8,116.4,70.7,54.1,51.8$, 47.6, 46.8, 42.50, 42.47, 40.0, 39.0, 39.4, 37.6, 36.4, 35.4, 35.3, 34.6, 28.2, 19.9; IR (thin film)

3262, 2920, 2853, 1698, 1441, $1059 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 339.2300 found 339.2307 .

## Axial Allyl 5.19 and Benzoate 5.B



To 1 dram vial containing $6 \mathrm{mg}(0.0 .25 \mathrm{mmol}, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 7} \mathrm{in} 0.3 \mathrm{~mL}$ MeOH was added 0.05 mL $(0.05 \mathrm{mmol}) 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ at room temperature, the flask sealed and the reaction heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 2 hours, sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the mixture extracted thrice with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a single diastereomer. The crude material in a 1 dram vial and 4 mg ( 0.033 mmol ) DMAP was diluted with $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} 1: 1 \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and treated with $11 \mathrm{mg}(0.050$ mmol) p-bromobenzoyl chloride at room temperature. The reaction was was stirred for 1 hour then quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted four times with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with $1: 1$ brine $/ \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $7 \mathrm{mg}(70 \%,>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . B}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.90-7.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.59-7.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.62(\mathrm{dddd}, J=16.7,10.3,8.3,6.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.05(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.0,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{tt}, J=11.4,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{dt}, J=8.0,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.49(\mathrm{td}, J=14.0,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.29(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=12.0,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24-2.09(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.98(\mathrm{ddt}, J=13.0,6.6,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.82-1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$,
$1.45-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.25(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.23-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{q}, J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.70-0.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ $214.2,165.3,134.8,131.6,131.1,129.6,127.9,116.7,73.9,51.4,50.4,47.4,42.4,40.8,38.1$, $36.2,34.3,34.2,34.2,31.5,30.4,28.2,19.8$; IR (thin film) $2922,2865,1713,1590,1272,1103$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 481.1354$ found 481.1342 .

## Ketone 5.20



To 1 dram vial of $14 \mathrm{mg}(0.051 \mathrm{mmol}, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ and 60 mg celite in $0.8 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.14 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ at room temperature. After 16 hours the mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, passed through a silica gel column and concentrated. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $12 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 2 0}$ as a white solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.70-5.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07-4.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-$ $2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.30-1.17 (m, 3H), $1.10(\mathrm{q}, J=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.03-0.82(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm})$ major $\delta 214.7,210.7,134.6,117.6,52.7,51.6,48.7,47.6,45.5,42.3,41.0,39.8,39.7$, 37.2, 36.3, 29.9, 28.6, 20.0, minor $\delta 213.7,211.0,134.3,116.9,51.2,51.1,46.9,44.0,43.1,42.1$, $41.0,37.9,36.1,34.3,33.9,30.2,30.1,19.9$; IR (thin film) 2960, 2916, 2859, $1713 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 297.1830$ found 297.1836.

## Diol 5.27 and 5.C




5.27

5.C: 7 (axial allyl) : 2 : 1 dr

To 1 dram vial was added $45 \mathrm{mg}(0.18 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CeCl}_{3}$ and dried under vacuum at $160{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 hours. The solid was cooled under argon and stirred with 0.6 mL THF for 30 minutes before being cooled in an ice bath and treated with $0.07 \mathrm{~mL}(0.19 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.7 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{MeMgCl} / \mathrm{THF}$. After 30 minutes at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ a solution of $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.036 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 7} \mathrm{in} 0.3 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was added dropwise at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The ice bath was removed after 10 minutes. After 5 hours the reaction was recooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with 1 mL 3 M HCl , then extracted thrice with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1 \rightarrow 1: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $6.5 \mathrm{mg}(62 \%$, single diastereomer) 5.27 as a white solid and $2.6 \mathrm{mg}(25 \%, 7$ (axial allyl):2:1 dr) 5.C as a colorless oil. 5.27: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 6.03-5.95$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09-5.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.50-3.46(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71-2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.18$ (m, 1H), 2.06-1.95 (m, 2H), 1.65 (dt, $J=13.2,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.9,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-$ $1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.22(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.21-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.90$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.70(\mathrm{t}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 140.5,115.1,73.6,71.6,49.1,48.0,47.4,44.2,42.6,42.1,39.4,37.4,35.1,34.8,30.8$, 29.3, 28.4, 20.4; IR (thin film) 3389, 3322, 2922, 1638, 1403, $1045 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 310.2746$ found 310.2743 . 5.C: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$)$ mixture $\delta 6.12-6.04(\mathrm{~m}, 0.09 \mathrm{H}), 6.03-5.94(\mathrm{~m}, 0.6 \mathrm{H}), 5.90-5.81(\mathrm{~m}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 5.15-$ $5.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1.2 \mathrm{H}), 4.97-4.93(\mathrm{~m}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 3.58-3.43(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$,
$1.94-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.79-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.12-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $0.95-0.81(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.80-0.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.61-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) major $\delta 141.7,114.2,70.7,48.1,47.8,45.8,43.3,41.2,38.8,36.3,35.4,34.6,34.4,31.7$, 29.4, 28.6, 27.7, 20.0; IR (thin film) 3369, 2924, 2856, 1637, 1459, $1050 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 315.2300$ found 315.2308.

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.32



3-Methoxy-4-methylphenylmagnesium bromide was prepared by addition of $1.60 \mathrm{~g}(7.96 \mathrm{mmol})$ 5-bromo-2-methylanisole in 1.0 mL THF to $0.220 \mathrm{~g}(9.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal in 5.0 mL THF activated by dibromoethane maintaining $40-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A 50 mL round bottom flask containing $154 \mathrm{mg}(1.22 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MnCl}_{2}$ and $109 \mathrm{mg}(2.57 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiCl}$ was dried under high vaccum in a 150 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath for 10 hours. The flask was cooled, placed under an argon balloon and 10 mL THF added to dissolve the salts. At $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 540 \mathrm{mg}(3.60 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.7 \mathrm{in} 4 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.010$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuCl}$ were added. After 10 minutes $0.64 \mathrm{~mL}(5.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TMSCl}$ was added, followed by the dropwise addition of $3.9 \mathrm{~mL}(4.1 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.05 \mathrm{M}$ 3-methoxy-4-methylphenylmagnesium bromide over the course of 5 minutes. Stirring at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was continued for 10 minutes before the cold bath was removed. After 5 hours at room temperature, the flask was again cooled in an ice bath and 20 mL 3 M HCl added slowly. The ice bath was removed and stirred for 10 minutes. The mixture was partitioned between an additional 10 mL 3 M HCl and $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The layers
were separated and the aqueous layer extracted with $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was carried on crude. Crude alkene in a 100 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and ozonized. After the solution became blue, the solution was sparged with oxygen. A single portion of $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{AcOH}, 1.2 \mathrm{~g}(18$ mmol) Zn powder and $15 \mathrm{mg}(0.088 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$ was added. After stirring at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours, the bath was removed and stirring continued for 2 hours. The reduction was determined complete by TLC and the solution was filtered over Celite, washing with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(\sim 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC). The filtrate was washed with 50 mL water, 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 100 mL round bottom flask containing crude aldehyde in 50 mL toluene was treated with 34 mg ( 0.18 mmol ) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and heated to $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under a Dean-Stark trap. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, washed with 20 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 10 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by trituration with hexanes to afford $628 \mathrm{mg}(67 \%) 5.32$ as a tan solid which was recrystallized from EtOAc to afford wispy white needles ( $\mathrm{mp}=193-194{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 6.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.62(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.27(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.11(\mathrm{ddd}, J=$ $14.1,4.0,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{td}, J=13.9,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.61-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.6,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 210.9,156.5$, $135.8,135.1,128.0,127.2,124.7,124.2,105.6,55.5,44.2,42.2,41.0,40.9,28.8,20.6,15.8$; IR (thin film) 2923, 2852, 1714, $1611 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$ 274.1807 found 274.1800 .

## Anisole 5.37



To a 10 mL round bottom flask charged with a glass stir bar was condensed 3 mL ammonia followed by the addition of $24 \mathrm{mg}(0.094 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 3 2} \mathrm{in} 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and 0.3 mL MeOH . Slowly, $24 \mathrm{mg}(3.46 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the blue color discharged, $0.140 \mathrm{~g}(2.62 \mathrm{mmol})$ solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the ammonia evaporated. The white residue taken up in water and EtOAc. The organic layer was separated and washed with brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a crude aromatic material assigned as $\mathbf{5 . 3 7}$.

## Skipped Enone 5.39



To a 25 mL round bottom flask charged with a glass stir bar was added $125 \mathrm{mg}(0.488 \mathrm{mmol})$ 5.32, 5.0 mL THF and 2.5 mL ( 37 mmol ) ethylene diamine before being cooled in an ice bath. After the addition of $1.2 \mathrm{~mL}(12.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}, 80 \mathrm{mg}(11.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces over the course of 3 hours at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete consumption of lithium metal, the cold bath was removed and stirring continued for 1 hour. The flask was recooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and canula transferred into a vigorously stirring flask of 10 mL conc. HCl and 50 g ice. Best results
were obtained by submerging the canula into the aqueous solution. After complete transfer the reaction flask was washed twice with $1.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The aqueous mixture was warmed to room temperature and extracted with 25 mL EtOAc, then four times with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL 6 M HCl then back extracted with 5 mL EtOAc and combined with the remaining organic layers. The organic phase was washed with 5 mL water, 5 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford $100 \mathrm{mg}(83 \%, 1.6: 1 \mathrm{dr})$ crude material of good purity. Column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) afforded $40 \mathrm{mg}(33 \%, 1.8: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.39$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 2.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=19.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=20.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 2.69(\mathrm{td}, J=12.9$, $6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60-2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.51-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.37-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.21-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-$ $1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94-0.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 211.6,211.0,130.0,126.7,44.9,44.8,44.7,41.9,41.2,41.1$, 40.1, 39.4, 32.7, 28.7, 18.9, 13.5, minor $\delta 212.1,211.1,129.6,126.3,45.1,45.0,44.5,42.4,41.1$, $40.4,39.8,39.1,32.9,28.9,19.0,14.6$; IR (thin film) $2962,2926,2874,1716,1453 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 269.1518$ found 269.1516.

## Enone 5.41



To 100 mL round bottom flask containing $1.20 \mathrm{~g}(5.12 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.2,0.525 \mathrm{~g}(7.71)$ imidazole and $60 \mathrm{mg}(0.49 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP in $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $0.950 \mathrm{~g}(6.30 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSCl}$ at room
temperature. After 15 hours, 100 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and the mixture extracted with 100 mL and 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to provide $1.67 \mathrm{~g}(93 \%) 5.41$ as a white solid which was recrystallized from pentane to afford colorless prisms ( $\mathrm{mp}=110-112{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.8,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 2.16-2.10 (m, 1H), 2.08-2.00 (m, 2H), 1.94-1.82 (m, 3H), 1.68-1.62 (m, 1H), 1.42-1.34 (m, 1H), $1.32-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.14(\mathrm{q}, J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.5,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.78(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.9,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 200.4,168.9,121.1,71.3,48.9,45.3,43.5,38.1,37.7,36.9,35.6,35.4,29.5$, 28.5, 25.9, 19.2, 18.2, -4.6; IR (thin film) 2929, 2857, 1677, $1092 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 371.2382$ found 371.2388 .

## Enone 5.42



LDA was prepared in a 50 mL round bottom flask by addition of $1.90 \mathrm{~mL}(5.13 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.7 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{n}$ $\mathrm{BuLi} /$ hexanes to $0.81 \mathrm{~mL}(5.78 \mathrm{mmol})$ diisopropylamine in 17 mL THF at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the stirring LDA solution at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $1.55 \mathrm{~g}(4.45 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.41$ with the assistance of 9 mL THF. After 10 minutes, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL}(5.75 \mathrm{mmol})$ HMPA was added neat followed by $0.83 \mathrm{~mL}(13.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ methyl iodide. The cold bath was removed after an additional 10 minutes and the reaction stirred for 50 minutes before 20 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added. The solution was extracted with 50
mL and 25 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $1.51 \mathrm{~g}(93 \%, 13: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 4 2}$ as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 5.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.8,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.47-2.40$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.6,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.3,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.77$ (dt, $J=13.7,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.06-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.74(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.6,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 202.9,168.1,119.5,71.2,49.9,45.7,42.8,37.8,37.6$, $37.4,37.2,36.0,35.5,29.6,25.9,19.2,18.2,15.4,-4.6$; IR (thin film) $2928,2856,1675,1627$, 1249, 1092, 863, 835, $775 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 363.2719$ found 363.2715.

## Ketone 5.D



To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing a glass stir bar and $5 \mathrm{mg}(0.72 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal then 3 mL ammonia was condensed and 0.4 mL THF added. At $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 10 \mathrm{mg}(0.028 \mathrm{mmol})$ 5.42 in 0.4 mL THF was added. After 2 minutes, 0.1 mL isoprene and $91 \mathrm{mg}(1.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the flask warmed to room temperature. The mixture was partitioned between 2 mL water and 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $20: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.9 \mathrm{mg}(89 \%,>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) 5.D as a
colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 3.54-3.48(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.8,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.56-2.49 (m, 2H), $2.05(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.7,12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-$ $1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.12(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.80(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.56(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.8,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.04(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 216.0,71.5,47.3,47.2,46.2,43.8,42.1,41.6,39.5,39.1,36.7,35.7,35.3$, 28.5, 20.0, 18.2, 17.7, -4.55, -4.60; IR (thin film) 2927, 2856, 1711, 1460, 1087, 860, 835, 774 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 387.2695$ found 387.2703.

## Ketone 5.E



To a 1 dram vial was added $8.1 \mathrm{mg}(0.022 \mathrm{mmol})$ 5.D in 0.2 mL MeOH and $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.013$ $\mathrm{mmol}) 0.13 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH} / \mathrm{MeOH}$. After 2 hours at room temperature, 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and and 5 mL EtOAc were added. The organic layer was separated, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford $7.9 \mathrm{mg}(97 \%,>10: 1 \mathrm{dr})$ 5.E as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 3.53-3.47(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.8,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.64(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42$ (dquintet, $J=12.9,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.69$ $(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.0,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{qt}, J=10.7,3.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.07(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95-0.75(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.55(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.8,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 213.2,71.5,48.4,47.3,46.2,45.2,44.7,42.6,41.7$, $41.5,39.3,36.6,35.7,28.5,25.9,20.0,18.2,14.3,-4.54,-4.59$; IR (thin film) 2927, 2856, 1713,

1460, 1250, 1090, 860, 835, $774 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 387.2695 found 387.2687 .

## Allyl 5.43



To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing a glass stir bar and $4.0 \mathrm{mg}(0.58 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was condensed 7 mL ammonia and 4 mL THF added. At $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 85 \mathrm{mg}(0.23 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 4 2}, 17 \mathrm{mg}$ ( 0.23 mmol ) t-BuOH in 3 mL THF was added. After stirring for 10 minutes, 0.1 mL isoprene was added and stirred until all lithium was discharged. To the white slurry was added 0.045 mL ( 0.50 mmol ) allyl iodide at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was stirred for 2.5 hours before 3 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added slowly and warmed to room temperature. The mixture was partitioned between 5 mL water and 15 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $30: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $54 \mathrm{mg}(56 \%,>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 4 3}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.68(\mathrm{ddt}, J=16.9,10.0,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{tt}, J=10.1,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.64(\mathrm{dqd}, J=10.3,6.9,3.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.3,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.1,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02-$ $1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.39(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.06$ (m, 3H), $1.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.97-0.77(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.56(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.5,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 217.9,135.1,116.7,71.6,54.4$, $51.9,47.7,47.1,42.7,40.1,40.0,38.5,37.7,37.5,36.5,35.8,28.4,25.9,19.9,18.3,16.3,-4.48$,
-4.55; IR (thin film) 2927, 2857, 1709, 1461, 1249, 1089, 835, $775 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 427.3008$ found 427.3014 .

## Nitroalkene 5.47



A 1 dram vial containing $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.0741 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 4 3}$ and $32 \mathrm{mg} 4 \AA \mathrm{MS}$ in 0.5 mL DCE was stirred for 15 minutes before $116 \mathrm{mg}(0.754 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{AgNO}_{2}$ and $20 \mathrm{mg}(0.128 \mathrm{mmol})$ TEMPO was added. The flask was sealed and heated at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 hours. The flask was cooled, filtered over Celite with EtOAc, then concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $23 \mathrm{mg}(69 \%,>20: 1 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}) \mathbf{5 . 4 7}$ as a light red oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.15(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.5,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=0.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{dt}, J=15.9,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.28(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{t}, J=13.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.31-0.78(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H})$, $0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.62-0.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.07(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 215.8$, $140.1,138.3,71.0,52.3,51.5,47.2,46.9,42.3,39.9,38.0,37.7,36.9,36.2,35.4,33.1,28.0,25.6$, 19.6, 17.9, 16.0, -4.7, -4.9; IR (thin film) 2928, 2857, 1706, 1527, 1461, 1349, 1089, 860, 835, $775 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 472.2859$ found 472.2862.

## Ketone 5.48



A 1 dram vial containing $5 \mathrm{mg}(0.013 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PDC}, 0.1 \mathrm{mLCH} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was treated with 0.1 $\mathrm{mL}(0.031 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.31 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TMSCl} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. After 10 minutes $\sim 2 \mathrm{mg}(0.0044 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 4 7}$ in 0.2 $\mathrm{mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added. After 5 minutes the cold bath was removed and after 12 hours silica gel was added and the contents filtered over silica gel with EtOAc. The filtrate was concentrated and the crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $\sim 0.5$ mg (33\%) 5.48.

## Enoxysilane 5.58



3-Methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide was prepared by addition of $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(15.0 \mathrm{mmol}) 3$ bromoanisole in 1.9 mL THF to $440 \mathrm{mg}(18.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal in 7.5 mL THF activated by dibromoethane maintaining $40-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A 50 mL round bottom flask was charged with 17 mL THF (rigorously degassed by purging with argon under sonication) then $0.80 \mathrm{~mL}(0.40 \mathrm{mmol})$ $0.50 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CuI} \cdot 2 \mathrm{LiCl} / \mathrm{THF}$. At $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $602 \mathrm{mg}(4.01 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.7 \mathrm{in} 6 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and $0.55 \mathrm{~mL}(4.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ TMSCl was added, followed by the dropwise addition of $3.4 \mathrm{~mL}(4.8 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.41 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{3-}$ methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide over the course of 5 minutes. Stirring at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was continued
for 1.5 hours before $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ was added and the reaction poured into a rapidly stiring solution of 25 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 25 \mathrm{~g}$ ice, $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ cooled in an ice bath. After all salts dissolved an additional $25 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added, the layers were separated and the organic layer washed with 20 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was flushed through a pad of Florisil ${ }^{\circledR}$, pretreated with hexanes $1 \% \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$, with hexanes $1 \% \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ to afford $830 \mathrm{mg}(62 \%,>20: 1$ conjugate addition dr$)$ 5.58 as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right.$ at 7.15 ppm$) \delta 7.16-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{dt}, J=$ $6.7,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.71-6.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.70-$ $5.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.03-4.88(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.41(\mathrm{dq}, J=8.6,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.36(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H})$, $2.35-2.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{ddt}, J=11.4,8.3,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.41-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.17(\mathrm{~s}, 4.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.16(\mathrm{~s}$, $4.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ at 128 ppm ) mixture $\delta 160.4,151.6,151.3,148.50,148.46$, $141.4,141.1,129.6,129.5,121.2,121.1,115.0,114.8,114.6,113.5,111.8,111.7,108.2,107.5$, $54.7,47.2,46.1,45.4,44.7,38.1,37.3,30.2,29.6,22.5,21.8,19.5,14.2,0.4$; IR (thin film) 2958 , 2873, 2835, 1665, 1251, 1184, $845 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for desilylation only, $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 281.1518$ found 281.1523.

## Ketoester 5.59



To 25 mL round bottom flask containing $819 \mathrm{mg}(2.48 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 5 8} \mathrm{in} 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was added 1.9 $\mathrm{mL}(2.6 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.40 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{MeLi} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 30 minutes the flask was placed into an ice bath and stirring continued for 30 minutes. The reaction was recooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then treated with $0.90 \mathrm{~mL}(5.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{HMPA}$ and stirred until homogeneous. After the addition of $0.70 \mathrm{~mL}(6.3$ mmol ) ethyl bromoacetate the reaction was kept at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 minutes. The cold bath was removed. After 1 hour the reaction was poured into 30 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with 30 mL EtOAc and 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purifed by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $768 \mathrm{mg}(90 \%,>20: 1$ alkylation) $\mathbf{5 . 5 9}$ as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.28-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 5.78 (ddd, $J=17.2,10.6,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 5.65(\mathrm{ddd}, J=17.2,10.3,8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 5.01-4.96(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{dt}, J=17.3,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.84-4.80(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.06-3.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.09$ (dddd, $J=16.7,12.5,8.9,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63(\mathrm{t}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 2.60-2.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2.5 \mathrm{H}), 2.43$ (ddd, $J=16.5,9.4,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{ddd}, J=20.2,16.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54$ (ddd, $J=12.6,7.8,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) mixture $\delta$ 210.02, 209.97, 172.7, 172.7, 159.97, 159.85, 143.3, 143.0, 142.8, 138.5, 130.0, 129.8, 115.9, 113.5, 111.90, 111.88, 60.31, $60.29,55.19,55.18,53.6,53.0,52.3,52.5,47.4,46.7,41.2,41.0,37.4,36.4,32.45,32.44,26.0$, 25.7, 19.0, 14.1, 11.0; IR (thin film) 3076, 2962, 2938, 2836, 1731, 1715, 1599, 1584, 1262,

1195, 1156, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 367.1885$ found 367.1866.

## Ketoester 5.61



A 100 mL round bottom flask containing $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.087 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 5 9}$ dissolved in $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with a stream of ozone. After the solution became blue, the solution was sparged with oxygen. A single portion of 0.2 mL AcOH, 30 mg ( 0.46 mmol ) Zn powder and $1 \mathrm{mg}(0.0059 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$ was added. After stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours, the bath was removed and stirring continued for 2 hours. The reduction was determined complete by TLC and the solution was filtered over Celite, washing with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The filtrate was washed with water, sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A round bottom flask containing crude aldehyde in toluene was treated with $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and heated to $140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under a Dean-Stark trap. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, washed with half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a crude material assigned as $\mathbf{5 . 6 1}$ as a $1.6: 1$ mixture of diastereomers.

## Diol 5.62



A 100 mL 3 -neck round bottom flask fitted with a thermometer was charged with $15 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, cooled in an ice bath and $260 \mathrm{mg}(6.85 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ added. After 10 minutes $768 \mathrm{mg}(2.23$ mmol ) dicarbonyl was added with the assistance of $7 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ensuring the internal temperature remained below $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over the course of 30 minutes. The ice bath was removed. After 3 hours 0.25 mL EtOAc was added at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then 0.25 mL water, $0.255 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 0.75 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and $0.50 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. After 30 minutes of vigorous stirring the contents were filtered over Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$; the filter cake was washed with $150 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The filtrate was concentrated and the residue purified by column chromatography (1:2 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $624 \mathrm{mg}(91 \%, 4: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2}$ as a viscous colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) mixture of diastereomers and slow rotation $\delta 7.22(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.69(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.83-5.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $0.5), 4.91-4.89(\mathrm{~m}, ~ 0.5), 4.85-4.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45-3.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.31-3.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{ddq}, J=12.6,8.5,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.71-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.19$ (quintett, $J=12.7,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ 7.0 Hz, 1.3H), $0.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) mixture or diastereomers and slow rotation $\delta 145.0,144.8,144.1,139.6$, $115.1,112.7,74.8,74.6,62.2,62.1,55.1,55.1,49.91,49.87,48.1,47.4,37.6,36.6,35.05,35.00$, 34.7, 34.5, 23.3, 23.2, 19.0, 11.1; IR (thin film) 3304, 3077, 2997, 2932, 2882, 1599, 1584, 1487, 1260, $1046 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 327.1936$ found 327.1933.

## TBS ether 5.65



To a 1 dram vial containing $15 \mathrm{mg}(0.050 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2} \mathrm{in} 1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $7 \mathrm{mg}(0.057$ mmol) DMAP and $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.36 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$. After the addition of $19 \mathrm{mg}(0.13 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSCl}$ the reaction stirred for 3 days. The reaction was quenches with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, extraced thrice with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined and washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $18 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%,>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 5}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.21(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.81-6.61(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.75-5.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.98(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.5,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.84-4.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.66(\mathrm{bs}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{dtd}, J=14.7,10.1,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.28-3.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.25-2.12 (m, 2H), 1.93-1.80 (m, 1H), 1.74-1.50 (m, 4H), 1.45-1.34 (m, 2H), 1.29-1.12 (m, 1H), $0.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 10.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.043(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.038(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.035(\mathrm{~s}$, $1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.031(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 145.4,145.1,144.2,139.9$, $115.0,112.6,74.3,74.2,63.1,55.12,55.11,50.60,50.54,48.3,47.6,37.8,36.7,36.6,35.0,34.9$, $34.4,34.3,25.9,23.4,23.2,19.0,18.2,11.2,-5.5,-5.6$; IR (thin film) $3416,3077,2953,2929$, 2858, 2882, 1599, 1584, 1257, 1080, 1048, 836, $777 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 441.2801$ found 441.2784 .

## Aldehyde 5.66



To a 1 dram vial containing $12 \mathrm{mg}(0.029 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 5}$ in $0.5 \mathrm{mLCH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was bubbled $\mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{O}_{2}$ at $78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until the solution turned blue. The flask was purged with $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ until the blue color faded, then $9 \mathrm{mg}(0.034 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ in $0.2 \mathrm{mLCH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added. Stirring was continued at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour then the bath was removed. After 2 hours the contents were diluted with EtOAc, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography ( $5: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 8 mg (67\%) 5.66 as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 9.47(\mathrm{~s}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 9.40(\mathrm{~s}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.21(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.88-6.57(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $4.80(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.61-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.39(\mathrm{qd}, J=10.1,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.31-3.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.97-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.01-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 4.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 4.5 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 205.1,203.9,144.2,144.1,73.8,73.8,63.0,55.2,48.2$, $47.8,46.5,35.1,34.8,34.4,34.0,26.8,25.9,24.6,18.2,10.9,6.8,-5.5,-5.6$; IR (thin film) 3410 , 2929, 2857, 1721, 1599, 1464, 1256, 1081, 1047, 836, $778 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 443.2594$ found 443.2595 .

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.64



To a 5 mL round bottom flask containing $7 \mathrm{mg}(0.017 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 6}$ was added a solution of 2 mg ( 0.011 mmol ) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ predried with 2 mL toluene over a Hickmann still. The reaction was refluxed over a Hickmann still for 2 hours. The reaction was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{EtOAc}$ and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography ( $5: 1$ hexanes $/ E t O A c$ ) to afford 3 mg ( $66 \%$, single diastereomer) $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $6.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09(\mathrm{q}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{td}, J=8.6,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.0,9.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{dtd}, J=11.1,7.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51$ (dd, $J=14.0,10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24(\mathrm{ddq}, J=14.0,10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{t}, J=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91$ (s, 3H), 1.88-1.74 (m, 2H), 1.55-1.39 (m, 2H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 157.9$, $139.5,138.4,128.7,125.7,123.6,112.4,109.9,83.7,67.1,55.2,46.8,46.4,41.9,31.8,29.9$, 27.0, 20.8; IR (thin film) 2935, 2869, 1607, 1489, 1157, 1064, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 288.1964$ found 288.1955.

## Perhydrobenzofuran 5.67 and 5.F



To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing $510 \mathrm{mg}(1.68 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2} \mathrm{in} 8 \mathrm{~mL}$ pyridine was added $820 \mathrm{mg}(4.30 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{p}$-toluenesulfonyl chloride at room temperature. The flask was placed in a $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 15 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and quenched with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and extraced with 30 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed thrice with 10 mL 6 M HCl then 5 mL water. The acidic aqueous washings were combined, back extraced with 10 mL EtOAc and all organic phases combined. The organic medium was washed with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $358 \mathrm{mg}(74 \%, 11: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.67$ as a colorless oil and $74 \mathrm{mg}(15 \%$, 2.7:1.8:1.7:1 dr) 5.F as a colorless oil. 5.67: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) spectrum for an 8:1 mixture of diastereomers $\delta 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.79-$ $6.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.80-5.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}),, 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $17.2,11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{qd}, J=9.1,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84-3.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.16(\mathrm{ddq}, J=$ $16.4,10.6,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31(\mathrm{dt}, J=15.5,10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21(\mathrm{ddq}, J=12.0,8.2,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.12-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $0.2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 144.8,144.6,144.1,139.8,129.5,129.4$, $115.0,112.7,110.9,82.8,82.6,67.1,67.1,55.1,52.1,52.0,50.3,49.9,48.0,47.4,37.3,36.2$, $30.6,30.5,30.0,30.0,23.51,23.45,19.1,11.6$; IR (thin film) $3073,2934,2871,1600,1583$,

1261, 1047, 911, 778, $701 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS could not be obtained. 5.F: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.25-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.80-5.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00-4.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.02$ $(\mathrm{dq}, J=14.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.6 \mathrm{H}), 3.90-3.80(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.20-3.12(\mathrm{~m}, 0.4 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.98-$ $1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1.3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.8 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm})$ mixture $\delta 159.6,159.5,146.0,145.7,144.8,144.6,144.2,144.1,139.80,139.76,129.4$, $129.4,129.3,129.1,115.0,114.8,112.7,112.6,110.94,110.86,110.8,82.8,82.6,77.6,77.4$, $67.1,67.1,65.8,65.7,55.13,55.11,52.1,52.0,50.3,49.9,48.1,48.0,47.7,47.4,46.6,46.1,46.0$, $45.8,37.9,37.3,36.8,36.2,30.9,30.9,30.6,30.5,30.0,28.09,28.06,23.51,23.45,19.7,19.6$, 19.1, 18.9, 11.6, 11.2; IR (thin film) 2934, 2869, 1599, 1486, 1458, 1261, 1047, 667, $702 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS could not be obtained.

Aldehyde 5.68


To a 1 dram vial containing $73 \mathrm{mg}(0.255 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.67 \mathrm{in} 2.5 \mathrm{mLCH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was bubbled $\mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{O}_{2}$ at $78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until the solution turned blue. The flask was purged with $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ until the blue color faded, then $80 \mathrm{mg}(0.305 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ was added. Stirring was continued at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours then the bath was removed. After 6 hours the reaction was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (3:1 $\rightarrow 1: 2$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford $65 \mathrm{mg}\left(89 \%\right.$, with $\sim 25 \%$ over oxidation) $\mathbf{5 . 6 8}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 9.55(\mathrm{~s}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 9.49(\mathrm{~s}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$,
6.81-6.74 (m, 3H), 4.09 ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94-3.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 3.21(\mathrm{dtd}, J=$ $17.8,10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{t}, J=10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39-2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-$ $1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 205.1,204.1,143.62,143.59,129.9,129.84,129.80,111.8,67.3,67.2,55.3,55.2$, $51.9,51.7,47.6,47.0,46.4,42.2,30.8,30.4,30.1,29.9,27.0,24.8,14.3,11.3,7.1$; IR (thin film) 2936, 2879, 1720, 1600, 1485, 1262, 1158, $1045 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ [M$+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 311.1623$ found 311.1635 .

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.64


5.68

5.64

To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing $63 \mathrm{mg}(0.218 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 8}$ was added a solution of 2 $\mathrm{mg}(0.011 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ predried with 3 mL toluene under a Hickmann still. The reaction was heated to reflux under a Hickmann still for 2 hours. The reaction was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{EtOAc}$ and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 31 mg ( $52 \%$, single diastereomer) $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09(\mathrm{q}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{td}, J=8.6,3.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.0,9.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75$ (dtd, $J=11.1,7.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.0,10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24(\mathrm{ddq}, J=14.0,10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{t}, J=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.55-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$
$157.9,139.5,138.4,128.7,125.7,123.6,112.4,109.9,83.7,67.1,55.2,46.8,46.4,41.9,31.8$, 29.9, 27.0, 20.8; IR (thin film) 2935, 2869, 1607, 1489, 1157, 1064, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 288.1964$ found 288.1955.

## Enone 5.70



To a 10 mL round bottom flask charged with a glass stir bar was condensed 4 mL ammonia followed by the addition of $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.11 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 6 4} \mathrm{in} 1.1 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF and $0.30 \mathrm{~mL}(4.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ MeOH. Slowly, $34 \mathrm{mg}(4.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces at $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After complete addition and the blue color discharged, 275 mg solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the ammonia evaporated. The white residue taken up in 3 mL water and 4 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated and washed with 1 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 2 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material in a 10 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in 1.1 mL MeOH and treated with 0.1 mL 6 M HCl . After 16 hours at room temperature half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and EOAc were added. The layers were separated and the aqueous extracted with EtOAc. All organic layers were collected washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 16 mg ( $52 \%$ over 2 steps) $\mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ as a white solid that recrystallized from benzene to afford colorless prisms $\left(\mathrm{mp}=85-86^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta$ $5.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.4,9.6,3.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.12$
$(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.7,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{t}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.26$ $(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.15-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 199.9,168.8,121.1,82.9,67.1,51.6,51.4,45.1,43.2,38.4,37.4,34.1,29.9$, 29.7, 29.2, 27.4, 19.6; IR (thin film) 2927, 2868, 1667, $1622 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 283.1674$ found 283.1682.

## Diol 5.62



3-Methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide was prepared by addition of 7 mL ( 56 mmol ) 3bromoanisole in 7 mL THF to $1.77 \mathrm{~g}(73 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal in 28 mL THF activated by dibromoethane maintaining $40-50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A 250 mL 3-neck round bottom flask fitted with a low temperature thermometer was charged with 110 mL THF and 31 mL ( 39 mmol ) $1.26 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{3-}$ methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide. At $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 9 \mathrm{~mL}(3.3 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.37 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CuI} \cdot 2 \mathrm{LiCl} / \mathrm{THF}$ was added followed by $5.01 \mathrm{~g}(33.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.7 \mathrm{in} 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF while mainting at least $-72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was continued for 2 hours before the cold bath was removed. After 1 hour the reaction was recooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the solution was added 12 mL ( 82.8 mmol ) HMPA. After 1 hour $15 \mathrm{~mL}(136 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl bromoacetate was added. The reaction was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes then the cold bath removed. After stirring for 28 hours at room temperature, the reaction was cooled in an ice bath and treated with 100 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, extracted with

100 mL and twice with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 50 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a crude oil. To an ice cooled 1 L 3-neck round bottom flask fitted with an overhead stirrer and thermometer, containing $300 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added $5.05 \mathrm{~g}(133 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$. The crude oil in $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added via canula and washed with an additional $50 \mathrm{mLEt}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, maintaining an internal temperature below $6{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over the course of 1.5 hours. The ice bath was removed after 30 minutes. After 5 hours the flask was recooled in an ice bath and 5 mL EtOAc added over the course of 30 minutes. An oil bubbler was connected and 5 mL water, $5 \mathrm{~mL} 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and $40 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ were added with careful temperature monitoring. After stirring the contents overnight, the solution was filtered over Celite and the filter cake washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $\sim 1.2 \mathrm{~L}$ as determined by TLC). The filtrate was concentrated and the residue purified by column chromatography $(1: 2 \rightarrow 1: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford $5.68 \mathrm{~g}(56 \%$ over 2 steps, $7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2}$ as a viscous colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) mixture of diastereomers and slow rotation $\delta 7.22(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.69(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.83-5.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $0.5), 4.91-4.89(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5), 4.85-4.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45-3.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.31-3.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{ddq}, J=12.6,8.5,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.71-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.19$ (quintett, $J=12.7,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) mixture or diastereomers and slow rotation $\delta 145.0,144.8,144.1,139.6$, $115.1,112.7,74.8,74.6,62.2,62.1,55.1,55.1,49.91,49.87,48.1,47.4,37.6,36.6,35.05,35.00$, 34.7, 34.5, 23.3, 23.2, 19.0, 11.1; IR (thin film) 3304, 3077, 2997, 2932, 2882, 1599, 1584, 1487, 1260, $1046 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 327.1936$ found 327.1933.

## Trans-Perhydrobenzofuran 5.67 and 5.G



To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing $510 \mathrm{mg}(1.68 \mathrm{mmol}, 4: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2} \mathrm{in} 8 \mathrm{~mL}$ pyridine was added $820 \mathrm{mg}(4.30 \mathrm{mmol})$ p-toluenesulfonyl chloride at room temperature. The flask was placed in a $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 15 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and quenched with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and extraced with 30 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed thrice with 10 mL 6 M HCl then 5 mL water. The acidic aqueous washings were combined, back extraced with 10 mL EtOAc and all organic phases combined. The organic medium was washed with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (10:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $358 \mathrm{mg}(74 \%, 11: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 7}$ as a colorless oil and $74 \mathrm{mg}(15 \%, 2.7: 1.8: 1.7: 1 \mathrm{dr})$ 5.G as a colorless oil. 5.67: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm})$ spectrum for an $8: 1$ mixture of diastereomers $\delta 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 6.79-6.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.80-5.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}),, 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{qd}, J=9.1,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84-3.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.16(\mathrm{ddq}, J=16.4,10.6,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31(\mathrm{dt}, J=15.5,10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21(\mathrm{ddq}, J=$ $12.0,8.2,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H})$, $1.32-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 144.8,144.6$, $144.1,139.8,129.5,129.4,115.0,112.7,110.9,82.8,82.6,67.1,67.1,55.1,52.1,52.0,50.3$, $49.9,48.0,47.4,37.3,36.2,30.6,30.5,30.0,30.0,23.51,23.45,19.1,11.6$; IR (thin film) 3073 ,

2934, 2871, 1600, 1583, 1261, 1047, 911, 778, $701 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS could not be obtained. 5.G: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.25-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.80-5.66(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00-4.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{dq}, J=14.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.6 \mathrm{H}), 3.90-3.80(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.20-3.12(\mathrm{~m}$, $0.4 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.98-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.4 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.8 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) mixture $\delta 159.6,159.5,146.0,145.7,144.8,144.6$, 144.2, 144.1, 139.80, 139.76, 129.4, 129.4, 129.3, 129.1, 115.0, 114.8, 112.7, 112.6, 110.94, $110.86,110.8,82.8,82.6,77.6,77.4,67.1,67.1,65.8,65.7,55.13,55.11,52.1,52.0,50.3,49.9$, 48.1, 48.0, 47.7, 47.4, 46.6, 46.1, 46.0, 45.8, 37.9, 37.3, 36.8, 36.2, 30.9, 30.9, 30.6, 30.5, 30.0, 28.09, 28.06, 23.51, 23.45, 19.7, 19.6, 19.1, 18.9, 11.6, 11.2; IR (thin film) 2934, 2869, 1599, 1486, 1458, 1261, 1047, 667, $702 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS could not be obtained.

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.64



To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing $320 \mathrm{mg}(1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 11: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 7} \mathrm{in} 8 \mathrm{~mL}$ acetone and 2.6 mL nano-pure water was added $0.14 \mathrm{~mL}(0.022 \mathrm{mmol}) 4 \mathrm{wt} \% \mathrm{OsO}_{4}$ in water then 270 $\mathrm{mg}(2.30 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NMO}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ open to air. The ice bath was immediately removed and after stirring 12 hours at room temperature 10 mL water and $1.20 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{3}$ was added. After 10 minutes the solution was extracted thrice with 15 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 10 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered
and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was subjected to the next reaction without further purification. To a 100 mL round bottom flask containing the crude oil was added 10 mL 1:1 THF/water then $485 \mathrm{mg}(2.27 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ open to air. After 1 hour 10 mL water was added followed by $1.20 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{3}$. The mixture was extracted thrice with 15 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 10 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was subjected to the next reaction without further purification. To a 25 mL round bottom flask containing crude aldehyde was added a solution of $12 \mathrm{mg}(0.063 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ predried with 11 mL toluene over a Hickmann still. The reaction was refluxed over a Hickmann still for 2 hours. The reaction was cooled, diluted with 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography ( $7: 1 \rightarrow 5: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 262 mg ( $86 \%$ over 3 steps, single diastereomer) $\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford colorless prisms ( $\mathrm{mp}=134-136{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) . ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.25$ (s, 1H), $4.09(\mathrm{q}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{td}, J=8.6,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.0$, 9.7, $3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 2.75 (dtd, $J=11.1,7.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.0,10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24$ (ddq, $J=14.0,10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{t}, J=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 1.55-1.39 (m, 2H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 157.9,139.5,138.4,128.7,125.7$, $123.6,112.4,109.9,83.7,67.1,55.2,46.8,46.4,41.9,31.8,29.9,27.0,20.8$; IR (thin film) 2935, 2869, 1607, 1489, 1157, 1064, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$ 288.1964 found 288.1955 .

## Tetracyclic Enone 5.70 and Anisole 5.H



To a 50 mL round bottom flask charged with a glass stir bar was condensed 20 mL ammonia followed by the addition of $248 \mathrm{mg}(0.917 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{1 2}$ in 4.5 mL THF and $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}(47 \mathrm{mmol})$ MeOH . Slowly, $250 \mathrm{mg}(36 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added in small pieces at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The side of the flasks were washed with $0.3 \mathrm{~mL}(7.4 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MeOH}$ after 150 mg lithium metal was added. After complete addition and the blue color discharged, $2.1 \mathrm{~g}(39 \mathrm{mmol})$ solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the ammonia evaporated. The white residue was taken up in 5 mL water and 20 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated and washed with 5 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material in a 50 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in 10 mL MeOH and treated with 0.5 mL 6 M HCl . After 16 hours at room temperature 20 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 20 mL EOAc were added. The layers were separated and the aqueous extracted with 10 mL and 5 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were collected washed with 5 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $4: 1 \rightarrow 2: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 44 mg ( $18 \%$ over 2 steps) $\mathbf{5 . G}$ as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford colorless needles ( $\mathrm{mp}=80-82^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and $128 \mathrm{mg}(53 \%$ over 2 steps) 5.70 as a white solid that recrystallized from benzene to afford colorless prisms ( $\mathrm{mp}=85-86{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). 5.H: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 7.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.2$, $2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.03-4.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.31(\mathrm{td}, J=10.6,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.79(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.3$,
$6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.61(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.5,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33(\mathrm{t}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.4,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=20.8,11.5$, $9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.45(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.89(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 157.6,141.87,129.9$, $129.2,112.1,110.4,83.7,67.1,55.2,48.5,47.7,46.1,37.3,33.8,31.8,30.5,29.1,21.1$; IR (thin film) $2929,2870,1610,1495,1237,1062,1040,805 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 290.2120$ found 290.2113. 5.70: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 5.85(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.4,9.6,3.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.90(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.7,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{t}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H})$, 1.15-1.08(m, 1H), 0.98-0.89(m, 1H), $0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 199.9,168.8,121.1,82.9,67.1,51.6,51.4,45.1,43.2,38.4,37.4,34.1,29.9,29.7$, 29.2, 27.4, 19.6; IR (thin film) 2927, 2868, 1667, $1622 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 283.1674$ found 283.1682.

## Dihydronaphthalene 5.64



To a 500 mL round bottom flask containing $5.68 \mathrm{~g}(18.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 6 2} \mathrm{in} 95 \mathrm{~mL}$ pyridine was added $8.91 \mathrm{~g}(47.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{p}$-toluenesulfonyl chloride at room temperature. The flask was placed in a $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 15 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and quenched with 100 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and extracted with 300 mL and 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were washed thrice with ice cold 100 mL 6 M HCl then 50 mL water.

The acidic aqueous washings were combined, back extracted with 100 mL and 50 mL EtOAc and all organic phases combined. The organic medium was washed with 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was taken on to the next step. To a 500 mL round bottom flask containing crude alkene in 150 mL acetone and 50 mL nano-pure water was added $1.2 \mathrm{~mL}(0.189 \mathrm{mmol}) 4 \mathrm{wt} \% \mathrm{OsO}_{4}$ in water then $4.40 \mathrm{~g}(37.6 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NMO}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ open to air. The ice bath was immediately removed and after stirring 20 hours at room temperature $9.5 \mathrm{~g}(75 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{3}$ in 50 mL water was added. After 20 minutes, 5 g NaCl was added and the solution was extracted with $150 \mathrm{~mL}, 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and 50 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, washed with 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 50 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was subjected to the next reaction without further purification. To a 1 L round bottom flask containing the crude oil was added $190 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{1:1} \mathrm{THF/water} \mathrm{then} \mathrm{immersed} \mathrm{in}$ a room temperature water bath and $8.14 \mathrm{~g}(38.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ added open to air. After 1 hour 18 $\mathrm{g}(150 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{3}$ suspended in 150 mL water was added. The mixture was extracted with 150 mL and 100 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined and washed with 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 50 mL brine. The aqueous layers were combined and back extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was subjected to the next reaction without further purification. To a 250 mL round bottom flask containing crude aldehyde was added 180 mL toluene and 180 mg ( 0.95 mmol ) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The reaction was refluxed over a Dean-Stark trap for 2 hours. The reaction was cooled, diluted with 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with 50 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all
volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $4.04 \mathrm{~g}\left(80 \%\right.$ over 4 steps, 6:1 dr) 5.70 as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 7.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,2.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09(\mathrm{q}, ~ J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{td}, J=8.6,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.20$ (ddd, $J=11.0,9.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{dtd}, J=11.1,7.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.0,10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24(\mathrm{ddq}, J=14.0,10.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{t}, J=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.74(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 1.55-1.39 (m, 2H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta 157.9,139.5,138.4$, $128.7,125.7,123.6,112.4,109.9,83.7,67.1,55.2,46.8,46.4,41.9,31.8,29.9,27.0,20.8 ;$ IR (thin film) 2935, 2869, 1607, 1489, 1157, 1064, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 288.1964$ found 288.1955.

## Tetracyclic Enone 5.70



To a 1 L 3-neck round bottom flask fitted with an overhead stirrer was added $4.04 \mathrm{~g}(14.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, 6:1 dr) 5.64 in 100 mL THF followed by 300 mL ammonia and 6 mL MeOH . At $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a total of $4.17 \mathrm{~g}(600 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal was added while additional 6 mL MeOH was added after $0.93 \mathrm{~g}, 1.80 \mathrm{~g}$ and 2.86 g lithium. After complete addition of lithium and disappearance of a blue color, an additional 1 mL MeOH and $35 \mathrm{~g}(654 \mathrm{mmol})$ solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the ammonia evaporated overnight. The white residue taken up in 100 mL water and extracted with 200 mL and 100 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed twice with 50 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material in a 1 L round
bottom flask was dissolved in 150 mL MeOH and treated with 15 mL 6 M HCl . After 10 hours at room temperature 200 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 100 mL water were added while controlling the temperature. The mixture was extracted with 300 mL and thrice with 100 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were collected washed with 50 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and 50 mL brine. These aqueous washings were combined and back extracted with 50 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $4: 1 \rightarrow 2: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $2.55 \mathrm{~g}(65 \%$ over 2 steps, $7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ as a white wax. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$)$ major $\delta 5.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.4,9.6,3.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, 2.23-2.12 (m, 3H), $1.90(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.7,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{t}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.56-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.15-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta$ 199.9, 168.8, 121.1, 82.9, 67.1, 51.6, 51.4, 45.1, 43.2, 38.4, 37.4, 34.1, 29.9, 29.7, 29.2, 27.4, 19.6; IR (thin film) 2927, 2868, 1667, $1622 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 283.1674$ found 283.1682.

## $\mathbf{L i} / \mathbf{N H}_{3}$ Reduction to $\mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ and 5.74



A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with a glass stir bar and filled with 3 mL liquid ammonia. To the stirring solution was added $3 \mathrm{mg}(0.43 \mathrm{mmol})$ lithium metal and 0.2 mL THF. At $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 14 \mathrm{mg}(0.054 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ was added with the assistance of 0.5 mL THF. After 2 minutes 0.1 mL isoprene was added, followed by 75 mg solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The flask was warmed to
room temperature. After evaporation of the ammonia, 1 mL water and 2 mL EtOAc were added. The layers separated and the organic phase washed with 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $9.0 \mathrm{mg}(64 \%, 1: 2 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3 / 5 . 7 4}$ as a colorless oil.

Table 5.1, Entry 1: $\mathbf{N a} / \mathbf{N H}_{3}$ Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with a glass stir bar and filled with 3 mL liquid ammonia. To the stirring solution was added $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.038 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.70$ with 0.8 mL THF followed by $16 \mathrm{mg}(0.70 \mathrm{mmol})$ sodium metal at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 minutes 0.15 mL isoprene was added, followed by 62 mg solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The flask was warmed to room temperature. After evaporation of the ammonia, 1 mL water and 2 mL EtOAc were added. The layers separated and the organic phase washed with 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography ( $2: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.5 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3} / \mathbf{5} .74$ as a colorless oil.

Table 5.1, Entry 2: K/NH3 Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with a glass stir bar and filled with 3 mL liquid ammonia. To the stirring solution was added $10.4 \mathrm{mg}(0.040 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ with 0.8 mL THF followed by $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.70 \mathrm{mmol})$ potassium metal at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 30 minutes 0.10 mL isoprene was added, followed by 71 mg solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The flask was warmed to room temperature. After evaporation of the ammonia, 2 mL water and 5 mL EtOAc were added. The layers separated and the organic phase washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography (3:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.6 \mathrm{mg}(82 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3 / 5 . 7 4}$ as a colorless oil.

Table 5.1, Entry 3: K/NH3/t-BuOH Reduction 5.73 and 5.74


A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with a glass stir bar and filled with 3 mL liquid ammonia. To the stirring solution was added $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.038 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ with 0.8 mL THF and $0.18 \mathrm{~mL}(1.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOH}$ followed by $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$ potassium metal at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 30 minutes, 0.10 mL isoprene was added, followed by 71 mg solid $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The flask was warmed to room temperature. After evaporation of the ammonia, 2 mL water and 3 mL EtOAc were added. The layers separated and the organic phase washed with 2 mL brine, dried over
$\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.0 \mathrm{mg}(80 \%, 1: 3 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3 / 5 . 7 4}$ as a white wax.

Table 5.1, Entry 5: Karstedt/Et ${ }_{3}$ SiH Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 1 dram vial was charged with $15 \mathrm{mg}(0.058 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}, 3 \mathrm{mg}(0.00016 \mathrm{mmol})$ Karstedt's catalyst $2 \mathrm{wt} \%$ in xylene and 0.4 mL triethylsilane, capped and heated to $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 12 hours the reaction was cooled and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was dissolved in 0.4 mL THF and treated with $0.15 \mathrm{~mL}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBAF} 1 \mathrm{M} /$ THF open to air. After 30 minutes 1 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the mixture extracted twice with 2 mL EtOAc . The organic layers were combined, washed with 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $14 \mathrm{mg}(92 \%$ over 2 steps, $1: 5 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3} / \mathbf{5 . 7 4}$ as a white solid. Crystallization from pentane/EtOAc afforded $\mathbf{5 . 7 4}$ as a single diastereomer in colorless prisms $\left(\mathrm{mp}=137-139^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.

Table 5.1, Entry 6: t-BuCu/DIBAI Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 1 dram vial containing $7.9 \mathrm{mg}(0.041 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CuI}$ in 0.4 mL THF was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.042 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{t-BuLi} /$ pentane. After stirring at $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 minutes the flask was recooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.10 \mathrm{~mL}(0.57 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{HMPA}$ then 0.10 mL ( 0.1 mmol ) 1.0 M DIBAlH/hexanes. After 20 minutes at $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the flask was recooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $11.3 \mathrm{mg}(0.043 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.70 \mathrm{in} 0.4 \mathrm{~mL}$ THF was added slowly. The reaction was stirred at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 8 hours, after which it was removed from the cold bath and quenched with 2 mL 2 M HCl . The flask was warmed to room temperature and partitioned with 6 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with $2 \mathrm{~mL} 3: 1$ sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl} / 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}$ twice then 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $9.8 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%, 1:>20 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3 / 5 . 7 4}$ as a white solid. Crystallization from pentane/EtOAc afforded colorless prisms ( $\mathrm{mp}=137-13{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). 5.74: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 3.95-3.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.11-3.06(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.47-2.38(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{dtd}, J=11.0,7.4,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $24.5,11.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 212.7,83.2,67.3,47.3,46.5,41.1,40.4,38.3$, $37.5,37.2,35.2,34.3,31.3,30.5,28.5,28.3,20.4$; IR (thin film) $2924,2866,1711,1453,1058$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 285.1830$ found 285.1843.

Table 5.1, Entry 7: Pd/C Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 1 dram vial containing $5.3 \mathrm{mg}(0.020 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ and catalytic $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ in 0.4 mL EtOAc was stirred under a hydrogen balloon for 20 hours. The reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with EtOAc and all volatiles removed in vauo. The crude solid was purified by column chromatography (3:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $5.0 \mathrm{mg}(94 \%, 6: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3 / 5 . 7 4}$ as a white semisolid.

Table 5.1, Entry 8: Rh/alumina Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 1 dram vial containing $5.9 \mathrm{mg}(0.023 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.70$ and catalytic $\mathrm{Rh} /$ alumina in 0.4 mL EtOAc was stirred under $400 \mathrm{psi}_{2}$ in a bomb reactor. After 20 hours, the reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with EtOAc and all volatiles removed in vauo to afford an alcohol as a mixture of diastereomers. The crude material was dissolved in $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 22 mg Celite added followed by $21 \mathrm{mg}(0.097 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ open to air. After 5 hours the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and filtered over silica gel, eluting with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All volatiles were removed in vacuo and the crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 5.5 mg ( $93 \%$ over 2 steps, $8: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) 5.73/5.74 as a white semi-solid.

Table 5.1, Entry 9: Rh/C Reduction to 5.73 and 5.74


A 25 mL round bottom containing $563 \mathrm{mg}(1.26 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.70$ and $46 \mathrm{mg}(0.022 \mathrm{mmol}) 5 \%$ $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}$ in 10 mL EtOAc was stirred under $500 \mathrm{psi}_{2}$ in a bomb reactor. After 24 hours, the reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with 30 mL EtOAc and all volatiles removed in vauo to afford a mixture of ketone and alcohol. The crude material in a 50 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 550 mg Celite added followed by $470 \mathrm{mg}(2.18 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ open to air. After 5 hours the reaction was diluted with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and filtered over silica gel, eluting with $120 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All volatiles were removed in vacuo and the crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $525 \mathrm{mg}(93 \%$ over 2 steps, $15: 1 \mathrm{dr})$ 5.73/5.74 as a white semi-solid. 5.73: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 3.88-$ $3.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.2,10.0,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.1,3.9,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41-$ $2.31(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{dq}, J=11.5,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{t}, J=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96$ (ddt, $J=13.2,6.0,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.46(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.03-0.72(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5,3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 212.083 .5,66.9,50.7,49.3,48.9,47.9,47.4,42.4,41.2,41.1,36.5,33.3,32.6,30.5$, 28.2, 20.8; IR (thin film) 2925, 2865, 1711, 1455, $1062 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+} 280.2277$ found 280.2279.

## Lactone 5.81 using Fieser's Reagent



A 25 mL round bottom flask containing dram vial containing $292 \mathrm{mg}(1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ and $35 \mathrm{mg}(0.017) 5 \% \mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}$ in 5.5 mL EtOAc was stirred under $500 \mathrm{psi}_{2}$ in a bomb reactor. After 18 hours, the reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with EtOAc and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a mixture of ketone and alcohol. Only $247 \mathrm{mg}(\sim 81 \%)$ crude material in a 20 mL scintillation vial was dissolved in 4 mL AcOH and treated with $410 \mathrm{mg}(4.10 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ in $6 \mathrm{~mL} 5: 1 \mathrm{AcOH} /$ water open to air. After 20 hours, 0.20 mL i- PrOH was added and stirring continuted for 20 minutes. After being poured into 70 mL ice cold stirring water, the solution was treated with 30 mL 5 M NaOH at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and extracted with $30 \mathrm{~mL}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ and 10 mL $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 10 mL water, 10 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 10 mL brine. The aqueous washings were combined and back extracted with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $1: 2$ hexanes $/ \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to afford 69 mg $(27 \%$ over 2 steps, $>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ as a white semi-solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm) $\delta 3.84(\mathrm{td}, J=11.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.1,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.9,3.9$, $1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.79-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-$ $1.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.19-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 210.6,175.9,84.9,50.2,48.4,48.2,47.1,46.8,42.0,41.0,40.9,37.4$,
36.5, 32.9, 29.6, 27.7, 20.3; IR (thin film) 2920, 2867, 1781, 1710, 1210, 1041, $966 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 299.1623$ found 299.1624.

## Diol 5.82



To a 1 dram vial containing $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.111 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3} \mathrm{in} 0.3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{AcOH}$ was added $51 \mathrm{mg}(0.51$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ in $0.8 \mathrm{~mL} 9: 1 \mathrm{AcOH} /$ water open to air. After 23 hours, 0.10 mL i- PrOH was added and stirring continuted for 20 minutes. After being poured into 7 mL ice cold stirring water and 5 $\mathrm{mLEt}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, the solution was treated with 3 mL 5 M NaOH at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and extracted with $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed twice with 2 mL water and 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. The aqueous washings were combined and back extracted with $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 10 mL round bottom flask containing crude $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ oxidation product in $2.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ was refluxed with $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.54 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethylene glycol and $2 \mathrm{mg}(0.011 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ under a Hickman Still. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with 5 mL EtOAc and washed with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 2 mL brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude lactone was added with the assistance of 01 mL THF to $16 \mathrm{mg}(0.42 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in 1 mL THF at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The flask was immediately removed from the cold bath and stirred for 10 minutes before being heated to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour. After cooling the flask to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.05 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc, 0.02 mL water, $0.02 \mathrm{~mL} 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 0.06 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ were carefully added sequentially. The solution was filtered over Celite and
washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $\sim 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc) to afford $15 \mathrm{mg}(42 \%$ over 3 steps, $>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 2}$ as a white semi-solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 3.94(\mathrm{~s}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 3.81-3.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.47-3.31(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.10(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.92-0.81(\mathrm{~m}$, $7 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 109.4,76.2,64.3,64.1,62.3,50.1,47.9,47.7$, 45.6, 43.3, 41.6, 40.7, 39.4, 37.6, 34.2, 32.1, 31.4, 26.0, 20.2.

## Benzyl Ether 5.83



To a 1 dram vial containing $11 \mathrm{mg}(0.034 \mathrm{mmol}) 5.82$ was added $5.5(0.081 \mathrm{mmol})$ imidazole, $2.5 \mathrm{mg}(0.020 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP and $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. At $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 7.0 \mathrm{mg}(0.046 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBSCl}$ was added and the cooling bath removed. After 10 hours sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and the mixture extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material and $2 \mathrm{mg}(0.0054 \mathrm{mmol})$ TBAI in a 1 dram vial were dissolved in 0.4 mL THF and at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ treated with $0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(0.10$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ KHMDS $0.5 \mathrm{M} /$ toluene and $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}(0.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ benzyl chloride. The cold bath was immediately removed. After 1 hour the reaction was recooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (20:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $8.5 \mathrm{mg}(47 \%) \mathbf{5 . 8 3}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta$ 7.34-7.26 (m, 5H), 4.53-4.41 (m, 2H), 3.93-3.87 (m,
$2 \mathrm{H}), 3.81-3.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75-3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.55-3.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04-$ $2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.95-0.77(\mathrm{~m}, 13 \mathrm{H})$, $0.62-0.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.04(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.03(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta$ 138.6, $128.3,127.81,127.77,127.44,124.41,109.5,73.2,71.8,69.3,64.0,63.9,48.6,47.3,42.9,42.0$, $41.8,41.7,38.6,38.4,35.0,34.8,31.3,26.4,25.9,24.2,20.0,17.9,-4.6,-4.7$.

## Benzyl Ether 5.H



A 1 dram vial containing $8.5 \mathrm{mg}(0.016 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 8 2}, 4 \mathrm{mg}(0.016 \mathrm{mmol})$ PPTS and $3 \mathrm{mg}(0.016$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in $0.2 \mathrm{~mL} 3: 1$ acetone/water was sealed and heated to $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 hours. The reaction was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatograph ( $3: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $3.7 \mathrm{mg}(62 \%) \mathbf{5 . H}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta$ 7.37-7.29 $(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63-3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.49-3.44(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.8,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{t}, J=13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.81-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 211.7,137.5,128.5,127.8,74.6,73.4,69.7,50.43,50.39,47.7,46.7,45.7,42.6,41.7$ $41.0,37.4,35.9,33.7,30.5,25.5,20.1$.

## Ketone 5.84



A 1 dram vial containing 5.H, DMP and $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ in $0.2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was stirred for 30 minutes. The reaction was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a crude material assigned as 5.84 .

## Trityl Alcohol 5.85



A 5 mL round bottom flask was charged with $15 \mathrm{mg}(0.046 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 8 2}, 6.8 \mathrm{mg}(0.056 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP, $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.22 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $18 \mathrm{mg}(0.064 \mathrm{mmol})$ triphenylmethyl chloride in 1 mL DCE. After stirring the reaction at $85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 hours the solution was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $5: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $15 \mathrm{mg}(58 \%) \mathbf{5 . 8 5}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.85-3.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.72-3.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.47-$ $3.43(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.30-3.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.13(\mathrm{dt}, J=9.1,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.46(\mathrm{~m}$,
$7 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91-0.78(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.70(\mathrm{t}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 171.1,143.9,128.7,128.6,127.8,127.0,109.4,87.4,77.3$, $77.076 .8,74.0,64.2,64.0,63.3,60.4,49.5,47.5,45.7,44.4,43.0,41.6,40.0,37.9,36.0,34.5$, 31.4, 29.3, 25.1, 21.1, 20.1, 14.2.

## Benzyl Ether 5.86



A 1 dram vial was charged with $5 \mathrm{mg}(\sim 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ oil free KH and layered with 0.2 mL THF. At $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ a solution of $1 \mathrm{mg}(0.0026 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBAI}$ and $15 \mathrm{mg}(0.026 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 8 2}$ was added with a total of 0.5 mL THF. After the addition of 1 drop benzyl chloride the reaction was heated to 50 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours. The reaction was cooled, then treated with water and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (15:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $11 \mathrm{mg}(64 \%) \mathbf{5 . 8 6}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 7.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 7.34-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87-3.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10(\mathrm{t}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.19$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.98-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.23(\mathrm{~m}$, $6 \mathrm{H}), 1.13-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.86(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) 0.70-0.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ 144.4, 139.4, 128.7, 128.2, 127.71, 127.68, 127.65, 127.2, $127.0,126.8,109.5,78.0,69.6,64.3,64.0,62.2,60.4,48.4,47.3,42.7,42.0,41.5,39.5,38.7$, 38.1, 35.1, 34.8, 31.2, 24.1, 22.7, 21.1, 19.9, 14.2.

## Ketoalcohol 5.87



A 1 dram vial containing $11 \mathrm{mg}(0.016 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 8 6}, 4.5 \mathrm{mg}(0.018 \mathrm{mmol})$ PPTS and 6.8 mg $(0.036 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ dissolved in $0.6 \mathrm{~mL} 5: 1$ acetone/water was sealed and heated to $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 1 hour the reaction was cooled, diluted with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered. The brine layer was back extracted with EtOAc , dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, combined with the previously dried organic layer and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $2: 1 \rightarrow 1: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $5.7 \mathrm{mg}(91 \%) 5.87$ as a white semi-solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.36-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{q}, J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3$, $3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.4,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{t}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{ddq}, J=13.3,8.6$, $4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.19-$ $1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm) $\delta 211.9,138.7,128.3,127.6,127.5,79.2,69.9,61.4,50.4,50.0,46.5,43.1,42.2,41.4$, $41.1,39.2,38.3,38.0,33.5,24.2,23.8,19.9$; IR (thin film) $3418,2921,1711,1065,734 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 393.2406$ found 393.2389.

## Enone 5.89



A 1 dram vial containing $5.87, \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and DMP in $0.2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was stirred at room temperature. After 10 minutes the reaction was treated with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, water and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, sat. aq. brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 1 dram vial containing crude $\mathbf{5 . 8 8}$ in 0.5 mL $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ was refluxed with $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $4 \AA$ MS. After 20 minutes the reaction was cooled, treated with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, diluted with EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford crude $\mathbf{5 . 8 9}$.

## Lactol 5.90



A 1 dram vial containing $6.9 \mathrm{mg}(0.069 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ dissolved in 0.4 mL MeCN was cooled to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $4.4 \mathrm{mg}(0.017 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 7 3}$ added with $0.2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The reaction was cooled to -50 to $-55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under vigorous stirring and treated with $30 \mathrm{mg}(0.069 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NIO}_{4}$ in 0.2 mL MeCN. After 15 minutes 1 mL 1:1:2 sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3} /$ sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} /$ water was added, the mixture warmed to room temperature and extracted twice with 2 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 1:1:2 sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3} /$ sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} /$ water, 1 mL brine, dried
over MgSO , filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(1: 1 \rightarrow 1: 4$ hexanes $/ E t O A c$ ) to afford $2.7 \mathrm{mg}(58 \%) \mathbf{5 . 9 0}$ as a colorless oil and $1.0 \mathrm{mg}(22 \%)$ recovered starting material as a thin film. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 4.02(\mathrm{td}, J=8.8,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.90(\mathrm{q}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.55-2.47$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-0.98$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.73(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta$ $211.6,105.6,65.8,50.6,49.1,47.6,47.4,46.8,42.5,41.0,40.9,36.7,35.3,33.6,32.7,25.1$, 20.1; IR (thin film) $3405,2923,2863,1713,1455,1116,1052,1029 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 301.1780$ found 301.1773 .

## Lactone 5.81 using Fieser's Reagent in $\mathbf{M e N O}_{2}$



A 10 mL round bottom flask containing $108 \mathrm{mg}(0.414 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 7 0}$ and $9 \mathrm{mg}(0.0044$ $\mathrm{mmol}) 5 \% \mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}$ in 1.8 mL EtOAc was stirred under $500 \mathrm{psi}_{2}$ in a bomb reactor. After 23 hours, the reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with EtOAc and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a mixture of ketone and alcohol. In a 25 mL round bottom flask, crude THF tetracycle was dissolved in 4 mL MeNO 2 , cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $166 \mathrm{mg}(1.66 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{CrO}_{3}$ dissolved in $0.8 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{10:1} \mathrm{AcOH/water} \mathrm{open} \mathrm{to} \mathrm{air}$.After 20 hours at room temperature, the reaction was recooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ then 5 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and 5 mL water added. The solution was extracted with 15 mLand 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed
with 3 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 3 mL brine. The aqueous washings were combined and backextracted with 3 mL EtOAc. All organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $\left(1: 2 \rightarrow 1: 4\right.$ hexanes $\left./ \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ to afford $43 \mathrm{mg}(38 \%$ over 2 steps, $>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 1}$ as a white semisolid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 3.84(\mathrm{td}, J=11.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $16.1,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.9,3.9,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.79-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.19-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 210.6,175.9,84.9,50.2$, 48.4, 48.2, 47.1, 46.8, 42.0, 41.0, 40.9, 37.4, 36.5, 32.9, 29.6, 27.7, 20.3; IR (thin film) 2920, 2867, 1781, 1710, 1210, 1041, $966 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 299.1623 found 299.1624 .

## Hydroxyketone 17



A 10 mL round bottom flask containing $67 \mathrm{mg}(0.242 \mathrm{mmol}>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 1} \mathrm{in} 3.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ benzene was refluxed with $0.07 \mathrm{~mL}(1.25 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethylene glycol and $3 \mathrm{mg}(0.016 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ over a Hickman Still. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with 10 mL EtOAc and washed with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 2 mL brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude lactone was added with the assistance of 0.9 mL THF to $19 \mathrm{mg}(0.501 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in 1 mL THF at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The flask was immediately
removed from the cold bath and stirred for 14 hours. After cooling the flask to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.02 \mathrm{~mL}$ water, $0.02 \mathrm{~mL} 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 0.06 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ were carefully added sequentially. The solution was filtered over Celite and washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\sim 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing crude diol in 2.2 mL DCE and $0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(1.43 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ was added $3 \mathrm{mg}(0.024 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP and $68 \mathrm{mg}(0.244$ mmol ) triphenylmethyl chloride. After heating the mixture at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 9 hours, the reaction was cooled, treated with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 10 mL round bottom flask containing $36 \mathrm{mg}(0.90 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{KH}$ freed from oil with three pentane washings was added 0.5 mL THF and $10 \mathrm{mg}(0.027 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBAI}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Crude alcohol was added with the assistance of 2 mL THF followed by $0.06 \mathrm{~mL}(0.52 \mathrm{mmol})$ benzyl chloride. The cold bath was removed and the reaction stirred for 30 minutes, after which the reaction was heated to $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 2 hours the flask was cooled in an ice bath, treated carefully with 2 mL water and extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material in a 10 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $4 \mathrm{~mL} 5: 1$ acetone/water then treated with $21 \mathrm{mg}(0.084$ mmol) PPTS and $35 \mathrm{mg}(0.18 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. A reflux condenser was fitted and the reaction immersed in a $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath open to air. After 2 hours the reaction was cooled, diluted with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with 10 mL and 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered. The brine layer was back extracted with 3 mL EtOAc, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, combined with the previously dried organic layer and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(2: 1 \rightarrow 1: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford $68 \mathrm{mg}(75 \%$ over 5 steps, $>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 7}$ as
a white semi-solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 7.36-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{q}, J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=13.3,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.4,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{t}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{ddq}, J=$ $13.3,8.6,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.23(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 1.19-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.83(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 211.9,138.7,128.3,127.6,127.5,79.2,69.9,61.4,50.4,50.0,46.5,43.1$, $42.2,41.4,41.1,39.2,38.3,38.0,33.5,24.2,23.8,19.9$; IR (thin film) $3418,2921,1711,1065$, $734 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 393.2406$ found 393.2389.

## Tetracyclic Enone 5.89



A 10 mL round bottom flask containing $65 \mathrm{mg}(0.175 \mathrm{mmol},>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{1 7}$ and $264 \mathrm{mg}(3.14$ mmol) $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ in $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added 149 mg ( 0.351 mmol ) DMP at room temperature open to air. After 20 minutes the reaction was treated carefully with $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Na} \mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and stirred for 20 minutes before being diluted with an additional $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Na} 2 \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and 2 mL water and extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed twice with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. A 10 mL round bottom flask containing crude keto-aldehyde in 3 mL benzene was refluxed with 4 mg ( 0.021 mmol ) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ over a Hickman Still. After 20 minutes the reaction was cooled, treated with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, diluted with 10 mL EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed
in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $44 \mathrm{mg}(72 \%, 15: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.89$ as a light yellow semi-solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $7.27 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 7.36-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.79(\mathrm{t}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.01(\mathrm{td}, J=10.4,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.80(\mathrm{dtd}, J=20.4,5.0,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59-2.55(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28(\mathrm{tdd}, J=21.5,11.5,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.07(\mathrm{dq}, J=9.8,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $1.54-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.73(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) $\delta 200.2,138.8,136.8,135.6,128.3,127.7,127.5,82.9,70.5,46.9$, 46.8, 45.7, 42.4, 41.4, 39.5, 39.3, 36.8, 30.7, 30.1, 29.9, 27.5, 19.7; IR (thin film) 2917, 2858, 1686, 1619, 1454, $1256 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 373.2144$ found 373.2159.

Methyl Enone 5.91


LDA was prepared in a 1 dram vial by addition of $0.3 \mathrm{~mL}(0.17 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.57 \mathrm{M}$ diisopropylamine/THF followed by $0.06 \mathrm{~mL}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}) 2.5 \mathrm{M} /$ hexanes at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the stirring LDA solution at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $42 \mathrm{mg}(0.12 \mathrm{mmol},>10: 1 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 8 9}$ with the assistance of 0.5 mL THF. After 10 minutes, $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ HMPA was added neat followed by 0.03 mL ( 0.48 mmol ) methyl iodide. The cold bath was removed after an additional 10 minutes and the reaction stirred for 50 minutes before 2 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added. The solution was extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by
column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 5: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $37 \mathrm{mg}(84 \%, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}, \sim 15 \%$ dimethylation?) $\mathbf{5 . 9 1}$ as a yellow solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta$ 7.36-7.29 (m, $5 \mathrm{H}), 6.79(\mathrm{t}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 6.69(\mathrm{t}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.2), 4.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.01(\mathrm{td}, J=10.4,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.83-2.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31-2.24$ (m, 1H), 2.09-2.06 (m, 1H), 1.87-1.45 (m, 6H), 1.33-1.21 (m, 3H), 1.14 (d, $J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 0.97-0.74 (m, 4H), $0.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major $\delta$ (major) 204.0, (mixture of diastereomers) 138.82, 136.0, 135.9, 134.5, 128.3, 127.7, 127.7, 127.5 , (major) $82.9,70.5,46.9,46.8,46.7,45.9,42.7,41.5,41.3,37.1,36.9,34.1,30.9,30.2$, 27.6, 19.7, 18.6; IR (thin film) 2917, 2864, 1684, 1769, 1453, 1093, $735 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 387.2300$ found 387.2293.

## Corey's Dione 5.4



A 1 dram vial containing $27 \mathrm{mg}(0.074 \mathrm{mmol}, 3: 1 \mathrm{dr}) 5.91$ and $9 \mathrm{mg}(0.0042 \mathrm{mmol}) 10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ ( $50 \%$ wetted) in 0.8 mL EtOAc was stirred under $900 \mathrm{psi}_{2}$ in a bomb reactor. After 23 hours, the reaction was filtered over Celite, eluting with EtOAc ( $\sim 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles removed in vauo to afford a keto-alcohol as a mixture of diastereomers. The crude material in a 1 dram vial was dissolved in $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and 64 mg Celite added followed by $60 \mathrm{mg}(0.278 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{PCC}$ open to air. After 2 hours the reaction was diluted with $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and filtered over silica gel, eluting with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\sim 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The crude material in a 1 dram vial was dissolved in 0.6 mL MeOH and 0.6
$\mathrm{mL}(0.078 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.13 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH} / \mathrm{MeOH}$. After 30 minutes at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the reaction was cooled, diluted with 2 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with 2 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 13 mg ( $65 \%$ over 3 steps, $>20: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) 5.4 as a white solid that was recrystallized from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to afford whispy white needles ( $\mathrm{mp}=160-161^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Corey's mp (no solvent specified, $60 \%$ ee) $=137-140$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}^{1}$, Miyaoka's mp (no solvent specified, no enantiopurity mentioned) $=123-125{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}^{62}$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) $\delta 2.50-2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.97(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.1$, $3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{qt}, J=11.5,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.10-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ 6.5 Hz, 3H), $0.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{q}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta 213.0,212.0,53.6,52.7,52.1,52.1,46.3,44.3,43.0,41.2,41.0,40.4,36.4,31.0,23.7$, 23.6, 19.9, 14.4; IR (thin film) 2923, 2859, 1710, 1455, 1259, 1088, $800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+} 274.1933$ found 274.1944.

## Diol (土)-5.94



A 1 dram vial was charged with $52 \mathrm{mg}(0.530 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 0}, 1.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{MeCN}, 0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.83 \mathrm{mmol})$ MVK and $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}(0.11 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{NTMS}$. The vial sealed and immersed into a $90{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath for 21 hours. The reaction was cooled to room temperature and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude Michael adduct was added to $21 \mathrm{mg}(0.52 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with the assistance of $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 30 minutes
before being recooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with 0.09 mL water, 0.02 mL 5 M NaOH and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. After 30 minuted of vigorous stirring the solution was filtered over Celite, eluting with Et2O ( $\sim 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $1: 2 \rightarrow 1: 3$ Hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $77 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%, 1: 1: 1: 1$ dr) ( $\pm$ )-5.94 as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta$ 5.83-5.74 (m, 1 H ), 5.03-4.98 (m, 2H), 3.83-3.75 (m, 1H), 3.65-3.53(m, 2H), 2.37-2.23(m, 1H), 2.13-2.04 (m, 2H), 1.54-1.32 (m, 5H), $1.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 142.97,142.87,142.85,142.77,114.0,113.80,113.76,68.4,68.0,63.6$, $63.5,63.35,63.25,45.5,45.4,45.09,45.06,38.8,38.74,38.71,38.7,37.1,36.8,36.7,36.4,24.1$, $24.0,23.8,23.6,23.6,23.5,17.0,16.9,16.8,16.8$; IR (thin film) $3335,2964,2928,2875 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 195.1361$ found 195.1353.

## Benzoate (土)-5.95



A 1 dram vial containing $12 \mathrm{mg}(0.070 \mathrm{mmol}, 1: 1: 1: 1 \mathrm{dr})( \pm)-\mathbf{S 9 4}, 1.7 \mathrm{mg}(0.014 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMAP, $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.72 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was treated with $0.1 \mathrm{~mL}(0.070 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.7 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{BzCl} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and stirred for 1 hour before the cold bath was removed. After 30 minutes at room temperature the reaction was quenched with 1 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with 5 mL EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude alcohol was dissolved in $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and stirred for 2 hours with 48 mg Celite and $32 \mathrm{mg}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$

PCC open to air. The reaction was diluted with $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and filtered over silica with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\sim 15$ mL as determined by TLC). All volatiles were removed in vacuo and purified by column chromatography to afford $8.2 \mathrm{mg}(42 \%, 1: 1 \mathrm{dr})( \pm)-5.95$ as colorless oil. Chiral HPLC analaysis was obtained on an AD-H column, 99:1 hexanes/IPA at $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, visualization at 230 nm , 54:46 dr, 50.1:49.9 (0\%ee) diastereomer 1, 51.4:48.6 (3\%ee) diastereomer 2. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm$) \delta 8.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.58(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.46(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 5.82-5.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.08-5.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.35-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.42$ (dquintet, $J=12.8,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1.5 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ at 77 ppm$) \delta 208.5,166.6,141.5$, $133.0,130.2,129.5,128.4,114.8,114.7,65.3,65.2,42.0,41.8,41.6,41.4,39.0,38.9,30.0,22.5$, 22.5, 17.0, 16.8; IR (thin film) 2963, $2928 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 297.1467 found 297.1464.

Figure 5.3. Chiral HPLC chromatogram of ( $\pm$ )-5.95.


## Diol 5.94



A 1 dram vial was charged with $5.7 \mathrm{mg}(0.021 \mathrm{mmol})$ prolinol catalyst, ${ }^{63} 52 \mathrm{mg}(0.53 \mathrm{mmol})$
5.10, 1 mL MeOH and $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.83 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$. The vial sealed and heated at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 36 hours, the reaction was cooled to room temperature and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude Michael adduct was added to $25 \mathrm{mg}(0.66 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with the assistance of $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The ice bath was removed and stirring continued for 30 minutes before being recooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with 0.09 mL water, 0.02 mL 5 M NaOH and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. After a minimum of 30 minutes of vigorous stirring, the solution was filtered over Celite, eluting with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\sim 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ as determined by TLC) and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $1: 2 \rightarrow 1: 3$ Hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $70 \mathrm{mg}(77 \%) \mathbf{5 . 9 4}$ as a colorless oil. The spectral data was identical to $( \pm)-5.94$.

## Benzoate 5.95



A 1 dram vial containing $70 \mathrm{mg}(0.41 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 9 4}, 10 \mathrm{mg}(0.82 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DMAP}, 3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $0.4 \mathrm{~mL}(2.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was treated with $0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(0.50$ $\mathrm{mmol}) 0.25 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{BzCl} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and stirred for 0.5 hour before the cold bath was removed. After 1
hour at room temperature the reaction was quenched with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude alcohol was dissolved in $4 \mathrm{mLCH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and treated with 350 mg ( 4.2 mmol ) $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and $257 \mathrm{mg}(0.61 \mathrm{mmol})$ DMP, then stirred until complete open to air. The reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, before being extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was separated and washed with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (8:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $82 \mathrm{mg}(74 \%, 49: 51 \mathrm{dr}) \mathbf{5 . 9 5}$ as a colorless oil, 90.7:9.3 (81\%ee) diastereomer 1, 90.2:9.8 ( $80 \%$ ee) diastereomer 2. Chiral HPLC analaysis was obtained on an AD-H column, using 99:1 hexanes $/ \mathrm{IPA}$ at $0.4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and visualized at 230 nm . The spectral data was identical to $( \pm)-\mathbf{5 . 9 5}$.

Figure 5.4. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.5, Entry5 for $\mathbf{5 . 9 5}$


Figure 5.5. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for cyclohexenone ( $\pm$ )-5.7.



A 1 dram vial was charged with $11 \mathrm{mg}(0.042 \mathrm{mmol})$ prolinol, ${ }^{63} 108 \mathrm{mg}(1.10 \mathrm{mmol} \mathbf{5 . 1 0}, 1.1$ mL MeOH and $0.13 \mathrm{~mL}(1.6 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$. The vial was sealed and immersed in a $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 39 hours the reaction was cooled and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Chiral HPLC analaysis was obtained on an AS-H column, using 90:10 hexanes/IPA at $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and visualized at 230 nm . The crude Michael adduct 5.93 was divided evenly into three 1 dram vials.

Table 5.6, Entry 1: 1. DBU 2. MsCl: ${ }^{64}$ The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1.2 mL dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.17 \mathrm{~mL}(1.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DBU}$. The cold bath was immediately removed and the reaction stirred for 10 hours. The reaction was then treated with $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.65$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 12 hours the reaction was
cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 33 mg (59\%) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless oil, $53: 47 \mathrm{dr}$, 52:48 (4\%ee) diastereomer 1, 53:47 (6\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.6. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 1.


Table 5.6, Entry 2: 1. DBU 2. MsCl: ${ }^{64}$ The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1.2 mL "wet" $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.17 \mathrm{~mL}(1.1 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{DBU}$ open to air. The cold was immediately removed and stirred for 8 hours. The reaction was quenched with brine and extracted with EtOAc. The organic phase was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude hydroxyketone was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and treated with $0.27 \mathrm{~mL}(1.9 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $0.05 \mathrm{~mL}(0.65 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 30 hours the reaction was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and
all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc $)$ to afford $30 \mathrm{mg}(54 \%)$ enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless oil, 54:46 dr, 52:48 (4\%ee) diastereomer 1, 53:47 (6\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.7. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 2.


Table 5.6, Entry 3: TsOH, MeCN: The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1 mL MeCN then 140 mg ( 0.74 mmol ) $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ added open to air. After 8 hours, the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with 0.7 mL 1 M NacOH and sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. All volatiles were removed in vacuo an the aqueous layer extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 36 mg ( $62 \%$ ) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless oil, $51: 49 \mathrm{dr}$, 67:33 (34\%ee) diastereomer 1, 66:34 (32\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.8. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 3.



A 1 dram vial was charged with $11 \mathrm{mg}(0.043 \mathrm{mmol})$ prolinol, ${ }^{63} 113 \mathrm{mg}(1.15 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 0}, 1.1$ mL MeOH and $0.13 \mathrm{~mL}(1.6 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$. The vial was sealed and immersed in a $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 36 hours the reaction was cooled and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Chiral HPLC analaysis was obtained on an AS-H column, using 90:10 hexanes/IPA at $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and visualized at 230 nm . The crude Michael adduct $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was divided evenly into four 1 dram vials.

Table 5.6, Entry 4: TBD, THF then MsCl: The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1 mL THF and treated with $2.6 \mathrm{mg}(0.02 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBD}$. Stirring was continued for 20 minutes after which time the reaction was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 2 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.39$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 22 hours the reaction was
cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 26 mg ( $59 \%$ ) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, $55: 45 \mathrm{dr}$, $66: 34$ ( $32 \%$ ee) diastereomer $1,67: 33$ (34\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.9. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 4.


Table 5.6, Entry 5: TBD, THF then $\mathbf{A c}_{2} \mathbf{O}$ : The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1 mL THF and treated with $2.6 \mathrm{mg}(0.02 \mathrm{mmol})$ TBD. Stirring was continued for 20 minutes after which time the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 2 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and $0.04 \mathrm{~mL}(0.42$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 22 hours the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 29 mg
(66\%) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, 52:48 dr, 66:34 (32\%ee) diastereomer 1, 66:34 (32\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.10. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 5.


Table 5.6, Entry 6: TBD, MeCN then TsOH: The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in 1 mL MeCN and treated with $2.7 \mathrm{mg}(0.02 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBD}$. Stirring was continued for 20 minutes after which time $54 \mathrm{mg}(0.28 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. After stirring for 4 hours the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with 0.2 mL 1 M NaOH , sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $30 \mathrm{mg}(68 \%)$ enantioenriched $\mathbf{5 . 7}$ as a colorless liquid, 51:49 dr, 67:33 (34\%ee) diastereomer 1, 68:32 (36\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.11. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 6.


Table 5.6, Entry 7: TBD, $\mathbf{C H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{C l}_{\mathbf{2}}$ then $\mathbf{M s C l}$ : The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and treated with $2.8 \mathrm{mg}(0.02 \mathrm{mmol})$ TBD. Stirring was continued for 3.5 hours after which time the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}(1.1 \mathrm{mmmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 2 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and 0.03 mL ( 0.39 mmol ) MsCl added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 18 hours the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (10:1 $\rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 25 mg (56\%) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, $54: 46 \mathrm{dr}$, 67:33 (34\%ee) diastereomer 1, 68:32 (36\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.12. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 7.



A 1 dram vial was charged with $14 \mathrm{mg}(0.050 \mathrm{mmol})$ prolinol, ${ }^{63} 166 \mathrm{mg}(1.69 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathbf{5 . 1 0}, 1.5$ mL MeOH and $0.2 \mathrm{~mL}(2.5 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MVK}$. The vial was sealed and immersed in a $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 36 hours the reaction was cooled and all volatiles removed in vacuo. Chiral HPLC analaysis was obtained on an AS-H column, using 90:10 hexanes $/ \mathrm{IPA}$ at $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and visualized at 230 nm . The crude Michael adduct was divided evenly into six 1 dram vials.

Table 5.6, Entry 8: 1. TBD, MeOH 2. MsCl: The crude 5.93 was dissolved in 1 mL MeOH and treated with $1.7 \mathrm{mg}(0.012 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{TBD}$. Stirring was continued for 4 hours after which time the reaction was quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The
crude material was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.25 \mathrm{~mL}(1.8$ $\mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 3 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.39 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 18 hours the reaction was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography $(10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $23 \mathrm{mg}(55 \%)$ enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, 51:49 dr, 73:27 (46\%ee) diastereomer 1, 73:27 (46\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.13. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 8.


Table 5.6, Entry 9: McQuade Diamine Catalyst: ${ }^{6}$ The crude 5.93 was dissolved in 1 mL hexanes and treated with $22 \mathrm{mg}(0.087 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{McQuade}$ diamine catalyst. Stirring was continued for 24 hours after which time the reaction was diluted with water and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 26 mg ( $62 \%$ ) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, $51: 49 \mathrm{dr}$, 83:17 ( $66 \% \mathrm{ee}$ ) diastereomer 1, 83:17 (66\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.14. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 9.


Table 5.6, Entry 10: 1. LDA 2. MsCl: The crude 5.93 was dissolved in 1 mL THF and treated with $0.3 \mathrm{~mL}(0.32 \mathrm{mmol}) 0.93 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{LDA} /$ THF slowly at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Stirring was continued for 1 minute after which time the reaction was quenched with half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.25 \mathrm{~mL}(1.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 3 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.39 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 18 hours the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 10 mg (23\%) enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, 56:44 dr, 88:12 (76\%ee) diastereomer 1, 89:11 (78\%ee) diastereomer 2 and 13 mg (27\%) Michael adduct.

Figure 5.15. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 10.


Table 5.6, Entry 11: 1. KOt-Bu 2. MsCl: A 1 dram vial was charged with 0.5 mL ( 0.08 mmol ) 0.16 M KOt-Bu/THF and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The crude $\mathbf{5 . 9 3}$ was added dropwise with the assistance of 1 mL THF. Stirring was continued for 1 minute after which time the reaction was quenched with half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc . The organic layer was separated, washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was dissolved in $1 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $0.25 \mathrm{~mL}(1.8 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}, \sim 3 \mathrm{mg}$ DMAP and $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}(0.39 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{MsCl}$ added. The cold bath was removed. After stirring for 18 hours the reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by column chromatography ( $10: 1 \rightarrow 8: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $18 \mathrm{mg}(43 \%)$ enantioenriched 5.7 as a colorless liquid, 53:47 dr, 81:19 (62\%ee) diastereomer 1, 78:22 (56\%ee) diastereomer 2.

Figure 5.16. Chiral HPLC chromatogram for Table 5.6, entry 11.

(S)-(-)-97 [Adapted from the literature] ${ }^{65}$


A 250 mL round bottom flask was charged with 5.20 g ( 34.6 mmol ) $90 \%$ pure (S)-(-)perillaldehyde [(S)-(-)-5.96] and $130 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and sequentially treated with $10 \mathrm{~mL}(71.7 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and $8.7 \mathrm{~mL}(37.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ TBSOTf. After 10 minutes at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the flask was removed and stirring continued for 20 minutes. The contents were poured into 60 mL stirring sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and the flask was rinsed with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The layers were separated and the aqueous layer extracted with $20 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude dienoxysilane in a 500 mL round bottom flask was dissolved in $130 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and 150 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ open to air. To the vigorously stirring mixture was added portionwise $14.7 \mathrm{~g}(59.7-63.9 \mathrm{mmol}) 70-75 \%$ pure
mCPBA. Upon complete consumption of dienoxysilane by TLC the layers were separated and extracted with $50 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 20 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 500 mL round bottom flask containing crude epoxide was added 100 mL MeCN then at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10.3$ $(48.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ and slowly 2.5 mL HF in 25 mL water open to air. The reaction was further stirred for 5 minutes then the cold bath removed. After 2 hours 250 mL water was added and the solution extracted thrice with $125 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 25 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and 25 mL brine. The last two aqueous washings were combined and back extracted with $30 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. All organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude material was purified by distillation $\left(68-75{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 1.5\right.$ $\mathrm{mmHg})$ to afford $2.93 \mathrm{~g}(62 \%$ over 3 steps) (S)-(-)-5.97 as a colorless solution. Spectral data was identical to the literature. ${ }^{65}$ Optical rotation $[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-159.1^{\circ}(c$ 1.03, MeOH $)$ and $[\alpha]^{24}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-189.4^{\circ}(c$ $0.0162, \mathrm{MeOH}$ ); lit. for (S)-4-(2-propenyl)-2-cycloexen-1-one is $[\alpha]^{26}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-153.8^{\circ}$ (c 1.03, $\mathrm{MeOH}),{ }^{66}$ for (R)-4-(2-propenyl)-2-cycloexen-1-one is $[\alpha]^{26}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+192.2^{\circ}(c 0.0162, \mathrm{MeOH})^{65}$ and $[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+157.6^{\circ}\left(c 1.37, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) .{ }^{67}$

## Diol (+)-5.100



3-Methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide was prepared by addition of 0.7 mL ( 5.6 mmol ) 3bromoanisole in 0.7 mL THF to $0.177 \mathrm{~g}(7.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ magnesium metal in 2.8 mL THF activated by dibromoethane maintaining $40-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A 10 mL round bottom flask was charged with 2 mL THF and $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}(0.90 \mathrm{mmol}) 1.29 \mathrm{M} 3$-methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide. $\mathrm{At}-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.3 \mathrm{~mL}$ ( 0.075 mmol ) $0.25 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CuI} \cdot 2 \mathrm{LiCl} / \mathrm{THF}$ was added followed by $100 \mathrm{mg}(0.73 \mathrm{mmol})(\mathrm{S})-(-)-\mathbf{5 . 9 7}$ in 0.6 mL THF. Stirring at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was continued for 2 hours before the cold bath was removed. After 1 hour the reaction was recooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To the solution was added $0.26 \mathrm{~mL}(1.50$ mmol) HMPA. After 1 hour $0.30 \mathrm{~mL}(3.62 \mathrm{mmol})$ ethyl bromoacetate was added. The reaction was stirred at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes then the cold bath removed. After stirring for 29 hours at room temperature, the reaction was cooled in an ice bath and treated with 1.5 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, 1.5 mL water, extracted with 10 mL and twice with $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The organic layers were combined, washed with 1 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo to afford a crude oil. To an ice cooled 25 mL round bottom flask containing $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added $158 \mathrm{mg}(4.2 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$. The crude oil was transferred using $5 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ dropwise. The ice bath was removed after 5 minutes. After 5 hours the reaction was placed into a room temperature water bath and 0.3 mL EtOAc added, then the flask was recooled in an ice bath and 0.16 mL water, $0.16 \mathrm{~mL} 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, 0.45 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ was added. After stirring the contents for several hours, the solution was filtered over Celite and the
filter cake washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ until no more product was detected by TLC ( $\sim 75 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ). The filtrate was concentrated and the residue purified by column chromatography ( $1: 3 \rightarrow 1: 5$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 79 mg ( $37 \%$ over 2 steps, $7: 1 \mathrm{dr}$ ) (+)-5.99 as a viscous colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) mixture of diastereomers and slow rotation $\delta 7.15$ (s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.70-6.63(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{dt}, J=10.1$, $4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.44(\mathrm{td}, J=9.6,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.26-3.22(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.10(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 77 ppm ) major with some resonances missing due to slow rotation $\delta 147.4,144.6,111.5,74.3,61.8,55.0,52.1,49.5,34.9,34.5,30.1,19.6$; IR (thin film) 3320, 2930, 1600, 1488, 1258, $1047 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 313.1780 found $313.1771 ;[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+35.5^{\circ}\left(c 0.50, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

## Perhydrobenzofuran (+)-5.100



To a 10 mL round bottom flask containing $73 \mathrm{mg}(0.251 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr})(+)-5.99$ in 1.2 mL pyridine was added $125 \mathrm{mg}(0.66 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{p}$-toluenesulfonyl chloride at room temperature. The flask was placed in a $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath. After 22 hours the reaction was cooled to room temperature and quenched with 3 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 1.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water and extraced with 15 mL and 10 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were washed with $3 \mathrm{~mL}, 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ and 1 mL ice cold 6 M HCl then 1 mL water. The acidic aqueous washings were combined, back extracted twice with 3 mL EtOAc and all organic phases combined. The organic medium was washed with 2 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 2$
mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) to afford $57 \mathrm{mg}(83 \%, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr})(+)$ $\mathbf{5 . 1 0 0}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at 7.27 ppm ) major $\delta 7.19(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.74-6.68(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.91(\mathrm{td}, J=9.1,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{q}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.26(\mathrm{td}, J=10.1,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.24-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{td}, J=6.6$, $3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at $77 \mathrm{ppm}) \delta$ (mixture of diastereomers) $159.4,146.8,144.5,129.1,128.9,121.2,120.0,114.9$, 113.7, 112.0, 111.3, 110.9, 110.7 (major) $82.6,67.1,55.1,51.7,51.6,50.4,30.8,30.6,30.0$, 19.9; IR (thin film) $3070,2934,2876,1645,1601,1489,1261,1048,776,700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 295.1674$ found 295.1664; [ $\left.\alpha\right]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+17.5^{\circ}$ (c 0.50, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).

## Dihydronaphthalene (-)-5.64



To a 1 dram vial containing $5 \mathrm{mg}(0.018 \mathrm{mmol}, 7: 1 \mathrm{dr})(+)-5.100$ and $19 \mathrm{mg}(0.23 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ in $0.3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was added $9 \mathrm{mg}(0.037 \mathrm{mmol}) 70 \% \mathrm{mCPBA}$ at room temperature open to air. After 13 hours 1 mL half sat. aq. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ was added and the mixture extracted with 2 mL and 1 mL EtOAc. The organic layers were combined, washed with 1 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. To a 5 mL round bottom flask containing crude epoxide was added 2 mL benzene and $2 \mathrm{mg}(0.011 \mathrm{mmol})$ $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The reaction was refluxed over a Hickman still for 2 hours. The reaction was
cooled, diluted with 1 mL sat. aq. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{~mL}$ EtOAc and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with 1 mL brine, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and all volatiles removed in vacuo. The crude oil was purified by column chromatography ( $6: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc) to afford 3 $\mathrm{mg}(60 \%$ over 2 steps, $6: 1 \mathrm{dr})(-)-\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$ as a white wax. Spectral data was identical to $( \pm)-\mathbf{5 . 6 4}$; $[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-165.0^{\circ}\left(c 0.50, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

### 5.9 References and Notes

(1) Corey, E. J.; Magriotis, P. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 287.
(2) Mander, L. N. Synlett 1991, 134.
(3) Parr, B. T.; Economou, C.; Herzon, S. B. Nature 2015, 525, 507.
(4) Chi, Y.; Gellman, S. H. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 4253.
(5) Franzén, J.; Marigo, M.; Fielenbach, D.; Wabnitz, T. C.; Kjærsgaard, A.; Jørgensen, K. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 18296.
(6) Houjeiry, T. I.; Poe, S. L.; Mcquade, D. T. Org. Lett. 2012, 14, 4394.
(7) Wei, X.; Lorenz, J. C.; Kapadia, S.; Saha, A.; Haddad, N.; Busacca, C. A.; Senanayake, C. H. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 4250.
(8) Chen, K.; Baran, P. S. Nature 2009, 459, 824.
(9) Watanabe, W. H.; Conlon, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1957, 79, 2828.
(10) Reetz, M. T.; Kindler, A. J. Organomet. Chem. 1995, 502, C5.
(11) Keinan, E.; Greenspoon, N. "Reduction of alpha,beta-Unsaturated Carbonyl Compounds" In The Chemistry of Enones; Patai, S.; Rappoport, Z., Ed.; John Wiley \& Sons, Ltd, 1989; pp 923-1022.
(12) Caine, D. Org. React. 1976, 23, 1.
(13) Numbering matches the isocycloamphilectane scaffold, i.e. 7, 20-diisocyanoadociane.
(14) Pronin, S. V.; Reiher, C. A.; Shenvi, R. A. Nature 2013, 501, 195.
(15) Pronin, S. V.; Shenvi, R. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 19604.
(16) Sasaki, T.; Nakanishi, A.; Ohno, M. J. Org. Chem. 1981, 46, 5445.
(17) Maruoka, K.; Itoh, T.; Yamamoto, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 4573.
(18) Suzuki, T.; Kobayashi, T.; Takegami, Y.; Kawasaki, Y. Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 1974, 47,
1971.
(19) Cahiez, G.; Duplais, C.; Buendia, J. Chem. Rev. 2009, 109, 1434.
(20) Garst, M. E.; Dolby, L. J.; Esfandiari, S.; Fedoruk, N. A.; Chamberlain, N. C.; Avey, A.
A. J. Org. Chem. 2000, 65, 7098.
(21) Hassner, A.; Kropp, J. E.; Kent, G. J. J. Org. Chem. 1969, 34, 2628.
(22) Sy, W.-W.; By, A. W. Tetrahedron Lett. 1985, 26, 1193.
(23) Taniguchi, T.; Fujii, T.; Ishibashi, H. J. Org. Chem. 2010, 75, 8126.
(24) Maity, S.; Naveen, T.; Sharma, U.; Maiti, D. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 3384.
(25) Maity, S.; Manna, S.; Rana, S.; Naveen, T.; Mallick, A.; Maita, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 3355.
(26) Cossio, F. P.; Aizpurua, J. M.; Palomo, C. Can. J. Chem. 1986, 64, 225.
(27) Emsermann, J.; Kauhl, U.; Opatz, T. Mar. Drugs 2016, 14, 16.
(28) Huffman, J. W. "Reduction of C=X to CHXH by Dissolving Metals and Related Methods" In Comprehensive Organic Synthesis; Trost, B. M.; Fleming, I., Ed.; Elsevier Science Ltd., 1991; pp 107-127.
(29) Johnson, C. R.; Raheja, R. K. J. Org. Chem. 1994, 59, 2287.
(30) Tsuda, T.; Hayashi, T.; Satomi, H.; Kawamoto, T.; Saegusa, T. J. Org. Chem. 1986, 51, 537.
(31) Daniewski, A. R.; Kiegiel, J. Synth. Commun. 1988, 18, 115.
(32) Krüerke, U. Chem. Ber. 1962, 95, 174.
(33) Karger, M. H.; Mazur, Y. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1969, 91, 5663.
(34) Karger, M. H.; Mazur, Y. J. Org. Chem. 1971, 36, 532.
(35) Beard, C. D.; Baum, K.; Grakauskas, V. J. Org. Chem. 1973, 38, 3673.
(36) Guindon, Y.; Therien, M.; Girard, Y.; Yoakim, C. J. Org. Chem. 1987, 52, 1680.
(37) Forbus, Jr, T. R.; Taylor, S. L.; Martin, J. C. J. Org. Chem. 1987, 52, 4156.
(38) Ohshita, J.; Iwata, A.; Kanetani, F.; Kunai, A.; Yamamoto, Y.; Matui, C. J. Org. Chem. 1999, 64, 8024.
(39) Iqbal, J.; Srivastava, R. R. Tetrahedron 1991, 47, 3155.
(40) Node, M.; Kajimoto, T.; Nishide, K.; Fujita, E.; Fuji, K. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 219.
(41) Funk, R. L.; Mossman, C. J.; Zeller, W. E. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 1655.
(42) Wettstein, A.; Mischer, K. Helv. Chim. Acta 1942, 25, 718.
(43) Godfrey, C. R. A. "Oxidation Adjacent to Oxygen of Ethers" In Comprehensive Organic Synthesis; Trost, B. M.; Fleming, I., Ed.; Elsevier Science Ltd., 1991; Vol. 7, pp 235-250.
(44) Courtney, J. L. "Ruthenium Tetroxide Oxidations" In Organic Syntheses by Oxidation with Metal Compounds; Mijs, W. J.; de Jonge, C. R. H. I., Ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1986; pp 445-468.
(45) Lee, J. S.; Cao, H.; Fuchs, P. L. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 5820.
(46) Freeman, F. "Oxidation by Chromium(VI) Compounds" In Organic Syntheses by Oxidation with Metal Compounds; Mijs, W. J.; de Jonge, C. R. H. I., Ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1986; pp 41-118.
(47) Lee, S.; Fuchs, P. L. Org. Lett. 2004, 6, 1437.
(48) Wang, J.; Ma, A.; Ma, D. Org. Lett. 2008, 10, 5425.
(49) Nicolaou, K. C.; Sarlah, D.; Shaw, D. M. Angew. Chemie Int. Ed. 2007, 46, 4708.
(50) Daub, M. E.; Prudhomme, J.; Le Roch, K.; Vanderwal, C. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 4912.
(51) Franzén, J.; Marigo, M.; Fielenbach, D.; Wabnitz, T. C.; Kjærsgaard, A.; Jørgensen, K. A.
J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 18296.
(52) Stevens, R. V.; Albizati, K. F. J. Org. Chem. 1985, 50, 632.
(53) Siegel, C.; Gordon, P. M.; Uliss, D. B.; Handrick, G. R.; Dalzell, H. C.; Razdan, R. K. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 6865.
(54) Weidmann, B.; Seebach, D. Angew. Chemie Int. Ed. 1983, 22, 31.
(55) Reetz, M. T.; Haning, H.; Stanchev, S. Tetrahedron Lett. 1992, 33, 6963.
(56) Reetz, M. T. Top. Curr. Chem. 1982, 106, 1.
(57) Ashby, E. C.; Laemmle, J. T. Chem. Rev. 1975, 75 (4), 521.
(58) Francisco, C. G.; Freire, R.; Rodríguez, M. S.; Suárez, E. Tetrahedron Lett. 1987, 28, 3397.
(59) Suginome, H.; Yamada, S. J. Org. Chem. 1985, 50, 2489.
(60) Love, B. E.; Jones, E. G. J. Org. Chem. 1999, 64, 3755.
(61) An ungreased joint led to a decreased yield of more than $20 \%$. .
(62) Miyaoka, H.; Okubo, Y.; Muroi, M.; Mitome, H.; Kawashima, E. Chem. Lett. 2011, 40, 246.
(63) Enders, D.; Kipphardt, H.; Gerdes, P.; Breña-Valle, L. J.; Bhushan, V. Bull. Soc. Chim. Belg. 1988, 97, 693.
(64) Wang, J.; Ma, A.; Ma, D. Org. Lett. 2008, 10, 5425.
(65) Siegel, C.; Gordon, P. M.; Uliss, D. B.; Handrick, G. R.; Dalzell, H. C.; Razdan, R. K. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 6865.
(66) Stevens, R. V; Albizati, K. F. J. Org. Chem. 1985, 50, 632.
(67) Sato, T.; Gotoh, Y.; Watanabe, M.; Fujisawa, T. Chem. Lett. 1983, 1533.

## APPENDIX A: NMR Data
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## APPENDIX B: X-ray Crystallographic Data

Figure B1. X-Ray Structure for 3.37.


Table B1. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 3.37.

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions

Volume
Z
Density (calculated)
Absorption coefficient
F(000)
Crystal color
Crystal size
Theta range for data collection
Index ranges
Reflections collected
Independent reflections
Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$
Absorption correction
Max. and min. transmission
Refinement method

CCDC \#1033631 (cdv24)
$\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}$
274.39

143(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Monoclinic
$P 2{ }_{1} / c$
$\mathrm{a}=5.9268(6) \AA \quad \mathrm{a}=90^{\circ}$.
$b=33.959(4) \AA \quad b=105.1645(12)^{\circ}$.
$\mathrm{c}=7.8335(8) \AA \quad \mathrm{g}=90^{\circ}$.
1521.7(3) $\AA^{3}$

4
$1.198 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
$0.076 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$
600
colorless
$0.284 \times 0.265 \times 0.152 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$
2.399 to $28.281^{\circ}$
$-7 \leq h \leq 7,-43 \leq k \leq 43,-9 \leq l \leq 10$
17594
$3575[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0253]$
99.8 \%

Semi-empirical from equivalents
0.8621 and 0.8088

Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$

Data / restraints / parameters
Goodness-of-fit on F2
Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=3045$ data]
R indices (all data, $0.75 \AA$ )
Extinction coefficient
Largest diff. peak and hole

3575 / 0 / 285
1.040
$\mathrm{R} 1=0.0390, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1012$
$R 1=0.0466, w R 2=0.1064$
$\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$
0.400 and -0.180 e. $\AA^{-3}$

Figure B2. X-Ray Structure for $\mathbf{3 . 5 8}$.


Table B2. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 3.58.

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions

Volume
Z
Density (calculated)
Absorption coefficient
F(000)
Crystal color
Crystal size

CCDC \#1033632 (cdv27)
$\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}$
274.39

143(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Monoclinic
$P 2_{1} / c$
$a=8.5541(7) \AA \quad a=90^{\circ}$.
$\mathrm{b}=8.9646(8) \AA \quad \mathrm{b}=101.7717(11)^{\circ}$.
$\mathrm{c}=20.1698(17) \AA \quad \mathrm{g}=90^{\circ}$.
1514.2(2) $\AA^{3}$

4
$1.204 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
$0.076 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$
600
colorless
$0.388 \times 0.362 \times 0.166 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$

Theta range for data collection
Index ranges
Reflections collected
Independent reflections
Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$
Absorption correction
Max. and min. transmission
Refinement method
Data / restraints / parameters
Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$
Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=2684$ data]
R indices (all data, ? Å)
Largest diff. peak and hole
2.063 to $27.094^{\circ}$
$-10 \leq h \leq 10,-11 \leq k \leq 11,-25 \leq l \leq 25$
11171
$3309[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0255]$
99.9 \%

Semi-empirical from equivalents 0.8621 and 0.8061

Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$
3309 / 0 / 285
1.023
$\mathrm{R} 1=0.0401, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1000$
$\mathrm{R} 1=0.0520, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1072$
0.322 and -0.169 e. $\AA^{-3}$

Figure B3. X-Ray Structure for 3.64.


Table B3. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 3.64.

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system
Space group
Unit cell dimensions

Volume
Z

CCDC \#1033633 (cdv25)
$\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2}$
206.27

83(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Triclinic
$P \overline{1}$
$a=7.4167(5) \AA \quad a=104.2514(8)^{\circ}$.
$\mathrm{b}=8.7830(6) \AA \quad \mathrm{b}=98.7965(8)^{\circ}$.
$\mathrm{c}=9.1296(7) \AA \quad \mathrm{g}=110.1474(7)^{\circ}$.
522.34(6) $\AA^{3}$

2

Density (calculated)
Absorption coefficient
F(000)
Crystal color
Crystal size
Theta range for data collection Index ranges
Reflections collected
Independent reflections
Completeness to theta $=25.500^{\circ}$
Absorption correction
Max. and min. transmission
Refinement method
Data / restraints / parameters
Goodness-of-fit on F2
Final R indices $[\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=2311$ data $]$ R indices (all data, $0.74 \AA$ )
Extinction coefficient
Largest diff. peak and hole
$1.311 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
$0.086 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$
224
colorless
$0.405 \times 0.324 \times 0.312 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$
2.385 to $28.865^{\circ}$
$-9 \leq h \leq 10,-11 \leq k \leq 11,-12 \leq l \leq 11$
6268
$2486[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0111]$
99.1 \%

Semi-empirical from equivalents
0.8621 and 0.8158

Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$
2486 / 0 / 208
1.084
$\mathrm{R} 1=0.0391, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1147$
$\mathrm{R} 1=0.0411, w R 2=0.1168$
n/a
0.390 and - 0.206 e. $\AA^{-3}$

Figure B4. X-Ray Structure for 5.70.


Table B4. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 5.70.

Identification code
Empirical formula
Formula weight
Temperature
Wavelength
Crystal system

CCDC \#1474440 (cdv39)
$\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ 260.36

133(2) K
$0.71073 \AA$
Triclinic

| Space group | $P \overline{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Unit cell dimensions | $\mathrm{a}=7.0946(5) \AA \quad \mathrm{a}=91.4370(8)^{\circ}$. |
|  | $b=10.4299(7) \AA \quad b=109.1829(8)^{\circ}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{c}=10.7084(7) \AA \quad \mathrm{g}=107.5789(8)$ |
| Volume | 706.60 (8) $\AA^{3}$ |
| Z | 2 |
| Density (calculated) | $1.224 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.078 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| F(000) | 284 |
| Crystal color | colorless |
| Crystal size | $0.464 \times 0.277 \times 0.255 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |
| Theta range for data collection | 2.033 to $28.669^{\circ}$ |
| Index ranges | $-9 \leq \mathrm{h} \leq 9,-13 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq 13,-14 \leq 1 \leq 13$ |
| Reflections collected | 8518 |
| Independent reflections | $3351[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0142]$ |
| Completeness to theta $=26.000^{\circ}$ | 99.7 \% |
| Absorption correction | Semi-empirical from equivalents |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.8621 and 0.8062 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 3351 / 0 / 172 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.035 |
| Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=2954$ data] | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0397, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1086$ |
| R indices (all data, 0.74 Å) | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0444, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.1131$ |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.351 and -0.224 e. $\AA^{\text {- }}$ - |

Figure B5. X-Ray Structure for $\mathbf{5 . 7 4}$.


Table B5. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 5.74.

| Identification code | CCDC \#1474441 (cdv40) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Empirical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ |
| Formula weight | 262.38 |
| Temperature | 88(2) K |
| Wavelength | 0.71073 A |
| Crystal system | Monoclinic |
| Space group | $P 21$ |
| Unit cell dimensions | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{a}=6.9229(3) \AA & \mathrm{a}=90^{\circ} . \\ \mathrm{b}=7.1568(4) \AA & \mathrm{b}=95.9776(7)^{\circ} . \\ \mathrm{c}=14.6894(7) \AA & \mathrm{g}=90^{\circ} . \end{array}$ |
| Volume | 723.84(6) $\AA^{3}$ |
| Z | 2 |
| Density (calculated) | $1.204 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $0.076 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| F(000) | 288 |
| Crystal color | colorless |
| Crystal size | $0.433 \times 0.297 \times 0.156 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}$ |
| Theta range for data collection | 2.788 to $29.179^{\circ}$ |
| Index ranges | $-9 \leq h \leq 9,-9 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq 9,-19 \leq 1 \leq 20$ |
| Reflections collected | 9092 |
| Independent reflections | $3603[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0154]$ |
| Completeness to theta $=26.000^{\circ}$ | 99.9 \% |
| Absorption correction | Semi-empirical from equivalents |
| Max. and min. transmission | 0.7458 and 0.6904 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 3603 / 1/173 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.033 |
| Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})=3427$ data] | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0324, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0864$ |
| R indices (all data, 0.73 Å) | $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0344, \mathrm{wR} 2=0.0882$ |
| Absolute structure parameter | 0.0(3) |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.319 and -0.171 e. $\AA^{-3}$ |

