## UC Irvine

UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

## Title

Forming Quaternary Carbons Using Photoredox Catalysis and Applications in Total Synthesis Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3zs3965g

## Author

Lackner, Gregory
Publication Date
2016
Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE 

Forming Quaternary Carbons Using Photoredox Catalysis and Applications in Total Synthesis

## DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

## DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Chemistry
by
Gregory Lawrence Lackner

Dissertation Committee:
Prof. Larry E. Overman, Chair
Prof. Christopher D. Vanderwal Prof. James S. Nowick

Portions of Chapter 1 reproduced with permission from: Lackner,G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 15342-15345; © 2013 American Chemical Society.
Lackner, G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Pratsch, G.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6012-6024; Pratsch, G.; Lackner, G. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6025-6036. (C) 2015 American Chemical Society.

Portions of Chapter 2 reproduced with permission from Müller, D. S.; Untiedt, N. L.; Dieskau, A. P.; Lackner, G. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 660-663; Slutskyy, Y.; Jamison, C. R.; Lackner, G. L.; Müller D. S.; Dieskau, A. P.; Unteidt, N. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2016. Accepted for publication. DOI: 10.1021/acs.joc.6b00697.
© 2015 American Chemical Society.
All other material © 2016 Gregory Lawrence Lackner

## Table of Contents

List of Figures ..... v
List of Schemes ..... vii
List of Tables ..... ix
List of Equations ..... x
Acknowledgements ..... xii
Curriculum Vitae ..... xv
Chapter 1: Forming Quaternary Carbons From Tertiary Alcohol and Tertiary
Carboxylic Acid Derivatives Using Photoredox Catalysis ..... xvii
1.1 Introduction ..... 1
1.2 Results and Discussion ..... 11
1.2.1 Synthesis of Tertiary Alkyl $N$-Phthalimidoyl Oxalates ..... 11
1.2.2 Optimization of the Photoredox-Catalyzed Radical Coupling ..... 15
1.2.3 Examining the Scope of the Coupling Reaction ..... 19
1.2.4 Comparing $N$-Phthalimidoyl Oxalate and ( $N$-Acyloxy)phthalimide
Radical Precursors ..... 24
1.2.5 Investigating the Radical Coupling in the Absence of $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy}){ }_{3}{ }^{2+}$. ..... 25
1.2.6 Proposed Reaction Mechanism ..... 27
1.2.7 Investigating the Termination Mechanism ..... 30
1.3 Conclusions ..... 36
1.4 Experimental Information ..... 37
1.5 Cyclic Voltammetry Experiments ..... 82
1.6 References and Notes ..... 84
Chapter 2: Total Synthesis of trans-Clerodane and ent-Halimane Diterpenoids via a Stereoselective Radical 1,6-Addition ..... 89
2.1 Introduction ..... 89
2.2 Retrosynthetic Analysis ..... 90
2.3 Results and Discussion ..... 93
2.3.1 Synthesis of a Radical Precursor. ..... 93
2.3.2 Optimization of a Radical 1,6-Addition ..... 97
2.3.3 Key Radical and Cuprate Fragment Couplings ..... 99
2.3.4 Unexpected Structural Rearrangement of Exocyclic Olefin 2.2.... ..... 101
2.3.5 Olefin Isomerization and Synthesis Endgame ..... 102
2.4 Conclusions ..... 103
2.5 Experimental Information ..... 105
2.6 References and Notes ..... 133
Chapter 3: Studies Toward the Total Synthesis of Macfarlandin C ..... 136
3.1 Introduction ..... 136
3.2 Previous work: Decalin Synthesis ..... 140
3.3 Previous Work: Bicyclic Lactone Synthesis ..... 142
3.4 Retrosynthetic Analysis ..... 146
3.5 Results and Discussion ..... 147
3.5.1 Enantioselective Synthesis of the Decalin Fragment ..... 147
3.5.2 Wittig Olefination of Ketone 3.21 ..... 152
3.5.3 Vinyl Coupling and 1,4-Hydrogenation ..... 156
3.5.4 Synthesis and Attempted Coupling of (8S)-Cesium Oxalate ..... 159
3.5.5 Accessing (8R)-Tertiary Alcohol 3.55 ..... 161
3.5.6 Radical Coupling with ( $8 R$ )-Oxalate 3.63 ..... 164
3.5.7 Hydrogenation Studies with Unsaturated Lactones 3.65 ..... 165
3.5.8 Iodolactonization Approach to the Bicyclic Lactone ..... 167
3.6 Conclusions ..... 173
3.7 Experimental Information ..... 174
3.8 References and Notes ..... 207
Appendix A: NMR Spectra ..... 211

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Representative rearranged spongian diterpene natural products ..... 3
Figure 1.2 Key Michael addition step in the total synthesis of shahamin K (1.5). ..... 4
Figure 1.3 First-generation Michael addition approach to aplyviolene (1.3) ..... 4
Figure 1.4 Formation of a quaternary carbon from a thiohydroxamate oxalate ..... 10
Figure 1.5 Proposed reactivity of an alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate ..... 11
Figure 1.6 Synthesis of alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates ..... 14
Figure 1.7 Coupling of various oxalates with MVK. ..... 20
Figure 1.8 Coupling oxalate 1.28 with various conjugate acceptors ..... 23
Figure 1.9 Coupling ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 and oxalate 1.28 with various alkenes24
Figure 1.10 Radical coupling reactions in the absence of $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy}){ }_{3}{ }^{2+}$. ..... 27
Figure 1.11 Proposed photoredox-catalyzed coupling mechanism ..... 28
Figure 1.12 Proposed "photoredox-initiated" coupling mechanism ..... 29
Figure 1.13 Coupling of radical precursors with allylic bromide 1.79 ..... 35
Figure 2.1 Proposed biosynthesis of clerodane diterpenoids ..... 89
Figure 2.2 Representative trans-clerodane natural products. ..... 90
Figure 2.3 Endgame retrosynthesis for trans-clerodane diterpenoids ..... 91
Figure 2.4 Retrosynthetic analysis of radical precursors ..... 93
Figure 2.5 Proposed rearrangement mechanism ..... 102
Figure 3.1 Representative rearranged spongian diterpenes ..... 136
Figure 3.2: Proposed biosynthetic pathway ..... 137
Figure 3.3: Simplified rearranged spongian diterpene analogs ..... 138

Figure 3.4: Proposed bioconjugation mechanism........................................................... 139
Figure 3.5: Proposed key radical coupling step ............................................................. 140
Figure 3.6 Retrosynthetic analysis for macfarlandin C (3.1).......................................... 147
Figure 3.7 Retrosynthetic analysis for halolactonization approach ................................ 168

## List of Schemes

Scheme 1.1 Two-step synthesis of alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates from tertiary alcohols.. 12
Scheme 1.2 Trapping of an alkoxycarbonyl radical by a 5-exo cyclization ..... 22
Scheme 1.3 Expected reactivity of Hantzsch dihydropyridine 1.20 ..... 26
Scheme 1.4 Proposed coupling mechanisms of cyclopentene nitrile 1.74 ..... 32
Scheme 2.1 Synthesis of carboxylic acid 2.14 ..... 94
Scheme 2.2 Attempted synthesis of oxalate 2.21 ..... 95
Scheme 2.3 Synthesis endgame ..... 103
Scheme 3.1 Synthesis of alcohol rac-3.15 ..... 142
Scheme 3.2: Theodorakis's Diels-Alder approach toward norrisolide (3.2) ..... 143
Scheme 3.3 Snapper's cyclopropanation-hydrogenation approach to norrisolide (3.2) . ..... 144
Scheme 3.4 Overman's synthesis of bicyclic lactone 3.32 ..... 145
Scheme 3.5 Overman's DIBAL-H reduction-cyclization cascade ..... 146
Scheme 3.6 Synthesis of allylic phosphate rac-3.44. ..... 148
Scheme 3.7 Synthesis of enantiopure phosphate 3.44 ..... 149
Scheme 3.8 Synthesis and derivitization of ketone 3.21 ..... 151
Scheme 3.9: Synthesis of methyl oxalate 3.52 ..... 153
Scheme 3.10 Salt- and base-free Wittig reaction of ketone 3.21 ..... 155
Scheme 3.11 Hydrogenation of diene 3.53 ..... 159
Scheme 3.12 Synthesis of cesium oxalate 3.12 ..... 160
Scheme 3.13 Proposed mechanism for the formation of 3.54 ..... 161
Scheme 3.14 Synthesis of ketone 3.56 ..... 162
Scheme 3.15 Synthesis of cesium oxalate 3.63 ..... 164

Scheme 3.16 Preparation of unsaturated lactones 3.65................................................... 165
Scheme 3.17 Synthesis of lactols 3.74............................................................................ 169

## List of Tables

Table 1.1 Optimization of photoredox coupling of 1.28 with MVK ..... 16
Table 1.2 Control experiments for photoredox coupling ..... 17
Table 1.3 Coupling of oxalate 1.28 and MVK with various photoredox catalysts ..... 18
Table 1.4 Coupling of oxalate 1.28 and MVK with various reductants ..... 19
Table 2.1 Acylation of 1,2-dimethylcyclohexan-1-ol (2.22) with 2.20 ..... 96
Table 2.2 Optimization of radical 1,6-addition ..... 98
Table 3.1 Wittig ethylidenation of ketone 3.21 ..... 154
Table 3.2 Attempted olefination of ketone 3.21 ..... 155
Table 3.3 Vinylation of iodide rac-3.49 ..... 157
Table 3.4 Methyl addition to ketone 3.56 ..... 163
Table 3.5 Hydrogenation of unsaturated lactones 3.65 ..... 166
Table 3.6 Dehydration of lactols 3.74 ..... 170

## List of Equations

Equation 1.1 ..... 6
Equation 1.2 ..... 7
Equation 1.3 ..... 8
Equation 1.4 ..... 13
Equation 1.5 ..... 21
Equation 1.6 ..... 23
Equation 1.7 ..... 30
Equation 1.8 ..... 31
Equation 1.9 ..... 32
Equation 1.10 ..... 33
Equation 1.11 ..... 34
Equation 1.12 ..... 35
Equation 2.1 ..... 97
Equation 2.2 ..... 100
Equation 2.3 ..... 100
Equation 2.4 ..... 101
Equation 3.1 ..... 141
Equation 3.2 ..... 150
Equation 3.3 ..... 151
Equation 3.4 ..... 160
Equation 3.5 ..... 164
Equation 3.6 ..... 171
Equation 3.7 .................................................................................................................... 172

Equation 3.8 .................................................................................................................... 172

## Acknowledgements

There are numerous individuals to whom I am indebted for their generous gifts of time, insight and support over the past five years. First of all, Professor Larry Overman has been an incredibly positive influence on my development as both a scientist and as a person. His ability to identify and address challenging yet important problems in chemical synthesis is a testament to the high regard in which he is held at UC Irvine and in the scientific community. Larry placed an enormous and, in my opinion, sometimes unfounded amount of trust in my decisions and skills, but his faith in me motivated me to become independent and confident in conducting my research.

I am grateful to my dissertation committee members, Professors Chris Vanderwal and James Nowick for their continued support and advice. It has been particularly enlightening to hear their perspectives on my research as it has developed over the last few years. I valued the time that they spent discussing science with me during my advancement to candidacy and learned a great deal from them during this experience.

My colleagues in the Overman group have contributed immensely to my growth as a chemist. The many talented postdoctoral scholars and fellow graduate students with whom I have worked have challenged me to approach problems in research with creativity and confidence, to give compelling oral presentations and to take criticism constructively. I am particularly grateful to Drs. Martin Schnermann, Kyle Quasdorf, André Dieskau and Nick Untiedt for selflessly spending countless hours explaining chemical reactions, discussing experimental results and proofreading my writing. Carol Schwartz, our former administrative assistant, was invaluable during her time spent with us.

I am lucky to have had so many positive early experiences in chemistry that undoubtedly pushed me in the direction of graduate research. My high school chemistry teacher, Dr. Doug Sisk, taught me that the mastery of difficult concepts is an exceptionally rewarding experience. I was also fortunate to learn from several outstanding individuals in the laboratory of Professor Michael VanNieuwenhze during my time as an undergraduate at Indiana University. Drs. Pablo Garcia-Reynaga, Srinivas Tekkam, Seth Carmody, Alvin Kalinda, Angela Carillo and Eddie Hall endured my unrelenting questions and optimistically mediocre laboratory techniques. The entire group was welcoming and approachable, and I could not be more grateful for my time with them.

My friends at home and my friends in California have made this experience truly enjoyable. I hope that Scott and Mary Szczechowski, Josh and Holly Bisig, Sam Hudson and Sarah Ferrara can forgive me for moving out to the west coast for the last few years. The friends I have made while at UC Irvine have challenged me to think more broadly about science and the world as a whole. I have treasured the experiences that I have had with them learning chemistry, spending time together and exploring California.

My family has been incredibly supportive and patient with me during my graduate school education as they have always. My parents Larry and Luann, my brother Ryan, and my sister Lori all work extremely hard at everything they do and set great examples for me. Their humility, generosity, wisdom and sense of humor are unrivaled.

The research presented herein was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation (CHE1265964) and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (R01GM098601) and by a fellowship provided by the American Chemical Society Division of

Organic Chemistry. NMR spectra and mass spectra were obtained at UC Irvine using instrumentation acquired with the assistance of NSF and NIH Shared Instrumentation grants.

# Curriculum Vitae 

Gregory L. Lackner

University of California, Irvine
Department of Chemistry 1102 Natural Sciences 2
Irvine, CA 92697-2025.

## Education:

University of California, Irvine - Irvine, CA. (2011-2016).
Ph.D. in Chemistry. Research advisor: Larry E. Overman.
Indiana University - Bloomington, IN. (2007-2011).
BS in Chemistry with Honors; Minor in Mathematics.
Research advisor: Michael S. VanNieuwenhze.

## Publications:

5. Enantioselective Total Syntheses of trans-Clerodane Diterpenoids: Convergent Fragment Coupling Using a trans-Decalin Tertiary Radical Generated from a Tertiary Alcohol Precursor. Slutskyy, Y.; Jamison, C. R.; Lackner, G. L.; Müller D. S.; Dieskau, A. P.; Unteidt, N. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2016. Accepted for publication.
6. Constructing Quaternary Carbons from $N$-(Acyloxy)phthalimide Precursors of Tertiary Radicals Using Visible-Light Photocatalysis. Pratsch, G.; Lackner, G. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6025-6036.
7. Fragment Coupling and the Construction of Quaternary Carbons Using Tertiary Radicals Generated From tert-Alkyl N-Phthalimidoyl Oxalates By Visible-Light Photocatalysis. Lackner, G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Pratsch, G.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6012-6024.
8. Constructing Quaternary Stereogenic Centers Using Tertiary Organocuprates and Tertiary Radicals. Total Synthesis of trans-Clerodane Natural Products. Müller, D. S.; Untiedt, N. L.; Dieskau, A. P.; Lackner, G. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 660-663.
9. Direct Construction of Quaternary Carbons from Tertiary Alcohols via Photoredox-Catalyzed Fragmentation of tert-Alkyl $N$-Phthalimidoyl Oxalates. Lackner,G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 1534215345.

Abstract of The Dissertation<br>Forming Quaternary Carbons Using Photoredox Catalysis and Applications in Total Synthesis<br>by<br>Gregory Lawrence Lackner<br>Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry<br>University of California, Irvine, 2016<br>Professor Larry E. Overman, Chair

In Chapter 1, the development of tert-alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalates as precursors for generating tertiary carbon radicals and forming quaternary carbons is discussed. The coupling of these radical precursors with conjugate acceptors is determined to be farily general with respect to both oxalate and alkene coupling partners. Studies that elucidate the mechanism of the coupling reaction are also presented. The mechanism of radical termination is found to be directly influenced by the stoichiometric reductant additive included in the reaction.

In Chapter 2, a bimolecular radical fragment coupling is employed as a key step to complete the total syntheses of several trans-clerodane diterpenoid natural products as well as one ent-halimane diterpenoid natural product. In this context, the tertiary radical is optimally generated from an ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide substrate rather than the corresponding tert-alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate.

In Chapter 3, a photoredox-catalyzed radical coupling is used to stereoselectively construct the central $\mathrm{C} 8-\mathrm{C} 14$ bond of the rearranged spongian diterpene macfarlandin C .

An allylic phosphate displacement and intramolecular carbonyl-ene cyclization enable a robust enantioselective synthesis of the decalin fragment. The unexpected intramolecular cyclization of an alkoxycarbonyl radical derived from the (8S)-oxalate prompts a revised synthetic approach targeting the $(8 R)$-oxalate radical precursor, which couples efficiently with ( $S$ )-5-methoxyfuran-2-one. Two synthetic routes to the bicyclic lactone moiety of macfarlandin C are investigated on a simple model substrate. These attempts are ultimately foiled by the difficulty in forming a cis-alpha, beta-disubstituted butyrolactone that bears a quaternary substituent at the beta-position.

## Chapter 1: Forming Quaternary Carbons From Tertiary Alcohol and Tertiary Carboxylic Acid Derivatives Using Photoredox Catalysis

### 1.1 Introduction

Despite the remarkable evolution of chemical synthesis over the past nearly two centuries, the preparation of organic molecules containing quaternary carbons is still a considerable challenge. ${ }^{1}$ These structural motifs are particularly difficult to access in the simplest sense because of the steric repulsion imposed by the substituents often present on the precursor carbon atom. The synthesis of chiral quaternary carbons poses an especially formidable challenge; thus, reliable and straightforward chemical methods to construct quaternary carbon stereocenters are especially valuable.

One useful metric of this particular challenge is the infrequency with which quaternary carbons have been incorporated into drugs. Of the top 200 prescription drugs sold in the US in 2011, only $12 \%$ contain quaternary carbons. ${ }^{2}$ Furthermore, those that do exhibit quaternary carbons are almost certainly prepared by semisynthesis from opioid, steroid, or taxane diterpenoid precursors. One should not interpret this statistic to mean that quaternary carbon-containing molecules do not make effective drugs, however. It has been suggested that both an abundance of $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ carbons as well as the presence of chiral carbons confers desirable properties to drug candidates and often correlates with success in clinical testing. ${ }^{3}$

A few chemical transformations have been routinely employed to synthesize molecules containing quaternary carbon centers. In particular, Diels-Alder reactions and alkylation of substituted enolates are among the reactions most frequently utilized for this
purpose. ${ }^{1 a}$ Many transition metal-catalyzed methods have also emerged in which the quaternary carbon precursor can act as either a nucleophile or an electrophile. ${ }^{\text {1a,b }}$ Powerful though these reactions may be, each of these approaches suffers from the requirement of vicinal functionality to establish the quaternary carbon center. The most desirable strategy to access these structural motifs would be one in which a tertiary carbon with minimal functionality directly participates in a carbon-carbon bond-forming process to generate the quaternary carbon. A reaction of this type would enable a fundamentally simpler retrosynthetic disconnection in which molecules could be disconnected straightforwardly at a quaternary carbon center. This approach then would permit one to propose a retrosynthetic precursor that does not require redox manipulation or the incorporation of extraneous functionality to introduce the quaternary carbon.

Previous studies in total synthesis carried out in the Overman lab prompted the development of such reactions to more efficiently form quaternary carbons. Several members of the rearranged spongian diterpene family of natural products (Figure 1.1) were recently chosen as the targets of these total synthesis efforts. ${ }^{4}$ Many members of this family exhibit unique biological properties that will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3. The rearranged spongian diterpenes in Figure 1.1 consist of a bicyclic hydrocarbon joined to an oxygenated ring system at a central sigma bond. In all of the depicted natural products, this bond joins a chiral quaternary carbon of one ring system to a tertiary stereocenter of the oxygenated fragment. One may note that this bond presents a particularly attractive retrosynthetic disconnection, as dissecting the molecules at this central bond gives rise to two precursors of relatively equal complexity, providing for a convergent synthetic approach. In spite of the appeal of this strategy, however, the

Figure 1.1 Representative rearranged spongian diterpene natural products




intermolecular coupling of two complex fragments and concomitant formation of the vicinal quaternary and tertiary stereocenters is a remarkably challenging task that can be accomplished by few chemical reactions. The evolution of the Overman group's approach to the total synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3) served to examine the current state of such bimolecular complex fragment couplings as well as to stimulate the development of more efficient methods for forming quaternary carbons in bimolecular coupling reactions.

The first approach to the key central bond formation in the total synthesis of aplyviolene was based on a similar strategy utilized in the total synthesis of shahamin K (1.5) completed previously by the Overman group. ${ }^{5}$ The construction of the C8-C14 bond of shahamin K was accomplished by Michael addition of the thermodynamic enolate of hydroazulenone $\mathbf{1 . 6}$ to conjugate acceptor $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ (Figure 1.2). The quaternary carbon stereocenter at C8 was formed diastereoselectively as a result of the approach of enone $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ from the less-hindered convex face of bicyclic hydroazulene 1.6. This reaction provided a single adduct $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ which could then be processed to shahamin K over several steps.

Figure 1.2 Key Michael addition step in the total synthesis of shahamin K (1.5)


The first-generation total synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3) also employed the Michael addition of an enolate to forge the key central C8-C14 bond. ${ }^{6}$ In the event, the same thermodynamic enolate generated from hydroazulenone $\mathbf{1 . 6}$ underwent diastereoselective addition to enone 1.9, providing adduct $\mathbf{1 . 1 0}$ in $81 \%$ yield (Figure 1.3). A series of steps first developed on a simpler model system ${ }^{7}$ successfully converted bromoketone 1.10 to aplyviolene (1.3).

Figure 1.3 First-generation Michael addition approach to aplyviolene (1.3)


One noteworthy detail in this Michael addition approach to both shahamin K (1.5) and aplyviolene (1.3) is the eventual fate of the ketone functionality at C 7 (aplyviolene and shahamin K numbering) that was necessary to construct the neighboring quaternary carbon. In the synthesis of shahamin $\mathrm{K}(\mathbf{1 . 5})$, this functional group is transformed into the acetoxy group present at this position in the natural product. ${ }^{5}$ The synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3), however, required that this ketone be reductively removed over three
steps to access the unfunctionalized methylene carbon at $\mathrm{C} 7 .{ }^{6}$ This undesirable redox manipulation demonstrates that, although high-yielding and diastereoselective, the Michael addition strategy could potentially be revised to incorporate the hydroazulene unit in the correct oxidation state.

One possibility for the direct formation of the C8 quaternary carbon center by an intermolecular coupling was the generation of a tertiary organocuprate that would engage an enone such as $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}$ in a conjugate addition. Spurred by this prospect and the potential general utility of such bimolecular coupling reactions, the Overman group developed a method to access tertiary organocuprates by reductive lithiation of tertiary nitrile precursors followed by transmetalation to copper. ${ }^{8}$ This strategy was then applied to the key fragment coupling step in the synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3). Surprisingly, the reductive lithiation of nitrile $\mathbf{1 . 1 2}$, transmetalation to copper and conjugate addition to enone $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}$ resulted in an adduct that was epimeric to aplyviolene (1.3) at the newly formed C8 quaternary carbon (Equation 1.1). This result suggested that the intermediate organocuprate underwent addition to enone $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}$ from the more hindered concave face of the hydroazulene and not from the more accessible convex face as was expected. Computational rationalization for this observed diastereoselectivity suggested that the intermediate organocuprate reacted from the more hindered face in order to minimize torsional strain effects within the bicyclic hydroazulene framework. ${ }^{8}$

## Equation 1.1



Another option for the direct and diastereoselective introduction of the hydroazulene unit was the addition of a tertiary radical intermediate to a conjugate acceptor. ${ }^{9}$ The selection of an appropriate precursor for generating the tertiary radical was nontrivial, and several were initially considered. Although carbon radicals are commonly generated from alkyl halide precursors, ${ }^{10}$ the general difficulties associated with synthesizing these substrates ${ }^{11}$ advocated that a tertiary radical for use in this coupling might be more efficiently generated from a more stable tertiary carboxylic acid-derived precursor. The most commonly employed carboxylic acid-derived thiohydroxamate esters, ${ }^{12}$ or "Barton esters" were initially considered for this purpose, as these intermediates have been widely used for several impressive radical carbon-carbon bond constructions in total synthesis for many years. ${ }^{10}$ However, preliminary studies conducted by the Overman group suggested their instability to ambient light made them unfit for general application in complex fragment coupling scenarios.

More appealing was the coupling of a tertiary radical intermediate generated from an ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide substrate. These carboxylic acid derivatives were first introduced for use in radical addition reactions by Okada in 1991, and were employed to generate primary, secondary and tertiary carbon radicals that coupled with electrondeficient olefins. ${ }^{13}$ This transformation likely occurs via electron transfer from the
photocatalyst to the (N-acyloxy)phthalimide substrate such as $\mathbf{1 . 1 4}$ (Equation 1.2), promoting homolytic cleavage of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ bond and radical decarboxylation to generate the key tertiary radical intermediate. In this reaction, 1-benzyl-1,4-dihydronicotinamide (BNAH, 1.15) is used as a stoichiometric reductant to facilitate catalyst turnover and termination of the radical addition process. Interestingly, the only example of a tertiary radical coupled in this way included in Okada's report was the 1-adamantanyl radical (Equation 1.2). Nevertheless, the mild photoredox catalysis conditions utilized in this transformation suggested that their use for the coupling of complex functionalized fragments in the context of the total synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3) might be successful.

## Equation 1.2



The pivotal fragment coupling reaction en route to the total synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3) was then attempted using Okada's method for the generation and coupling of tertiary radicals. Subjection of hydroazulene ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 1 7}$ to reductive photoredox catalysis conditions efficiently induced radical coupling with chloroenone 1.18, giving the desired adduct 1.19 in $61 \%$ yield (Equation 1.3). Slightly modified reaction conditions first used by Gagné for the reductive generation of radicals from glucosyl halides were found to be optimial in this transformation. ${ }^{14}$ Analysis of the stereochemical outcome of this coupling revealed that addition to the enone acceptor $\mathbf{1 . 1 8}$ had occurred from the less-hindered convex face as was desired. Thus, the diastereoselectivity realized in the course of this radical coupling was complementary to
that previously observed in the case of the analogous tertiary organocuprate and facilitated a second-generation formal synthesis of aplyviolene.

## Equation 1.3



The success of Okada's method in stereoselectively coupling highly functionalized structural fragments hinted that this method for forming quaternary carbons may hold considerable untapped potential. Although this approach has been curiously omitted from a recent survey of methods to construct quaternary carbons, ${ }^{\text {b }}$ the general use of tertiary radicals to form these structural motifs has several notable advantages. First, the addition of carbon radicals to olefins is calculated to occur with an early transition state, which contributes to a long forming bond (ca. 2.2-2.5 A) in this transition state, suggesting that these bond formations can succeed in highly hindered steric environments. Tertiary radicals are also known to add to alkenes with higher diastereoselectivity than primary or secondary radicals, advocating their use in the diastereoselective formation of quaternary carbons. ${ }^{15}$ Finally, the three alkyl substituents of a tertiary radical confer a "nucleophilic" character to this radical by hyperconjugative donation of electron density. This effect contributes to a higher SOMO and a higher rate of addition of the tertiary radical to electron-deficient olefins than primary and secondary radicals. Despite these attractive features, the adoption of tertiary radicals as useful
intermediates for forming quaternary carbons has been stagnant, likely because of the lack of convenient precursors and conditions for generating tertiary carbon radicals.

The Overman group's implementation of Okada's radical coupling method to the total synthesis of aplyviolene (1.3) established that tertiary ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide substrates are robust precursors for forming quaternary carbons. One potentially unattractive aspect of the general use of these substrates in total synthesis, however, is that a structural carbon-carbon bond must be incorporated into the substrate only to be subsequently cleaved in the generation of the tertiary radical intermediate. Thus, a quaternary carbon must already be present in the substrate in order to form the desired quaternary carbon in the intermolecular coupling. This requirement can in some cases add several steps to a synthetic route, often requiring cumbersome manipulation of highly hindered tertiary functional groups. ${ }^{16}$ A potential improvement to Okada's method envisioned by the Overman group was to utilize instead a radical precursor derived from a tertiary alcohol. Tertiary alcohols are easily constructed by the addition of carbon nucleophiles to ketone substrates, and as a result would be more accessible than the carboxylic acid derivatives employed in Okada's study.

The most common alcohol-derived precursors of carbon radicals are xanthate esters. ${ }^{17,10 b}$ These substrates have been most widely used to perform deoxygenations of secondary alcohols, however, as tertiary xanthate esters are more prone to elimination. Alternatively, a series of publications by Barton detail the generation of radicals from thiohydroxamate oxalate derivatives of alcohols (Figure 1.4). ${ }^{18}$ Much like the analogous thiohydroxamate esters, alkyl radicals are generated by photolysis or thermolysis of these acyloxythiopyridone derivatives 1.A, promoting homolytic $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ bond cleavage and
decarboxylation. In reactions of thiohydroxamate oxalates, however, generation of the alkyl radical proceeds after two decarboxylation events that occur in a stepwise manner (Figure 1.4). This important distinction provides access to alkyl radicals from alcohols by direct activation of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}$ bond via a decarboxylation process.

Figure 1.4 Formation of a quaternary carbon from a thiohydroxamate oxalate


Barton's report described the addition of several carbon radicals to electrondeficient olefins by this method; however, the yields of coupling products obtained were disappointingly low. One possible explanation for the inefficiency of these couplings could be the instability of the radical precursor, as the thiohydroxamate oxalates 1.A must be generated in situ during the course of the reaction and presumably cannot be isolated. This characteristic is in stark contrast to the properties of the previously discussed ( N acyloxyphthalimides, which are stable to chromatography, ambient light, and prolonged storage at room temperature. Additionally, these phthalimide derivatives are typically crystalline solids that are easily handled. It was reasoned these desirable attributes might be conferred to an alcohol derivative similar to 1.A by simple replacement of the thiohydroxypyridine moiety by an $N$-hydroxyphthalimide unit. These previously unreported alkyl N -phthalimidoyl oxalate substrates could then ideally provide access to
carbon radicals under the same mild photoredox catalysis conditions used to generate radicals from the analogous ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides such as $\mathbf{1 . 1 4}$. It was envisioned that formation of the tertiary radical from a phthalimidoyl oxalate should occur in the same manner as observed for the thiohydroxamate oxalates by two decarboxylation steps proceeding through an alkoxycarbonyl intermediate (Figure 1.5). The successful coupling of tertiary radicals generated from alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates with conjugate acceptors was anticipated to provide a useful method for synthesizing quaternary carbons in a straightforward and synthetically convenient fashion.

Figure 1.5 Proposed reactivity of an alkyl N -phthalimidoyl oxalate


### 1.2 Results and Discussion

### 1.2.1 Synthesis of Tertiary Alkyl $\boldsymbol{N}$-Phthalimidoyl Oxalates

The preparation of alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalate radical precursors from their corresponding alcohols was first investigated using 1-methylcyclohexanol (1.26) as a simple tertiary alcohol substrate. Since Barton had shown that chlorooxalate esters such as $\mathbf{1 . 2 1}$ could be reliably formed by treatment of the alcohol with oxalyl chloride, it was supposed that incorporation of the phthalimide moiety via this intermediate might be successful. Accordingly, exposure of 1-methylcyclohexanol (1.26) to a slight excess of oxalyl chloride in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, followed by warming to room temperature overnight, afforded chlorooxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ in $80 \%$ yield (Scheme 1.1). The chlorooxalate was isolated by simply removing the solvent, excess oxalyl chloride, and any remaining traces of
hydrogen chloride under reduced pressure. Introduction of the phthalimidoyl moiety at this stage proved to be significantly challenging owing to the lability of the oxalate products 1.28. The most effective conditions for this process were found to be addition of chlorooxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ to a solution of N -hydroxyphthalimide, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, and DMAP in THF at room temperature for 1 h .

## Scheme 1.1 Two-step synthesis of alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates from tertiary alcohols.



While purification of the crude products by silica gel chromatography was unsuccessful, an aqueous extraction procedure could be employed to obtain the oxalates in high purity. Washing a dilute solution of oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ with aqueous saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was required to remove $N$-hydroxyphthalimide from the product mixture, but provided 1.28 in variable yields (Scheme 1.1). Resubjection of pure $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ to this purification procedure resulted in substantial cleavage of the phthalimidoyl moiety, confirming the workup as the cause of the inconsistent yields. Although small amounts of 1.28 could be synthesized by this method for use in initial studies, the method was not effective when applied to many other tertiary alcohols and provoked elimination upon acylation of many of the alcohol substrates. A more efficient and general synthesis of the desired radical precursors was then pursued.

The second strategy examined for synthesizing tert-alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates from tertiary alcohols was the direct acylation of a tertiary alcohol substrate with N phthalimidoyl chlorooxalate 1.29. After careful optimization, a reliable method was
developed to prepare chlorooxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}$ from $N$-hydroxyphthalimide and a large excess of oxalyl chloride by stirring in THF from $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to room temperature overnight. ${ }^{19}$ Chlorooxalate 1.29 was then obtained as a colorless solid by concentration of the reaction mixture. This reactive acylating reagent was then most easily manipulated under argon as a 0.06 M solution in THF. The acylation of 1-methylcyclohexanol (1.26) proceeded efficiently using two equivalents of chlorooxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}$ in THF in the presence $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ and DMAP (Equation 1.4). Phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ was purified in this case according to a procedure developed by Dr. Kyle Quasdorf in which the crude product mixture was dissolved in a minimal amount of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and then poured into a large volume of hexanes. This produced a brown suspension that could be filtered through cotton, providing a colorless filtrate solution, which was concentrated to give the phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ in quantitative yield and high purity.

## Equation 1.4



The preparation of phthalimidoyl oxalate intermediates from tertiary alcohol substrates by this procedure was successfully applied to a variety of structurally diverse tertiary alcohols (Figure 1.6). ${ }^{20}$ With most simple substrates, the acylation proceeded to completion in one hour. When significantly hindered tertiary alcohols were employed,

Figure 1.6 Synthesis of alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates

however, the reaction required up to 24 hours. The purification method developed by Dr. Quasdorf was remarkably effective for nearly all oxalates synthesized in this fashion. Oxalates 1.31 and 1.36 which bear nitrogen-based functional groups were isolated in somewhat lower yields, presumably owing to the lack of solubility of these compounds in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} /$ hexanes. Most solid oxalates prepared in this way could be stored indefinitely at $-20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, while those that are oils could typically be stored at this temperature for about one week before decomposition. The structure of these previously unknown esters was confirmed by X-ray single crystal analysis of oxalate 1.32. ${ }^{19}$

### 1.2.2 Optimization of the Photoredox-Catalyzed Radical Coupling

With a robust method for preparing alkyl phthalimidoyl oxalates in hand, the photoredox-catalyzed coupling of these intermediates with electron-deficient alkenes was next explored (Table 1.1). For the initial optimization of the photoredox reaction, oxalate 1.28 and methyl vinyl ketone were employed as coupling partners. The first conditions examined in the transformation were those that are typically used for coupling of the related ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide substrates. Encouragingly, exposure of oxalate 1.28 and methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) to $1.5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$, Hantzsch dihydropyridine 1.20 and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ in dichloromethane at room temperature under irradiation with blue LEDs produced adduct 1.40 in $16 \%$ yield (entry 1 ). It was observed that the addition of $i$ $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ to the reaction mixture (prior to the addition of the photocatalyst) produced a bright red color, suggesting that it directly interacts with one of the reaction components. After carrying out several control experiments to establish the nature of this reactivity, it was confirmed that this amine rapidly decomposes the substrate oxalate to liberate the red conjugate base of N -hydroxyphthalimide. The omission of $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ in the photoredox coupling reaction gave a small increase in yield (entry 2). Including $i$ - $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}^{\mathrm{H}} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$, an additive that was examined in a related study by Gagné, ${ }^{14}$ resulted in a slight improvement to the yield and reproducibility of the reaction (entry 3 ). ${ }^{21}$ A survey of the relative equivalents of the coupling partners employed in the reaction (entries 4-6) revealed that a substantially higher yield of $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ could be achieved when the oxalate component was present in slight excess (entry 6). Final optimization of the reaction parameters established that only one equivalent of the ammonium additive was required (entries 8 and 10) and that the use of $\mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ as a solvent resulted in a significant
improvement in the yield of $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}{ }^{22}$ Conveniently, the commercially available $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$ catalyst performed equally well as $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$. Under the optimized reaction conditions, oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ coupled with MVK to give adduct $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ in $82 \%$ isolated yield (entry 9).

Table 1.1 Optimization of photoredox coupling of 1.28 with MVK


| entry | $\begin{gathered} \text { equiv } \\ \mathbf{1 . 2 8} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { equiv } \\ & \text { MVK } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { equiv } \\ \mathbf{1 . 2 0} \end{gathered}$ | additive | solvent | X | $\begin{gathered} \text { yield } \\ \mathbf{1 . 4 0 ( \% )} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $19^{\text {b }}$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | - | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $36^{\text {b }}$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $40^{\text {b }}$ |
| 4 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NE} \bullet \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $22^{\text {b }}$ |
| 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $56^{\text {b }}$ |
| 6 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $77^{\text {b }}$ |
| 7 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{c}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $82^{b}$ |
| 8 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NE} t \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{c}$ | THF/ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{BF}_{4}$ | $92{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 9 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NE} \bullet \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{c}$ | THF/ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{PF}_{6}$ | $92^{\text {b, }} 82^{d}$ |
| 10 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | - | THF/ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{PF}_{6}$ | $65^{\text {b }}$ |

${ }^{a} 2.2$ equivalents were used. ${ }^{b}$ Yield measured by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR relative to an internal standard ( $1,4-$ dimethoxybenzene). ${ }^{c} 1.0$ equivalent was used. ${ }^{d}$ Isolated yield.

A series of control reactions was then performed to evaluate the necessity of each reaction component (Table 1.2). Although the coupling reactions were initially carried out for 18 hours because the oxalate substrates were not amenable to TLC analysis, the yield of $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ was nearly identical when the reaction was run for only 2 hours (entries 1 and 2). Visible light proved to be essential for reactivity, as no conversion of oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ was observed when the reaction was conducted in the dark (entry 3). Omission of Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ gave a similar outcome, resulting in complete recovery of $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$. Interestingly, significant product formation in the absence of the photocatalyst was
observed (entries 5 and 6). This background reaction was notably slower than the photocatalyzed reaction, producing $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ in only $28 \%$ yield after 2 hours, although the yield was markedly higher after a reaction time of 18 hours. This reactivity was attributed to being mediated by Hantzsch ester 1.20, as Okada and co-workers had made a similar observation in their initial studies using a related dihydropyridine. ${ }^{13}$ Omitting the ammonium additive resulted in a somewhat depressed yield of $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ (entry 7). Finally, revisiting the stoichiometry of coupling substrates in the reaction (entries 8-10) confirmed that the highest yield of $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ was obtained when oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ was present in slight excess.

Table 1.2 Control experiments for photoredox coupling


Several other photoredox catalysts were examined to promote the formation of adduct $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ from phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ and MVK (Table 1.3). Although no catalyst performed as well as $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{2+}$ (entry 1 ), many strongly reducing iridium photoredox catalysts were nearly as effective (entries $2-4) .{ }^{23}$ Even $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpz}){ }_{3}{ }^{+}\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}{ }^{\mathrm{II} / \mathrm{I}}-0.80 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs $\mathrm{SCE}),{ }^{24}$ a significantly weaker reductant than $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy}){ }_{3}{ }^{+}\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}{ }^{\mathrm{II} / \mathrm{I}}-1.33 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs SCE$)$, gave a $62 \%$ yield (by NMR analysis) of ketone $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ (entry 5).

Table 1.3 Coupling of oxalate 1.28 and MVK with various photoredox catalysts

${ }^{a}$ Yield measured by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR relative to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene).
The replacement of Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ with several other potential stoichiometric reductants (Table 1.4) was also investigated. Introduction of a substituent at the 4-position of the Hantzsch ester rendered the dihydropyridine unreactive under the reaction conditions (entries 2 and 3). The use of 2-phenylbenzothiazoline (1.41) ${ }^{25}$ or $N, N$ '-dimethyl-2-phenylbenzimidazoline $(\mathbf{1 . 4 2})^{26}$ resulted in the formation of product 1.40, although the yield was somewhat less than that observed under identical conditions
using Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ (entries 4 and 5). No conversion to adduct $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ was observed using $N$-methylacridane (1.43), a known reductive quencher of $\operatorname{Ru}($ bpy $){ }_{3}{ }^{2+^{* *}}$ (entry 6 ). ${ }^{27}$

Table 1.4 Coupling of oxalate 1.28 and MVK with various reductants


### 1.2.3 Examining the Scope of the Coupling Reaction

The scope of the photoredox coupling reaction with respect to the oxalate coupling partner was then explored (Figure 1.7). A wide variety of $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate substrates were tolerated in the transformation, which generally gave good yields of the coupled products. Oxalates derived from both cyclic and linear tertiary alcohols coupled readily with MVK, providing the radical addition products in approximately $80 \%$

Figure 1.7 Coupling of various oxalates with MVK

yield for most substrates. Various common alcohol and amine protecting groups were unaffected by the mild reaction conditions, as demonstrated by the efficient formation of 1.47, 1.48 and 1.49. The coupling of an indole-containing oxalate with MVK was less successful, forming $\mathbf{1 . 5 0}$ in only $36 \%$ yield. Three chiral N -phthalimidoyl oxalates that were examined coupled with MVK from the less-sterically hindered face of the tertiary radical to give products $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}, \mathbf{1 . 5 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$ with $>20: 1$ diastereoselection. Adducts $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$ were formed in $>80 \%$ yield. The yield was somewhat lower in the construction of a quaternary center at C 17 in the estrone series (1.52, 68\%), likely reflecting the demand in forming vicinal quaternary carbon centers. As was observed during
exploratory studies, yields were somewhat lower when equal amounts of the phthalimidoyl oxalate and alkene were employed: $43 \%$ vs $68 \%$ in forming $\mathbf{1 . 5 2}$ and $63 \%$ vs $85 \%$ in forming 1.53. In a number of the coupling reactions summarized in Figure 1.7, the yield was nearly the same when $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ was omitted. Nonetheless, the product yields were more reproducible when this additive is present.

In two cases, the alkoxycarbonyl radical (intermediate 1.B, Figure 1.4) was trapped by the radical acceptor more rapidly than it underwent decarboxylation to generate the tertiary radical intermediate. Adamantyl phthalimidoyl oxalate (1.32) when coupled with MVK gave $\gamma$-ketoester $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ and the product $\mathbf{1 . 1 6}$ of trapping the adamantyl radical in a 3:1 ratio (Equation 1.5). It is well known that alkoxycarbonyl radicals decarboxylate many orders of magnitude more slowly than carboxy radicals, ${ }^{28,29}$ with the activation barrier decreasing with the stability of the carbon radical produced. ${ }^{30}$ Trapping of the adamantyl oxycarbonyl radical by MVK to give $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ as the major product is a reflection of the higher energy of the non-planar tertiary adamantyl radical than the tertiary radicals generated in the reactions reported in Figure 1.7.

Equation 1.5


In the example illustrated in Scheme 1.2, it is the high rate of 5-exo radical cyclizations (1.E $\rightarrow \mathbf{1 . F}$ ) that results in capture of the intermediate alkoxycarbonyl radical to yield lactone $\mathbf{1 . 5 5}$ from phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 3 5} .{ }^{31}$

## Scheme 1.2 Trapping of an alkoxycarbonyl radical by a 5-exo cyclization



The coupling of oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ with various conjugate acceptors was then surveyed (Figure 1.8). As expected, the highest yields were realized in the coupling reactions with terminal alkenes such as MVK, acrylonitrile and phenyl vinyl sulfone. Several radical acceptors having a substituent at the $\beta$-carbon also provided coupled products in good yields. Dimethyl fumarate gave adduct $\mathbf{1 . 6 0}$ in $85 \%$ yield, and cyclopenten-2-one coupled with $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ to give product $\mathbf{1 . 6 2}$ in $55 \%$ yield. The yield of adduct $\mathbf{1 . 6 3}$ resulting from the coupling of $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ with 2-carbomethoxycyclopenten-2-one (62\%) was only slightly higher than that observed with cyclopenten-2-one. ${ }^{32}$ Butenolides were also competent acceptors, with the presence of a $\gamma$-methoxy substituent enhancing the yield of the coupled product ( $72 \%$ for $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}$ vs $52 \%$ for $\mathbf{1 . 6 1}$ ) and completely regulating face-stereoselectivity.

Unfortunately, radical addition to acceptors possessing electron-donating alkyl groups at the $\alpha$-position was less successful under these conditions. The deactivated acceptor benzyl methacrylate coupled with $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ to provide $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ in only $41 \%$ yield. Product was not detected in the coupling of $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ with methacrylonitrile. ${ }^{33}$

Figure 1.8 Coupling oxalate 1.28 with various conjugate acceptors


Radical addition-fragmentation reactions using electron-deficient allylic halides or halomethyl styrenes as the olefin coupling components were subsequently examined by Dr. Gerald Pratsch. These reactions gave the products of formal allylation of the tertiary radical intermediate, as exemplified by the formation of $\mathbf{1 . 6 7}$ from the coupling of oxalate 1.28 and methyl bromomethacrylate (Equation 1.6). ${ }^{34}$

## Equation 1.6



### 1.2.4 Comparing $N$-Phthalimidoyl Oxalate and ( $N$-Acyloxy)phthalimide Radical Precursors

To compare the efficiency of the oxalate radical precursors to that of the related ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides, the coupling of 1-methylcyclohexyl ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide (1.68) with several alkene acceptors (Figure 1.9) was next investigated. To facilitate comparison, the yields obtained in the coupling of oxalate 1.28 with the respective conjugate acceptors from Figure 1.8 are reproduced below in Figure 1.9. Both radical precursors coupled efficiently with MVK, providing adduct $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ in over $80 \%$ yield. In the case of the remaining acceptors surveyed, however, ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ consistently coupled in higher yield than the corresponding oxalate 1.28. The addition of

Figure 1.9 Coupling ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 and oxalate 1.28 with various alkenes

a tertiary radical generated from ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ to cyclopentenone and benzyl methacrylate occurred in $80 \%$ and $59 \%$ yield, respectively, while the analogous reactions of oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ took place in much lower yield. Remarkably, ( $N$ acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ coupled to methacrylonitrile in high yield; oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ gave no product in this transformation.

The consistently higher performance of the ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide substrates in radical couplings relative to reactions of the oxalate substrates could result from several factors. First, reactions employing the oxalates require that an excess of the oxalate be used to account for decomposition of the substrate over the course of the reaction. The ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides, by contrast, exhibit superior stability, and therefore the use of one equivalent of these substrates in a given reaction is sufficient to obtain high product yields. Additionally, using only one equivalent of the ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide radical precursor enables an excess of the acceptor to be employed, which likely results in more efficient coupling of the tertiary radical that is generated in very low concentration.

### 1.2.5 Investigating the Radical Coupling in the Absence of $\mathbf{R u}(b p y)_{3}{ }^{\mathbf{2 +}}$.

As described previously, the observation of significant product formation in coupling reactions when $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{2+}$ was omitted was a surprising result (Table 1.2, entries 5 and 6). In accordance with Okada's proposed mechanism of the reactions of ( N acyloxy)phthalimides ${ }^{13}$ and the requirement of a dihydropyridine or similar reductant for any reaction progress (Table 1.2, entry 4), it was rationalized that the observed reactivity in the absence of catalyst was mediated by this stoichiometric reductant.

Based on the known reactivity of Hantzsch esters, it was recognized that several possible dihydropyridine intermediates could be involved in single electron transfer to an $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate substrate. The parent dihydropyridine $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ is a known reductive quencher of photoexcited $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy}) 3_{3}{ }^{2+} .{ }^{35}$ Single-electron oxidation of Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ by this process would generate radical cation 1.G (Scheme 1.3). Deprotonation of 1.G at C 4 produces radical intermediate $\mathbf{1 . H}$, which is a strong one-electron reductant $(-0.70 \mathrm{~V}$
vs SCE). ${ }^{36}$ Loss of one electron, followed by deprotonation of the resulting pyridinium intermediate, yields pyridine $\mathbf{1 . 6 9}$, which is an isolable product of the coupling reactions reported in this account. When a photoredox catalyst is not present, oxidation of Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ by trace amounts of oxygen is likely responsible for the observed reactivity of $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalates. ${ }^{37}$

Scheme 1.3 Expected reactivity of Hantzsch dihydropyridine 1.20


To determine whether the coupling reaction in the absence of the photocatalyst could be a general method for promoting the desired reactivity, several radical couplings depicted in Figure 1.7 and Figure 1.8 were repeated with omission of the photocatalyst (Figure 1.10). Reasonable yields of products were obtained in the coupling of two oxalates with MVK ( $67 \%$ for $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ and $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ for $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$ ). However, the conversion of oxalate substrates to product was typically sluggish and inconsistent, and in two coupling reactions the yields of products obtained were significantly lower than in reactions employing a photocatalyst.

Figure 1.10 Radical coupling reactions in the absence of $\mathbf{R u}(\mathrm{bpy}) \mathbf{3}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$


### 1.2.6 Proposed Reaction Mechanism

At this point, the Overman group's understanding of the reaction mechanism was based on the mechanistic hypotheses proposed by Barton for the coupling of thiohydroxamate oxalates ${ }^{18}$ and by Okada for the coupling of ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide substrates. ${ }^{13}$ The proposed mechanism for the photoredox-catalyzed coupling of N phthalimidoyl oxalates with conjugate acceptors is described in Figure 1.11.

The mechanism of the radical coupling of begins with irradiation of $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{2+}$ with visible light to generate photoexcited species $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{2+*}$. This catalyst intermediate is then reductively quenched by the dihydropyridine reductant $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$, forming $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{+}$ and radical cation 1.G. The strong reductant $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{+}$likely transfers an electron to the substrate oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 7 0}$, regenerating the ground state photocatalyst and forming oxalate radical anion 1.I. ${ }^{38}$, This radical anion intermediate 1.I undergoes $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ homolysis to liberate phthalimide anion (or phthalimide, if protonation occurs first) and subsequently decarboxylates to generate $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and alkoxycarbonyl radical 1.J. In most cases, alkoxycarbonyl radical 1.J performs a second decarboxylation to form tertiary radical

Figure 1.11 Proposed photoredox-catalyzed coupling mechanism

1.K, which readily adds to an electron-deficient olefin such as MVK. The stabilized electrophilic radical 1.L can then be terminated in one of two ways. One possibility for this process is direct hydrogen atom abstraction from radical cation 1.G to furnish the addition product $\mathbf{1 . 7 1}$ and concomitantly generate pyridinium 1.M. Alternatively, singleelectron transfer from one of a number of possible intermediates (Scheme 1.3) could provide enolate 1.N, which would be quickly protonated under the reaction conditions to generate 1.71 .

Okada's mechanistic proposal included speculation that the dihydropyridine reductant, or a downstream intermediate produced by its oxidation, is primarily responsible for reductive fragmentation of the substrate radical precursor. ${ }^{13}$ This mode of reactivity in the case of N -phthalimidoyl oxalate substrates would account for the substantial reactivity observed in the absence of the photocatalyst discussed previously.

Based on this hypothesis, it is possible that the true mechanism of the coupling of N phthalimidoyl oxalates with conjugate acceptors is more accurately described by the "photoredox-initiated" mechanism shown in Figure 1.12. In this proposed mechanism, dihydropyridine radical cation 1.G produced by reductive quenching of $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}{ }^{2+} *$ is deprotonated at C 4 to generate dihydropyridine radical 1.H as shown previously in Scheme 1.3. Reductive fragmentation of the substrate oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 7 0}$ by this intermediate could then occur, with termination of the radical coupling by hydrogen atom abstraction from the parent dihydropyridine $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$. This process would regenerate dihydropyridine

Figure 1.12 Proposed "photoredox-initiated" coupling mechanism

radical intermediate $\mathbf{1 . H}$, effectively constituting a radical chain reaction where $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy}){ }_{3}{ }^{2+}$ serves only to initiate the chain sequence. At this point, the photocatalyst's role in initiating the coupling reaction has not been unambiguously identified. It is also
possible that the operative reaction mechanism is some combination of the processes depicted in Figure 1.11 and Figure 1.12.

### 1.2.7 Investigating the Termination Mechanism

As depicted in Figure 1.11, two mechanistic possibilities exist for the termination of electrophilic radical intermediate 1.L. Although previous evidence obtained by the Overman group suggested that both mechanistic outcomes are possible ${ }^{39}$ it was at this time unclear what factors govern the termination mechanism. It was reasoned that this information would be valuable in future applications of these coupling reactions, and so this mechanistic duality was next examined in detail.

The coupling of both 1-methylcyclohexyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate (1.28) and 1methylcyclohexyl ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide (1.68) with MVK in the presence of dideuterio-Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 7 2}$ was first investigated. The coupling of oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ under the standard conditions using dihydropyridine $\mathbf{1 . 7 2}$ provided adduct $\mathbf{1 . 7 3}$ in $38 \%$ yield (Equation 1.7). This product was determined to have incorporated deuterium in nearly quantitative fashion at the position adjacent to the carbonyl, suggesting that termination is mediated exclusively by the dihydropyridine reductant. ${ }^{40}$

## Equation 1.7



By contrast, the coupling of the related ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide under the conditions optimized for reactions of these substrates in the presence of dihydropyridine $\mathbf{1 . 7 2}$ resulted in only $38 \%$ deuterium incorporation in adduct $\mathbf{1 . 7 3}$. This result implied that multiple termination pathways may occur under these conditions.

## Equation 1.8



To further probe the termination pathway, a series of experiments was designed in which a tertiary radical intermediate would couple with an acceptor bearing a leaving group at the allylic $\alpha^{\prime}$ position. Addition of a tertiary radical intermediate 1.K to cyclopentenenitrile 1.74 would initially provide nitrile-stabilized radical 1.0 (Scheme 1.4). If termination by hydrogen atom abstraction were to occur, the product isolated from the reaction would be $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ which retains the benzoate group. Alternatively, singleelectron reduction of $\mathbf{1 . O}$ would generate stabilized anion 1.P, which should rapidly $\beta$ eliminate benzoate anion to furnish a product such as $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ that exhibits a resulting desaturation. Thus, the termination mechanism could easily be established by simply identifying which products were obtained in a given radical coupling reaction.

## Scheme 1.4 Proposed coupling mechanisms of cyclopentene nitrile 1.74



The reaction of $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.28 with acceptor 1.74 under the previously optimized reaction conditions provided adduct 1.77 in $50 \%$ yield. In this coupling, no trace of the $\beta$-elimination product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ was seen (Equation 1.9). This result, in accordance with the outcome of the deuterium-labeling experiment described above, establishes that termination of the coupling of phthalimidoyl oxalates occurs by hydrogen atom abstraction from Hantzsch dihydropyridine 1.20.

## Equation 1.9



Subjecting 1-methylcyclohexyl (N-acyloxy)phthalimide (1.68) to a radical coupling with acceptor $\mathbf{1 . 7 4}$ under the standard conditions (Equation 1.10) resulted in the formation of adducts $\mathbf{1 . 7 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ in $28 \%$ and $45 \%$ yield, respectively. Addition product 1.77 was undoubtedly formed via hydrogen atom abstraction of the intermediate $\alpha$-cyano radical, resulting in preservation of the benzoate group. In contrast, olefin $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ is likely
the product of an ionic $\beta$-elimination event. These results suggest that under the typical conditions for coupling ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides with conjugate acceptors, both hydrogen atom abstraction and single-electron transfer followed by protonation occur competitively. ${ }^{41}$

## Equation 1.10



To examine if the radical precursor itself is in some way responsible for regulating the termination mechanism, ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ was subjected to the coupling conditions typically used for the related oxalate substrates (Equation 1.11). Interestingly, only adduct $\mathbf{1 . 7 7}$ was isolated from this reaction, while product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ that would have resulted from $\beta$-elimination of an anionic intermediate was not detected. This result was identical to that obtained when oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ was used as the radical source, confirming as expected that both radical precursors terminate via the same mechanism under a given set of conditions.

## Equation 1.11



One major difference with respect to the optimized reaction conditions utilizing either radical precursor is that the coupling of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides employs $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ as a co-reductant, while the coupling of the related oxalates uses $i \operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ which is presumably redox-inactive. It was thus suspected that the reductant additive was responsible for determining the termination mechanism. The coupling of ( N acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ with acceptor $\mathbf{1 . 7 4}$ was next conducted, omitting Hantzsch ester 1.20 and utilizing only $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ as a terminal reductant (Equation 1.12). This experiment resulted in the exclusive formation of product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ which had been formed by $\beta$-elimination to eject the benzoate group. ${ }^{42}$ These results implicate the combination ${ }^{43,44,45}$ of $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ and photocatalyst as the operative single-electron donors in the reduction of the initially formed product radical, and show that the aminium radical cation generated upon oxidation of the amine during the course of the reaction does not act as a hydrogen atom donor in the termination step. Hydrogen atom transfer to the $\alpha$-cyano radical by an intermediate derived from $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}^{23}$ would have resulted in the formation of 1.77, which was not detected in this reaction.

## Equation 1.12



As expected, the coupling of either radical precursor under the typical conditions with allylic bromide $\mathbf{1 . 7 9}$ resulted in the exclusive formation of desaturated product $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ (Figure 1.13). Addition of the tertiary radical intermediate produced from either substrate to $\mathbf{1 . 7 9}$, followed by homolytic cleavage of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Br}$ bond is the most reasonable mechanism for these two transformations.

Figure 1.13 Coupling of radical precursors with allylic bromide 1.79


### 1.3 Conclusions

A new photoredox-catalyzed radical coupling reaction that permits the direct formation of quaternary carbons from tertiary alcohol derivatives was developed. The N phthalimidoyl oxalate radical precursors were easily synthesized from a variety of structurally diverse tertiary alcohols in high yields. Coupling of the oxalates with electron-deficient alkenes was successful for many oxalates and acceptors, generally providing good yields of radical addition products. Importantly, the reaction is successful using only a $1.5: 1$ ratio of coupling partners, making this process amenable to the coupling of structurally elaborate fragments. The mechanism of the photoredox-catalyzed coupling of both alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalates and ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides with conjugate acceptors was also investigated. It was confirmed that the termination pathway is governed by choice of the stoichiometric reductant employed. The coupling reactions of phthalimidoyl oxalate substrates were found to be slightly less efficient than those of the corresponding ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide radical precursors; however, the synthetic advantage afforded by utilizing an alcohol derivative in the construction a quaternary carbon makes the phthalimidoyl oxalate substrates valuable intermediates for complex molecule synthesis.

### 1.4 Experimental Information

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of nitrogen or argon using anhydrous solvents (either freshly distilled or passed through activated alumina columns). For all photoredox-catalyzed coupling reactions, THF and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ were sparged with argon for 5 minutes prior to use. All commercially obtained reagents were used as received. $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$ was obtained from Sigma Aldrich. Methyl vinyl ketone, acrylonitrile, methyl acrylate, N,N-dimethyl acrylamide, and $2(5 H)$-furanone were distilled neat prior to use. Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}{ }^{46}$ and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}{ }^{14}$ were prepared according to literature procedures. Reaction temperatures were controlled using an IKAmag temperature modulator, and unless stated otherwise, reactions were performed at room temperature (rt, approximately $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with E. Merck silica gel 60 F254 precoated plates, ( 0.25 mm ) and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or by anisaldehyde, ceric ammonium molybdate and potassium permanganate staining. EMD silica gel 60 (particle size $0.040-0.063 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) was used for flash column chromatography. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 500 or 600 MHz ) and are reported relative to deuterated solvent signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant ( Hz ) and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 125 or 150 MHz ). Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift. IR spectra were recorded on a Varian $640-\mathrm{IR}$ spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. Blue LEDs ( $30 \mathrm{~cm}, 1$ watt) were purchased from http://www.creativelightings.com and powered by 8 AA batteries. Optical rotations were measured with a Jasco P-1010
polarimeter. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility with a Micromass LCT spectrometer. Most data for isolated yield and percent deuterium incorporation reported in the main text are average results of multiple experiments. The data reported in the following experimental information are described for one experiment and may differ from the average yields and percent deuterium incorporation depicted in the main text.


1-Methylcyclohexyl 2-chloro-2-oxoacetate (1.27): A round-bottom flask was charged with 1-methylcyclohexanol $1.26(2.00 \mathrm{~g}, 17.5$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(87 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. The vessel was then cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath. Oxalyl chloride ( $2.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 22.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise over 1 min , and the homogeneous reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt overnight. After this time, the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure to provide chlorooxalate ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 7}$ as a colorless oil ( $2.85 \mathrm{~g}, 14.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%$ ) which was used without further purification: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.22-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.67$ (m, 10H), 1.27-1.38 (m, 1H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 161.43,154.3,89.5,36.2$, 25.1, 24.9, 21.9; IR (thin film) 2939, 2865, 1801, 1751, 1449, 1294, 1273, 1244, $973 \mathrm{~cm}^{-}$


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl (1-methylcyclohexyl) oxalate (1.28). Coupling of 1.27 with $N$-hydroxyphthalimide: To a 500 mL round-bottom flask containing $N$-hydroxyphthalimide ( 2.85 g , $17.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( $213 \mathrm{mg}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added THF ( 175 mL ) and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(2.4$
$\mathrm{mL}, 17.5 \mathrm{mmol})$. Chlorooxalate ester 1.27 ( $3.57 \mathrm{~g}, 17.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added as a solution in THF ( 5 mL ) and a colorless precipitate was immediately formed. The mixture was stirred for 1 h at rt , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and was poured into saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was separated and washed with additional saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$, aqueous $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 100$ mL ), and brine ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated under reduced pressure to afford oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}(3.21 \mathrm{~g}, 9.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%)$ as a colorless solid which was used without further purification (typical yields for this reaction ranged from $40-70 \%)$ : ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.92-7.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.83-$ $7.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.62(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz, DMF- $d_{7}$ ) $\delta 162.5,156.1,154.4,136.9,129.7$, 125.3, 90.2, 36.9, $25.8,25.6,22.9$; IR (thin film) 2938, 2863, 1824, 1792, 1756, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} .{ }^{47}$


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 2-chloro-2-oxoacetate (1.29): A roundbottom flask was charged with $N$-hydroxyphthalimide ( $1.97 \mathrm{~g}, 12.09$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of THF ( 200 mL ) under argon. The resulting solution was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and oxalyl chloride ( $5.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 60.47 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise. The solution was then allowed to warm to rt and was stirred for 18 h. After this time, the solution was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}$ as a colorless solid. The crude material was dissolved in THF ( 200 mL ) for use as a 0.06 M solution in the preparation of tert-alkyl N -phthalimidoyl oxalates; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.99-7.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.90-7.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 160.5$, $157.8,152.4,135.5,128.6,124.7$; IR (thin film) $1827,1791,1744,1468,1354 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} .^{48}$


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl (1-methylcyclohexyl) oxalate (1.28). Acylation of 1-methylcyclohexanol with 1.29. A round-bottom flask was charged with 1-methylcyclohexanol ( $690 \mathrm{mg}, 6.05$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP $(74 \mathrm{mg}, 0.60 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(1.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 12.09$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}(200 \mathrm{~mL}, 12.09 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes $(1 \mathrm{~L})$. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( 2 x 100 mL ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ as a beige solid ( $1.90 \mathrm{~g}, 5.74 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%$ ). Characterization data acquired for $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ were identical to those reported above.


1-Methyl-4,4-diphenylcyclohexan-1-ol (1-S1): A round-bottom flask was charged with 4,4-diphenylcyclohexanone ${ }^{49}$ ( $1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 3.76$ mmol ), followed by the addition of THF ( 38 mL ). The resulting solution was then cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of methylmagnesium bromide ( 3.8 mL , $11.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added. The reaction was allowed to stir at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , then was allowed to warm to rt and stirred an additional 12 h . The reaction mixture was quenched by slow addition of 3 mL of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and the resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(75 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 25 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through
cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The resulting residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield $\mathbf{1 . S 1}(802 \mathrm{mg}, 3.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%$ ) as a colorless solid. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.31$ ( $2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.42(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=7.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.36(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.33-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.12(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.55-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.23(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 128.5,128.3,127.5,126.7,125.8,125.6,69.4,45.7,36.1,32.5,30.2$; IR (thin film) $3361,3057,2945,1597,1447 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{NH}_{4}{ }^{+}$284.2014, found 284.2017 .


## 1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl

(1-methyl-4,4-
diphenylcyclohexyl) oxalate (1.30): A round-bottom flask was charged with $\mathbf{1 . S 1}(724 \mathrm{mg}, 2.72 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP (33 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.272 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.75 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.44 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}(90 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.44 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1.5 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(18 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 450 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( 2 x 100 mL ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 3 0}$ as a beige solid ( $1.25 \mathrm{~g}, 2.59 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.95-7.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 7.86-7.79 (m, 2H), 7.43-7.31 (m, 4H), 7.25-7.17 (m, 5H), 7.15-7.07 (m, 1H), $2.50(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=13.3,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.31(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.70(\mathrm{t}, J=12.9,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz ,
$\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 161.1,154.5,153.1,135.2,128.79,128.75,128.4,127.6,126.5,126.1,125.9$, $124.4,88.8,45.5,33.1,32.0,25.1$; $\mathbb{R}$ (thin film) $2951,1825,1792,1756,1599 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

tert-Butyl 4-hydroxy-4-methylpiperidine-1-carboxylate (1.S2): A round-bottom flask was charged with $N$-Boc-piperidone $(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 5.03$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting solution was then cooled to $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of methylmagnesium bromide (1.84 $\mathrm{mL}, 5.53 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added. The reaction was allowed to stir at $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , then was allowed to warm to rt and stirred an additional 12 h . The reaction mixture was quenched by slow addition of 1 mL of saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and the resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 15 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{1 . S 2}(1.07 \mathrm{~g}, 4.97 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.26\left(2: 1\right.$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.72-3.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 3.26-3.17 (m, 2H), $1.52(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.0,4.7,4 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.24(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 154.9,79.5,68.1,40.2,38.5,30.2,28.6$; IR (thin film) 3434, 2971, 2932, 1670, $1428 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ 238.1419, found 238.1420 .

was charged with $\mathbf{1 . S 2}(430 \mathrm{mg}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( $24 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.56 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.00 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.29 ( $65 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 2 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 250 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes $(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $1.31(710 \mathrm{mg}, 1.63 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%)$ as a pale yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.94-7.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.84-7.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.5,2.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.70(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.46 (s, 9H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 161.0,155.0,154.3,153.1,135.3,128.9$, $124.4,86.6,80.5,35.7,28.6,24.9$; IR (thin film) $2977,1825,1793,1749,1686 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
 adamantanol ( $225 \mathrm{mg}, 1.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.41 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.96 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.29 ( $50 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.96 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 15 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 6 mL ) then poured into hexanes ( 200 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes $(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate 1.32 ( $532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.44 \mathrm{mmol}, 97 \%$ ) as a
colorless solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.94-7.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.85-7.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 2.25 (app. s, 9H), 1.75-1.66 (m, 6H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 161.1,154.5,152.7$, 135.2, 128.9, 124.4, 87.7, 41.0, 36.0, 31.2; IR (thin film) 2915, 2855, 1824, 1792, 1748 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$. Single crystals suitable for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$-heptane. ${ }^{19}$


## 4-((tert-Butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)-2-methylbutan-2-yl

 (1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl) oxalate (1.33): A roundbottom flask was charged with 4-((tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)-2-methylbutan-2-ol ${ }^{50}(250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.14 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( 14 mg , $0.11 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.29 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro N -phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.29 ( $38 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.29 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(9 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 180 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( 2 x 100 mL ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate 1.33 (493 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.95-7.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $7.85-7.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{t}, J=6.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{t}, J=6.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.65(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$, $0.06(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 161.0,154.4,153.1,135.2,128.8,124.3$, 89.2, 58.9, 43.1, 26.2, 26.0, 18.3, -5.3; IR (thin film) $2956,1825,1793,1751,1469 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl (4-((4-methoxybenzyl)oxy)-2-methylbutan-2-yl) oxalate (1.34): A round bottom flask was charged with 4-((4-methoxybenzyl)oxy)-2-methylbutan-2-ol ${ }^{51}(381 \mathrm{mg}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( $21 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.47 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.40 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.29 ( $56 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.40 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(14 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 280 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes $(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 3 4}(781 \mathrm{mg}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a pale yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.92-7.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.84-7.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.25(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.6,2 \mathrm{H})$, $6.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.6,2 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{t}, J=6.2,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.21(\mathrm{t}, J=6.2,2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.63(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 161.0,159.2,154.4,153.3,135.2,130.3$, $129.4,128.8,124.3,113.8,88.7,72.8,65.5,55.3,39.8,26.2$; IR (thin film) 2935, 2866, 1823, 1791, $1748 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

tert-Butyl 3-(3-oxobutyl)-1H-indole-1-carboxylate (1.S3): A round-bottom flask was charged with 4-(1H-3-indolyl)butan-2-one ${ }^{52}$ $(1.50 \mathrm{~g}, 8.02 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(27 \mathrm{~mL})$. $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(2.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 16.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP $(98 \mathrm{mg}, 0.80 \mathrm{mmol})$ were then added and the solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Di-tert-butyl dicarbonate ( $2.10 \mathrm{~g}, 9.62 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in one portion and the resulting solution was allowed to warm to rt and was stirred for 4 h .

The mixture was then transferred to a separatory funnel and the organic layer was washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (93:7 hexanes:EtOAc to 90:10 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield carbamate $1.53(1.54 \mathrm{~g}, 5.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 67 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.51$ (3:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.12(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0,1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.36(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.34-7.29(\mathrm{t}, J=8.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.97(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{t}$, $J=7.7,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 208.0,149.9$, $135.6,130.4,124.5,122.6,122.5,119.8,118.9,115.4,83.6,43.1,30.2,28.3,19.0$; IR (thin film) 2978, 2932, 1727, 1454, $1376 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 310.1419$, found 310.1425 .

tert-Butyl 3-(3-hydroxy-3-methylbutyl)-1H-indole-1-carboxylate
(1.S4): A round-bottom flask was charged with ketone $\mathbf{1 . S 3}(1.00 \mathrm{~g}$, $3.48 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(17 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting solution was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of methylmagnesium bromide (1.27 $\mathrm{mL}, 3.83 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added. The reaction was allowed to warm to rt and was stirred for an additional 2 h . After this time, the reaction was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched by slow addition of 10 mL of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution. The resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (90:10 hexanes:acetone) to yield $\mathbf{1 . S 4}(980 \mathrm{mg}, 3.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 93 \%)$ as a
pale yellow oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.38$ ( $3: 1$ hexanes: EtOAc ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.13$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.81-$ $2.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 149.9,135.7,130.8,124.4,122.4,122.1,121.3,119.0,115.4,83.4,71.0,43.2,29.4$, 28.3, 19.8; IR (thin film) 3396, 2973, 2931, 1731, $1377 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$326.1732, found 326.1730.


4-(1-(tert-Butoxycarbonyl)-1H-indol-3-yl)-2-methylbutan-2-yl (1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl) oxalate (1.36): A round-bottom flask was charged with alcohol
1.S4 ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.65 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.46 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.30 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro N -phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}$ ( $55 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(14 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes $(250 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $1.36(560 \mathrm{mg}, 1.08 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%)$ as a colorless foam: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.12(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.94-7.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.85-7.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.39(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.30(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85-2.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.29-2.23(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $1.74(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 161.1, 154.5, 153.2, $149.9,135.7,135.2,130.5,128.8,124.5,124.4,122.6,122.4,120.1,119.0,115.4,89.3$, $83.6,40.8,28.3,25.6,19.5$; IR (thin film) 2979, 2933, 1823, 1791, $1749,1731 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl
((rel-1S,3aR,6aR)-1-methyloctahydropentalen-1-yl) oxalate
(1.37): A round-bottom flask was charged with (rel$1 S, 3 \mathrm{a} R, 6 \mathrm{a} R$ )-1-methyloctahydropentalen-1-ol ${ }^{53}$ (392 mg, 2.80 $\mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( $34 \mathrm{mg}, 0.28 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.76 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.59$ mmol). A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $1.29(93 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.59 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 1 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(23 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 460 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate $1.29(950 \mathrm{mg}, 2.66 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%)$ as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 7.92-7.89 (m, 2H), 7.83-7.80 (m, 2H), 2.58-2.48 (m, 2H), 2.26-2.17 (m, 1H), 1.93-1.79 $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-$ 1.27 ( $\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 161.0,154.6,153.3,135.2,128.9,124.3$, 96.0, 53.6, 41.7, 36.6, 35.2, 29.2, 28.5, 27.2, 23.9; IR (thin film) 2951, 1824, 1792, 1747, $1467, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

(1R,2R,4aS,8aS)-1-(2-Hydroxyethyl)-2,5,5,8a-tetramethyldecahydronaphthalen-2-ol (1.S5): A round-bottom flask was charged with (+)-sclareolide $(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 4.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by the addition of THF $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting solution was then cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and lithium aluminum hydride ( $150 \mathrm{mg}, 4.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in one portion. The
reaction temperature was maintained at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while the heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously for 30 min . The reaction mixture was then quenched by the slow addition of 3 mL of EtOAc and the resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 50 mL ) and aqueous $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield $\mathbf{1 . S 5}(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 3.93 \mathrm{mmol}, 98 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.16$ ( $2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.82-3.77$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51-3.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.0,3.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.62(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.20$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;[\alpha]^{25.6}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-16.6$, $[\alpha]{ }^{25.8}{ }_{577},-17.8,[\alpha]{ }^{25.8}{ }_{546}-22.4,[\alpha]{ }^{25.8}{ }_{435}-45.8,[\alpha]{ }^{25.8}{ }_{405}-53.5\left(c=1.11, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$; Spectral data matched those previously reported. ${ }^{54}$


## 2-((1R,2R,4aS,8aS)-2-Hydroxy-2,5,5,8a-

 tetramethyldecahydronaphthalen-1-yl)ethyl pivalate (1.S6): A round-bottom flask was charged with alcohol $\mathbf{1 . S 5}(950 \mathrm{mg}, 3.77$ mmol ), followed by the addition of 1,2-dimethoxyethane (DME, 20 $\mathrm{mL})$. The resulting solution was then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil) ( $151 \mathrm{mg}, 3.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in one portion. The reaction temperature was maintained at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while the heterogeneous mixture was stirred vigorously for 5 min , after which pivaloyl chloride ( $462 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt and allowed to stir for 2 h . The flask was again cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{NaH}(60 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil) ( $151 \mathrm{mg}, 3.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by pivaloyl chloride( $392 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The reaction vessel was allowed to warm to rt and the mixture was stirred for an additional 12 h . The reaction mixture was quenched by slow addition of 1 mL of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and the resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 20 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (2:1 hexanes: $\left.\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ to yield $\mathbf{1 . S 6}(1.27 \mathrm{~g}, 3.75 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.36(2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.17-4.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09-4.03(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.90(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.4,3.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.32-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.21(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.12-1.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.802(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.797(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 178.9, 73.7, $66.8,58.2,56.3,44.5,42.0,39.8,38.9,38.8,33.5,33.4,27.4,24.5,24.1,21.6,20.6,18.5$, 15.5; IR (thin film) 3484, 2934, 2869, 1726, $1162 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 361.2719$, found 361.2717; $[\alpha]^{25.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+2.5,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{577}+1.7,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{546}$ $-4.0,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{435}-28.3,[\alpha]{ }^{25.8}{ }_{405}-31.6\left(c=0.50, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl
((1R,2R,4aS,8aS)-2,5,5,8a-
tetramethyl-1-(2-
(pivaloyloxy)ethyl)decahydronaphthalen-2-yl) oxalate
(1.38): A round-bottom flask was charged with 1.S6 (500 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.48 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP $(18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.41$ $\mathrm{mL}, 2.96 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9}$ ( $50 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.96$
mmol ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 15 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(6 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 200 mL ). The resulting heterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate 1.38 ( $818 \mathrm{mg}, 1.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ ) as a beige solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 7.93-7.89 (m, 2H), 7.84-7.78 (m, 2H), 4.27-4.18 (m, 1H), 4.13-4.03(m, 1H), $2.89(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=11.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.51-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~s}$, $9 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 178.6,161.2,154.4,152.4,135.1,129.0,124.3,95.1$, 65.6, 55.7, 55.5, 41.9, 39.4, 39.3, 38.9, 38.7, 33.4, 33.3, 27.3, 25.0, 21.5, 20.1, 20.0, 18.4, 15.7; IR (thin film) $2958,1825,1793,1751,1721 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+5.6,[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{577}+6.4$, $[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{546}+0.7,[\alpha]^{25.9}{ }_{435}-20.7,[\alpha]{ }^{25.9}{ }_{405}-20.5\left(c=0.50, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(8R,9S,13S,14S,17S)-3-Methoxy-13,17-dimethyl-7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17-decahydro-6H-cyclopenta[a]phenanthren-17-ol (1.S7) ${ }^{55}$ : A round-bottom flask fitted with a reflux condenser was charged with ( $8 R, 9 S, 13 S, 14 S, 17 S$ )-3-methoxy-13-methyl-7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17-decahydro-6H-cyclopenta[a]phenanthren-17-one ${ }^{56}$ ( $830 \mathrm{mg}, 2.92 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by the addition of benzene ( 20 mL ). A 3 M solution of methylmagnesium bromide ( $3.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 11.28 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. The reaction was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and allowed to stir for 2 h . The reaction mixture was then allowed to cool
to rt and was quenched by slow addition of 5 mL of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution. The resulting mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$, water $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield $\mathbf{1 . S 7}(876 \mathrm{mg}, 2.92 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.29$ (2:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.9,2.61 \mathrm{H}), 6.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.92-2.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.37-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.31$ $(\mathrm{m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 157.6, 138.1, 132.8, $126.4,113.9,111.6,81.8,55.3,49.8,45.9,44.0,39.8,39.2,31.8,30.0,27.6,26.4,26.0$, 23.1, 14.0; IR (thin film) 3427, 2933, 2870, 1610, $1500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{26.1}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+56.7,[\alpha]^{26.1}{ }_{577}$ $+58.9,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{546}+63.0,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{435}+93.9,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{405}+116.8\left(c=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl ((8R,9S,13S,14S,17S)-3-methoxy-13,17-dimethyl-

## 7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17-decahydro-6H-

 cyclopenta[a]phenanthren-17-yl) oxalate (1.39): A round bottom flask was charged with alcohol $\mathbf{1 . S 7}$ ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.67 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP (20 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.1$ equiv) followed by the addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.46 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.33 \mathrm{mmol})$. A 0.06 M solution of chloro $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 9 ( 5 7 ~ m L , ~} 3.33 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF was added via cannula. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 4 h . The volatiles were removed under reduced pressure, and the resulting crude residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7 \mathrm{~mL})$ then poured into hexanes ( 200 mL ). The resultingheterogeneous mixture was filtered through a cotton plug and washed with hexanes ( 2 x 100 mL ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure to yield oxalate 1.39 (786 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.52 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%)$ as a colorless solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.93-7.90(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.85-7.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.6,2.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $2.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.95-2.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-$ $1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.29(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.64(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 161.1,157.6,154.6,153.5,138.0,135.2,132.4,128.9,126.5,124.4,114.0,111.7,97.3$, $55.4,48.3,47.3,43.8,39.3,36.3,32.0,29.9,27.6,26.2,23.4,21.5,14.5$; IR (thin film) 2935, 2874, 1824, 1792, $1748 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+33.1,[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{577}+34.0,[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{546}+34.9$, $[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{435}+47.0,[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{405}+59.2\left(c=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


4-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)butan-2-one (1.40). General procedure for the optimization of the coupling of oxalate 1.28 with methyl vinyl
ketone: A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The resulting suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (98:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield ketone $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ ( $27 \mathrm{mg}, 0.162 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%$ ) as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.45$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.39-$
$2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 210.0,38.4,37.7,35.5,32.2,30.0,26.5,24.6,22.0$; IR (thin film) 2926, 2860, 1718, $1448 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS $(\mathrm{CI}) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$ 186.1858, found 186.1862 .


4-(1-Methyl-4,4-diphenylcyclohexyl)butan-2-one (1.46): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.30 ( $146 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $2: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield ketone $1.46(56 \mathrm{mg}, 0.175$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 87 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.45\left(9: 1\right.$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ $\delta 7.37-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) 1.52-1.44(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 1.44-1.30 (m, 4H), $0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) $\delta$ 209.3, 128.7, $128.6,127.5,127.0,125.84,125.81,46.2,38.5,35.9,34.3,32.2,32.0,30.1,24.6$; IR (thin
film) $3056,3029,2934,1716 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS $(\mathrm{ESI}) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{ONa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ 343.2038, found 343.2046.


7-((4-Methoxybenzyl)oxy)-5,5-dimethylheptan-2-one (1.47): A
1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.34 ( $133 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $i$ $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \bullet \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 10$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield 1.47 as a clear oil ( $44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.158 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%$ ): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.13$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.24(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 6.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-$ $1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 209.6,159.3,130.8,129.4$, $113.9,72.9,67.1,55.4,40.8,39.0,35.8,31.9,30.0,27.4$; IR (thin film) 2955, 2932, 2866, $1714,1513, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 301.1780$, found 301.1769.


## 7-((tert-Butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)-5,5-dimethylheptan-2-one

(1.48): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.33 ( 131 mg , $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (98:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to afford $\mathbf{1 . 4 8}$ as a clear oil ( $45 \mathrm{mg}, 0.165 \mathrm{mmol}$, $82 \%): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.47$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.64(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5$, $2 H), 2.43-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 15 \mathrm{H}), 0.03(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 209.5,60.0,44.0,39.1,35.8,31.8,30.0,27.4,26.1,18.4$, 5.2; IR (thin film) 2956, 2929, 2857, 1719, $1473 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SiNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$295.2069, found 295.2063.

tert-Butyl
(1.49): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 3 1}$ ( $130 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}^{\mathrm{H}} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm
loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 10$ mL ), the organic layer dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $3: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 4 9}$ $(41 \mathrm{mg}, 0.166 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.13$ ( $9: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.59-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.19-3.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.58-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 209.2,155.1,79.4,40.3,38.0,36.7,35.1,31.0,30.1,28.6,23.1$; IR (thin film) 2970, 2927, 1715, 1691, 1422, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na})^{+}$292.1889, found 292.1888


## tert-Butyl

3-(3,3-dimethyl-6-oxoheptyl)-1H-indole-1-
carboxylate (1.50): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.36 ( $157 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003$ mmol ), Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then
transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then aqueous $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (95:5 hexanes:EtOAc to $90: 10$ hexanes:EtOAc) to afford $\mathbf{1 . 5 0}$ as a clear oil ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.090$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 44 \%): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.28$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.12$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.49(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.34(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.68-$ $2.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.49-2.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.67(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~s}$, $6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 209.6,150.0,135.7,130.8,124.4,122.4,122.0$, $121.8,119.0,115.4,83.4,41.4,39.1,35.3,32.6,30.2,26.9,19.6$; IR (thin film) 2956 , 2932, 1728, 1453, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$380.2202, found 380.2192 .


4-((rel-1S,3aR,6aR)-1-Methyloctahydropentalen-1-yl)butan-2-
one (1.51): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.37(107 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $97: 3$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield ketone 1.51 ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.165 \mathrm{mmol}, 82 \%$ )
as a clear oil as a single diastereomer: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.39$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.48-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{q}, J=9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-$ $1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.25-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. Spectral data matched those previously reported. ${ }^{9}$

( $\mathbf{8 R}, 9 \mathrm{9}, 13 S, 14 S, 17 R)$-3-Methoxy-13,17-dimethyl-
7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17-decahydro-6H-cyclopenta[a]phenanthren-17-yl) butan-2-one (1.52): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.39 ( $156 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NE} \cdot{ }^{-} \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ ( $44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then aqueous 2 M $\mathrm{NaOH}\left(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}\right.$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (2:1 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield ketone $\mathbf{1 . 5 2}$ ( $49 \mathrm{mg}, 0.144 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \%$ ) as a clear oil as a single diastereomer: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.33$ (2:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=$
$8.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.71(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.6,2.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.94-2.78(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 H), 2.54-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 2.32-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.59$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $210.1,157.5,138.2,133.1,126.4,113.9,111.5,55.3,49.5,46.0,45.4,43.8,40.2,39.6$, $33.5,31.8,30.4,30.3,30.1,28.3,26.5,24.8,20.8,16.3$; IR (thin film) 2937, 2869, 1716, $1500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 377.2456$, found 377.2461; $[\alpha]^{26.0}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+37.3,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{577}+38.4,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{546}+40.3,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{435}+58.7,[\alpha]^{26.2}{ }_{405}+75.2(c=1.00$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).


2-((1S,2S,4aS,8aS)-2,5,5,8a-Tetramethyl-2-(3-
oxobutyl)decahydronaphthalen-1-yl)ethyl pivalate (1.53): A 1dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.38 ( $168 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \bullet \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, the organic layer dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $9: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield ketone $\mathbf{1 . 5 3}$ ( $68 \mathrm{mg}, 0.173 \mathrm{mmol}$,
$86 \%)$ as a colorless solid as a single diastereomer: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.30$ (9:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.05-3.99(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94-3.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.15(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.19(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$, $1.16-1.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88-0.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.70(\mathrm{t}, J=3.6,1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 206.6,178.0,66.6,56.3,56.0$, $42.3,40.1,39.3,39.1,38.8,37.7,37.4,37.1,33.5,33.4,29.5,27.5,25.9,21.8,19.5,18.8$, 18.6, 16.2; IR (thin film) 2958, 2930, 2869, 1723, $1479 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 415.3188$, found 415.3170; $[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+3.6,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{577}+2.3,[\alpha]^{25.9}{ }_{546}$ $-2.5,[\alpha]^{25.9}{ }_{435}-23.7,[\alpha]^{25.9}{ }_{405}-25.0\left(c=0.50, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$. Single crystals suitable for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation from $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$-hexanes. ${ }^{19}$


4-((rel-3r,5r,7r)-Adamantan-1-yl)butan-
2-one (1.16) and (rel-3s,5s,7s)-adamantan-1-yl
4-oxopentanoate (1.54): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.32(111 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, the
organic layer dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 1 6}(10 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.048 \mathrm{mmol}, 24 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.45$ (4:1 hexanes: $\left.\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}(600 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.42-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.0,3 \mathrm{H}), 1.62(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=12.0,3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 210.2,42.3$, 37.9, 37.6, 37.2, 31.9, 30.1, 28.7; IR (thin film) 2903, 2846, 1719, $1451 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{ON}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$224.2014, found 224.2005. Purification by flash chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) also afforded $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ as a clear oil ( $34 \mathrm{mg}, 0.136 \mathrm{mmol}$, $68 \%): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.20\left(4: 1\right.$ hexanes: $\left.\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.66$ (app. $\mathrm{t}, J=6.5$, 2H), 2.48 (app. t, $J=6.5,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.68-1.57(\mathrm{~m}$, $6 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 207.1, 171.9, 80.8, 41.4, 38.2, 36.3, 30.9, 30.1, 29.5; IR (thin film) 2914, 2854, 1721, $1456 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na})^{+}$273.1467, found 273.1459.


## 3,5,5-Trimethyl-3-(4-oxopentyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one

(1.55): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.35 ( 100 mg , $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}_{\mathrm{HBF}}^{4}$ ( $44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv), and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then
transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then aqueous 2 M NaOH ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $9: 1$ hexanes:acetone) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 5 5}$ oil ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.086 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \%$ ) as a clear: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.14$ (3:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.45(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16,(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.3,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.57-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 208.4,181.6,81.2,46.2,45.2,43.4,38.8,30.23,30.22,30.18,25.9$, 18.7; IR (thin film) 2974, 2937, 2876, 1758, $1715 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$235.1310, found 235.1310.

1.56: $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}$ Exact Mass: 151.1361

3-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)propanenitrile (1.56): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$ ( $2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i$ $\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by acrylonitrile (13 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $98: 2$ hexanes:EtOAc) to yield nitrile 1.56 ( $28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.185 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%$ ) as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.40$ ( $9: 1$ hexanes: EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.28-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.42$
$(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 120.9,37.6,37.2,32.7,26.3,24.2,21.9,11.8$; IR (thin film) 2928, 2856, 2249, $1454 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$174.1259, found 174.1260.

((2-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)ethyl)sulfonyl)benzene (1.57): A 1dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.28 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\text { bpy })_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, phenyl vinyl sulfone ( $34 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was then added. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with EtOAc (10 mL ) and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (2:1
 hexanes: $\left.\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.66(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2,1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.58(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,2 \mathrm{H}), 3.07-3.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.31-$ $1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 139.3$, 133.7, 129.4, 128.1, 52.1, $37.5,33.7,32.4,26.2,24.6,21.8$; IR (thin film) 2926, 2857, 1447, 1304, $1148 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$289.1238, found 289.1246.


Methyl 3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)propanoate (1.58): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by methyl acrylate $(21 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 5 8}(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.173 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.56$ (3:1 hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.66(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-$ $2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.20(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.2,51.7,37.6,36.8,32.4,28.9$, 26.5, 24.5, 22.0; IR (thin film) 2925, 2852, 1741, 1436, $1167 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$185.1542, found 185.1544 .


## $N, N$-Dimethyl-3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)propanamide (1.59): A

 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was added followed by $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$ dimethylacrylamide ( $21 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension wasfiltered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then aqueous 2 M $\mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (1:1 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 5 9}$ ( $27 \mathrm{mg}, 0.137 \mathrm{mmol}, 68 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.33(1: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.01(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.22(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 1.25(\mathrm{t}, J=6.0,4 \mathrm{H}), 0.87$ (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.1,37.7,37.5,37.1,35.6,32.5,28.0,26.6$, 24.8, 22.1; IR (thin film) 2926, 2858, 1643, $1452 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{NNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$220.1677, found 220.1676.


Dimethyl 2-(1-methylcyclohexyl)succinate (1.60): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$
( $2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i$ $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, dimethyl fumarate $(29 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was then added. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with EtOAc (10 mL ) and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with
aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography (2:1 hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 6 0 ( 4 5 \mathrm { mg } , 0 . 1 8 6 \mathrm { mmol } , 8 8 \% ) \text { as a clear oil: } \mathrm { R } _ { \mathrm { f } } = 0 . 4 0 ( 2 : 1 ) .}$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 3.68(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.84-2.72(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 H), 2.52-2.41(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) 1.32-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91$ (s, 3H) ; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.9,173.5,51.9,51.5,36.4,35.3,31.8,26.1$, 21.84, 21.78, 21.0; IR (thin film): 2933, 2856, $1733,1438 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$265.1416, found 265.1417.


4-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (1.61): A 1dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.28 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \bullet \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by $2(5 \mathrm{H})$-furanone $(14 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ then aqueous 2 M $\mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (95:5

hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.30$ (app. t, $J=8.7,1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 4.13 (app. t, $J$ $=8.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.53(\mathrm{p}, J=9.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.44-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.48(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 177.7,69.3,35.9,35.4,33.9,29.2,26.2,21.58,21.55$; IR (thin film) 2926, 2855, 1780, $1462 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ 205.1205, found 205.1207.


3-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)cyclopentan-1-one (1.62): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, and a magnetic stir bar. A $1: 1$ mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was added followed by cyclopentenone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $4: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 6 2}(20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.111 \mathrm{mmol}, 56 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.35$ (4:1 hexanes:Et O ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.36-2.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.22-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.31$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 220.2$, 39.7, 39.4, 36.6, 36.0, $34.2,26.5,23.3,21.89,21.86$; IR (thin film) 2925, 2850, 1743, 1446, $1157 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$189.1858, found 198.1850.


## Methyl

(rel-1S,2R)-2-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-5-oxocyclopentane-1-carboxylate (1.63): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.003 mmol ), Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, 2-carboxymethyl-2-cyclopenten-1-one ${ }^{57}(28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$ was then added. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with EtOAc ( 10 mL ) and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aqueous 4 M $\mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography $\left(2: 1\right.$ hexanes: $\left.\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ to yield $1.63(30.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.128 \mathrm{mmol}, 64 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.41(9: 1 \mathrm{Hexanes}: E t O A c) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 3.73(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.74-2.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-$ $2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.35(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.23-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $212.9,171.4,56.9,52.6,38.9,36.5,36.1,34.9,26.3,21.8,21.7,21.5$; IR (thin film) 2927, 2853, 1757, $1728 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$261.1467, found 261.1471.

(rel-4R,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)dihydrofuran$\mathbf{2 ( 3 H})$-one (1.64): A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.28 (100 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}), 5-\mathrm{methoxy}-2(5 \mathrm{H})-$ furanone ( $23 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and a magnetic stir bar. A 1:1 mixture of THF: $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2$ mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ) was then added. The vial was placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs and the mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 14 h . The suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel, washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was then transferred to a separatory funnel with $\operatorname{EtOAc}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting biphasic mixture was washed with aquous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $2: 1$ hexanes: $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}(31 \mathrm{mg}, 0.147 \mathrm{mmol}$, $73 \%$ ) as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.31$ (9:1 Hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 5.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.4,10.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.4,6.0$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27(\mathrm{ddd}, J=18.4,6.0,2.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 176.4,106.9,57.0,35.5,35.3,33.8,29.0,26.1$, 21.49, 21.47; IR (thin film) 2927, 2853, 1785, $1113 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$235.1310, found 235.1316.


Benzyl 2-methyl-3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)propanoate (1.65): A 1dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$,
$\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $i-$ $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NE} t \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, (1 mL, sparged with Ar for 5 min ), THF ( 1 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), and benzyl methacrylate ( $34 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The yield of product obtained was determined by comparison of diagnostic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals to those of an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene). An analytically pure sample of $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ was obtained by silica gel chromatography ( $2.5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.57(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.38-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.12-5.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.61-2.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.2,9.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H})$, 0.83 (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 178.0,136.3,128.6,128.4,128.2,66.3$, 38.1, 37.7, 35.4, 33.3, 26.5, 22.11, 22.10, 20.7; IR (thin film) 2925, 2850, 1736, 1455, 1145. $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$297.1830, found 297.1835.


## 1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl

1-methylcyclohexane-1-
carboxylate (1.68): A round bottom flask was charged with 1-methyl-1-cyclohexanecarboxylic acid $(5.00 \mathrm{~g}, 35.2 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{N}$ hydroxyphthalimide $(8.61 \mathrm{~g}, 52.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $N, N$ 'dicyclohexylcarbodiimide ( 10.88 g , 52.8 mmol ) under argon. After sequential addition of THF ( 350 mL ) and DMAP (430 $\mathrm{mg}, 3.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the reaction mixture was stirred at rt overnight. After this time, the heterogeneous mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure and the resulting residue suspended in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(400 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was filtered through cotton, transferred to a
separatory funnel, and washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( $3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (7\% EtOAc/hexanes) to give ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 ( $9.05 \mathrm{~g}, 31.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 90 \%$ ) as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.26(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.90-$ $7.84(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.79-7.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.26-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.40-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.7$, 162.3, 134.7, 129.2, 123.9, 43.2, 35.8, 26.8, 25.5, 23.1; IR (thin film) 2934, 2860, 1807, 1782, $1743 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 310.1055$, found 310.1051 .

4-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)butan-2-one (1.40). Coupling of ( $N$ acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with methyl vinyl ketone: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), methyl vinyl ketone ( $33 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57$ mmol ), the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1.5 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (2.5\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide ketone 1.40 ( $40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.237 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%$ ) as a clear oil. Spectral data obtained for $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ matched those reported above.


3-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)cyclopentan-1-one (1.62). Coupling of ( N acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with cyclopentenone: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), cyclopentenone ( $33 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57$ mmol ), the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $2.5 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 6 2}(37 \mathrm{mg}, 0.208 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%)$ as a clear oil. Spectral data obtained for $\mathbf{1 . 6 2}$ matched those reported above.


## Benzyl 2-methyl-3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)propanoate

Coupling of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with benzyl methacrylate: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( N acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), benzyl methacrylate ( $66 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt, after which 1,4-dimethoxybenzene ( $36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added as an NMR internal standard and the reaction mixture was concentrated. The yield of product obtained ( $0.154 \mathrm{mmol}, 59 \%$ ) was determined by examining the relative integration of

NMR signals using the internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene). An analytically pure sample of $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ was obtained by silica gel chromatography ( $2.5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ as a clear oil. Spectral data obtained for $\mathbf{1 . 6 5}$ matched those reported above.
 1.66: $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}$

2-Methyl-3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)propanenitrile (1.66): A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 (100 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), methacrylonitrile ( $33 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $2.5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide nitrile $\mathbf{1 . 6 6}$ ( $36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.217 \mathrm{mmol}$, $83 \%)$ as a clear oil. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.47(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $2.64-2.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.1,13.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.4(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H})$, 0.97 (s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 124.5,38.0,37.6,33.2,26.3,22.0,21.9$, 20.8, 20.2; IR (thin film) 2927, 2853, 2237, 1455, $1382 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS-ESI $m / z(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NNa}$ 188.1415, found 188.1408.


4-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)butan-2-one-3-d (1.73). Coupling of phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.28 with methyl vinyl ketone in the presence of 4,4- $\boldsymbol{d}_{2}$-Hantzsch ester 1.72: A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol}), 4,4-d_{2^{-}}$

Hantzsch ester $1.72(77 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})^{58}, i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, ( 1 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), THF ( 1 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), and methyl vinyl ketone ( $17 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $0.201 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel chromatography ( $2.5 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Hx})$ provided ketone $\mathbf{1 . 7 3}(13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.43$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.39-2.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.49(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4,2 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 210.2,38.1(\mathrm{t}, J=20.2), 37.7,32.3,30.0,29.8,26.5,24.7,22.1$; IR (thin film) 2925, 2853, 1716, $1356 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{DONa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ 192.1475, found 192.1484.

1.73: $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{DO}$ Exact Mass: 169.1577

4-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)butan-2-one-3-d (1.73). Coupling of ( $N$ acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with methyl vinyl ketone in the presence of $\mathbf{4 , 4}-\boldsymbol{d}_{\mathbf{2}}$-Hantzsch ester 1.72: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$ acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol}), 4,4-$ $d_{2}$-Hantzsch ester 1.72 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), methyl vinyl ketone ( $32 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by silica gel chromatography (2.5 EtOAc/hexanes) provided ketone 1.73 ( $21 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 48 \%$ ) as
a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for $\mathbf{1 . 7 3}$ matched those described previously. Analysis of the compound by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR confirmed that the deuterium incorporation was $38 \%$.


5-Hydroxycyclopent-1-ene-1-carbonitrile (1.S8): A solution of 2,5dimethoxytetrahydrofuran ( $3.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 24.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, mixture of cis and trans) in aqueous $0.6 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ was heated to $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The mixture was cooled to rt and sat. aqueous $\mathrm{KHCO}_{3}$ solution ( 14 mL ) was added to neutralize the reaction mixture. Diethyl cyanomethylphosphonate $(4.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 24.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added, followed by aqueous $5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the mixture was stirred at rt for 48 h . After this time, the solution was transferred to a separatory funnel and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered through cotton. Concentration of the filtrate under reduced pressure provided a crude residue which was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $25-50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes ) to yield alcohol $1.58(2.25 \mathrm{~g}, 20.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 84 \%)$ as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for $\mathbf{1 . S 8}$ matched that previously reported. ${ }^{59}$


2-Cyanocyclopent-2-en-1-yl benzoate (1.74): A round-bottom flask was charged with alcohol $\mathbf{1 . S 8}(500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.58 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(1.3$ $\mathrm{mL}, 9.17 \mathrm{mmol})$, DMAP ( $56 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and THF ( 15 mL ) were added sequentially under argon. The solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{BzCl}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.17$ mmol) was added dropwise. The cloudy suspension was stirred while warming to rt over 18 h . After this time, the reaction mixture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and quenched with
saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The contents of the flask were transferred to a separatory funnel, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the layers separated. The organic layer was washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( $3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), aqueous 1 N $\mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$, and brine ( $2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (10-20\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide 1.74 ( $862 \mathrm{mg}, 4.04 \mathrm{mmol}$, $88 \%)$ as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.14(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.04$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=7.9,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.57(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9,2 \mathrm{H}) 7.03-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.08-6.04$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.81-2.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.64-2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 165.8,154.3,133.3,129.7,129.5,128.4,115.1,114.9,79.3,32.1,30.6$; IR (thin film) $3069,2950,2226,1972,1915,1720 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$236.0687, found 236.0678.

(rel-1S,2S,3S)-2-Cyano-3-(1-methylcyclohexyl)cyclopentyl benzoate (1.77). Coupling of $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate 1.28 with cyclopentene nitrile 1.74: A 1-dram vial was charged with oxalate 1.28 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 (76 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$, THF (1 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), and cyclopentene nitrile $1.74(43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and transferred to a separatory funnel. The ether layer was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(4 \mathrm{x}$

20 mL ) and aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The organic layer was filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was subjected to silica gel chromatography ( $4 \%$ acetone/hexanes) to provide 1.77 ( 34 mg , $0.110 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%)$ as a colorless oil: Data for major diastereomer ( $\mathbf{8 : 2 : 1 : 1}): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.40$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.58(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.4,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.45(\mathrm{t}, J=8.0,2 \mathrm{H}), 5.30($ app. q, $J=7.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.42-3.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31-2.24$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.82-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, $1.31-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 166.2,133.5,130.0$, $129.6,128.6,118.6,74.4,37.01,37.0,35.3,34.5,28.2,26.2,21.9,21.62,21.61$; IR (thin film) 2925, 2853, 1722, $1271 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$ 334.1783, found 334.1789. Data for minor diastereomer (8:2:1:1): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.44$ (10\% EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1,2 \mathrm{H}), 7.6(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6,1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.46(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6,2 \mathrm{H}), 5.52-5.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.08-3.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.53-2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-$ $2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13}{ }^{3}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 165.6,133.5,129.8,129.7,128.6,119.9,78.5,37.5,37.1$, $36.9,34.1,30.6,26.3,23.1,22.0,21.7$. The relative stereochemistry of the major and minor diastereomers was assigned by nOe analysis.

(rel-1S,2S,3S)-2-Cyano-3-(1methylcyclohexyl)cyclopentyl benzoate (1.77) and

5-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)cyclopent-1-ene-1carbonitrile (1.78). Coupling of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with cyclopentene nitrile 1.74: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester 1.20 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ )
and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.75 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min ), cyclopentene nitrile $\mathbf{1 . 7 4}(84 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and transferred to a separatory funnel. The organic layer was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(4 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH} \mathrm{( } 3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The organic layer was filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was subjected to silica gel chromatography (4\% acetone/hexanes) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 7 7}(23 \mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%$, dr 8:2:1:1) and $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \%)$ as clear oils. Spectral data acquired for $\mathbf{1 . 7 7}$ matched those reported above. Data for $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}: \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ $=0.47(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.79-6.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.89-$ $2.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.38(\mathrm{~m}$, $7 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 152.4,118.7,116.7$, $36.7,36.1,36.0,33.0,26.3,25.2,22.0,21.8$; IR (thin film) $2926,2853,2215,1459 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NNa}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 212.1415$, found 212.1405 .


5-Bromocyclopent-1-ene-1-carbonitrile (1.79): A round-bottom flask was charged with alcohol $\mathbf{1 . S 8}(400 \mathrm{mg}, 3.67 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 16 mL ) and $\mathrm{CBr}_{4}(2.43 \mathrm{~g}, 7.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added sequentially under argon. The solution was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(1.92 \mathrm{~g}, 7.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added in one portion. The resulting heterogeneous mixture was allowed to warm to rt while stirring for 3 h . After this time, the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of Celite and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica
gel chromatography ( $10-15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to yield 1.79 ( $304 \mathrm{mg}, 1.78 \mathrm{mmol}, 48 \%$ ) as a clear oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.26(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.87-6.82$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09-5.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.86-2.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 151.9,119.1,114.7,53.1,35.5,32.3$; IR (thin film) 2927, 2227, 1607, 1189, $1010 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{BrN}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ 193.9581, found 193.9582.


## 5-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)cyclopent-1-ene-1-carbonitrile

Coupling of oxalate 1.28 with bromocyclopentene nitrile 1.79: A 1dram vial was charged with oxalate $1.28(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $1.20(76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.302 \mathrm{mmol})$, $i-$ $\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt} \bullet \mathrm{HBF}_{4}(44 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL}$, sparged with Ar for 5 min$)$, THF ( 1 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), and bromocyclopentene nitrile 1.79 ( $34 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was subjected to silica gel chromatography ( $2 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to provide $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ ( 22 mg , $0.114 \mathrm{mmol}, 57 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data for $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ matched those reported above.


5-(1-Methylcyclohexyl)cyclopent-1-ene-1-carbonitrile
Coupling of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 1.68 with bromocyclopentene nitrile 1.79: A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide 1.68 ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.261 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$, Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{1 . 2 0}$ (100
$\mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and a magnetic stir bar under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.75 mL , sparged with Ar for 5 min ), bromocyclopentene nitrile $\mathbf{1 . 7 9}(67 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a 30 cm loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt , after which it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was subjected to silica gel chromatography ( $2 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide 1.78 ( $30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.156 \mathrm{mmol}, 60 \%$ ) as a clear oil. Spectral data acquired for $\mathbf{1 . 7 8}$ matched those reported above.

### 1.5 Cyclic Voltammetry Experiments

Cyclic Voltammetry was conducted using a Pine Research Instruments Wavedriver potentiostat, a glassy carbon disk working electrode, a glassy carbon rod counter electrode, and a $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{Ag}^{+}$reference electrode (Vycor tip). Samples were prepared with a substrate concentration of 0.01 M in a $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NBF}_{4}$ in MeCN electrolyte solution. Data was collected with a sweep rate of $100 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$. Reduction potentials were measured in reference to ferrocene and were converted to reference the saturated calomel electrode (SCE) using the reported reduction potential of ferrocene $\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=+0.38 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs SCE, reported in the following publication: Zanello, P.; Cinquantini, A.; Mangiani, S.; Opromolla, G.; Pardi, L.; Janiak, C.; Rausch, M. D. J. Organomet. Chem. 1994, 471, 171-177.).


$$
\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-1.14 \mathrm{~V} \text { vs } \mathrm{SCE}
$$


$\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-\mathbf{1 . 2 6} \mathrm{V}$ vs SCE
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# Chapter 2: Total Synthesis of trans-Clerodane and ent-Halimane Diterpenoids via a Stereoselective Radical 1,6-Addition 

### 2.1 Introduction

The clerodane diterpenoids are a large family of natural products isolated primarily from dicotyledonous plants. ${ }^{1}$ Many of these secondary metabolites exhibit antifeedant activity, ${ }^{1}$ although the biological activity of certain clerodane diterpenes is more extensive. ${ }^{2}$ This scaffold is thought to originate biosynthetically from geranylgeranyl pyrophosphate (2.1) via a series of enzymatic cyclizations (Figure 2.1). Intermediate 2.A, which has been implicated in this biosynthetic pathway, provides a point of divergence from which the clerodanes and related labdane diterpenoids can both be derived. ${ }^{1 a} \mathrm{~A}$ series of hydride and methyl migrations is then thought to ensue from intermediate 2.A to generate a common precursor 2.B from which both the cis- and trans-clerodane diterpeoids can be formed, depending on which of the geminal methyl groups migrates in the following step. ${ }^{1 \mathrm{a}}$

Figure 2.1 Proposed biosynthesis of clerodane diterpenoids


The trans-clerodane subset of this family of natural products, represented by 2.2, ${ }^{3}$ solidagolactone (2.3), ${ }^{3}$ 16-hydroxycleroda-3,13-dien-15,16-olide (2.4, referred to as PL3 or HCD), ${ }^{2,4}$ and annonene (2.5) ${ }^{5}$ (Figure 2.2), is structurally characterized by a transdecalin core bearing four contiguous stereocenters, two of which are 1,3-related
quaternary carbons. As a result of this structural complexity, early total syntheses of trans-clerodanes, including those of PL3 (2.4) ${ }^{6}$ and annonene (2.5), ${ }^{6,7}$ required lengthy sequences to install the contiguous stereocenters and fashion the C9 quaternary carbon. ${ }^{8}$

Figure 2.2 Representative trans-clerodane natural products




Despite the substantial previous work in the total synthesis of trans-clerodane natural products, ${ }^{1 \mathrm{~b}}$ a concise route to diterpenes of this family remained elusive. It was envisioned that recent studies in the Overman group involving the construction of quaternary carbons via tertiary radical ${ }^{9,10}$ and tertiary organometallic ${ }^{11}$ intermediates could enable efficient construction of the C9 quaternary carbon of these diterpenoids and provide for efficient syntheses of trans-clerodanes 2.2-2.5. Importantly, this total synthesis venture would also enable investigation of the diastereoselectivity of tertiary radical and tertiary organometallic couplings using a decalin substrate, as previous investigations in the Overman group suggested that the diastereoselectivity in such reactions can be divergent depending on the nature of the reactive intermediate employed. ${ }^{10,11}$

### 2.2 Retrosynthetic Analysis

The projected total synthesis (Figure 2.3) was initially outlined to target transclerodane 2.2, the simplest member of the exemplary natural products depicted in Figure
2.2. It was assumed that by isomerization of the exocyclic olefin and redox manipulation of the butenolide moiety, solidagolactone (2.3), PL3 (2.4), and annonene (2.5) would be directly accessible from 2.2. ${ }^{12}$ The key quaternary carbon stereocenter present in $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ would be formed at this late stage by the coupling of the corresponding structurally complex tertiary radical or tertiary organometallic intermediate with an electron-deficient olefinic acceptor.

Figure 2.3 Endgame retrosynthesis for trans-clerodane diterpenoids


Several options for the choice of an appropriate conjugate acceptor were considered. Methyl vinyl ketone, a simple and competent substrate in such radical addition reactions, ${ }^{9}$ was initially considered, as elaboration of the ketone functional group over several steps would form the butenolide moiety of 2.2-2.5. ${ }^{13}$ More attractive was the direct incorporation of the entire ethanobutenolide fragment via a 1,6-addition to 4 vinylfuranone (2.6). Since 1,6-additions of organocuprates are well-known in the literature, ${ }^{14}$ coupling the decalin and vinylbutenolide units was expected to occur readily, providing that access to the required tertiary organometallic intermediate was obtained. By contrast, the analogous radical 1,6-additions of this type held only modest precedent, ${ }^{15}$ perhaps due to the difficulty of terminating the highly stabilized allylic radical intermediate using classical radical chain transfer chemistry. However, it was
anticipated that mechanistic knowledge regarding photoredox-catalyzed radical couplings garnered in the previous exploratory studies would enable the development of a synthetically viable radical 1,6-addition reaction. ${ }^{9 b, c}$

Significant literature precedent suggested that coupling via the tertiary radical intermediate would occur from the less-hindered equatorial face, avoiding destabilizing interactions with the axial angular methyl group and carbon substituents neighboring the radical-bearing carbon. ${ }^{9,10}$ The stereoselectivity of the coupling of the corresponding tertiary organocuprate was less predictable, as previous studies advocated that tertiary organocuprates in some instances react from the more-hindered faces of bicyclic ring systems. ${ }^{11}$ Thus, access to both a tertiary radical and a tertiary organometallic intermediate at this stage of the synthesis would allow a comparison of the diastereoselectivity observed in either a radical or anionic coupling in the case of a decalin substrate.

A final consideration was the precursor from which a tertiary radical would be generated. Recent results from the Overman group had established that tertiary radicals are efficiently generated and coupled from tertiary carboxylic acid-derived ( N acyloxy)phthalimides ${ }^{9 c, 10}$ such as $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ as well as tertiary alcohol-derived tert-alkyl-( $N$ phthalimidoyl)oxalates such as $\mathbf{2 . 8} .^{9 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ It was inferred that both of these radical precursors would be accessible from a common intermediate 2.9 (Figure 2.4). Decalone $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ could be synthesized using straightforward chemistry developed by Piers. ${ }^{16}$ Closure of the decalin ring would be accomplished by intramolecular alkylation of chloroketone 2.11, which in turn could be formed via copper-catalyzed conjugate addition of a vinylalane derived from 2.12 to 3-methylcyclohexenone (2.13). The use of a chiral Ag-NHC ligand
developed by Hoveyda and coworkers in this conjugate organometallic addition would ideally enable the execution of the total synthesis in enantioselective fashion. ${ }^{17}$ The preparation of a tertiary organometallic precursor with which to investigate the key coupling reaction was also pursued by a similar route. ${ }^{18}$

Figure 2.4 Retrosynthetic analysis of radical precursors


### 2.3 Results and Discussion

### 2.3.1 Synthesis of a Radical Precursor

Because the synthetic utility of both ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimides and tert-alkyl-( N phthalimidoyl) oxalates had not yet been fully explored at the onset of these studies, both of these substrates were initially sought to investigate the key radical fragment coupling. The synthesis of decalin carboxylic acid 2.14 is summarized in Scheme 2.1. ${ }^{19}$ Regioselective hydroalumination of 5-chloro-1-pentyne (2.12) using diisobutylaluminum hydride (DIBAL-H) and catalytic $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{dppp}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in THF generated a branched vinylaluminum species that underwent enantioselective conjugate addition to 3methylcyclohexeneone (2.13) in the presence of $\mathrm{CuCl}_{2} \bullet 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and chiral $\mathrm{Ag}-\mathrm{NHC}$ ligand 2.15. ${ }^{17}$ When using $0.25 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of the $\mathrm{CuCl}_{2} / \mathrm{Ag}-\mathrm{NHC}$ catalyst system, ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ was formed in $89 \%$ yield and $84 \% e e$. Importantly, since the Ag-NHC ligand required several

Scheme 2.1 Synthesis of carboxylic acid 2.14

steps to synthesize, the catalyst loading was optimized in order to prepare the maximum amount of ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ per amount of ligand. These studies conducted by Dr. André Dieskau confirmed that using $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of this $\mathrm{CuCl}_{2} / \mathrm{Ag}-\mathrm{NHC}$ catalyst system in the conjugate addition reaction was sufficient to generate ketone $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ in $50-55 \%$ yield and comparable enantioselectivity. Intramolecular alkylation of $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ mediated by $t$ - BuOK in $t$ - BuOH formed decalone 2.16 in $86 \%$ yield as a 3:1 mixture of trans:cis decalin diastereomers. Both decalones were then methylated in high yield via the kinetic enolate of $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}$ using LDA and MeI. Although alkylation occurred predominantly from the $\beta$-face of decalones 2.16, this methyl-bearing stereocenter as well as the decalin ring fusion were equilibrated to give the stereochemistry required for the trans-clerodanes at these positions in the ensuing reductive cyanation reaction, which provided secondary nitriles 2.17 as a mixture of epimers at only the nitrile-bearing carbon. As expected, these diastereomers converged after methylation to form tertiary nitrile 2.10. After many failed attempts to hydrolyze the sterically hindered nitrile 2.10, a two-step sequence of
reduction of $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ to the intermediate aldehyde, followed by Lindgren-Kraus oxidation was employed to provide carboxylic acid 2.14 in $50 \%$ yield over two steps.

Tertiary alcohol 2.18 was also synthesized by Dr. Nick Untiedt in 2 steps and $80 \%$ yield from ketone 2.19 (Scheme 2.2). ${ }^{20}$ Because the synthesis of this alcohol is considerably shorter than that of carboxylic acid $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$, it was reasoned that a radical precursor derived from $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ would be the most attractive substrate to use in the key coupling reaction. Unfortunately, Dr. Untiedt's attempted acylation of $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ with N phthalimidoyl chlorooxalate $\mathbf{2 . 2 0}$ returned only the unreacted substrate, suggesting that this alcohol may be too sterically hindered to access the corresponding alkyl N phthalimidoyl oxalate 2.21.

Scheme 2.2 Attempted synthesis of oxalate 2.21


A series of studies examining the acylation of 1,2-dimethylcyclohexan-1-ol (2.22) was then initiated to determine whether more forcing conditions could be used to prepare tert-alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalates from severely hindered tertiary alcohols when the standard conditions (Scheme 2.2) failed. Accordingly, subjection of $\mathbf{2 . 2 2}$ to the acylation conditions depicted in Scheme 2.2 resulted in only $72 \%$ conversion to the desired oxalate 2.23 (Table 2.1, entry 1). Heating the reaction mixture to $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (entry 2) or employing additional 2.20, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ and DMAP (entry 3) failed to improve conversion. Unfortunately, triturative purification of $\mathbf{2 . 2 3}$ was unsuccessful in these cases where conversion was
incomplete. In an attempt to improve conversion, alcohol 2.22 was treated with either NaH or $n$ - BuLi (entries 4 and 5) to initially generate a sodium or lithium alkoxide, respectively, followed by exposure to acyl chloride 2.20. Analysis of the crude reaction mixtures by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR revealed that nearly all of the substrate had been consumed, although multiple decomposition products were present in addition to the desired oxalate 2.23.

Table 2.1 Acylation of 1,2-dimethylcyclohexan-1-ol (2.22) with 2.20.


| entry | conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { conversion (\%) } \\ \text { by }{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \text { NMR } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{gathered} 2.20 \text { (2 equiv), } \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N} \text { (2 equiv), DMAP (0.1 equiv), } \\ \mathrm{THF}, \mathrm{rt}, 24 \mathrm{~h} \end{gathered}$ | 72 |
| 2 | 2.20 (2 equiv), $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ( 2 equiv), DMAP ( 0.1 equiv), THF, $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 24 \mathrm{~h}$ | 72 |
| 3 | 2.20 (4 equiv), $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ (4 equiv), DMAP ( 0.2 equiv) THF, rt, 7 h | 74 |
| 4 | NaH (1 equiv), THF/DMF, 20 min , rt then 2.20 (2 equiv), rt, 24 h | $\_^{a}$ |
| 5 | $n$-BuLi ( 1 equiv), THF, $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min}$ then 2.20 ( 2 equiv), $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $\mathrm{rt}, 24 \mathrm{~h}$ ${ }^{a}$ A complex mixture of products was observed by | $-^{a}$ |

Ultimately, clean conversion of $\mathbf{2 . 2 2}$ to its phthalimidoyl oxalate could not be realized. These results underscored a general limitation to the use of phthalimidoyl oxalates in complex settings in that the synthesis and purification of these radical precursors can be problematic depending on the nature and reactivity of the tertiary alcohol substrate. Because these sensitive intermediates are prone to decomposition, no
purification methods attempted could successfully isolate the desired oxalates in cases when conversion from the tertiary alcohol is incomplete. Thus, conversion of a tertiary alcohol to its phthalimidoyl oxalate must occur cleanly under the standard conditions (Table 2.1, entry 1) in order to isolate oxalate products of acceptable purity.

An ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide radical precursor derived from carboxylic acid $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$ was then pursued for use in the key radical fragment coupling. This intermediate was formed most efficiently by first generating the acyl chloride of $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$, followed by subjection of this intermediate to KONPhth and 18-crown-6 in THF at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Equation 2.1). The ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 2.7 so formed was stable to silica gel chromatography using pH 7-buffered silica gel. With access to a radical precursor for use in the key coupling reaction, the optimization of a radical 1,6-addition was next investigated.

Equation 2.1


### 2.3.2 Optimization of a Radical 1,6-Addition

The initial development of the key radical coupling was conducted using a simple ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide substrate $\mathbf{2 . 2 4}$ derived from trimethylacetic acid (Table 2.2). Using conditions optimized for the 1,4 -addition of tertiary radicals to electron-deficient alkenes, ${ }^{9 c} \mathbf{2 . 2 4}$ coupled with 4 -vinylfuranone (2.6) to form adduct $\mathbf{2 . 2 5}$ accompanied by trace amounts of $\beta, \gamma$-unsaturated lactones $\mathbf{2 . 2 6}$ (entry 1 ). This product distribution would be inconsequential, as treatment with base had been previously shown to converge
regioisomeric products of this type. More problematic was the formation of a significant amount of a product containing two tert-butyl butenolide fragments, 2.27. Such a product

Table 2.2 Optimization of radical 1,6-addition

${ }^{a}$ Conditions unless otherwise noted: 2.24 ( 1 equiv), 2.6 ( 1.3 equiv), photocatalyst ( 0.01 equiv), $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ ( 2.2 equiv), reductant ( 1.5 or 5 equiv), 0.15 M (with respect to 2.24 ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{rt}, 18 \mathrm{~h}$, blue LEDs. ${ }^{b}$ Determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR integration relative to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene). ${ }^{c}$ A compact fluorescent light was used in place of blue LEDs. ${ }^{d}$ The concentration of 2.24 was 0.02 M .
could arise from dimerization of the highly delocalized allylic radical intermediate 2.C at the carbon adjacent to the carbonyl group, followed by isomerization of the double bonds
into conjugation with the lactone carbonyls. Speculating that the reduction potential of the catalyst might affect the termination sequence, several common photoredox catalysts were screened in an attempt to minimize the formation of $\mathbf{2 . 2 7}$. Of the iridium photocatalysts examined, $\operatorname{Ir}(\mathrm{ppy})_{3}$ did not promote the reaction, whereas $\operatorname{Ir}\left(\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}$ provided primarily dimer 2.27 (entries $\left.2-4\right) . \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpz})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$, whose +1 oxidation state is a much poorer reductant than $\operatorname{Ru}(\text { bpy })_{3},{ }^{+21}$ also did not promote reactivity (entry 5). In addition to Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{2 . 2 8}$ the use of two other reductive quenchers, $\mathbf{2 . 2 9}{ }^{22}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 3 0},{ }^{23}$ with $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$ was examined. Both reduced the formation of dimer $\mathbf{2 . 2 7}$ (entries 6 and 7), with $\mathbf{2 . 3 0}$ delivering a 75\% overall yield of 1,6-addition products. Ultimately, it was found that the highest yields of adducts 2.25 and 2.26 were obtained, while avoiding the formation dimer 2.27, by conducting the reaction at higher dilution $(0.02 \mathrm{M})$ using an excess of the dihydropyridine reductant $\mathbf{2 . 2 8}$ (entry 9). With optimal conditions for the key radical fragment coupling identified, the radical 1,6-addition was next attempted using the structurally complex radical precursor 2.7 synthesized previously.

### 2.3.3 Key Radical and Cuprate Fragment Couplings

The direct application of the optimized conditions to the coupling of decalin tertiary radical formed from ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide 2.7 gave the desired 1,6-adducts in high yield as a mixture of double bond isomers (Equation 2.2). Equilibration of these crude products with DBU afforded the trans-clerodane diterpenoid 2.2 as a single stereoisomer at the newly formed C9 quaternary carbon stereocenter. As expected, ${ }^{10}$ this
coupling took place exclusively from the less-hindered face of the trans-decalin tertiary radical intermediate.

## Equation 2.2



The coupling of a structurally similar tertiary organocuprate intermediate was performed by Dr. Daniel Müller in the racemic series (Equation 2.3). In the key coupling event, reductive lithiation of phenyl thioether $\mathbf{2 . 3 1}$ followed by transmetalation and 1,6conjugate addition of the resulting organocuprate to 4 -vinylfuranone provided a mixture of regioisomeric olefin products that converged upon treatment with DBU to solidagolactone (2.3). The yield of 1,6-addition product in the coupling of this organocuprate was notably lower than that obtained via the radical coupling.

## Equation 2.3



The quaternary carbon was formed with complete diastereoselectivity in this cuprate coupling with addition occurring from the less-hindered face of the decalin ring system. Although the Overman group's prior investigations suggested that coupling from the more-hindered face of the decalin might be reasonable or even preferred, ${ }^{11}$ the
observed stereoselectivity was attributed in this case to the severe 1,3-diaxial interaction between the angular methyl group and the incoming electrophile that such a bond formation would incur.

### 2.3.4 Unexpected Structural Rearrangement of Exocyclic Olefin 2.2

The conversion of trans-clerodane diterpene 2.2 to solidagolactone (2.3), PL3 (2.4), and annonene (2.5) required that the exocyclic olefin be isomerized to the internal position. In a first attempt to enact this transformation, $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ was exposed to CSA in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ at elevated temperature for three days. ${ }^{24}$ Unexpectedly, the single product isolated from the reaction was not the desired solidagolactone (2.3) but the ent-halimane diterpenoid 2.32 (Equation 2.4). ${ }^{3}$

## Equation 2.4



Tetrasubstituted olefin 2.32 is perhaps the result of the cationic rearrangement depicted in Figure 2.5. Protonation of the exocyclic olefin of $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ generates a tertiary carbocation 2.D which can reversibly form the endocyclic olefin 2.3. Alternatively, migration of the angular methyl group of 2.D can occur to alleviate 1,3-diaxial interaction with the methyl substituent at C , forming a tertiary carbocation 2.E that can generate tetrasubstituted olefin 2.32 by action of a conjugate base present in solution. Not surprisingly, ent-halimane 2.32 has been co-isolated with several trans-clerodane
diterpenoids, ${ }^{3}$ suggesting that certain trans-clerodanes may be biosynthetic precursors to $e n t$-halimanes via a similar structural rearrangement. ${ }^{25}$

Figure 2.5 Proposed rearrangement mechanism


### 2.3.5 Olefin Isomerization and Synthesis Endgame

After noting that exposure of exocyclic olefin 2.2 to acid in the presence of heat provoked a structural rearrangement, alternative isomerization conditions were then explored. Fortunately, subjection of $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ to a catalytic amount of $\mathrm{RhCl}_{3}$ in refluxing EtOH promoted clean isomerization of the exocyclic alkene to provide solidagolactone (2.3) with no observable rearrangement product $\mathbf{2 . 3 2}$ detected (Scheme 2.3). ${ }^{26}$ Installation of the butenolide hydroxyl group required to complete the synthesis of PL3 (2.4) was accomplished by soft enolization to form the corresponding silyloxyfuran, followed by oxidation with $m$-CPBA. ${ }^{27}$ Conversion of solidagolactone (2.3) to annonene (2.5) occurred smoothly by treatment of $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ with DIBAL-H in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ at low temperature. ${ }^{28}$ Completion of the total syntheses was confirmed by comparison of ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra obtained for the natural products with those published previously for $\mathbf{2 . 2}{ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ solidagolactone (2.3), ${ }^{3} \operatorname{PL} 3(2.4){ }^{2 \mathrm{c}}$, and annonene (2.5). ${ }^{6}$

Scheme 2.3 Synthesis endgame


### 2.4 Conclusions

The late-stage coupling of either a structurally elaborate tertiary radical or tertiary organocuprate intermediate with a vinylbutenolide conjugate acceptor was a successful strategy for stereoselectively forming the key central quaternary carbon present in several trans-clerodane natural products. In both fragment couplings, addition occured from the less hindered face of the nucleophilic decalin intermediate. This selectivity is likely due to the avoidance of unfavorable steric interactions present in the transition states corresponding to approach of the electrophile from the more hindered decalin face. The superior yield obtained in the fragment coupling of the tertiary radical intermediate compared to that of the tertiary organocuprate intermediate validates the radical coupling approach as a general means to unite structurally elaborate molecular fragments. This convergent coupling approach permitted efficient enantioselective syntheses of four trans-clerodane diterpenes: 2.2, solidagolactone (2.3), PL3 (2.4), and annonene (2.5). In
addition, a cationic rearrangement allowed a biosynthetically related ent-halimane diterpene, 2.32, to be synthesized via this route.

The inability to access tert-alkyl $N$-phthalimidoyl oxalate $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ for use in the coupling reaction reveals a limitation to the general utility of these radical precursors in complex molecule synthesis. Although these substrates can be prepared from many easily accessible tertiary alcohols, the instability of oxalates such as $\mathbf{2 . 2 3}$ under both harsh acylation conditions and various purification techniques is a critical liability that complicates their further application to total synthesis.

Since the completion of the work described in this chapter, novel tertiary alcoholderived radical precursors have been developed in the Overman and MacMillan laboratories that exhibit much greater stability than phthalimidoyl oxalates. ${ }^{29}$ These advances have allowed much streamlined syntheses of $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 3}$, and will be drawn upon in the succeeding chapter. ${ }^{29,30}$

### 2.5 Experimental Information

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of argon using anhydrous solvents (either freshly distilled or passed through activated alumina columns). $t$ - BuOH was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ for 18 h and distilled prior use. DMPU and HMPA were purified by distillation under a vacuum ( $\sim 0.1$ torr) over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$. All other commercially obtained reagents were used as received. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted with E. Merck silica gel 60 F254 pre-coated plates, $(0.25 \mathrm{~mm})$ and visualized by exposure to UV light ( 254 nm ) or stained with anisaldehyde, ceric ammonium molybdate, or potassium permanganate. Flash chromatography and filtration were performed using 40-63 $\mu \mathrm{m}$ EMD Chemicals Silica Gel $60 \AA$ Geduran silica gel. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 500 or 600 MHz ) and are reported relative to deuterated solvent signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant (Hz) and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Spectrometers (at 125 or 150 MHz ). Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift. IR spectra were recorded on a Varian 640-IR spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption (cm-1). High resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility with a Micromass LCT spectrometer. Blue LEDs (30 cm , 1 watt) were purchased from http://www.creativelightings.com (product code CL-FRS5050-12WP-12V) and powered by 8 AA batteries. Enantiomeric excess for compound 2.11 was determined by gas chromatography (GC) and was performed using a Hewlett Packard Series II 5890 Series with a Chiraldex ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ B-DM $30 \mathrm{~mm} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~mm} \times 0.12$
$\mu \mathrm{m}$ column ( $50-180^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$ ). See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations. Available at: http://pubs.acs.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah_abbreviations.pdf

## (-)-(R)-3-(5-Chloropent-1-en-2-yl)-3-methylcyclohexan-1-one

(2.11). Preparation of the vinylaluminum stock solution: A roundbottom flask was charged with $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{dppp}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.30 \mathrm{~g}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol})$ and THF ( 22 mL ). DIBAL-H (neat, $3.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 18 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added slowly to the mixture to form a black solution (temperature increase, gas evolution). The reaction was maintained for 15 min at rt and then the vessel was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath. 5-Chloro-1pentyne ( $1.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 18 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then slowly* added dropwise to the solution over ca. 40 $\min$; after complete addition, the reaction was maintained at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min . The reaction was then allowed to warm to rt and stir for 3 h (concentration $=0.8 \mathrm{M}$ ). * Note: If alkyne is added too quickly, a substantial amount of the linear $\beta$-vinylaluminum species is formed.

Enantioselective conjugate addition: A round-bottom flask was charged with $\mathrm{CuCl}_{2} \cdot 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.014 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Ag}-\mathrm{NHC} \mathbf{2 . 1 5}{ }^{17}(9.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.014 \mathrm{mmol})$ in a glove box under a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere. The flask was sealed with a rubber septum and removed from the glove box, THF was added ( 10 mL ), and the blue solution was stirred for 5 min . The vinylaluminum reagent in THF ( $21 \mathrm{~mL}, 16.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.8 \mathrm{M}$ ) was added slowly via syringe, followed by dropwise addition of 3-methylcyclohex-2-ene-1-one ( $0.62 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.5$ mmol ) and the black reaction mixture was stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of Rochelle's salt ( 10 mL ), the aqueous phase
was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo to produce a yellow syrup that was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to obtain $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ as a clear yellow oil ( $1.05 \mathrm{~g}, 4.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 89 \%, 84 \%$ ee determined by chiral GLC: CHIRALDEX B, $30 \mathrm{psi}, 50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow 180{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, @ $15{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$, injection volume $\left.1 \mu \mathrm{~L}\right): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.68(40 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.92(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.87(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.80$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 211.8,152.7,110.5,52.8,45.0$, 44.5, 41.0, 35.0, 31.9, 27.8, 27.0, 22.1; IR (thin film) 3096, 2957, 2871, 1714, 1635, 1455, $903 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{ClO},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 232.1468$, found 232.1476; $[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-29.1,[\alpha]^{26.8}{ }_{577}-32.3,[\alpha]^{26.8}{ }_{546}-37.3,[\alpha]^{26.8}{ }_{435}-64.5,[\alpha]^{26.8}{ }_{405}-81.0$ $\left(c=1.04, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.



4a-Methyl-5-methylene-octahydronaphthalen-1(2H)ones (2.16): The general procedure of Piers was followed. ${ }^{16 a} \mathrm{~A}$ round-bottom flask was charged with chloroketone 2.11 ( 2.0 g ,
$9.32 \mathrm{mmol}), t$ - $\mathrm{BuOH}(19 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $t-\mathrm{BuOK}^{*}(2.1 \mathrm{~g}, 18.6 \mathrm{mmol})$. The vessel was placed in a sand bath, heated to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and maintained for 4 h . The reaction was then allowed to cool to rt and quenched with aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(18 \mathrm{~mL})$, extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 100$ mL ) and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo to produce a yellow oil. The oil was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to obtain a $3: 1$ diastereomeric mixture of 2.16, as a clear yellow oil ( $1.43 \mathrm{~g}, 8.03 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%$ ). The trans configuration of the major diastereomer was previously assigned by Piers ${ }^{16 c}$ on the basis of diagnostic nOe correlations; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR, IR and mass spectrometry data for $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}$ were consistent with those previously reported: ${ }^{16 \mathrm{c}}$ $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.48\left(10 \%\right.$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of diastereomers): $\delta 214.2,212.3,155.7,152.9,107.8,105.8,59.1,58.3,44.7,42.7,41.3$, $38.1,35.7,32.7,32.3,32.2,26.6,26.2,26.0,25.9,22.4,22.1,20.9,18.9$.
*Note: It is very important to use freshly sublimed (or a new batch) of t-BuOK as well as dried and distilled t-BuOH to get satisfactory and reproducible yields.


## 2,4a-Dimethyl-5-methylene-octahydronaphthalen-

 $\mathbf{1 ( 2 H )}$-ones (2.19). A round-bottom flask was charged with $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NH}(2.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 19.7 \mathrm{mmol})$, THF ( 23 mL ), and cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an acetone/dry ice bath. A solution of $n-\mathrm{BuLi}$ in hexanes $(2.65 \mathrm{M}, 7.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 19.7$ mmol ) was added dropwise to the cooled solution. After complete addition the reaction was allowed to warm to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath and maintained for 20 min . The solution was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a dry ice-acetone bath and a 3:1 mixture of $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}(3.18 \mathrm{~g}, 17.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 3.3 mL ) was added dropwise. The solution was stirred for 30 min at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 108after which MeI ( $5.6 \mathrm{~mL}, 89.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise. The vessel was removed from the dry ice-acetone bath, allowed to warm to rt , and maintained at rt for 2 h . The reaction mixture was then quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(70 \mathrm{~mL})$, extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $3 \times 120 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting yellow oil was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to obtain a $3: 1$ diastereomeric mixture of $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ as a clear yellow oil ( $3.17 \mathrm{~g}, 16.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%$ ). A third diastereomer present in trace amount is visible by inspection of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum. This impurity was carried through the formation of tertiary nitrile $\mathbf{2 . 1 0}$ and was removed by silica gel chromatography at that stage. $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.5$ ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes). Spectral data for minor diastereomer was consistent with previously reported data. ${ }^{16 a}$ Major diastereomer trans-2.19: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54$ (dddd, $J=6.4,6.4,6.4,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{dd}, J=3.5,12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{ddd}, J=5.0$, $13.9,13.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) 1.58$ (dddd, $J=3.9,13.5,13.5,13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.94(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 216.5,156.0,106.0,53.5,45.0,43.9,32.4$, 31.0, 28.5, 26.8, 21.0, 19.0, 18.3; IR (thin film) 2934, 2861, 1704, 1640, 1456, 997, 879 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$193.1592, found 193.1585. X-ray quality crystals of a racemic sample of the major diastereomer were obtained by slow evaporation from 1:1 THF:heptane, confirming the relative configuration of this isomer. ${ }^{12}$


## 2,4a-Dimethyl-5-methylene-trans-decahydronap-

hthalene-1-carbonitriles (2.17). The procedure by Piers was followed with minor modification. ${ }^{16 a}$ A scintillation vial was charged with a $3: 1$ mixture of $2.19(0.528 \mathrm{~g}, 2.75 \mathrm{mmol})$, TosMIC $(1.61 \mathrm{~g}, 8.24$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, DMPU ( 9.2 mL ), and $t-\mathrm{BuOH}(0.28 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The mixture was stirred until homogenous (sonication helpful) and then $\mathrm{KOt} t \mathrm{Bu}(2.22 \mathrm{~g}, 19.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The vessel was sealed with a Teflon-coated cap, wrapped with Teflon tape, placed in a sand bath, and heated at $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 d . The reaction was then allowed to cool to rt and was quenched with aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo to produce a yellow oil. The oil was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to obtain a $6: 1$ diastereomeric mixture of $\mathbf{2} .17$ as clear yellow oil ( $0.352 \mathrm{~g}, 1.73 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%$ ). A third diastereomer present in trace amount is visible by inspection of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum. This impurity was carried through the formation of tertiary nitrile 2.10 and was removed by silica gel chromatography at that stage. The relative configuration of the major diastereomer was previously assigned by Piers on the basis of coupling constants observed in diagnostic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR resonances; ${ }^{16 \mathrm{a}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and mass spectrometry data were consistent with previously reported data: ${ }^{16 a} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.54(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, major diastereomer) $\delta$ 156.0, 121.7, 105.7, 47.3, 39.1, 38.7, 36.4, 35.6, 32.4, 29.6, 27.4, 26.7, 21.0, 17.2.
*Note: It is very important to use freshly sublimed (or a new batch) of KOt-Bu as well as dried and distilled t-BuOH to get satisfactory and reproducible yields.
(+)-1,2,4a-Trimethyl-5-methylene-trans-decahydronaphthalene-1carbonitrile (2.10). A round-bottom flask was charged with $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NH}$ $(252 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ and THF $(8 \mathrm{~mL})$, and was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an acetone/dry ice bath. A solution of $n$ - BuLi in hexanes $(2.6 \mathrm{M}, 730 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise and the solution was allowed to warm to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and maintained for 20 min . HMPA ( $310 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added followed by dropwise addition of a solution of secondary nitriles 2.17 ( $183 \mathrm{mg}, 0.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( $700 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and the reaction was allowed to stir at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $40 \mathrm{~min} . \mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}(170 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise and the vessel was removed from the ice-water bath, allowed to warm to rt and maintained for 16 h . The reaction was then quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo to produce a yellow oil that was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to obtain tertiary nitrile 2.10 as a clear colorless oil ( $193 \mathrm{mg}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%$ ): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.54(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes $)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.61(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.16$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.51-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.37-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.25(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=3.1,12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 158.1,123.1$, $104.5,53.1,41.8,40.7,40.3,36.4,32.4,28.6,28.0,25.1,23.4,18.9,18.1$; IR (thin film) 3086, 2929, 2860, 2360, 2341, 2229, 1639, 1455, 1379, 982, $893 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (GC) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2},\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$235.2174, found 235.2181; $[\alpha]^{24.4}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+62.5,[\alpha]^{24.6}{ }_{577}$ $+64.9,[\alpha]^{24.7}{ }_{546}+72.1,[\alpha]^{24.8}{ }_{435}+121.2,[\alpha]^{24.8}{ }_{405}+150.5\left(c=1.15, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(+)-1,2,4a-Trimethyl-5-methylene-trans-decahydronaphth-alene-1-carboxylic acid (2.14). A flame dried round-bottom flask was charged with tertiary nitrile $2.10(200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.92 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DME $(13 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was treated with DIBAL-H (neat, $0.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.68 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and the reaction was stirred and heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h . The clear solution was then allowed to cool to rt and was pipetted into a stirred saturated aqueous solution of Rochelle's salt (45 $\mathrm{mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the combined organics were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was dissolved in THF $(5.8 \mathrm{~mL})$, $\mathrm{AcOH}(1.9 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.29 \mathrm{~mL})$ and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was then concentrated in vacuo, the residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and washed with a saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution, and brine. The organic phase was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give the tertiary aldehyde, which was used without further purification. Data for aldehyde: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.62$ ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 9.96$ (s, 1H), 4.58 (br s, 2H), 2.28 (ddd, $J=5.0,13.5,13.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 207.7,158.7$, 104.0, 56.4, 52.6, 40.9, 40.2, 37.0, 32.9, 28.9, 28.0, 22.7, 21.4, 21.3, 17.4; IR (thin film) 3085, 2929, 2858, 1717, 1637, 1448, 1376, $892 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (GC) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$221.1905, found 221.1908.

The crude tertiary aldehyde ( $219 \mathrm{mg}, 0.99 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then dissolved in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (20 mL ), THF ( 20 mL ), and $t$-BuOH ( 5 mL ). 2-Methyl-2-butene ( 5 mL ), $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}(1.37 \mathrm{~g}$, $9.9 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{NaClO}_{2}(477 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added and the reaction was stirred at rt
for 24 h . The reaction was then quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10$ $\mathrm{mL})$, extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and the organic layers were combined, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to produce a colorless solid. The solid was purified by flash column chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to obtain the title compound as a colorless solid ( $116 \mathrm{mg}, 0.49 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%$ ): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.41(10: 1$ hexanes/EtOAc,); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33$ (ddd, $J=$ $4.6,11.8,11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{ddd}, J=2.8,2.8$, $10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{dddd}, J=3.2,3.2,3.2,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-1.33$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.6,10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 180.2, 159.9, 103.8, 55.7, 48.2, 42.8, 40.6, 37.7, 33.1, 29.0, 27.9, 25.8, 24.0, 18.8, 17.4; IR (thin film) 2930, 2858, 1696, 1447, 1258, 892 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{2},(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H})^{-}$235.1698, found 235.1696; $[\alpha]^{25.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ $+66.5,[\alpha]^{25.7}{ }_{577}+69.6,[\alpha]^{25.7}{ }_{546}+78.6,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{435}+133.2,[\alpha]^{25.8}{ }_{405}+165.5(c=1.04$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).

(1R,2R,4aR,8aS)-(-)-1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl-1,2,4a-trimethyl-5-methylene-trans-decahydronaphthalene-1-carboxylate (2.7). A flame-dried round-bottom flask was charged with tertiary acid $2.14(20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.085 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(85 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and the solution was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Oxalyl chloride ( $11 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added followed by two drops of DMF (gas evolution occurred), and the reaction was removed from the cooling bath and stirred for 1 h at rt . Toluene $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added and the reaction was concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow oil. In a scintillation vial, this yellow oil was
dissolved in THF ( $85 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and potassium phthalimide $N$-oxide ( $17 \mathrm{mg}, 0.085 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 18-crown-6 ( $22 \mathrm{mg}, 0.085 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added sequentially. The vial was capped and the heterogeneous brick-red solution was heated with stirring at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 h , the cloudy yellow solution was diluted with hexanes ( 2 mL ) and passed through a small plug of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$. The filtrate was concentrated and the residue was purified by silica gel chromatography using pH 7 -buffered silica gel ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to obtain ( N acyloxy)phthalimide 2.7 as a colorless solid ( $30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}, 94 \%$ ): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.43(10 \%$ EtOAc /hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.87-7.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.78-7.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.57(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.8,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{dt}, J=3.2,13.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.13$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.4,162.4,159.7$, $134.8,129.2,124.0,103.7,55.4,48.6,43.7,40.6,37.3,32.9,28.9,27.7,25.2,23.8,18.8$, 17.0; IR (thin film) 2932, 2866, 1781, 1746, 1467, 1014, $879 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Na},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$404.1838, found 404.1842; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-3.2,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-$ $3.5,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-3.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-5.9,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-8.0\left(c=1.02, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

1,3-Dioxoisoindolin-2-yl pivalate (2.24): Pivalic acid (2.00 g, 19.6 mmol ) and $N$-hydroxyphthalimide ( $4.80 \mathrm{~g}, 29.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were dissolved in THF ( 200 mL ) under an argon atmosphere. After sequential addition of dicyclohexylcarbodiimide $(6.07 \mathrm{~g}, 29.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP (120 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.98 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h at rt . The mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure, the resulting residue was suspended in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (200
mL ) and transferred to a separatory funnel. The organic layer was washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( $3 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The drying agent was removed by filtration and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $7 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to provide ( $N$-acyloxy) phthalimide 2.24 ( 3.68 g , $14.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \%$ ) as a colorless solid. Characterization data matched that previously reported. ${ }^{31}$

4-(3,3-Dimethylbutyl)furan-2(5H)-one (2.25), $\quad E$ - $\quad$ and $\quad Z-\quad 4$-(3,3-Dimethylbutylidene)-dihydrofuran-2(3H)-one (2.26), and 4,4'-bis(3,3-dimethylbutyl)-[3,3'-bifuran]-2,2'(5H,5'H)-dione (2.27); General procedure for 1,6radical addition optimization reported in Table 2.2. (Table 2.2, entry 1 is described): A solution of 4-vinylfuran-2-one (2.6) $)^{32}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.53 \mathrm{M}, 610 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to a 1-dram vial and the solution was concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue was immediately dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1.5 mL , previously sparged with Ar for 5 min ) under an argon atmosphere. After sequential addition of ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide 2.24 (64 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Hantzsch ester $\mathbf{2 . 2 8}^{33}(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}), i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.57$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and a solution of $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}{ }^{10}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.01 \mathrm{M}, 260 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.003 \mathrm{mmol})$ under Ar , the 1 -dram vial was capped and placed in the center of a $30-\mathrm{cm}$ loop of blue LEDs. The reaction mixture was stirred at rt under visible light irradiation for 18 h , after which a solution of 1,4-dimethoxybenzene ( $36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1 mL ) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 min and a small aliquot was removed and concentrated under reduced pressure. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the residue and
comparison of relative peak integrations using 1,4-dimethoxybenzene as an internal standard was used to determine the yield of products obtained. Silica gel chromatography ( $10 \%$ acetone/hexanes) of the crude mixture provided analytically pure samples of $\mathbf{2 . 2 5}$, 2.26, and 2.27.


4-(3,3-Dimethylbutyl)furan-2(5H)-one (2.25): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.16$ ( $10 \%$ acetone/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.80-5.83(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.74$ (s, 2H), 2.32-2.38 (m, 2H), 1.43-1.48 (m, 2H), 0.93 (s, 9H);
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.3,171.4,115.1,73.2,41.2,30.4,29.2,24.2$; IR (thin film) 2955, 2868, 1781, 1748, 1638, $1027 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$, $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$191.1048, found 191.1054.


E- and Z- 4-(3,3-Dimethylbutylidene)dihydrofuran-2(3H)one (2.26, a 2.6:1 mixture of double-bond isomers): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.3(10 \%$ acetone/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of isomers) $\delta$ 5.50-5.60 (m, 1H, major and minor isomers), 4.85-4.88 ( $\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, major and minor isomers), 3.22-3.25 (m, 2H, major isomer), 3.13-3.15 (m, 2H, minor isomer), 1.90 (d, J $=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, minor isomer), $1.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, major isomer), $0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}$, major and minor isomers); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of isomers): $\delta 175.9,175.8$, $130.1,129.6,122.7,122.2,72.5,70.7,43.9,42.6,34.0,31.9,31.73,31.68,29.34,29.29$; IR (thin film) 2955, 1785, 1364, 1163, $1028 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$191.1048, found 191.1057.

dione (2.27): $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.12$ ( $10 \%$ acetone/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.87(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.50(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.91$ $(\mathrm{s}, 18 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 172.1, 169.7, 117.3, 72.2 , 41.6, 30.7, 29.1, 24.4; IR (thin film) 2955, 1756, 1620, 1157, $1030 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 357.2042$, found 357.2043.

(1R,2R,4aR,8aS)-(+)-4-(2-(1,2,4a-Trimethyl-5-methylenedeca-hydronaphthalen-1-yl)ethyl)furan-2(5H)-one (2.2). A 1-dram vial was charged with ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $2.7(20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and a magnetic stir bar under argon. A solution of 4-vinylfuran-2-one 2.6 ( $105 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.068 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, followed by $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. After sequential addition of Hantzsch ester $2.28(66 \mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}{ }^{10}(0.01 \mathrm{M}$ in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}\right)$ and $i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol})$, the vial was capped and placed in the center of a $30-\mathrm{cm}$ loop of blue LEDs. The heterogeneous reaction mixture was stirred for 18 h , after which it was transferred to a separatory funnel containing $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 30 mL ). The organic layer was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(4 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and aqueous $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The ether layer was filtered and concentrated in vacuo to provide a yellow crude solid mixture that was suspended in $7 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes and filtered through a plug of silica gel (eluting with $200 \mathrm{~mL} 7 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes). Concentration of the filtrate provided a mixture of butenolide 2.2 and the corresponding $\beta, \gamma$-unsaturated lactone products (a mixture of $E$ - and $Z$ - olefins). The product mixture was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{DBU}(9 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added.

The colorless solution was maintained at rt for 10 min , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with aqueous $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The ether layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give butenolide $\mathbf{2 . 2}(11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.038$ mmol, $74 \%$, dr $>20: 1$ ) as a thin film. Spectral data were consistent with previously reported data: ${ }^{3} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.40(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.80(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.50(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.32-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.87(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.05$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.09-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.2,171.2,160.2,115.0,103.0,73.2,48.8,40.1,39.4,37.3,36.8,35.3,33.0$, 28.7, 27.4, 22.3, 21.9, 20.9, 18.1, 16.1. $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+6.2,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{577}+5.5,[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{546}+8.0$, $[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{435}+13.3,[\alpha]^{22.8}{ }_{405}+14.0\left(c=0.35, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

${ }^{1} H$ NMR Data

| position | $\begin{gathered} \text { literature } \mathbf{2 . 2}^{\mathbf{3}} \\ (500 \mathrm{MHz}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { synthetic } \mathbf{2 . 2} \\ (600 \mathrm{MHz}) \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | not reported | $\begin{aligned} & 1.54-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), \\ & 1.92-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 2 | not reported | $\begin{gathered} \text { and } \\ 1.34-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 3 | not reported | $2.32-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}),$ <br> and | -- |
|  |  | 2.15-2.07 (m, 1H) |  |
| 6 | not reported | $\begin{aligned} & 1.64-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), \\ & \text { and } \end{aligned}$ | -- |
|  |  | 1.54-1.44 (m, 1H), |  |
| 7 | not reported | $1.54-1.44$ (m, 2H), | -- |
| 8 | not reported | 1.54-1.44 (m, 1H), | -- |
| 10 | not reported | $1.09-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
|  |  | $1.44-1.37$ (m, 1H) |  |
| 11 | not reported | and | -- |
|  |  | 1.64-1.55 (m, 1H), |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.32-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), \\ \text { and } \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 12 | not reported | 2.15-2.07 (m, 1H) |  |
| 14 | 5.81 (s) | 5.80 (br s, 1H) | -0.01 |
| 16 | 4.72 (s) | 4.70 (br s, 3 H ) | -0.02 |
| 17 | $0.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$ | 0.80 (d, $J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, | -0.02 |
| 18 | 4.51 (s) | 4.50 (br s, 2H) | -0.01 |
| 19 | 1.06 (s) | 1.05 (s, 3H) | -0.01 |
| 20 | 0.79 (s) | 0.78 (s, 3H) | -0.02 |


${ }^{13}$ C NMR Data

| position | literature 2.2 <br> $(100.6 \mathrm{MHz})$ | literature $\mathbf{2 . 2}^{\mathbf{3}}$ <br> $(125 \mathrm{MHz})$ | synthetic 2.2 <br> $(126 \mathrm{MHz})$ | $\Delta \delta[$ Lit. 3] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 21.8 | 21.7 | 21.9 | 0.2 |
| 2 | $22.2^{*}$ | $32.9^{*}$ | 28.7 | 0.1 |
| 3 | $32.9^{*}$ | $28.6^{*}$ | 33.0 | 0.1 |
| 4 | 160.4 | 160.1 | 160.2 | 0.1 |
| 5 | $39.3^{*}$ | 40.0 | 40.1 | 0.1 |
| 6 | $27.4^{*}$ | 37.2 | 37.3 | 0.1 |
| 7 | $37.3^{*}$ | 27.3 | 27.4 | 0.1 |
| 8 | $36.8^{*}$ | 36.7 | 36.8 | 0.1 |
| 9 | $40.0^{*}$ | 39.2 | 39.4 | 0.2 |
| 10 | $48.8^{*}$ | 48.7 | 48.8 | 0.1 |
| 11 | $28.6^{*}$ | 35.2 | 35.3 | 0.1 |
| 12 | $35.3^{*}$ | 22.3 | 22.3 | 0.0 |
| 13 | 170.9 | 171.1 | 171.2 | 0.1 |
| 14 | 115.0 | 114.9 | 115.0 | 0.1 |
| 15 | 174.0 | 174.0 | 174.2 | 0.2 |
| 16 | 73.0 | 73.0 | 73.2 | 0.2 |
| 17 | 15.9 | 16.0 | 16.1 | 0.1 |
| 18 | 102.8 | 102.8 | 103.0 | 0.2 |
| 19 | $18.3^{*}$ | 20.7 | 20.9 | 0.2 |
| 20 | $20.8^{*}$ | 17.9 | 18.1 | 0.2 |



## 4-(2-((1S,2R)-1,2,5,5-Tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-

 octahydronaphthalen-1-yl)ethyl)furan-2(5H)-one (2.32): A 1-dram vial was charged with exocyclic olefin 2.2 ( $11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.036 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(200 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and camphorsulfonic acid ( $10 \mathrm{mg}, 0.044 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). Thevial was capped, sealed with Teflon tape, and was placed in an aluminum block preheated to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was maintained at this temperature for 66 h and then removed from the aluminum block and allowed to cool to rt. The vial was opened and the reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, washed with aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(2 \times 15$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and brine ( $2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography to provide ent-halimane diterpenoid 2.32 as a colorless oil $(6.4 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 59 \%): \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.58(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.82$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.07-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-$ $1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.30(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.3,171.6,138.7,131.3,115.0,73.3,40.8,40.0,34.7,33.8,33.4,29.4$, 27.7, 27.2, 25.9, 25.4, 23.8, 21.0, 20.0, 16.3; IR (thin film) 2925, 2866, 1779, 1749, 1458, 1168; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na},(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$325.2144, found 325.2136; $[\alpha]^{21.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+12.5,[\alpha]^{21.9}{ }_{577}+11.6,[\alpha]^{21.9}{ }_{546}+12.9,[\alpha]^{21.8}{ }_{435}+16.2,[\alpha]^{21.9}{ }_{405}+24.0(c=0.50$, $\mathrm{MeOH})$.

${ }^{1}$ H NMR Data

| position | literature 2.32 ( 500 MHz ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { synthetic } \mathbf{2 . 3 2} \\ (600 \mathrm{MHz}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | not reported | 2.05-1.99 (m, 2H) | -- |
| 2 | not reported | $1.66-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 3 | not reported | $\begin{aligned} & 1.59-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \text { and } \\ & 1.40-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 6 | not reported | $\begin{aligned} & 1.99-1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \text { and } \\ & 1.66-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 7 | not reported | $\begin{aligned} & 1.59-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \text { and } \\ & 1.40-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 8 | not reported | $\begin{gathered} 1.59-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \text { and } \\ 1.40-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 11 | not reported | $1.66-1.52$ (m, 2H) | -- |
| 12 | not reported | $\begin{gathered} 2.34-2.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \text { and } \\ 2.07-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 14 | 5.83 (s) | 5.82 (s, 1H) | -0.01 |
| 16 | 4.74 (s) | 4.73 (s, 2H) | -0.01 |
| 17 | 0.86 (d, $J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz})$ | 0.86 (d, $J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | 0.00 |
| 18 | 0.97 (s) | 0.97 (s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| 19 | 0.99 (s) | 0.99 (s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| 20 | 0.87 (s) | 0.86 (s, 3H) | -0.01 |



## ${ }^{13}$ C NMR Data

| position | literature $\mathbf{2 . 3 2}^{\mathbf{3}}$ <br> $(125 \mathrm{MHz})$ | synthetic $\mathbf{2 . 3 2}$ <br> $(126 \mathrm{MHz})$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 25.2 | 25.4 | +0.2 |
| 2 | 19.8 | 20.0 | +0.2 |
| 3 | 39.8 | 40.0 | +0.2 |
| 4 | 34.5 | 34.7 | +0.2 |
| 5 | 138.6 | 138.7 | +0.1 |
| 6 | 25.8 | 25.9 | +0.1 |
| 7 | 27.0 | 27.2 | +0.2 |
| 8 | 33.7 | 33.8 | +0.1 |
| 9 | 40.7 | 40.8 | +0.1 |
| 10 | 131.1 | 131.3 | +0.2 |
| 11 | 33.3 | 33.4 | +0.1 |
| 12 | 23.6 | 23.8 | +0.2 |
| 13 | 171.4 | 171.6 | +0.2 |
| 14 | 114.9 | 115.0 | +0.1 |
| 15 | 174.0 | 174.3 | +0.3 |
| 16 | 73.1 | 73.3 | +0.2 |
| 17 | 16.1 | 16.3 | +0.2 |
| 18 | 27.6 | 27.7 | +0.1 |
| 19 | 29.2 | 29.4 | +0.2 |
| 20 | 20.9 | 21.0 | +0.1 |


(-)-4-1,2,4a,5-Tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,7,8,8a-octahydronap-hthalen-1-yl)ethyl)furan-2(5H)-one ((-)-solidagolactone) (2.3). A 1-dram vial was charged with exocyclic olefin 2.2 ( $19 \mathrm{mg}, 0.062 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{RhCl}_{3}$ hydrate ( $3 \mathrm{mg}, 38-41 \% \mathrm{Rh}$ ), and a magnetic stir bar. After the addition of $\mathrm{EtOH}(1.3 \mathrm{~mL})$, the vial was capped with a Teflon ${ }^{\circledR}$-coated cap and sealed with Teflon ${ }^{\circledR}$ tape. The black heterogeneous mixture was heated to $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stirred for 18 h . The vial was then allowed to cool to rt and the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide ( - )-solidagolactone (2.3) (13 mg, $0.044 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%$ ) as a thin film. Spectral data were in excellent agreement with previously reported data: ${ }^{3} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.40\left(3: 1\right.$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $5.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.32-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22-2.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.03$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{apt} \mathrm{d}, J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65($ apt d, $J=13.6,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.54-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.2,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.12(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $0.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.2$, $171.4,144.4,120.4,115.0,73.2,46.5,38.7,38.2,36.8,36.4,35.3,27.4,26.9,22.3,20.0$, $18.4,18.2,18.1,16.1 .[\alpha]^{23.0} \mathrm{D}-26.3,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{577}-25.9,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{546}-28.1,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{435}-53.4$, $[\alpha]{ }^{23.0}{ }_{405}-67.9\left(c=0.32, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

${ }^{1}$ H NMR Data

| position | $\begin{gathered} \text { literature } \mathbf{2 . 3}^{3} \\ (500 \mathrm{MHz}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { synthetic } \mathbf{2 . 3} \\ (600 \mathrm{MHz}) \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | not reported | $1.54-1.38$ (m, 2H), | -- |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.99-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), \\ \text { and } \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 2 | not reported | 2.09-2.03 (m, 1H) |  |
| 3 | 5.19 (br s, 1H) | 5.17 (br s, 1H) | -0.02 |
|  |  | 1.71 (apt d, $J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, |  |
| 6 | not reported | and | -- |
|  |  | $1.20-1.12$ (m, 1H), |  |
| 7 | not reported | $1.54-1.38$ (m, 2H), | -- |
| 8 | not reported | 1.54-1.38 (m, 1H), | -- |
| 10 | not reported | $\begin{gathered} 1.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.2,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \\ 1.65(\mathrm{apt} \mathrm{td}, J=13.6,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{gathered}$ | -- |
| 11 | not reported | and | -- |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.54-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), \\ & 2.32-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 12 | not reported | and | -- |
|  |  | 2.22-2.14 (m, 1H) |  |
| 14 | 5.83 (s, 1H) | 5.81 (s, 1H) | -0.02 |
| 16 | 4.73 (s, 2H) | 4.71 (s, 2 H ) | -0.02 |
| 17 | $0.82(\mathrm{~d}, ~ J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | 0.79 (d, J = 5.2 Hz, 3H), | -0.03 |
| 18 | 1.59 (s, 3H) | 1.56 (s, 3H) | -0.03 |
| 19 | 1.01 (s, 3H) | 0.99 (s, 3H) | -0.02 |
| 20 | 0.78 (s, 3H) | 0.75 (s, 3H) | -0.03 |


${ }^{13}$ C NMR Data

| position | literature $\mathbf{2 . 3}^{\mathbf{3}}$ <br> $(125 \mathrm{MHz})$ | synthetic $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ <br> $(\mathbf{1 2 6 \mathrm { MHz } )}$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 18.3 | 18.4 | +0.1 |
| 2 | 26.8 | 26.9 | +0.1 |
| 3 | 120.2 | 120.4 | +0.2 |
| 4 | 144.4 | 144.4 | +0.0 |
| 5 | 38.7 | 38.7 | +0.0 |
| 6 | 36.7 | 36.8 | +0.1 |
| 7 | 27.3 | 27.4 | +0.1 |
| 8 | 36.3 | 36.4 | +0.1 |
| 9 | 38.2 | 38.2 | 0.0 |
| 10 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 0.0 |
| 11 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 0.0 |
| 12 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 0.0 |
| 13 | 171.2 | 171.4 | +0.2 |
| 14 | 115.0 | 115.0 | 0.0 |
| 15 | 174.0 | 174.2 | +0.2 |
| 16 | 73.1 | 73.2 | +0.1 |
| 17 | 16.0 | 16.1 | +0.1 |
| 18 | 17.9 | 18.1 | +0.2 |
| 19 | 19.9 | 20.0 | +0.1 |
| 20 | 18.1 | 18.2 | +0.1 |


(-)-16-Hydroxycleroda-3,13 (14)Z-dien-15,16-olide, (-)-PL3
(2.4). To a stirred solution of (-)-solidagolactone (2.3) (45 mg, 0.15 $\mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added at rt a solution of $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(29 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $0.21 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.4 \mathrm{~mL})$. After 3 min , a solution of TBSOTf ( $38 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and stirring at rt was continued for an additional 30 min , after which a solution of 2-methyl-2-butene (6 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The reaction mixture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of $m$-CPBA ( $49 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}$; technical grade $\sim 70 \%$ purity) was added and stirring was continued for 30 min at this temperature. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(0.3 \mathrm{M}, 4 \mathrm{x}$ $2 \mathrm{~mL})$, aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. This residue was purified by column chromatography (7:1 hexanes:acetone) to obtain $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ as a colorless amorphous solid ( $33 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%$ ). Spectral data were consistent with previously reported data: ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~d}, 3} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.30$ (2:1 hexanes:acetone); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(600 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.84(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.19(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72$ (apt d, $J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.63(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34($ apt d, $J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.21-1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.7,170.71, * 170.66, * 144.52, * 144.46, * 120.55, * 120.48, * 117.18, * 117.15, *$ 99.16,* 99.14,* 46.6, 38.82,* 38.79,* 38.3, 36.8, 36.48,* 36.44,* 34.93,* 34.88,* 27.5, $26.9,21.50, * 21.47, * 20.0,18.4,18.3,18.1,16.1$ (*Two sets of carbons observed as a result of $1: 1$ mixture of epimers at C 16$) ; \mathrm{mp}=163{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-21.4,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{577}-26.6$, $[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{546}-30.7,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{435}-52.4,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{405}-70.8\left(c=0.23, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

${ }^{1}$ H NMR Data

| position | $\begin{aligned} & \text { literature 2.4 }{ }^{2 \mathrm{~d}} \\ & (300 \mathrm{MHz})^{a} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | synthetic 2.4 <br> ( 600 MHz ) | $\Delta \delta^{b}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.52 (m, 2H) | 1.56-1.49 (m, 2H) | +0.01 |
| 2 | 2.04 (m, 2H) | 2.10-1.91 (m, 2H) | -0.04 |
| 3 | 5.18 (br s, 1H) | 5.19 (s, 1H), | -0.01 |
|  | 1.75 (m, 1H) | 1.72 (apt d, $J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ |  |
| 6 | and | and | -0.03 |
|  | 1.18 (m, 1H) | 1.22-1.13 (m, 1H) |  |
| 7 | 1.44 (m, 2H), | $1.49-1.40$ (m, 2H) | 0.00 |
| 8 | 1.45 (m, 1H) | 1.49-1.40 (m, 1H) | 0.00 |
| 10 | 1.34 (m, 1H) | 1.34 (apt d, $J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | 0.00 |
|  | 1.70 (m, 1H) | 1.72 (d, $J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ |  |
| 11 | and | and | +0.01 |
|  | 1.52 (m, 1H) | 1.56-1.49 (s, 1H) |  |
| 12 | 2.26 (m, 2H) | 2.44-2.10 (m, 2H) | -- |
| 14 | 5.85 (s, 1H) | 5.84 (s, 1H) | -0.01 |
| 16 | 6.07(s, 1H) | 6.00 (d, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $-0.07^{c}$ |
| 17 | $0.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | 0.81 (br s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| 18 | 1.58 (s, 3H) | 1.58 (s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| 19 | 1.00 (s, 3H) | 1.00 (s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| 20 | 0.77 (s, 3H) | 0.77 (s, 3H) | 0.00 |
| C16-OH | not reported | 4.39 (d, $J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| ${ }^{a}$ Reported as the $16 S$ isomer. ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~d}}{ }^{b}$ When a multiplet is reported as a range of chemical shifts, the center of the range is used in this comparison. ${ }^{c}$ This is attributed this larger difference to the synthetic product being a 1:1 mixture of 16 -hydroxy epimers. |  |  |  |


${ }^{13}$ C NMR Data

| position | literature 2.4 <br> $(75 \mathrm{MHz})^{a d}$ | literature 2.4 ${ }^{3}$ <br> $(125 \mathrm{MHz})^{b, c}$ | synthetic 2.4 <br> $(126 \mathrm{MHz})^{c}$ | $\Delta \delta^{d}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 18.4 | 18.3 | 18.4 | +0.1 |
| 2 | 26.9 | 26.8 | 26.9 | +0.1 |
| 3 | 120.5 | $120.3,120.4$ | $120.55,120.48^{*}$ | +0.2 |
| 4 | 144.5 | $144.3,144.3$ | $144.52,144.46^{*}$ | +0.2 |
| 5 | 38.3 | 38.1 | 38.3 | +0.2 |
| 6 | 36.9 | 36.7 | 36.8 | +0.1 |
| 7 | 27.5 | 27.4 | 27.5 | +0.1 |
| 8 | 36.5 | 36.3 .36 .3 | $36.48,36.44^{*}$ | +0.1 |
| 9 | 38.8 | $38.6,38.7$ | $38.82,38.79^{*}$ | +0.2 |
| 10 | 46.6 | 46.5 | 46.60 | +0.1 |
| 11 | 35.0 | $34.8,34.8$ | $34.93,34.88^{*}$ | +0.1 |
| 12 | 21.5 | $21.3,21.4$ | $21.50,21.47^{*}$ | +0.2 |
| 13 | 170.4 | 171.0 | $170.71,170.66^{*}$ | -0.3 |
| 14 | 117.6 | 116.8 | $117.18,117.15^{*}$ | -0.4 |
| 15 | 172.0 | 172.0 | 171.7 | -0.3 |
| 16 | $101.8^{e}$ | 99.3 | $99.16,99.14^{*}$ | -0.1 |
| 17 | 16.1 | 15.9 | 16.1 | +0.2 |
| 18 | 18.1 | 17.9 | 18.1 | +0.2 |
| 19 | 20.0 | 19.9 | 20.0 | +0.1 |
| 20 | 18.3 | 18.1 | 18.3 | +0.2 |

${ }^{a}$ Reported as the $16 S$ isomer. ${ }^{2 \mathrm{~d} b}$ Reported as a 1:1 mixture of 16 -hydroxy epimers. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{c}$ Asterisk indicates that two signals are observed for this carbon in the $1: 1$ mixture of 16 hydroxy epimers. ${ }^{d}$ This comparison is for the natural and synthetic $1: 1$ mixture of 16 hydroxy epimers. ${ }^{e}$ The larger chemical shift of this carbon is undoubtedly a result of this sample being a single hydroxyl epimer, whereas the signals reported in columns 3 and 4 are for this carbon of a $1: 1$ mixture of hydroxyl epimers. $0.076 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ DIBAL- H $(150 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.150 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ solution in hexanes). After 30 min , MeOH was added and the acetone/dry ice bath was removed. The reaction was allowed to warm to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(270 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.530 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The mixture was stirred for 30 min at rt . The organic phase was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting residue was purified by flash chromatography (20:1 to $10: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc) to obtain (-)-annonene (2.5) as a colorless oil ( $16 \mathrm{mg}, 0.056 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%$ ). Spectral data were consistent with previously reported data: ${ }^{6,34} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.69\left(10: 1\right.$ hexanes:EtOAc); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.27(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.41$ $(\mathrm{m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.24-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.74(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 144.7,142.8,138.5,126.0,120.6,111.2,46.6,38.9$, $38.7,38.3,37.0,36.4,27.6,27.0,20.1,18.44,18.43,18.3,18.2,16.2 ;[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{D}-28.9$, $[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{577}-29.2,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{546}-31.6,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{435}-56.4,[\alpha]^{23.0}{ }_{405}-68.9\left(c=0.71, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

${ }^{1}$ H NMR Data

| position | literature 2.5 <br> $(100.6 \mathrm{MHz})$ | synthetic 2.5 <br> $(500 \mathrm{MHz})$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.75-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 2 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $2.11-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 3 | $5.20(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | +0.01 |
| 6 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.75-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 7 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.75-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 8 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.24-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 10 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.75-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 11 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.75-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 12 | $1.27-2.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | $2.36-2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ | -- |
| 14 | $6.27(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $6.27(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, | -- |
| 15 | $7.37(\mathrm{t}, J=2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H})$ | $7.35(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, | -0.02 |
| 16 | $7.22(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | $7.21(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ | -0.01 |
| 17 | $0.83(\mathrm{~d} \mathrm{J=5Hz,3H)}$ | $0.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | -0.00 |
| 18 | $1.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | $1.61(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | -0.02 |
| 19 | $1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | $0.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | -0.01 |
| 20 | $0.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | $0.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |



## ${ }^{13}$ C NMR Data

| position | literature $\mathbf{2 . 5}^{\mathbf{3 4}}$ <br> $(\mathbf{1 2 5 ~ M H z})$ | synthetic $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ <br> $(126 \mathrm{MHz})$ | $\Delta \delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 18.2 | 18.3 | +0.1 |
| 2 | 26.7 | 27.0 | +0.3 |
| 3 | 120.6 | 120.6 | 0 |
| 4 | 143.7 | 144.7 | $+1.0^{\text {a }}$ |
| 5 | 37.9 | 38.3 | +0.4 |
| 6 | 36.6 | 37.0 | +0.4 |
| 7 | 27.4 | 27.6 | +0.2 |
| 8 | 36.2 | 36.4 | +0.2 |
| 9 | 38.4 | 38.7 | +0.3 |
| 10 | 46.1 | 46.6 | +0.5 |
| 11 | 38.5 | 38.9 | +0.4 |
| 12 | 18.2 | 18.44 | +0.24 |
| 13 | 125.2 | 126.0 | +0.8 |
| 14 | 110.7 | 111.2 | +0.5 |
| 15 | 142.3 | 142.8 | +0.5 |
| 16 | 138.0 | 138.5 | +0.5 |
| 17 | 16.1 | 16.2 | +0.1 |
| 18 | 17.9 | 18.43 | +0.53 |
| 19 | 19.8 | 20.1 | +0.3 |
| 20 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 0 |
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## Chapter 3: Studies Toward the Total Synthesis of Macfarlandin C

### 3.1 Introduction

Macfarlandin C (3.1) is a rearranged spongian diterpene first isolated from the marine nudibranch Chromodoris macfarlandi in 1986 by Faulkner, Clardy and coworkers. ${ }^{1}$ Like many related members of this natural product family (Figure 3.1), macfarlandin C exhibits a bicyclic hydrocarbon unit joined to a dioxabicyclooctanone moiety via the central $\mathrm{C} 8-\mathrm{C} 14$ bond. ${ }^{2}$ Although this general feature is common among most rearranged spongian diterpenes, the two conjoined bicycles can exist in various

Figure 3.1 Representative rearranged spongian diterpenes

different permutations. For example, the hydrophobic unit present in macfarlandin C is a functionalized octahydronaphthalene ring system, whereas many other rearranged spongian diterpenes bear a cis-perhydroazulene or trans-hydrindane fragment, among other possibilities. Additionally, the highly oxygenated portion of these diterpenes can vary greatly; two of the notably more complex motifs are the dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octan-3-
one (macfarlandin $C$ (3.1), norrisolide (3.2) and dendrillolide $A$ (3.5)), and dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-ones (macfarlandin E (3.3) and aplyviolene (3.4)).

The structural similarity between the many known rearranged spongian diterpenes has prompted speculation that they share a common biosynthetic precursor. ${ }^{2}$ As many spongian diterpenes have been isolated that possess the general skeleton 3.7, it has been proposed that enzymatic oxidations and structural rearrangements from precursors such as 3.7 account for the variety of diverse natural products in this family. A commonly invoked biosynthetic process is oxidative cleavage of the C9-C11 bond in 3.7. ${ }^{2}$ This bond cleavage is thought to lead to an oxidized intermediate such as 3.A, which is a proposed intermediate in the biosynthetic pathway of several rearranged spongian diterpenes. ${ }^{2,3,4}$ Further enzymatic processing of 3.A could then occur, with a skeletal shift displacing leaving group " X " to form the fused perhydroazulene unit present in dendrillolide $\mathrm{A}(\mathbf{3 . 5})$ or alternatively the octahydronaphthalene fragment found in macfarlandin $C$ (3.1). The bicyclic lactone moiety could similarly be formed via extensive oxidation of the tetrahydrofuran ring. ${ }^{2,4}$

Figure 3.2: Proposed biosynthetic pathway


A diverse array of biological activities has been reported for members of the rearranged spongian diterpene family. ${ }^{1,2}$ In particular, the Overman group's interest in this category of natural products arose not only from the structural complexity of these diterpenes but also from the remarkable effects that several members exhibit on the Golgi
apparatus. ${ }^{5}$ Specifically, norrisolide (3.2) and simplified analogs have been reported to fragment the Golgi ribbon into stacks that are then dispersed throughout the cytosol. ${ }^{5,6}$ By contrast, recent collaborative studies between the Overman and Sütterlin groups at UC Irvine revealed that macfarlandin E also acts to induce considerable alterations of Golgi structure in normal rat kidney (NRK) cells; however, these fragments remain localized in the pericentriolar region of the cell. ${ }^{5}$ This disruption of Golgi structure was also demonstrated to affect protein secretion via blockage of Golgi to membrane transport. ${ }^{5}$ Speculating that the highly oxidized bicyclooctanone moiety was responsible for the observed biological effects, synthetic analogs (3.8) and (3.9) were prepared, which are effectively simplified congeners of macfarlandin E (3.3) and aplyviolene (3.4) in which the cis-perhydroazulene moiety has been replaced with a simple tert-butyl group. ${ }^{5,7}$ Related analogs (3.10) and (3.11) were also synthesized, which are simplified forms of macfarlandin C (3.1) and dendrillolide A (3.5). Analog $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ bears an additional acetoxy group adjacent to the lactone carbonyl (Figure 3.3).

Figure 3.3: Simplified rearranged spongian diterpene analogs



A Golgi phenotype nearly identical to that effected by macfarlandin E (3.3) was observed for 3.8, while compound $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ induced no Golgi modification. ${ }^{5,7}$ Not surprisingly, the bicyclo[3.3.0]octanones $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 1 1}$ exhibited the same trend, where treatment of NRK cells with acetoxylated bicycle $\mathbf{3 . 1 0}$ caused significant disruption of Golgi
structure. ${ }^{7}$ Des-acetoxy congener 3.11, however, elicited no biological response. These results suggested that the acetoxy group adjacent to the carbonyl plays a critical role in inducing the Golgi phenotype observed. ${ }^{5,7}$ Bioconjugation studies conducted by the Overman group subsequently contributed evidence for the precise role of this functional group, suggesting that conjugation may occur via the mechanism depicted in Figure 3.4. Degradation of either the dioxabicylclo[3.2.1]octanone or the dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octanone ring systems by a cellular nucleophile may first occur to generate dialdehyde intermediate 3.B, which engages in Paal-Knorr pyrrole formation with the primary amine group of enzymatic lysine residues. The acetoxy group of 3.C could then be ejected in a gramine-type fragmentation, generating electrophilic intermediate 3.D that was shown to be intercepted by additional amino groups in bioconjugation experiments to provide amines such as 3.E. ${ }^{7}$

Figure 3.4: Proposed bioconjugation mechanism


The effect of macfarlandin C (3.1) on Golgi structure and function has not yet been studied. Based on the proposed mechanism of action of macfarlandin E (3.3) and the simplified analogs depicted in Figure 3.4, it is expected that macfarlandin C (3.1) will not
elicit the Golgi fragmentation phenotype, as it lacks an acetoxy group at C12. In order to assess the in vitro activity of macfarlandin C , the Overman lab chose to prepare this molecule, potentially as well as C12-acetoxylated variants, by total synthesis. Access to significant amounts of macfarlandin $C$ (3.1) would enable the comparison of any observed biological activity to that exhibited by previously studied members of the rearranged spongian diterpene family.

Central to the proposed synthetic approach toward macfarlandin C was stereoselective construction of the key C8-C14 bond by a photoredox-catalyzed radical coupling. ${ }^{8,9}$ Recent advances in the development of tertiary alcohol-derived radical precursors strongly suggested that generation of the required tertiary carbon radical would be possible via the corresponding hemioxalate salt $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}^{9}$ in the coupling reaction with butenolide 3.13 ${ }^{\mathbf{1 0}}$ depicted in Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.5: Proposed key radical coupling step


### 3.2 Previous work: Decalin Synthesis

To obtain radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ for the key radical coupling step, an efficient synthesis of the corresponding decalin tertiary alcohol was required. At the onset, it was speculated that the hemioxalate salt of either epimer of the precursor alcohol would be effective for generating a tertiary radical to couple with butenolide 3.13, so the intitial
synthesis plan targeted either epimer of the alcohol (or a mixture of the epimers if they were obtained). The synthesis of the decalin framework itself was not expected to be straightforward, as the trisubstituted olefin of carbons C1 and C10 gives the bicyclic ring system a bent shape significantly departed from a typical cis- or trans- decalin. The consequence of this ring shape is that the molecule does not have well-defined axial and equatorial positions, preventing one from drawing on established reactivity to functionalize cis- or trans- decalin ring systems. Interestingly, however, an attractive carbonyl-ene cyclization had been previously used by Oltra and co-workers to construct a similar decalin ring system (Equation 3.1). ${ }^{11}$ It was anticipated that a nearly identical substrate bearing an additional alkenyl methyl group would cyclize stereoselectively to directly provide the tertiary alcohol required to access a radical precursor.

## Equation 3.1



Dr. André Dieskau designed an expedient route to synthesize racemic tertiary alcohol rac-3.15 using a similar carbonyl-ene cyclization (Scheme 3.1). ${ }^{12}$ The synthesis of rac-3.15 begins with conjugate methyl cuprate addition to 3-methylcyclohexenone (3.16) to generate an enolate which was subsequently trapped with aldehyde 3.17 to provide a mixture of alcohols 3.18. Mesylation of the aldol products and elimination with DBU afforded a mixture of regioisomeric olefins $\mathbf{3 . 1 9}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 2 0}$ in $60 \%$ yield over the three steps. This mixture of olefins converged in the ensuing hydrogenation step mediated by $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$, forming ketone rac-3.21 in high yield. Cyclization precursor rac-

Scheme 3.1 Synthesis of alcohol rac-3.15

3.22 was then generated as a single olefin isomer by Wittig ethylidenation of rac-3.21 followed by resin-assisted purification. The critical carbonyl-ene reaction proceeded readily in the presence of catalytic p-toluenesulfonic acid in wet $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ at room termperature after in situ ketal deprotection to provide tertiary alcohol rac-3.15 in $85 \%$ yield as a single diastereomer. ${ }^{13}$ It was anticipated that the synthesis of this decalin fragment could be rendered enantioselective by performing an enantioselective hydrogenation of enone 3.19. ${ }^{14}$

### 3.3 Previous Work: Bicyclic Lactone Synthesis

The dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octan-3-one fragment of macfarlandin C (3.1) also poses a considerable synthetic challenge. In particular, establishing the relative stereochemistry of substituents on the lower tetrahydrofuran ring would require careful execution. The bicyclic lactone of macfarlandin C (3.1) as well as those of dendrillolide A (3.5) and norrisolide (3.2) are significantly challenging due to the presence of a large substituent (either the decalin, cis-perhydroazulene, or vinylhydrindane, respectively) on the concave face of the bicyclooctanone. The steric interaction of these substituents with the bicyclic
lactone framework is maximized when this substituent resides on the concave face, and as a result complicates the synthesis of these structural motifs.

To date, two total syntheses of norrisolide (3.2) have been completed that demonstrate successful methods for constructing dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octan-3-one units. The first synthesis of norrisolide was published in 2004 by Theodorakis and co-workers, and featured a Diels-Alder cycloaddition of butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}$ with butadiene to establish the cis-stereochemistry of the C 12 and C 11 substituents (norrisolide numbering). ${ }^{15,16}$ Oxidative degradation of the cyclohexene ring of $\mathbf{3 . 2 4}$ then generated two methylcarboxaldehyde moieties that were differentiated by cyclization of the C12substituent with a lactol, thus stereoselectively forming the framework of the [3.3.0] bicycle. Incorporation of the hydrindane unit was then accomplished over several steps from 3.25 to complete Theodorakis's synthesis of norrisolide (3.2).

Scheme 3.2: Theodorakis's Diels-Alder approach toward norrisolide (3.2)


The Snapper group utilized a much different approach to the bicyclic lactone in their synthesis of norrisolide reported in 2012 (Scheme 3.3). ${ }^{17,18}$ The absolute configuration of the bicyclic lactone is established by enantioselective cyclopropanation of $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ using dimethyl diazomalonate and dirhodium catalyst 3.27 to give cyclopropane 3.28 in $70 \%$ yield, albeit in low enantioselectivity. Cyclopropane opening and intramolecular trapping of the resulting oxocarbenium ion under thermal conditions then formed bicyclooctanone 3.29 in $86 \%$ yield. This intermediate was hydrogenated using
$\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ at $60 \mathrm{~atm} \mathrm{H}_{2}$, forming 3.30 in which the carbomethoxy and methoxy groups reside on the concave face of the bicycle. Although the stereochemistry at the methoxy-bearing carbon would be erased later in the synthesis, this strategy proved successful for establishing the critical C11 and C12 stereocenters.

Scheme 3.3 Snapper's cyclopropanation-hydrogenation approach to norrisolide (3.2)


The Overman group has also developed novel approaches to the synthesis of both dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-ones and dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octan-3-ones. The simplified rearranged spongian diterpene analogs described in Figure 3.3 were prepared via a divergent route from enone $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$; the synthesis of bicyclooctanone $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ is depicted in Scheme 3.4. The synthesis of bicyclic lactone $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ commences with conjugate tert-butyl cyanocuprate addition to $\mathbf{3 . 3 1}$ and silyl protection of both the free alcohol and the intermediate enolate to provide $\mathbf{3 . 3 3}$ in excellent yield. Transformation of the ester group to a methyl ketone was carried out in $66 \%$ yield over two steps, generating enoxysilane 3.34 which was cleaved under oxidative conditions to form tricarbonyl 3.35. This intermediate engaged in acid-promoted cyclization after in situ deprotection of the silyl ether to yield tetrahydrofuran $\mathbf{3 . 3 6}$ in $65 \%$ yield as a mixture of methoxy epimers. Deprotection of the methyl ester and dimethoxy ketal groups to provide ketone 3.37,
followed by Baeyer-Villiger oxidation and lactonization efficiently gave the bicyclic lactone in $83 \%$ yield over three steps. The analogous dioxabicyclo[3.2.1]octan-3-ones were synthesized in divergent fashion from tricarbonyl 3.35.

Scheme 3.4 Overman's synthesis of bicyclic lactone 3.32


More recently, the Overman group has developed a streamlined approach for the synthesis of dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octanones that employs a DIBAL-H reductioncyclization cascade of a carboxymethyl-substituted lactone. ${ }^{19}$ A variety of substituted bicyclic lactones have been synthesized to date according to the general strategy shown in Scheme 3.5 specifically for bicyclic lactone 3.38. The sequence begins with diastereoselective coupling of a tertiary radical intermediate generated from any of a variety of possible precursors ( $N$-acyloxyphthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 3 9}$ is shown arbitrarily) with 5-methoxyfuran-2-one rac- $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ to provide lactone 3.40. Alkylation of the lithium enolate of $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ with methyl bromoacetate installs the methyl carboxymethyl side chain diastereoselectively, with the electrophile approaching from the face opposite the 1 methylcyclohexyl group. Treatment of substituted lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ with DIBAL-H results in
hydride delivery to the lactone carbonyl, generating a presumed metalated lactol intermediate that cyclizes on the pendant ester. In many cases, the bicyclic lactone so formed is in turn reduced with excess DIBAL-H present in the reaction, so the product mixture is treated with $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} /$ Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ to oxidize any bicyclic lactol formed to the desired lactone 3.38.

Scheme 3.5 Overman's DIBAL-H reduction-cyclization cascade


While the synthetic process described above can be used to construct bicyclic lactones such as $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ rapidly from coupling products such as $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$, the stereoselectivity of the alkylation of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ suggests that only dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octanones bearing the quaternary substituent on the convex face of the bicycle can be accessed via this sequence of steps. Thus, in order to apply the expedient DIBAL-H reduction-cyclization reaction to the total synthesis of macfarlandin $C$ (3.1), it would be necessary to establish the stereochemistry of the carbon center adjacent to the lactone carbonyl by another means prior to the reductive cascade.

### 3.4 Retrosynthetic Analysis

The reduction-lactonization cascade was expected to be carried out late-stage, followed by exchange of the methoxy acetal for an acetoxy group to provide
macfarlandin C (3.1) (Figure 3.6). It was anticipated that this cyclization precursor 3.42 might be generated by diastereoselective and chemoselective hydrogenation of unsaturated lactone 3.43, which in turn could arise from aldol condensation of lactone 3.14 with methyl glyoxylate. Lactone $\mathbf{3 . 1 4}$ could be formed by the photoredox-catalyzed coupling of cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ with methoxybutenolide 3.13.

Figure 3.6 Retrosynthetic analysis for macfarlandin C (3.1)


The major objectives that required consideration at the onset of this total synthesis project were the synthesis of the decalin fragment in enantioselective fashion and the stereoselective synthesis of the bicyclic lactone unit, likely initially employing a simpler model system.

### 3.5 Results and Discussion

### 3.5.1 Enantioselective Synthesis of the Decalin Fragment

It was projected that the route to racemic alcohol rac-3.15 developed by Dr. André Dieskau could be made enantioselective by employing an asymmetric hydrogenation of exocyclic enone 3.19. ${ }^{14}$ Evaluating this approach required access to regioisomerically pure enone 3.19, however. A brief survey of various conditions for dehydrating aldol
adduct 3.18 were explored with no success. It was then decided that the absolute configuration of the ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ should be set by an alternative strategy. A two-step method for forming substituted cyclohexanones in enantiopure form developed by the Knochel group was most attractive, as they had shown that even highly hindered neopentylic carbon stereocenters can be formed adjacent to ketones in a stereospecific manner. ${ }^{20}$ This two-step procedure consists of displacement of an allylic phosphate group by an organocuprate nucleophile, followed by oxidative installation of the carbonyl group. To evaluate this sequence for the enantioselective preparation of ketone 3.21, allylic phosphates rac-3.44 and $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ were prepared in racemic (Scheme 3.6) and enantiopure (Scheme 3.7) form, respectively. The synthesis of both phosphates commenced with iodination of commercially available 4,4'-dimethylcyclohexen-1-one (3.45), which occurs in high yield. Iodoenone 3.46 was then reduced using sodium borohydride in the presence of cerium trichloride to give racemic alcohol rac-3.47 in good yield. Phosphorylation of rac-3.47 proceeded in nearly quantitative yield, providing allylic phosphate rac-3.44.

## Scheme 3.6 Synthesis of allylic phosphate rac-3.44.



Enantiopure phosphate $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ was accessed in a similar manner, with the stereocontrolled formation of allylic alcohol 3.47 accomplished using a Corey-BakshiShibata reduction. ${ }^{20 b}$ The highest yields and enantioselectivities were obtained using Knochel's protocol, which required in situ generation of the active catalyst from ( $R$ )-
diphenylprolinol and trimethylborate. ${ }^{20 \mathrm{~b}}$ The use of borane-diethylaniline complex as a hydride donor was also found to be optimal. Phosphorylation of $\mathbf{3 . 4 7}$ occurred uneventfully, yielding allylic phosphate 3.44. Using this three-step sequence, quantities of enantiopure phosphate $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ in excess of 15 g could be routinely prepared.

## Scheme 3.7 Synthesis of enantiopure phosphate 3.44



The stereospecific allylic phosphate displacement was then examined under a variety of conditions. Although Knochel and coworkers demonstrated that organocuprates derived from the corresponding organozinc halides were effective in this transformation, the preparation of an organozinc halide on small scale to test the displacement reaction was exceptionally challenging. Numerous literature reports, however, described similar allylic displacement reactions using organocuprates generated from either organolithiums ${ }^{21}$ or Grignard reagents, ${ }^{21,22}$ and so these two classes of organometallic nucleophiles were examined first. The organolithium intermediate required for formation of the cuprate was efficiently generated by lithium-halogen exchange with iodide 3.48 using $t$-BuLi (Equation 3.2). Transmetalation of the resulting organolithium using CuCN and various other copper sources was somewhat unreliable, providing in some instances displacement of the allylic phosphate of rac-3.44 to provide rac-3.49 in encouraging yield. However, this reaction suffered from poor reproducibility, especially as the scale of the reaction was increased.

## Equation 3.2



In a control experiment, the intermediate organolithium generated from $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ was trapped with benzaldehyde in high yield, confirming that lithium-halogen exchange occurred efficiently. It was inferred that the transmetalation step was responsible for the disappointing results obtained with this reaction. Because lithium-halogen exchange using $t$-BuLi cannot typically be carried out in THF, this process was conducted in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, which resulted in thick, viscous solutions of the intermediate organocuprate. It was speculated that the use of a Grignard reagent, in place of the organolithium, which could be easily generated in THF and would result in more reproducible cuprate formation. Accordingly, the preparation of an alkyl Grignard reagent from bromide $\mathbf{3 . 5 0}$ and excess magnesium in THF at room temperature, followed by transmetalation of the intermediate organomagnesium halide with CuCN at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ generated a cyanocuprate reagent that efficiently displaced the allylic phosphate moiety of either rac-3.44 or $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ (Equation 3.3). When three equivalents of the bromide precursor with respect to the phosphate were used, the reaction proceeded in nearly quantitative yield. As expected, the reaction of enantioenriched phosphate $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ occurred with perfect stereospecificity to yield vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ in $99 \%$ ee. In addition, this transformation could be easily carried out on a 10 g scale with respect to phosphate $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}$ with no loss of product yield or enantiopurity.

## Equation 3.3



Vinyl iodide 3.49 was then converted to the corresponding ketone by Knochel's one-pot protocol (Scheme 3.8). ${ }^{20 \mathrm{c}}$ Exposure of 3.49 to excess $t$-BuLi in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at low temperature generated a vinyllithium that added readily to trimethyl borate. The organoboron intermediate generated in this way was subsequently oxidized in situ to provide ketone 3.21 in $80 \%$ yield.

Scheme 3.8 Synthesis and derivitization of ketone 3.21


To confirm that the transformation of vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ resulted in no loss of enantiopurity, ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was analyzed by HPLC and GC using chiral stationary phases. The resolution of rac-3.21 by these techniques was unsuccessful, so derivatization of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was explored. ${ }^{23}$ Initial attempts to condense ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ with a hydrazine derivative under neutral conditions to form the corresponding hydrazone were unsuccessful, likely because of the hindered nature of $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ and the omission of an acid catalyst in an attempt to avoid epimerization. Fortunately, the diastereoselective addition of phenyllithium to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ in the presence of cerium trichloride gave tertiary alcohol 3.51, which bears a suitable chromophore for HPLC analysis. Examination of both rac-3.51 and $\mathbf{3 . 5 1}$ by HPLC revealed that tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 1}$ was
formed in $98 \% e e$, and therefore no epimerization had occurred in the conversion of vinyl iodide 3.49 to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$.

### 3.5.2 Wittig Olefination of Ketone 3.21

After developing a concise and enantioselective route to ketone 3.21, procedures developed by Dr. André Dieskau were employed to convert $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ to a tertiary radical precursor for use in the key coupling step (Scheme 3.9). Ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was subjected to Wittig olefination under the conditions first developed by Dr. Dieskau to form trisubstituted alkene $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ in $69 \%$ yield. Carbonyl-ene cyclization then successfully converted ketal $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ to tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ as a single diastereomer in $86 \%$ yield. After a brief survey of conditions to acylate 3.15, it was determined that the formation of methyl oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ occurred most efficiently when stoichiometric DMAP was employed in dichloromethane at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Surprisingly, analysis of methyl oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase revealed that the enantiomeric purity of $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ was significantly diminished. Since the C5 (macfarlandin C numbering) methine stereocenter is not particularly labile during either the carbonyl-ene or acylation steps, it was suspected that racemization of the substrate was occurring during the course of the Wittig reaction. ${ }^{24}$ In an attempt to suppress this undesired epimerization process, numerous alternative conditions for the ethylidenation of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ were examined (Table 3.1). ${ }^{25}$

## Scheme 3.9: Synthesis of methyl oxalate 3.52




A variety of solvents and bases were employed in the olefination of ketone 3.21. All ethylidenation reactions described in Table 3.1 were conducted using ethyltriphenylphosphonium bromide as the phosphorus ylide precursor. The ketone substrate $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was added to a solution of preformed ylide at room temperature in all cases, as it was speculated that heating the reaction mixture would lead to epimerization of 3.21. The olefination was surprisingly effective in nearly every solvent examined, and even proceeded to give $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ in high yield in solvents such as hexanes (entry 3). Of all bases investigated, potassium tert-butoxide (entries 1-5) and potassium hexamethyldisilazide (entry 6) were the only bases that promoted ethylidenation. When n-butyllithium or LHMDS were used to generate the phosphorus ylide, no reactivity of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was observed. Unfortunately, every set of conditions that resulted in successful olefination of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ also caused racemization to a certain extent. Methyl oxalate 3.52 was obtained in highest enantiomeric purity ( $56 \% e e$ ) when the respective Wittig reaction was conducted using potassium tert-butoxide as a base and toluene as the solvent (entry 4).

Table 3.1 Wittig ethylidenation of ketone 3.21


| entry | solvent | base | yield 3.22 <br> $(\%)$ | ee 3.52 <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | THF | $\mathrm{KOt} t-\mathrm{Bu}$ | 69 | 44 |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{KOt} t-\mathrm{Bu}$ | 80 | 5 |
| 3 | hexanes | $\mathrm{KO} t-\mathrm{Bu}$ | 94 | 6 |
| 4 | PhMe | $\mathrm{KO} t-\mathrm{Bu}$ | 89 | 56 |
| 5 | DME | $\mathrm{KO} t-\mathrm{Bu}$ | 93 | 28 |
| 6 | PhMe | KHMDS | 99 | 24 |

After evaluating several conditions for the olefination of 3.21, it was still not evident which specific reagent or intermediate was promoting epimerization of the substrate. The base employed in every Wittig reaction described is certainly capable of racemizing ketone 3.21; however, it is well-known that phosphorus ylides such as the one presumably generated in this reaction are also sufficiently basic and capable of racemizing the substrate. ${ }^{24}$ To directly examine if the phosphonium ylide intermediate generated in these reactions epimerized the ketone substrate in the absence of exogenous base, a "salt- and base-free" Wittig reaction was conducted. ${ }^{26}$ Ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was exposed to a homogeneous solution of the ylide generated from ethyltriphenylphosphonium bromide and sodamide in toluene, ${ }^{27}$ providing exocyclic olefin $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ in $80 \%$ yield (Scheme 3.10). However, conversion of olefin $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ to the corresponding methyl oxalate 3.52 over two steps revealed a significant loss of enantiopurity. This result suggested that the ylide intermediate generated under any set of conditions could likely promote
racemization and that the Wittig reaction would not be a useful method for the preparation of a radical precursor in enantiopure form.

## Scheme 3.10 Salt- and base-free Wittig reaction of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$



Various other reactions using less basic olefinating agents were then briefly examined with ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ (Table 3.2). Horner-Wadsworth-Emmons ${ }^{28}$ olefination of ketone 3.21 with the stabilized ylide derived from trimethylphosphonoacetate (entry 1) resulted in only poor conversion of $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$, giving unacceptable yields of the $\alpha, \beta$ -

## Table 3.2 Attempted olefination of ketone 3.21



| entry | conditions | R | result |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{MeO}_{2} \mathrm{CCH}_{2} \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{O})(\mathrm{OMe})_{2}, \mathrm{NaH}$, THF, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt | $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$ | $<20 \%$ <br> conversion |
| 2 | $\mathrm{EtSO}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}, \mathrm{LHMDS}$, <br> THF, $0-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Me | no conversion |
| 3 | $\mathrm{EtSO}_{2}$ (benzothiazole), LHMDS, THF, 0-65 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Me | no conversion |
| 4 | $\mathrm{EtSO}_{2}$ (2-phenyltetrazole), <br> LHMDS, THF, $0-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Me | no conversion |
| 5 | $\mathrm{CrCl}_{2}, \mathrm{CHI}_{3}, \mathrm{THF}, \mathrm{rt}$ | I | no conversion |
| 6 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{CHCH}_{3}, \mathrm{Zn}, \mathrm{PbCl}_{2}, \mathrm{TiCl}_{4}, \\ \mathrm{THF}, \mathrm{rt} \end{gathered}$ | Me | no conversion |

unsaturated ester product. Similarly, attempted Julia olefination ${ }^{29}$ (entry 2 ) or "modified" Julia olefination ${ }^{30}$ (entries 3 and 4) of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ was unsuccessful, returning only
unreacted 3.21. Takai-Utimoto iodomethylenation ${ }^{31}$ (entry 5) or ethylidenation ${ }^{32}$ (entry 6) reactions also to failed to convert ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ to a synthetically useful product. Unable to advance ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ to the desired methyl oxalate radical precursor $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ in enantiopure form, the use of ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ as a synthetic intermediate was abandoned.

### 3.5.3 Vinyl Coupling and 1,4-Hydrogenation

The efficiency and high enantioselectivity in which vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ could be prepared suggested that an alternative synthetic pathway to transform $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ to carbonylene precursor $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ would be worth investigating. Installation of the ethyl moiety directly from vinyl iodide 3.49, while avoiding labile ketone intermediate 3.21, was at this time the most attractive and logical strategy for preventing undesired racemization of the substrate. It was reasoned that appendage of a vinyl unit followed by functionalization of the resulting diene intermediate might be successful in converting iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ to cyclization precursor 3.22.

The vinylation of iodide rac-3.49 via a transition metal-catalyzed cross-coupling was next examined under several conditions (Table 3.3). ${ }^{33}$ Kumada coupling ${ }^{34}$ (entry 1) of rac-3.49 with vinylmagnesium bromide in the presence of $5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{PdCl}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}$ resulted in $50 \%$ conversion of iodide rac-3.49 to diene rac-3.53. Increasing the catalyst loading to $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ (entry 2 ) gave full conversion of the starting material, and diene rac3.53 was isolated in $64 \%$ yield. However, the product obtained in this reaction was contaminated with a significant amount of protodeiodinated starting material. It was speculated that replacing the reactive Grignard reagent employed in this coupling with a milder nucleophile might result in cleaner reactivity of iodide rac-3.49. A brief survey of
other established cross-coupling methods using alternative organometallic coupling partners was then conducted. Specifically, the Stille ${ }^{35}$ (entry 4), Suzuki ${ }^{36}$ (entry 5) and Negishi ${ }^{37}$ (entries 6 and 7) couplings were examined. The Negishi coupling was found to give exceptionally clean reactivity of iodide rac-3.49, perhaps because it could be executed at room temperature. Using $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of catalyst $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$ promoted full conversion of the iodide starting material and provided diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ in $93 \%$ isolated yield. ${ }^{38}$ As expected, enantiopure vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ reacted identically under these conditions to provide enantiopure diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$.

Table 3.3 Vinylation of iodide rac-3.49


| entry | conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { ratio } \\ r a c-3.49: r a c-3.53 \end{gathered}$ | yield of rac- $3.53 \text { (\%) }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHMgBr}$, cat. $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}$ THF, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt | 1:1 | - |
| $2^{\text {b }}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHMgBr}$, cat. $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}$ THF, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt | 0: 1 | 64 |
| $3^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHMgBr}$, cat. $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$ THF, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt | $1.7: 1$ | - |
| $4^{a}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHSn}(n \mathrm{Bu})_{3} \text {, cat. } \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \\ \text { DMF, } 90^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | 1:1.7 | - |
| $5^{b}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHBF}_{3} \mathrm{~K} \text {, cat. } \mathrm{Pd}(\text { dppf }) \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \\ \mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, \mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 85^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | 0:1 | 64 |
| $6^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHMgBr}, \mathrm{ZnCl}_{2}$, <br> cat. $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$, $\mathrm{DMF} / \mathrm{THF}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt | $1: 2$ | - |
| $7^{\text {b }}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHMgBr}, \mathrm{ZnCl}_{2}$, <br> cat. $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$, $\mathrm{DMF} / \mathrm{THF}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to rt <br> ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The catalyst loading was $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ | $0: 1$ <br> he catalyst loading was |  |

Although several known 1,4-functionalizations of diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ were initially considered, ${ }^{39,40}$ the most direct way to transform diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ to carbonyl-ene precursor
3.22 in a single step was presumed to be the net delivery of hydrogen to the 1- and 4positions. Hydrogenations of this type are known to be effected by chromium $\eta-6$ arene tricarbonyl complexes, but the application of this strategy in total synthesis is extremely limited. ${ }^{40}$ Nevertheless, the appeal of directly converting diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ to exocyclic olefin 3.22 warranted exploration of this approach.

A variety of chromium $\eta-6$ arene tricarbonyl complexes participate in 1,4hydrogenations of dienes, but the most widely used catalysts are ( $\eta-6$ methylbenzoate)chromium tricarbonyl $\left(\left(\eta-6 \quad \mathrm{PhCO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}\right) \mathrm{Cr}(\mathrm{CO})_{3}\right)$ and $(\eta-6$ naphthalene)chromium tricarbonyl $\left((\eta-6\right.$ nap $\left.) \mathrm{Cr}(\mathrm{CO})_{3}\right){ }^{40}$ The generally accepted mechanism for these transformations is that dissociation of the arene moiety from chromium first occurs to generate a 12 -electron chromium tricarbonyl intermediate that coordinates to the diene in an s-cis fashion. Association of hydrogen to the complex is then followed by regioselective delivery of hydrogen to the 1- and 4- positions. Importantly, since the diene must coordinate to the catalyst in an s-cis orientation, the geometry of the resulting olefin is completely controlled in these processes. ${ }^{40}$

Subjection of diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ to $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ( $\eta-6$ methylbenzoate)chromium tricarbonyl under 75 atmospheres of hydrogen pressure in acetone at $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h resulted only in the recovery of starting material (Scheme 3.11). The related ( $\eta-6$ naphthalene)chromium tricarbonyl catalyst, which is known to react efficiently at much lower temperatures, ${ }^{40}$ was then examined. Hydrogenation of diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ mediated by this catalyst under 75 atmospheres of hydrogen pressure in acetone at $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in quantitative conversion

## Scheme 3.11 Hydrogenation of diene 3.53


to exocyclic olefin 3.22, which was confirmed to be a single olefin isomer by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis. A brief assessment of the reaction parameters revealed that this hydrogenation could be run under one atmosphere of hydrogen pressure; however, conversion of diene 3.53 to product was variable under these conditions. The addition of reagents to the Parr bomb apparatus in a glove box as well as the use of rigorously degassed acetone ensured highly reproducible results.

### 3.5.4 Synthesis and Attempted Coupling of (8S)-Cesium Oxalate 3.12

With the 1,4-hydrogenation of diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ providing access to carbonyl-ene substrate 3.22, cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ could then be prepared in enantiopure form for use in the key radical coupling reaction (Scheme 3.12). Cyclization of olefin $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ was carried out as previously mentioned using catalytic p-toluenesulfonic acid in wet dichloromethane at room temperature. The addition of one equivalent of water to the reaction mixture facilitated clean ketal deprotection and cyclization, providing tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ in quantitative yield. Acylation of alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ as previously discussed

Scheme 3.12 Synthesis of cesium oxalate 3.12

gave methyl oxalate 3.52, which was pleasingly determined to be enantiopure by HPLC analysis using a chiral stationary phase. Oxalate ester $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ was easily saponified using 1 equiv of cesium hydroxide in tetrahydrofuran/water at room temperature to yield the radical precursor 3.12.

The attempted radical coupling of cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ with (S)-5-methoxyfuran-2-one (3.13) was met with a surprising result. Reaction of a slight molar excess (1.1 equiv) of cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ with butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ in the presence of $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of $\operatorname{Ir}\left(\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \text { ppy }\right)_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}$ and 10 equiv $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in DME at room temperature produced lactone $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ in $54 \%$ yield with no trace of the desired coupling product $\mathbf{3 . 1 4}$ (Equation 3.4).

## Equation 3.4



Lactone $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ is likely formed via cyclization of intermediate alkoxycarbonyl 3.F radical produced after the first decarboxylation event onto the trisubstituted olefin, followed by hydrogen atom abstraction by secondary radical 3.G (Scheme 3.13). ${ }^{41}$

Scheme 3.13 Proposed mechanism for the formation of 3.54


After cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ was proven to be an ineffective substrate for the generation of the required tertiary radical intermediate, alternative precursors from which a tertiary radical might be more easily accessed for use in the coupling were then considered.

### 3.5.5 Accessing (8R)-Tertiary Alcohol 3.55

The failure of cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ to generate a tertiary radical was attributed to the proximity of the postulated intermediate alkoxycarbonyl radical to the trisubstituted olefin. A potential straightforward solution to this problem was to access the epimeric tertiary alcohol 3.55, which should be more distant from the trisubstituted olefin, and attempt to employ its corresponding cesium oxalate in a radical coupling reaction.

It was anticipated that ( $8 R$ )-tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ could be formed by addition of a methyl organometallic nucleophile to the precursor ketone 3.56. A sequence similar to that developed for the synthesis of (8S)-tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ was used to access ketone 3.56 (Scheme 3.14). Phosphate 3.44, an intermediate prepared in the synthesis of (8S)-
3.12, was subjected to an allylic displacement reaction using as a nucleophile the cuprate
derived from acetal-bearing Grignard reagent 3.57. Vinylation of iodide 3.58 and 1,4hydrogenation of the resulting diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 9}$ occurred smoothly as observed with previous substrates. The carbonyl-ene cyclization of acetal $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}$ was significantly more troublesome than the cyclization of its ketal-bearing analog 3.22. The most successful conditions for promoting this cyclization were found to be exposure of acetal $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}$ to 0.3 equiv of PPTS in acetone/water at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This transformation provided secondary alcohol 3.61 as a single diastereomer in $69 \%$ yield. ${ }^{42}$ Alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 6 1}$ was then oxidized in high yield using Dess-Martin periodinane ${ }^{43}$ to ketone 3.56. ${ }^{44}$

Scheme 3.14 Synthesis of ketone 3.56


The addition of a methyl nucleophile to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ was next examined (Table 3.4). The "bent" shape of the decalin scaffold of $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ significantly complicated conformational analyses to predict the diastereoselectivity of the transformation, although the neighboring secondary methyl group was expected to exhibit some steric influence. Addition of methylmagnesium bromide to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at low temperature (entry 1) gave a mixture of diastereomeric alcohols $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$; however, the undesired ( $8 S$ )tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ predominated. The reaction of $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ with either methyllithium (entry 2) or the organocerium species derived from methyllithium and cerium trichloride (entry
3) gave only the ( $8 S$ )-alcohol 3.15. The use of Yamamoto's bulky Lewis acid bis[2,6-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)-4-methylphenolato]methylaluminum ("MAD," 3.62), which is proposed to invert the diastereoselectivity typically observed in organometallic additions by coordinating to and blocking the less-hindered face of a carbonyl substrate, was then examined. ${ }^{45}$ Employing this Lewis acid additive with methyllithium (entry 4) was not successful in providing alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$, as a complex mixture of products was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. By contrast, the addition of methylmagnesium bromide to ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ in the presence of $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ (entry 5) was exceptionally clean and completely selective for the ( $8 R$ )alcohol 3.55. Methyl addition under these conditions provided alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ in $62 \%$ isolated yield.

Table 3.4 Methyl addition to ketone 3.56


### 3.5.6 Radical Coupling with ( $8 R$ )-Oxalate 3.63

The synthesis of radical precursor $(8 R)-\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ was carried out in straightforward manner from tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ (Scheme 3.15). Acylation of $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ with methylchlorooxalate in the presence of triethylamine and catalytic DMAP in dichloromethane at room temperature provided methyl oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ in $90 \%$ yield. The oxalate ester $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ was then selectively saponified with cesium hydroxide to give cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ in quantitative yield.

Scheme 3.15 Synthesis of cesium oxalate 3.63


Oxalate salt $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ coupled readily with (S)-5-methoxyfuran-2-one (3.13) (Equation 3.5). Pleasingly, no trace of a lactone product arising from intramolecular cyclization of the intermediate alkoxycarbonyl radical onto the trisubstituted olefin was observed. Exposure of oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ and butenolide $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ to $\left.1 \mathrm{~mol} \% \operatorname{Ir}\left(\mathrm{dF}_{\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}$ in $\mathrm{DME} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ under visible light irradiation for 24 h provided adduct $\mathbf{3 . 1 4}$ in $54 \%$ yield as a 5:1 mixture of diastereomers.

## Equation 3.5



### 3.5.7 Hydrogenation Studies with Unsaturated Lactones $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$

At this point, the construction of the bicyclic lactone unit of macfarlandin C (3.1) was explored using a model substrate bearing a simpler 1-methylcyclohexyl group in place of the decalin fragment. This lactone could be accessed in gram quantities by the reductive coupling of 1-methylcyclohexyl ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide (3.39) with racemic 5-methoxyfuran-2-one (3.13) catalyzed by $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$ (Scheme 3.16). The lactone enolate generated by treatment of $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ with LHMDS in THF at low temperature engaged in aldol coupling with methyl glyoxylate (3.66), which was itself generated in situ via ozonolysis of dimethyl maleate. ${ }^{46}$ Aldol adducts $\mathbf{3 . 6 7}$ were obtained in variable yield in this reaction, likely due to the instability of methyl glyoxylate that was meticulously prepared and distilled prior to use. Dehydration of alcohols $\mathbf{3 . 6 7}$ was accomplished most efficiently by conversion to the trifluoroacetate derivatives and in situ elimination with DBU. This sequence provided useful quantities of unsaturated lactone $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ as mixtures of olefin isomers that were expected to converge upon hydrogenation.

Scheme 3.16 Preparation of unsaturated lactones 3.65


The hydrogenation of olefins $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ was examined under a variety of conditions (Table 3.5). Several heterogeneous catalysts were initially employed, anticipating that a metal hydrogenation catalyst would approach from the lactone face opposite the sterically
encumbered 1-methylcyclohexyl group. Unfortunately, hydrogenation of unsaturated lactones 3.65 with $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ (entry 1), $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ (entry 3), and $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (entry 4) occurred to provide predominantly the undesired $\alpha, \beta$-trans-disubstituted lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ rather than the desired cis-substituted lactone 3.68. ${ }^{19}$ Pearlman's catalyst and rhodium on carbon were

Table 3.5 Hydrogenation of unsaturated lactones 3.65

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entry | conditions | $\begin{gathered} \text { ratio }^{a} \\ \mathbf{3 . 6 8}: \mathbf{3 . 4 1} \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | cat. $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~atm})$, $\mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{rt}$ | 1:7 |
| 2 | cat. $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}, \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ (1 atm), EtOAc, rt | ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}, \mathrm{H}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~atm})$, EtOAc, rt | 1:1.4 |
| 4 | cat. $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{H}_{2}$ (15 atm), EtOAc, rt | 1:3 |
| 5 | cat. $\mathrm{Rh} / \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}_{2}(85 \mathrm{~atm})$ THF, rt | ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { cat. } \mathrm{Rh}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{3} \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{H}_{2}(7 \mathrm{~atm}) \\ \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}, \mathrm{rt} \end{gathered}$ | $-{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { cat. }\left[\operatorname{Ir}(\mathrm{COD})(\mathrm{pyr}) \mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right]\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right) \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}(85 \mathrm{~atm}), \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{rt} \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 8 | Raney Ni, THF, rt | $-{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 9 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{NNH}_{2}, \mathrm{PhI}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} \\ \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{rt} \end{gathered}$ | $-^{b}$ |
| 10 | IPr-CuCl, NaOt - Bu , PMHS PhMe, rt | 0: 1 |
| 11 | Red-Al, CuI, 2-butanol, <br> THF/PhMe, -78 to $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $1.3: 1$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}, \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$, MeOH $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1:2 |
| 13 | L-selectride, THF, $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0:1 |

${ }^{a}$ Determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture. ${ }^{b}$ No conversion of the starting material was observed. $\mathrm{IPr}-\mathrm{CuCl}=N, N$-bis(2,6diisopropylphenyl)imidazol-2-ylidene copper(I) chloride. PMHS = polymethylhydrosiloxane.
inactive in the transformation (entries 2 and 5 respectively). Hydrogenations with Wilkinson's catalyst (entry 6) and Crabtree's catalyst (entry 7) were also unsuccessful, giving no product even after subjection to high pressure of hydrogen. More exotic reducing conditions using Raney nickel (entry 8), diimide (entry 9) or an NHC-copperhydride species ${ }^{47}$ (entry 10) failed as well. Not surprisingly, good conversion of the electron-deficient olefin substrate was observed with nucleophilic metal-hydride reagents (entries 11-13). However, the ratio of cis:trans substituted lactones was at best 1.3:1 when using Red-Al/CuI (entry 11). This reaction gave a mixture of several products in addition to lactones $\mathbf{3 . 6 8}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$, so it was likely unfeasible for application to the more complex decalin-bearing substrate without extensive optimization.

The hydrogenation of olefins $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ under the conditions examined could not be stereochemically controlled as was initially desired. Clearly, the bulky quaternary carbon substituent and the methyl carboxymethyl lactone side chain exhibit a severe steric interaction in the diastereomeric hydrogenation transition state that would result in placing these substituents on the same face of the lactone. Even though the hydrogenation of a very similar substrate has been successfully accomplished to establish a cisrelationship between $\alpha$ - and $\beta$-substituents, ${ }^{47 \mathrm{~b}}$ the large quaternary $\beta$-substituent present in this case likely obstructs the desired stereochemical outcome.

### 3.5.8 Iodolactonization Approach to the Bicyclic Lactone

With the hydrogenation of exocyclic olefins $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ showing little promise in reliably establishing the relative stereochemistry of the bicyclic lactone of macfarlandin C (3.1), various alternative approaches to access this structural fragment were considered.

Inspiration for revising the synthetic route was taken from studies ${ }^{19}$ carried out concurrently in the Overman group that confirmed that enolates derived from lactones such as $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ undergo highly diastereoselective alkylation from the lactone face opposite the quaternary substituent. The bicyclic lactone of macfarlandin C (3.1) has a proton present on this face at C13 however, so alkylation of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ would presumably give the incorrect stereochemistry at C13. Instead, a proton equivalent such as a halide could be introduced at this position from the less-hindered lactone face, orienting the carboxymethyl group on the correct face. This halide could subsequently be stereoselectively converted to a hydrogen atom via radical dehalogenation once the dioxabicyclo[3.3.0]octanone framework was constructed to provide bicyclic lactone $\mathbf{3 . 6 9}$ with the appropriate relative configuration (Figure 3.7). It was inferred that diastereoselective electrophilic halogenation and concomitant cyclization might occur to form iodolactone $\mathbf{3 . 7 0}$ from a precursor such as carboxylic acid 3.71. ${ }^{48}$ Ester-bearing dihydrofuran $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$ could derive from reduction of the corresponding lactone $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ to a lactol, followed by dehydration. The tert-butyl carboxymethyl side chain of $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ would

Figure 3.7 Retrosynthetic analysis for halolactonization approach

be introduced via alkylation of the enolate of lactone 3.40, with the stereochemical outcome of this alkylation being inconsequential.

The assessment of the halolactonization strategy began with alkylation of the enolate of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ with tert-butyl bromoacetate, which occurred in high yield (Scheme 3.17). Reduction of the lactone to the corresponding lactol proved to be significantly troublesome. Exposure of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ to DIBAL-H in a variety of solvents at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ frequently gave complex mixtures of products corresponding to unselective reduction of the dicarbonyl substrate. The best results were obtained when the reduction was carried out in dichloromethane as solvent. Although greater than one equivalent of DIBAL-H was typically required to consume the substrate, it was necessary to add the reagent portionwise to realize clean reactivity. Lactols $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ were isolated in $53 \%$ as an anomeric mixture using this protocol. ${ }^{49}$ All attempts to improve this reduction by employing other substrates bearing various bulky esters in place of the tert-butyl ester were unsuccessful.

## Scheme 3.17 Synthesis of lactols 3.74



The dehydration of lactols $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ to form dihydrofuran $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$ (Table 3.6) was also problematic. As one might expect, activation of the lactol to generate an oxocarbenium intermediate in most cases invited closure of the lactone ring by attack of the pendant tert-butyl ester. The lactol functionality of $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ also appeared to be sterically hindered, as it was unreactive under many conditions typically employed in lactol dehydrations.

Treatment of lactols 3.74 with methanesulfonyl chloride and triethylamine in dichloromethane at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, followed by heating at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (entry 1) gave only a small amount of dihydrofuran 3.72. The substrate was more reactive towards phosphorus oxychloride, although the formation of bicyclic lactone byproduct $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ could not be avoided (entries 2 and 3). Other common dehydrating agents thionyl chloride and the Burgess reagent failed to react with lactols $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ (entries 4 and 5). Whereas conversion of the substrate to the corresponding triflate gave a complex mixture of products (entry 6), the trifluoroacetate analog proved to be more useful (entries 7 and 8). Employing

Table 3.6 Dehydration of lactols 3.74


| entry | conditions | ratio 3.72: 3.38 ${ }^{a}$ | comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{MsCl}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ | - | complex mixture |
|  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-20$ to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{POCl}_{3}$, pyridine, $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1:3 |  |
| 3 | $\mathrm{POCl}_{3}$, pyridine | 0:1 |  |
| 4 | SOCl 2 , pyridine 0-70 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - | low conversion |
| 5 | Burgess reagent <br> $\mathrm{MeCN}, \mathrm{rt}-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - | no conversion |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Tf}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, cat. DMAP $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78$ to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - | complex mixture |
| 7 | TFAA, pyridine, cat. DMAP <br> THF, $0-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1:3.4 |  |
| 8 | TFAA, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, cat. DMAP THF, $0-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $2.3: 1$ | isolated 35\% 3.72 |

triethylamine as the auxiliary base in this reaction shifted the product distribution towards the desired dihydrofuran 3.72, although the isolated yield of this product was poor (entry
8). All attempts to effect the dehydration of lactols $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ under various other conditions were unproductive.

The dehydration of lactols $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ could fortunately be conducted on a 300 mg scale to provide sufficient material to test the halolactonization strategy. Prior to cyclization, tert-butyl ester $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$ was first saponified using aqueous sodium hydroxide in methanol/tetrahydrofuran at $65{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Equation 3.6). Hydrolysis of this ester occurred cleanly; however, acidification of the carboxylate obtained by this method provoked cyclization to form bicyclic lactone $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ which bears the undesired relative configuration on the tetrahydrofuran ring. Because of this complication, carboxylic acid 3.71 could rarely be isolated in pure form. Even after silica gel chromatography, purified acid $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ was observed to undergo lactonization on standing in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.

Equation 3.6


A reasonably pure sample of carboxylic acid 3.71 obtained by the above hydrolysis reaction was submitted to iodolactonization on small scale. Subjection of $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ to excess iodine in the presence of sodium bicarbonate in acetonitrile/tetrahydrofuran at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ induced rapid iodolactonization (Equation 3.7). Complete regioselectivity in this reaction was observed as expected, with the tetrahydrofuran oxygen presumably facilitating the opening of the transient iodonium intermediate. The transformation was also highly stereoselective, providing a single diastereomer of bicyclic lactone 3.75.

Unfortunately, attempts to establish the relative stereochemistry of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$ via NOESY or ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ nOe NMR experiments were not informative.

## Equation 3.7



To confirm the relative configuration of bicyclic lactone 3.75, this intermediate was dehalogenated to enable comparison with a known compound. ${ }^{19}$ Exposure of a small sample of 3.75 to tris(trimethylsilyl)silane and a catalytic amount of azobisisobutyronitrile in toluene at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ produced solely bicyclooctanone $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ exhibiting a trans- relationship between the lactone ring and 1-methylcyclohexyl groups (Equation 3.8).

## Equation 3.8



The relative stereochemistry of this product at the angular positions of the bicyclooctanone is unfortunately opposite to that required for the synthesis of macfarlandin C. At the moment it is unclear why iodolactonization of dihydrofuran $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ occurs with this stereochemical outcome. If the formation of the iodonium intermediate is reversible, this reaction may proceed under thermodynamic control to place the iodine atom on the concave face of the bicycle. In this configuration, the long carbon-iodine bond likely contributes to a lesser steric interaction between the iodide and the quaternary
substituent than would be present between the lactone carbons and the quaternary substituent were the iodide on the opposite convex face. Alternatively, the acetal methoxy group may exhibit more steric influence than previously expected.

Although only one set of conditions was evaluated for the halolactonization of dihydrofuran 3.71, the development of this strategy to construct the bicyclooctanone moiety of macfarlandin C was terminated. The troublesome chemoselective reduction of dicarbonyl 3.73 as well as the propensity of several intermediates in this route to prematurely lactonize contributed to low yields in almost every step. The inefficiency of this route thus obstructed a comprehensive evaluation of halolactonization conditions.

### 3.6 Conclusions

An enantioselective synthesis of the decalin moiety of macfarlandin C was developed, allowing the preparation of radical precursor cesium oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ in 11 steps and $26 \%$ overall yield from dimethylcyclohexenone 3.45. Oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ coupled in moderate yield and good diastereoselectivity with methoxybutenolide $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ to construct the central C8-C14 bond of macfarlandin C. Two approaches for forming the bicyclic lactone moiety were explored on a simpler model compound; however, these efforts were complicated by the difficulty of establishing the correct relative stereochemistry at the position corresponding to the C13 stereocenter of macfarlandin C. A well-precedented kinetic protonation approach ${ }^{50}$ is currently under investigation and, if successful, will ideally enable completion of the total synthesis.

### 3.7 Experimental Information

Unless stated otherwise, reactions were conducted in oven-dried glassware under an atmosphere of argon using anhydrous solvents (either freshly distilled or passed through activated alumina columns). All commercially obtained reagents were used as received. Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted on EMD Chemicals silica gel 60 F254 plates and visualization was carried out by exposing plates to UV light or staining plates with anisaldehyde or $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$. Flash chromatography and filtration were performed using 40-63 $\mu \mathrm{m}$ EMD Chemicals Silica Gel $60 \AA$ Geduran silica gel. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers (at 500 or 600 MHz ) and are reported relative to deuterated solvent signals. Data for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant (Hz) and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Spectrometers (at 125 or 150 MHz ). Data for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra are reported in terms of chemical shift. IR spectra were recorded on a Varian 640-IR spectrometer and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$. High resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility with a Micromass LCT spectrometer. Enantiomeric excess for compounds 3.47, 3.49, 3.51 and 3.52 was determined by HPLC using an Agilent 1100 Series analytical HPLC. Two "Kessil KSH150B LED Grow Light 150, Blue" were purchased from http://www.amazon.com for use in photoredox-catalyed coupling reactions. See JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms for abbreviations. Available at: http://pubs.acs.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1218717864819/joceah_abbreviations.pdf


2-Iodo-4,4-dimethyl-2-cyclohexenone (3.46): To a solution of 4,4-dimethylcyclohex-2-ene-1-one ( $9.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 72.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 180 mL ) and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(180 \mathrm{~mL})$ at rt was added sequentially $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(17.96 \mathrm{~g}, 130.0$ $\mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{I}_{2}(40.31 \mathrm{~g}, 158.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP ( $2.646 \mathrm{~g}, 21.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The purple heterogeneous solution was stirred vigorously for 18 h at rt . After this time, additional $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(4.49 \mathrm{~g}, 32.5 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{I}_{2}(10.07 \mathrm{~g}, 39.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ and DMAP $(0.66 \mathrm{~g}, 5.41 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added sequentially. After stirring for an additional 5 h at rt , EtOAc ( 300 mL ) was added and the biphasic mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel. The organic layer was separated, washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ solution ( $3 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), aqueous $0.1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL})$, and brine ( $2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. The drying agent was removed by filtration and the filtrate was concentrated to provide a viscous yellow oil. The crude product was loaded onto a short plug of silica gel and was quickly eluted into a single round-bottom flask using $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(700 \mathrm{~mL})$. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure gave iodoenone 3.46 ( $17.26 \mathrm{~g}, 69.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 96 \%$ ) as an orange oil that solidified upon storage at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those previously reported. ${ }^{51}$


2-Iodo-4,4-dimethyl-2-cyclohexenol (rac-3.47): A round-bottom flask containing 2-iodo-4,4-dimethyl-2-cyclohexenone (3.46) (500 mg, $2.00 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{CeCl}_{3} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(890 \mathrm{mg}, 2.40 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{MeOH}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under argon. To the solution was then added $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(90 \mathrm{mg}, 2.40$ mmol ) in one portion. The suspension was allowed to warm to rt while stirring for 18 h . After this time, aqueous $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the resulting biphasic mixture
was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to provide alcohol rac-3.47 (499 mg, $1.98 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for $\mathrm{rac} \mathbf{- 3 . 4 7}$ matched those reported previously. ${ }^{20 \mathrm{~b}}$
(S)-2-Iodo-4,4-dimethyl-2-cyclohexenol (3.47): The procedure of Knochel was adopted with the exception that $D$-diphenylprolinol was employed to synthesize the $(S)$-configured secondary alcohol. ${ }^{20 b}$ To a solution of $D$-diphenylprolinol ${ }^{52}(253 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 21 mL ) under argon at rt was added $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{OMe})_{3}(110 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.05$ equiv) under argon. The resulting colorless solution was maintained at rt for 1 h . After this time, $\mathrm{BH}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{NPh}(3.56 \mathrm{~mL}, 20.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added via syringe. A solution of enone 3.46 ( $5.00 \mathrm{~g}, 20.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 21 mL ) was then added over 1 h using a syringe pump. After the addition was complete, the homogeneous solution was maintained at rt for an additional 3 h . Methanol ( 10 mL ) was then added and the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(3 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, saturated aqueous $\mathrm{KHSO}_{4}(3 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, and brine $(3 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to provide a crude residue that was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to give alcohol 3.47 ( $4.576 \mathrm{~g}, 18.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for 3.47 matched those reported previously. ${ }^{20 b}$ Analysis by HPLC confirmed that the compound was obtained in $98 \%$ ee: OD-H column, $215 \mathrm{~nm}, 2 \% \mathrm{IPA} / n$-hexane, 0.3
$\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min} . \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}: 26.555 \mathrm{~min}$ (major), 32.594 min , (minor). $[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-39.8,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{577}-42.0$, $[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{546}-49.3,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{435}-92.2,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{405}-117.1 \quad\left(c=1.28, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$. The absolute configuration of $(R)-\mathbf{3 . 4 7}$ was previously assigned by Knochel. ${ }^{20 b}$


Signal 3: DAD1 D, Sig $=230,16$ Ref $=360,100$

| Peak \# | $\begin{gathered} \text { RetTime } \\ \text { [min] } \end{gathered}$ | Type | Width [min] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {[\mathrm{mAU} * \mathrm{~s}]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Height } \\ & \text { [mAU] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 27.933 | BB | 0.9064 | 3.53400 e 4 | 609.58514 | 99.0469 |
| 2 | 34.522 | BB | 0.7560 | 340.06027 | 5.52561 | 0.9531 |


(S)-Diethyl (2-iodo-4,4-dimethylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl) phosphate (3.44):

The procedure of Knochel was slightly modified. ${ }^{20 \mathrm{~b}}$ To a solution of alcohol $3.47(4.58 \mathrm{~g}, 18.16 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(48 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added sequentially $N$-methylimidazole ( $2.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 36.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and diethyl chlorophosphate ( $27.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 27.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The mixture was allowed to warm to rt and was maintained at this temperature for 18 h . Brine ( 50 mL ) was added and the biphasic mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel. The layers were separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (25-
$50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $)$ to provide phosphate $3.44(6.78 \mathrm{~g}, 17.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 96 \%)$ as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those previously reported. ${ }^{20 b}$ $[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-27.2,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{577}-29.8,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{546}-34.1,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{435}-63.8,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{405}-79.6(c=1.10$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).


## (S)-2-(2-(2-Iodo-6,6-dimethylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl)ethyl)-2-methyl-

1,3-dioxolane (3.49): A solution of 2-(2-bromoethyl)-2-methyl-1,3dioxolane ${ }^{53}(6.00 \mathrm{~g}, 30.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1,2-dibromoethane ( 0.6 mL ) in THF ( 20 mL ) was added to a suspension of Mg turnings $(2.25 \mathrm{~g}, 92.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 45 mL ). The mixture was briefly warmed with a heat gun for 10 seconds, and was then stirred for 2 h at rt . The resulting black suspension was transferred via cannula to a round-bottom flask containing a stir bar under argon. The mixture was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a homogeneous solution of $\mathrm{CuCN}(2.77 \mathrm{~g}, 30.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{LiCl}(2.62 \mathrm{~g}, 61.85 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 31 mL ) was added via syringe. After stirring vigorously for 15 minutes at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of phosphate $3.44(4.00 \mathrm{~g}, 10.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 20 mL ) was added. The suspension was stirred for 30 minutes at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then was allowed to warm to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while stirring for an additional 30 minutes. Saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 150 mL ) was added and the biphasic mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 200$ mL ) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $7 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ ( $3.49 \mathrm{~g}, 9.97 \mathrm{mmol}, 97 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those previously reported. ${ }^{20 b}$ Analysis by HPLC confirmed that the compound was present in $99 \% e e$ : AD
column, $215 \mathrm{~nm}, 0.5 \% \mathrm{IPA} / n$-hexane, $0.15 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min} . \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}: 36.528 \mathrm{~min}$ (major), 39.080 min (minor). $[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-58.5,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{577}-61.8,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{546}-70.7,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{435}-123.2,[\alpha]^{26.7}{ }_{405}-152.6$ $\left(c=0.58, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$.


Signal 4: DAD1 D, Sig=230,16 $\operatorname{Ref}=360,100$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Peak } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | RetTime <br> [min] | Type | Width <br> [min] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {\left[\mathrm{mAU}{ }^{*} \mathrm{~s}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | Height <br> [mAU] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 36.155 | BB | 0.7998 | 1.81009 e 4 | 307.93616 | 99.3413 |
| 2 | 38.867 | MM | 0.8000 | 120.01323 | 2.50017 | 0.6587 |


(S)-3,3-Dimethyl-2-(2-(2-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-
yl)ethyl)cyclohexan-1-one (3.21): A round-bottom flask was charged
with vinyl iodide $3.49(1.50 \mathrm{~g}, 4.28 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(14 \mathrm{~mL})$ under Ar. The reaction mixture was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of $t$ - $\mathrm{BuLi}(6.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.00$ mmol, 1.5 M in pentane) was added slowly. The homogeneous solution was maintained at this temperature for 45 min , after which $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{OMe})_{3}(1.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 10.71 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added in one portion. The reaction mixture was then allowed to warm to rt and was maintained at this temperature for 3 h . After this time, THF ( 15 mL ), $\mathrm{NaBO}_{3} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(6.59 \mathrm{~g}, 42.85$
$\mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added sequentially. The heterogeneous mixture was stirred at rt for 24 h , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{x}$ $50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The suspension was filtered through cotton to remove the drying agent and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10-15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to provide ketone $\mathbf{3 . 2 1}$ ( 830 mg , $3.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.36(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.97-3.90(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12$ (apt. d, $J$ $=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.59(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 213.6,110.1,64.7,64.6,61.1,41.2,39.8,39.0,37.8,29.5,23.8,23.3,22.5$, 18.9; IR (thin film) 2962, 2874, 1708, 1459, 1370, 1259, 1222, 1058, $868 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$241.1804, found 241.1798; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+11.3,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}$ $+12.6,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}+14.9,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}+47.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}+75.6\left(c=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

## (S)-2-(2-(6,6-Dimethyl-2-vinylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl)ethyl)-2-methyl-

 1,3-dioxolane (3.51): In a glove box, anhydrous $\mathrm{CeCl}_{3}$ (178 mg, 0.724 mmol ) was placed in a round-bottom flask. The flask was sealed and removed from the glove box. Under an atmosphere of argon, THF ( 1 mL ) was added, and the resulting suspension was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of $\mathrm{PhLi}(0.4 \mathrm{~mL}$, $0.724 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.9 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{Bu}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added slowly, and the reaction mixture was stirred at $78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . After this time, ketone $3.21(58 \mathrm{mg}, 0.241 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(0.75 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the reaction vessel was transferred to an ice-water bath and was allowed towarm to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 2 h . After this time, saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( $300 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added, and the mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (10-15-20\% EtOAc/hexanes) to yield alcohol 3.51 ( $53 \mathrm{mg}, 0.165 \mathrm{mmol}$, $69 \%$ ) as a colorless solid. HPLC analysis confirmed that the alcohol was present in $98 \%$ $e e: \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.71(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{t}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.19(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79-3.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.61(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-$ $1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 148.7,128.0,126.4,125.4,109.8,77.6,64.3,64.2$, $54.2,41.9,41.6,40.8,35.3,32.4,23.0,21.8,20.5,18.6$; $\mathbb{R}$ (thin film) $3474,2954,1201$, $845 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$341.2093, found 341.2091; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-7.4,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-7.2,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-8.1,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-9.6,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-9.4(c=1.03$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ); AD column, $5 \% \mathrm{IPA} /$ hexanes, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min} . \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}: 8.577 \mathrm{~min}$ (major), 12.934 min (minor).


Signal 3: DAD1 C, Sig=210,8 Ref=360,100

| Peak \# | $\begin{gathered} \text { RetTime } \\ \text { [min] } \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Width } \\ & \text { [min] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {\left[\mathrm{mAU}^{\star} \mathrm{S}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | Height [mAU] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { \% } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 8.515 |  | 0.2374 | 1.64634 e 4 | 1047.01770 | 99.2210 |
| 2 | 12.934 | MM | 0.3182 | 129.25429 | 6.77047 | 0.7790 |

(2S)-3,3-Dimethyl-2-(2-(2-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-yl)ethyl)-1-phenylcyclohexan-1-ol (3.22). Wittig ethylidenation of ketone 3.21: A round bottom flask was charged with $\mathrm{EtPPh}_{3} \mathrm{Br}(1.32 \mathrm{~g}, 3.57$ mmol ) and THF ( 5.3 mL ) under argon. To the flask was added KOt - Bu ( $365 \mathrm{mg}, 3.25$ mmol ) in one portion, and the orange mixture was stirred at rt for 30 min . The reaction mixture was then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and ketone $3.21(104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.43 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added as a solution in THF ( 4.3 mL ). The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt and was maintained at this temperature for 18 h . After this time, the reaction vessel was heated to $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a sand bath, and was maintained at this temperature for 6 h . The reaction mixture was then allowed to cool to rt and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 5 mL ) was added. The aqueous and organic layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine (2 x 15 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude solid obtained was then dissolved in acetone ( 3 mL ), and Merrifield's resin ( 219 mg ) and $\mathrm{NaI}(130 \mathrm{mg})$ were added. The mixture was stirred vigorously for 18
$h$ at rt, and was subsequently filtered through Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$. The pad of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ was washed with THF ( 8 mL ), $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetone ( 8 mL ) and $\mathrm{MeOH}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$. This washing sequence was repeated a second time, washing the pad of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ with THF (8 $\mathrm{mL}), \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetone $(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{MeOH}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic solvents were removed from the biphasic mixture under reduced pressure, and the resulting aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $3 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to give exocyclic olefin $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$, $69 \%$ ) as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.46$ ( $3 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $5.07(\mathrm{q}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95-3.90(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{dt}, J=14.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.74$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.55-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.34(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 139.2,117.7,110.6,64.67,64.72,55.9,37.9,35.8,34.9,28.3,27.9,24.0,23.9$, 23.0, 21.1, 12.8; IR (thin film) 2953, 2926, 2864, 1449, 1376, 1238, 1220, 1063, 864, 825 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{2}$, $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$253.2168, found 253.2161. Conversion of $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ to oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ and analysis of oxalate $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ by HPLC revealed that the enantiomeric purity of $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ was significantly diminished.

(S)-2-(2-(6,6-Dimethyl-2-vinylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl)ethyl)-2-methyl-

1,3-dioxolane (3.53): A solution of vinylmagnesium bromide (4.6 $\mathrm{mL}, 2.86 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.62 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added to a solution of $\mathrm{ZnCl}_{2}$ ( $8.56 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The suspension was then allowed to
warm to rt while stirring for 1.5 h . After this time, a solution of iodide 3.49 ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.43$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(165 \mathrm{mg}, 0.143 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 3.3 mL ) and DMF ( 3.3 mL ) was added slowly. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 36 h , after which saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 10 mL ) and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The organic layer was separated, washed with brine ( $2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $3-5 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to provide diene $\mathbf{3 . 5 3}$ ( $333 \mathrm{mg}, 1.33$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 93 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.49\left(10 \%\right.$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.23(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.8,11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.61(\mathrm{t}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{~d} J=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95-3.86(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.79-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.12(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}\right) \delta 140.05,140.04,127.3$, $109.9,109.1,63.94,63.92,42.3,32.0,30.0,28.4,26.7,26.3,23.5,23.0$; IR (thin film) 3088, 2953, 2872, 1375, $1060 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ 251.2011, found 251.1920; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-72.0,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-75.4,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-85.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-$ $146.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-177.8\left(c=1.14, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(2S)-3,3-Dimethyl-2-(2-(2-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-yl)ethyl)-1-phenylcyclohexan-1-ol (3.22). Hydrogenation of diene 3.53: In a glove box under a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere, a stainless steel Parr bomb containing a stir bar was charged with $\left(\eta^{6}\right.$-naphthalene)chromium tricarbonyl ${ }^{54}$ ( 106 mg , 0.40 mmol ), diene $3.53(500 \mathrm{mg}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and acetone ( 20 mL , degassed in a Schlenk tube by 3 freeze-pump-thaw cycles prior to bringing into the glove box). The Parr bomb
was sealed, removed from the glove box, and quickly purged with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ gas three times before being pressurized to $75 \mathrm{~atm}(\sim 1100 \mathrm{psi}) \mathrm{H}_{2}$. The apparatus was then placed in a sand bath preheated to $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and was maintained at this temperature while stirring for 18 h. The $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ pressure was released and the reaction mixture was transferred to a roundbottom flask and concentrated under reduced pressure. Silica gel chromatography (2-4\% EtOAc/hexanes) of the residue provided exocyclic olefin 3.22 ( $496 \mathrm{mg}, 1.97 \mathrm{mmol}, 98 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those reported above. $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+24.7,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}+24.9,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}+27.7,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}+45.3,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}+56.1(c=1.04$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).
(1R,2S,4aS)-1,2,5,5-Tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-octahydronaphthalen-2-ol (3.15): To a 1-dram vial containing a stir bar and ketal 3.22 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) at rt was added sequentially $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol})$. The homogeneous reaction mixture was maintained at rt for 3 h , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide alcohol $3.15(41 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.41\left(10 \%\right.$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(600 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.44(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.77-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53(\mathrm{td}, J$ $=13.4,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, J=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.21(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$

NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 141.9,119.0,72.5,49.2,47.9,40.7,31.9,31.3,27.6,27.5$, 26.7, 26.5, 23.1, 10.7; IR (thin film) 2925, 2866, 1454, 1380, 1363, 1271, 1246, 999, 948, 909, $724 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$209.1905, found 209.1907; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-78.6,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-83.2,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-95.0,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-163.8,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-200.1(c=$ $\left.1.24, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


## Methyl

((1R,2S,4aS)-1,2,5,5-tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-
octahydronaphthalen-2-yl) oxalate (3.52): Tertiary alcohol 3.15 ( $81 \mathrm{mg}, 0.38 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP ( $71 \mathrm{mg}, 0.58 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ in a scintillation vial under argon. After the addition of methyl chlorooxacetate ( $71 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the vial was sealed with a Teflon-coated cap and was placed in an aluminum block preheated to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The homogeneous mixture was maintained at this temperature for 2 h . After this time, the vial was removed from the block and allowed to cool to rt. Additional portions of DMAP ( $71 \mathrm{mg}, 0.58 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and methyl chlorooxacetate $(71 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added, and the vial was capped, placed in the aluminum heating block at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and maintained at this temperature for a further 3 h. The vial was then allowed to cool to rt and the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 2 mL ). The biphasic mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel and diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 30$ mL ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (5\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide methyl oxalate ester $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ ( $105 \mathrm{mg}, 0.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%$ ) as a
colorless oil. HPLC analysis confirmed that the compound was present in $98 \% e e$ : $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=$ 0.45 (10\% EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.45(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.85(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, J=15.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.07-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.63-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{td}, J=14.4,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-$ $1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 159.2,157.2,138.5,119.2,88.7,53.2,48.4,48.0,35.2,33.7,31.5,28.2,25.8$, 24.7, 24.3, 23.0, 10.9; IR (thin film) 2951, 2919, 1766, 1739, 1452, 1331, 1208, 1164, 1100, $873 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 317.1729$, found 317.1736; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-12.9,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-13.3,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-14.9,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-20.3,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-29.3$ $\left(c=1.15, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ; \mathrm{AD}$ column, $1 \% \mathrm{IPA} / n$-hexane, $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min} . \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}: 9.735 \mathrm{~min}$ (major), 10.921 min (minor).



Signal 3: DAD1 C, Sig=210,8 Ref=360,100

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Peak } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RetTime } \\ \text { [min] } \end{gathered}$ | Type | Width <br> [min] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {\left[\mathrm{mAU}{ }^{*} \mathrm{~s}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Height } \\ & \text { [mAU] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9.675 |  | 0.3512 | 1.27364 e 4 | 577.63605 | 98.9094 |
| 2 | 10.871 | MM | 0.3569 | 140.43681 | 6.55890 | 1.0906 | 1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-octahydronaphthalen-2-yl)oxy)acetate (3.12): A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar was charged with methyl oxalate ester 3.52 ( $101 \mathrm{mg}, 0.340 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and THF ( $340 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). To this colorless solution was added dropwise aqueous $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{CsOH}(340 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.340 \mathrm{mmol})$ with vigorous stirring. The progress of the reaction was monitored by TLC during addition of the aqueous CsOH solution. After complete addition of the aqueous CsOH solution, the reaction mixture was transferred to a round-bottom flask and was concentrated under reduced pressure at $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to yield cesium oxalate salt $\mathbf{3 . 1 2}$ ( $133 \mathrm{mg}, 0.322 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%$ ) as a colorless powder. The oxalate was dried under vacuum for 18 h before use: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 5.27$ (br s, 1H), 2.74-2.69 (m, 1H), 1.95-1.86 (m, 2H), 1.85$1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.8,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.23$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 0.75 (s, 3H) ; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (150 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 168.0,163.7,139.5,117.3,81.6,47.7$, 47.3, 34.8, 34.2, 31.1, 28.5, 24.84, 24.76, 23.4, 22.4, 10.8 ; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{Cs})^{-}$279.1596, found 279.1588.


(3S,5aS,9aR,10R)-3,6,6,10-Tetramethyloctahydro-1H-3,9a-methanobenzo[c]oxepin-1-one (3.54): To a 1-dram vial was added sequentially ( $S$ )-5-methoxyfuranone ( $\mathbf{3 . 1 3}$ ) ( $13 \mathrm{mg}, 0.110 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), cesium oxalate salt 3.12 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.121 \mathrm{mmol}), \operatorname{Ir}\left(\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{ppy}\right)_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.001$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, DME $(550 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.11 \mathrm{mmol})$. The yellow reaction mixture was sparged with argon for 5 minutes, after which it was placed in the center of two 34 W
blue LED lamps and stirred vigorously for 36 h . Air was blown on the vial to prevent an increase in temperature due to the LED lamps. After 36 h , the reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and flushed through a pipette plug of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. The yellow solution was concentrated under reduced pressure to obtain a crude residue that was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $3 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes), providing lactone 3.54 (16 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.066 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \%$ based on the cesium oxalate) as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.44(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.13-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.71(\mathrm{q}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.2,5.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.91-0.88(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 180.2,83.6,53.8,50.5,50.4,41.8,36.5,34.1,32.2,29.3,21.9,21.6,20.3,18.7$, 10.4; IR (thin film) 2932, $1754,1136 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{2}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\left.\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$254.2120, found 254.2111; $[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-3.4,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-3.2,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-3.9,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-$ 4.8, $[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-3.3\left(c=1.29, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(S)-2-(2-(2-Iodo-6,6-dimethylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl)ethyl)-1,3-
dioxolane (3.58): A solution of 2-(2-bromoethyl)-1,3-dioxolane ${ }^{55}$ ( $6.96 \mathrm{~g}, 38.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 1,2-dibromoethane ( 0.7 mL ) in THF ( 25 mL ) was added to a suspension of Mg turnings ( $2.82 \mathrm{~g}, 116 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 55 mL ). The mixture was briefly warmed with a heat gun for 10 seconds, and was then stirred for 2 h at rt . The resulting black suspension was transferred via cannula to a round-bottom flask containing a stir bar under argon. The mixture was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a homogeneous solution of $\mathrm{CuCN}(3.46 \mathrm{~g}, 38.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{LiCl}(3.28 \mathrm{~g}, 77.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 40 mL ) was added via syringe. After stirring vigorously for 15 minutes at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of 189
phosphate $3.44(5.00 \mathrm{~g}, 12.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 25 mL ) was added. The suspension was stirred for 30 minutes at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then was allowed to warm to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while stirring for an additional 30 minutes. Saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 150 mL ) was added and the biphasic mixture was transferred to a separatory funnel. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \mathrm{x}$ 300 mL ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to provide vinyl iodide 3.58 ( 4.03 g , $11.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 93 \%)$ as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those previously reported: ${ }^{20 b}[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-59.2,[\alpha]^{24.9}{ }_{577}-62.6,[\alpha]^{25.0}{ }_{546}-70.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{435}-$ $126.5,[\alpha]^{25.1}{ }_{405}-155.8\left(c=1.02, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(S)-2-(2-(6,6-Dimethyl-2-vinylcyclohex-2-en-1-yl)ethyl)-1,3-
dioxolane (3.59): A solution of vinylmagnesium bromide ( 22.5 mL , $22.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added to a solution of $\mathrm{ZnCl}_{2}(48 \mathrm{~mL}$, $33.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.7 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) and THF ( 19 mL ) at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The suspension was then allowed to warm to rt while stirring for 1.5 h . After this time, a solution of iodide $\mathbf{3 . 5 8}$ (3.78 g, 11.2 mmol$)$ and $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(1.30 \mathrm{~g}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(25 \mathrm{~mL})$ and DMF (25 mL ) was added slowly. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir at rt for 36 h , after which saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layer was separated, washed with brine ( $2 \times 200$ mL ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (3-7\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide diene $3.59(2.54 \mathrm{~g}, 10.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=$
0.61 ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) ${ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.29(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.7,10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.64-5.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98-3.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.84-3.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.92(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.12(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00$ (s, 3H), $0.85(\mathrm{~s} 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 140.5,140.2,127.9,109.8,105.1$, $64.95,64.92,43.0,34.7,32.5,30.5,28.8,27.0,26.8,23.7$; IR (thin film) 2954, 2870, 1647, 1406, 1139, 1034, $893 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\left(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)^{+}$ 254.2120, found 254.2129; $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-87.4,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{577}-93.7,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{546}-105.4,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{435}-$ 182.8, $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{405}-219.1\left(c=1.02, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


## (S,E)-2-(2-(6-Ethylidene-2,2-dimethylcyclohexyl)ethyl)-1,3-

 dioxolane (3.60): In a glove box under a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere, a stainless steel Parr bomb containing a stir bar was charged with $\left(\eta^{6}-\right.$ naphthalene)chromium tricarbonyl ${ }^{54}(565 \mathrm{mg}, 2.1 \mathrm{mmol})$, diene $3.59(2.52 \mathrm{~g}, 10.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ and acetone ( 107 mL , degassed in a Schlenk tube by 3 freeze-pump-thaw cycles prior to bringing into the glove box). The Parr bomb was sealed, removed from the glove box, and quickly purged with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ gas three times before being pressurized to $75 \mathrm{~atm}(\sim 1100$ psi) $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The apparatus was then placed in a sand bath preheated to $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and was maintained at this temperature while stirring for 18 h . The $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ pressure was released and the reaction mixture was transferred to a round-bottom flask and concentrated. Silica gel chromatography ( $2 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) of the residue provided exocyclic olefin $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}$ (2.47 $\mathrm{g}, 10.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 97 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.67\left(10 \%\right.$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500$\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.08(\mathrm{q}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{t}, J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98-3.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.87-3.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=6.7,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.23-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 138.9,118.0,105.2,65.0,64.9,55.7$, 35.6, 34.8, 32.8, 28.2, 28.0, 23.8, 22.9, 21.2, 12.8; IR (thin film) 2951, 2926, 1460, 1408, 1382, 1364, 1140, 1037, 955, 891, 907, $824 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $(\mathrm{M})^{+}$238.1933, found 238.1942; $[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+32.8,[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{577}+33.3,[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{546}+38.2,[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{435}$ $+60.8,[\alpha]^{22.7}{ }_{405}+74.5\left(c=0.96, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(1R,2S,4aS)-1,5,5-Trimethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-octahydronaphthalen-2-ol (3.61): A round-bottom flask containing a stir bar was charged with exocyclic olefin $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}(1.42 \mathrm{~g}, 9.95 \mathrm{mmol})$, acetone ( 53 mL ) and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. To the mixture was added PPTS ( $450 \mathrm{mg}, 1.79 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and the flask was placed in a sand bath pre-heated to $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at this temperature for 20 h , after which it was allowed to cool to rt . The mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to provide alcohol 3.61 ( $796 \mathrm{mg}, 4.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, 69\%) as a colorless oil that solidified upon storage at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.40$ ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.38(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-$ $2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.7,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60(\mathrm{tdd}, J=13.6$,
$4.5,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.53-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{qd}, J=12.9,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.17(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.0,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 140.0,119.6,72.4,49.1,43.7,33.9,32.7,31.4,27.8,27.0$, 24.4, 23.0, 14.3; IR (thin film) 2911, 2867, 2360, 2340, 1452, 1382, 1363, 1186, 1093, 969, 940, $714 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{M})^{+}$194.1671, found 194.1672; $[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-84.8,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{577}-89.2,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{546}-101.2,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{435}-174.0,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{405}-208.4(c=$ $\left.1.14, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.


## (1R,4aS)-1,5,5-Trimethyl-3,4,4a,5,6,7-hexahydronaphthalen-

$\mathbf{2 ( 1 H )}$-one (3.56): To a round-bottom flask containing a stir bar and alcohol 3.61 ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 2.57 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(26 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. The solution was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and Dess-Martin periodinane ${ }^{43}(1.31 \mathrm{~g}, 3.09$ mmol ) was added in one portion. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt and was maintained at this temperature for 2 h . After this time, $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(26 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the solution was flushed through a pad of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$. The pad of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ was washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(300 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The solid residue obtained was suspended in $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and flushed through a small plug of silica gel. The plug of silica gel was eluted with $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes (100 mL ), and the filtrate was concentrated to obtain ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}(454 \mathrm{mg}, 2.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%)$ as a colorless oil. Ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ was used immediately in the next step: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.48(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.41(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04-3.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.48$ $(\mathrm{ddd}, J=14.5,5.1,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41(\mathrm{dddd}, J=14.6,12.3,6.2,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-2.04$ (m, 2H), 2.04-1.98 (m, 2H), 1.48-1.42 (m, 1H), 1.41-1.36 (m, 1H), 1.27-1.22 (m, 1H),
$1.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 210.9$, $139.0,118.5,52.2,48.0,41.1,32.9,31.8,28.1,27.7,26.5,23.1,10.5$; IR (thin film) 2953 , $2869,1717,1673,1453,1365,1337,1174,953,849 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (EI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{M})^{+}$192.1514, found 192.1519; $[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-139.3,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{577}-147.9,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{546}-$ $171.4,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{435}-333.2,[\alpha]^{22.5}{ }_{405}-72.8\left(c=1.05, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$.

(1R,2R,4aS)-1,2,5,5-Tetramethyl-1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-
octahydronaphthalen-2-ol (3.55): A round-bottom flask containing a stir bar was charged with 2,6-di-tert-butyl-4-methylphenol (3.09 g, $14.04 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{PhMe}(23 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. A solution of $\mathrm{AlMe}_{3}(3.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.03 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2 M in PhMe ) was added slowly via syringe at rt and vigorous gas evolution was observed. The homogeneous light yellow solution was maintained at rt for 1 h , after which it was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}(450 \mathrm{mg}, 2.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added slowly as a solution in $\mathrm{PhMe}(7 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the solution was maintained at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 minutes. A solution of $\mathrm{MeMgBr}\left(2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.03 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.0 \mathrm{M}\right.$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added slowly, and the solution was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1.5 h . After this time, the solution was allowed to warm to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 20 min . The reaction mixture was then quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 20 mL ) and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes) to provide alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}(304 \mathrm{mg}, 1.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%)$ as a colorless solid: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.30(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.35(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.07-$
$1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{dt}, J=12.8,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{dq}, J=13.3,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.53$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-1.35(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{qd}, J=13.1$, $4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 140.9,117.8,74.5,48.9,48.5,42.8,34.0,31.4,28.4,26.0,23.0$, 20.2, 10.6; IR (thin film) 3307, 2947, 2922, 2845, 1454, 1374, 1126, 1001, $948 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-88.5,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{577}-91.6,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{546}-108.8,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{435}-180.6,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{405}-212.5(c=$ $0.04, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ). Several attempts to acquire HRMS data for $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ using ESI and CI ionization techniques were unsuccessful.


Methyl
( $\mathbf{1 R , 2 R , 4 a S ) - 1 , 2 , 5 , 5 - t e t r a m e t h y l - 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 4 a , 5 , 6 , 7 -}$ octahydronaphthalen-2-yl) oxalate (3.64): A scintillation vial containing a stir bar was charged with tertiary alcohol 3.55 (304 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.46 \mathrm{mmol})$, DMAP ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. After sequential addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(410 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.92 \mathrm{mmol})$ and methyl chlorooxacetate ( $270 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, 2.92 mmol ), the reaction mixture was maintained at rt for 2 h . After this time, saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 4 mL ) was added and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (3\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide methyl oxalate ester $3.64(385 \mathrm{mg}, 1.31 \mathrm{mmol}, 90 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.57(10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.43(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.55(\mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.89(\mathrm{td}, J=13.2,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.83-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.23-1.16(\mathrm{~m}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 159.2,156.8,139.3,119.7,91.2,53.4,48.2,46.1,36.7,34.0,31.4$, 28.4, 25.7, 25.4, 23.0, 17.3, 10.9; IR (thin film) 2951, 2919, 1772, 1741, 1200, $1168 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$217.1729, found 317.1732; $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-$ 103.0, $[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{577}-100.8,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{546}-108.5,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{435}-187.3,[\alpha]^{22.4}{ }_{405}-221.9(c=0.22$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ).


Cesium
2-oxo-2-(( $(1 R, 2 R, 4 \mathrm{aS})-1,2,5,5$-tetramethyl-

## 1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-octahydronaphthalen-2-yl)oxy)acetate (3.63):

A scintillation vial containing a stir bar was charged with methyl oxalate ester 3.64 ( $379 \mathrm{mg}, 1.29 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and THF ( 2.6 mL ). A solution of $\mathrm{CsOH}(1.29$ $\mathrm{mL}, 1.29 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~N}$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added in $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ portions with vigorous stirring. After a total of $900 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ had been added, the remaining CsOH solution was added in $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ portions and the progress of the reaction was checked by TLC after each addition. After the addition was complete, the solution was transferred to a pear-shaped flask and concentrated under reduced pressure at $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The residue obtained was dried under vacuum overnight to produce a colorless solid. This solid was washed with n-pentane (3 $\times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and further dried 1 h under vacuum to provide cesium oxalate salt $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ ( 525 mg , $1.27 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%$ ) as a colorless powder: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 5.36$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-2.52(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41-2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{td}, J=13.6,3.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{qd}, J=13.7,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.80$
(s, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta$ 167.5, 163.4, 139.8, 118.0, 83.7, 47.6, 45.3, 36.4, 33.6, 30.9, 28.1, 25.3, 24.8, 22.4, 17.5, 10.5; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ $(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{Cs})^{-} 279.1596$, found 279.1602.

(4R,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-((1S,2R,4aS)-1,2,5,5-tetramethyl-
1,2,3,4,4a,5,6,7-octahydronaphthalen-2-yl)dihydrofuran-2(3H)one (3.14): To a one-dram vial containing a stir bar was added sequentially (S)-5-methoxyfuranone (3.13) (11 mg, 0.097 mmol ), cesium oxalate salt $3.63(40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.097 \mathrm{mmol}), \operatorname{Ir}\left(\mathrm{dF}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \text { ppy }\right)_{2}(\mathrm{dtbbpy}) \mathrm{PF}_{6}(1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.97$ $\mu \mathrm{mol})$, DME ( 1 mL ), and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(17 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.97 \mathrm{mmol})$. The heterogeneous yellow solution was sparged with argon for 5 minutes, then the vial was sealed with a Teflon-lined cap and the vial was placed in the center of two 34 W blue LED lamps. The reaction mixture was stirred vigorously for 24 h , and was then dilued with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography to provide lactone 3.14 (16 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.052 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \%)$ as a colorless oil and as a $5: 1$ mixture of diastereomers: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.37$ (10\% EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.35-5.31$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{dd}, J=18.4,10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54-2.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $18.4,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.54$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.21-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.66(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 150 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 176.8,140.6,118.5,106.2,57.0,49.3,48.9,43.4,39.2,33.2,32.7,31.4,29.7$,
28.0, 26.6, 24.7, 23.1, 17.5, 11.3; IR (thin film) 2931, 1786, $1451,1168,947 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$329.2093, found 329.2099; $[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-$ 43.7, $[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{577}-45.4,[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{546}-52.2,[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{435}-93.1,[\alpha]^{22.6}{ }_{405}-111.3\left(c=0.60, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$. The relative stereochemistry of the major diastereomer was assigned based on analogy to the products of several diastereoselective coupling reactions conducted in Chapter 1.

(rel-4R,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)dihydrofuran-
$\mathbf{2 ( 3 H})$-one (3.40): A round-bottom flask was charged with 5methoxyfuranone ( $2.01 \mathrm{~g}, 17.62 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ( $N$-acyloxy)phthalimide $\mathbf{3 . 3 9}^{56}$ ( $4.60 \mathrm{~g}, 16.02 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Hantzsch ester ( $6.09 \mathrm{~g}, 24.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and $\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{3}\left(\mathrm{PF}_{6}\right)_{2}$ ( $138 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol})$. Under argon, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(107 \mathrm{~mL}$, previously sparged with argon for 15 min ) and $i-\operatorname{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(6.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 35.24 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added sequentially, and the flask was placed in the center of a 30 cm strip of blue LEDs. The heterogeneous reaction mixture was stirred for 24 h , after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was washed with aqueous $4 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(3 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL})$, aqueous $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH} \mathrm{( } 3 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine $(2 \times 400 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \%$ acetone/hexanes) to provide lactone $3.40(2.27 \mathrm{~g}, 10.69 \mathrm{mmol}$, $67 \%$ ) as a colorless oil. Spectral data acquired for the compound matched those reported previously in Chapter 1.

cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and a solution of LHMDS ( $2.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added dropwise. The resulting yellow solution was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min , after which a solution of freshly prepared and distilled methyl glyoxylate $(\mathbf{3 . 6 6})^{46}(30 \mathrm{~mL}, 24.0$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 0.81 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added. The reaction mixture was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 $h$ and was subsequently quenched by the addition of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution (7 $\mathrm{mL})$. The layers were separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 15$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (25-30-40\% EtOAc/hexanes) to obtain alcohol $3.67(492 \mathrm{mg}, 1.64 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%)$ as a colorless oil and as a $2: 1$ mixture of diastereomers: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.36(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$, mixture of diastereomers) $\delta 5.22$ (br s, 1 H, minor), $5.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), $4.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.4$, $3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 4.37-4.34 ( $\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), 3.84 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major), 3.75 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 3.50 (s, 3 H , minor), 3.49 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major), $3.48-3.47$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor), $3.26(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , major), 3.06 (dd, $J=6.5,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), $2.91-2.89$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 2.38-2.33 $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), 2.11-2.07 ( $\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 1.60-1.16 (m, 10H, major and minor), $0.90(\mathrm{~s}$, 3 H , major), 0.81 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of diastereomers) $\delta 176.2,174.8,172.9,172.8,106.0,105.4,70.8,70.6,57.3,56.9,53.2,52.6,52.3,52.1$, $45.9,45.5,35.6,35.4,34.9,34.6,34.5,34.0,26.02,25.96,21.45,21.38,21.3,20.3,19.5 ;$

IR (thin film) 2929, 2854, 1777, 1747, 1446, 1124, $964 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{6}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 301.1651$, found 301.1658 .

Methyl 2-((rel-4S,5S)-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-2-oxodihydrofuran-3(2H)-ylidene)acetate (3.65): A scintillation vial containing a stir bar was charged with alcohol 3.67 ( $486 \mathrm{mg}, 1.62$ mmol ), DMAP ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 1,2-dichloroethane ( 11 mL ) under argon. After sequential addition of pyridine ( $520 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 6.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and trifluoroacetic anhydride ( 460 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 3.24 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), the reaction mixture was maintained at rt for 45 minutes when complete consumption of the starting material was observed by TLC. After this time, DBU (1.45 $\mathrm{mL}, 9,72 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added by syringe and the reaction mixture was stirred at rt for 1 h . The reaction mixture was then quenched by the addition of saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 6 mL ) and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide alkene $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}(415 \mathrm{mg}, 1.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%)$ as a colorless oil and as a 1.4:1 mixture of olefin isomers: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.68$ and $0.50(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$, mixture of olefin isomers) $\delta 6.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), $6.28(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor $), 5.39(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), 5.27 (s, 1H, minor), 3.83 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 3.78 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major), 3.49-3.46 (m, 1H), 3.48 ( s , $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.47(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}$, major and minor), $0.93(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major), 0.86 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, minor); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of diastereomers) $\delta 170.5,167.3,165.7,165.6,141.7,133.5,130.2,127.6,105.1,104.2,56.63,56.59,55.9$,
$52.6,52.2,38.1,35.8,35.3,35.1,34.6,34.3,25.97,25.93,21.7,21.6,21.50,21.46,20.5$, 19.8 ; IR (thin film) 2931, 2858, 1774, 1731, 1214, 938, $911 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$305.1365, found 305.1362.


Methyl
2-((rel-3R,4R,5S)-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-2-oxotetrahydrofuran-3-yl)acetate
(3.68) and Methyl 2-((rel-3S,4R,5S)-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-2-oxotetrahydrofuran-3-yl)acetate
3.41. Exemplary procedure for the hydrogenation of $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated lactone $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$.

Table 3.5, entry 1 is described: A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar was charged with alkene $3.65(11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.041 \mathrm{mmol}), 10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(4 \mathrm{mg})$ and $\mathrm{MeOH}(410 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The vial was evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ using a balloon of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ gas. The vial was equipped with the hydrogen balloon and the reaction mixture was stirred vigorously for 3 h at rt . After this time, the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ and the plug was then washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3 mL ). The filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure and the crude residue was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. Inspection of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum and comparison to ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data previously obtained ${ }^{19}$ for $\mathbf{3 . 6 8}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ revealed that compounds $\mathbf{3 . 6 8}$ and $\mathbf{3 . 4 1}$ were present in a 1:7 ratio.
Exact Mass: 326.2093
tert-Butyl 2-((rel-3S,4R,5S)-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-2-oxotetrahydrofuran-3-yl)acetate (3.73): A solution of lactone $\mathbf{3 . 4 0}$ $(1.37 \mathrm{~g}, 6.46 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 32 mL ) was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and a
solution of LHMDS ( $7.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in THF) was added dropwise. The yellow solution was maintained at this temperature for 15 minutes, after which tert-butyl bromoacetate ( $1.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.69 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added via syringe. The reaction mixture was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h , after which saturated aqueous NH 4 Cl solution ( 20 mL ) was added. The layers were separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 80 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{hexanes}$ ) to provide lactone $3.73(1.82 \mathrm{~g}, 5.57 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.21(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.18(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $2.83(\mathrm{q}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.1,7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=16.1,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.08-2.05 (m, 1H), 1.59-1.18 (m, 10H), $1.46(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 150 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 178.0,170.0,106.0,81.7,57.1,38.4,38.1,35.6,34.3,28.1,26.1,21.55,21.49$, 20.4; IR (thin film) 2929, 2857, 1776, 1730, 1367, 1151, $952 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$349.1991, found 349.1997.

tert-Butyl
2-((rel-3S,4R,5S)-2-hydroxy-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)tetrahydrofuran-3-yl)acetate (3.74): A solution of lactone $3.73(1.82 \mathrm{~g}, 5.57 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(56 \mathrm{~mL})$ was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of DIBAL-H ( $6.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 6.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in hexanes) was added dropwise. The reaction mixture was maintained at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , after which additional solution of DIBAL-H ( $6.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 6.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in hexanes) was added dropwise. The reaction mixture was maintained at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h 45 min and was
then quenched with $\mathrm{MeOH}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to rt and saturated aqueous Rochelle's salt solution $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The suspension was stirred vigorously at rt for 45 min and was then extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{x}$ 100 mL ). The combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over MgSO 4 , filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes ) to provide lactols 3.74 ( $972 \mathrm{mg}, 2.96 \mathrm{mmol}, 53 \%$ ) as a colorless oil and a 1.4:1 mixture of lactol diastereomers: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.37(25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes $) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 5.82(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=8.2,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), $5.51-5.47(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor $), 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor $)$, $4.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), $3.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, minor $), 3.28(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, minor $), 3.22$ (s, 3H, major), 3.09 (d, $J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), 2.81 (dd, $J=16.7,11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, major), 2.66-2.59 (m, 1H, major), 2.52-2.44 (m, 2H), 2.42-2.35 (m, 1H, minor), $1.42(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}$, major), $1.39(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}$, minor), $1.39-0.97(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}$, major and 10 H , minor), $0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, minor), 0.68 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, major) ; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$, mixture of diastereomers) $\delta$ $172.1,171.8,108.2,106.0,103.8,101.8,80.4,79.9,55.0,54.9,43.9,40.6,40.3,37.3$, $36.6,36.5,36.1,35.9,28.17,28.10,26.5,26.4,22.0,21.96,21.94,21.88$; IR (thin film) $3448,2927,2859,1730,1367,1155,1106 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;$ HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 351.2148$, found 351.2159. Note: Lactol 3.74 decomposed rapidly when dissolved in commercial $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, so it was more suitable for $N M R$ analysis in $C_{6} D_{6}$.

tert-Butyl 2-((rel-4S,5S)-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-4,5-
dihydrofuran-3-yl)acetate (3.72): A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar
was charged with lactol 3.74 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), DMAP ( $4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and THF $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. The vial was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and pyridine ( $230 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.05 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and trifluoroacetic anhydride ( $210 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added sequentially. The vial was then capped with a Teflon-lined cap and was placed in an aluminum block preheated to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The brown reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h , after which it was allowed to cool to rt . The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 1 mL ) and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were washed with brine $(2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography (2-3-5\% EtOAc/hexanes) to provide dihydrofuran 3.72 ( $34 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 36 \%$ ) as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.79(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.33(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.41(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=29.9,17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 1.44(\mathrm{~s}$, 9H), $0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.7,143.2,109.0,108.9,80.8,55.2$, 36.4, 36.1, 35.5, 34.5, 28.2, 26.3, 21.9, 21.8; IR (thin film) 2928, 2857, 1732, 1368, 1148, $1081 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$333.2042, found 333.2036.


## 2-((rel-4S,5S)-5-Methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)-4,5-

 dihydrofuran-3-yl)acetic acid (3.71): A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar was charged with ester $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}$ ( $33 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{MeOH}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and THF ( 1 mL ). Aqueous $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(1 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added and the reaction mixture was heated to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an aluminum block for 18 h . After this time, the solution was allowed to cool to rt and aqueous $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. Themixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $4 \times 3 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine ( $2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over MgSO , filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $20 \%$ acetone/hexanes then $100 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ ) to obtain a mixture of carboxylic acid $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ and bicyclic lactone 3.38. Repeated chromatography under these conditions eventually gave a trace amount of carboxylic acid 3.71 that was pure by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) $\delta 6.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.21$ $(\mathrm{m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. Carboxylic acid 3.71 was used immediately after preparation in the subsequent reaction. Repeating the above procedure to obtain analytically pure carboxylic acid $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ for characterization purposes was unsuccessful due to the propensity of $\mathbf{3 . 7 1}$ to spontaneously cyclize to form $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$.

(rel-4R,5S)-3a-Iodo-5-methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)tetrahydrofuro[2,3-b]furan-2(3H)-one (3.75): A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar was added sequentially carboxylic acid 3.71 ( $6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.025 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(10 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$, THF $(120 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and $\mathrm{MeCN}(250 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ under argon. The reaction mixture was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2}(20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added in one portion. The resulting heterogeneous purple solution was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 minutes, after which it was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and transferred to a separatory funnel. The solution was washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ solution ( $3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through cotton and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue
obtained was purified by silica gel chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes ) to provide iodolactone $3.75(7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%)$ as a colorless oil: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.41(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexanes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.28(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.24(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=18.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=18.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.70-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{td}, J=12.3,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.19(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 126 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.0,117.0,109.8,62.3,56.5,52.0,38.0,35.9,35.1,33.6,25.9,21.6,21.3$, 19.9; IR (thin film) 2928, 1793, 1100, 895, $692 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{IO}_{4} \mathrm{Na}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+} 403.0382$, found 403.0367 .

(rel-3aS,4R,5S,6aS)-5-Methoxy-4-(1-methylcyclohexyl)tetrahydrofuro[2,3-b]furan-2(3H)-one (3.38): A 1-dram vial containing a stir bar was charged with iodolactone 3.75 (4 $\mathrm{mg}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ and $\mathrm{PhMe}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ under argon. After sequential addition of $(\mathrm{TMS})_{3} \mathrm{SiH}(6 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and AIBN solution $(16 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 61 \mathrm{mM}$ in PhMe$)$, the vial was capped and placed in an aluminum block preheated to $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was maintained at this temperature for 40 minutes, after which it was allowed to cool to rt and was concentrated under reduced pressure. Analysis of the residue by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR confirmed that the bicyclic lactone was formed as a single diastereomer. ${ }^{19}$

### 3.8 References and Notes

1. Molinski, T. F.; Faulkner, D. J.; Cun-heng, H.; Van Duyne, G. D.; Clardy, J. J. Org. Chem. 1986, 51, 4564-4567.
2. Keyzers, R. A.; Northcote, P. T.; Davies-Coleman, M. T. Nat. Prod. Rep. 2006, 23, 321-334.
3. Sullivan, B.; Faulkner, D. J. J. Org. Chem. 1984, 49, 3204-3206.
4. Carmely, S.; Cojocaru, M.; Loya, Y.; Kashman, Y. J. Org. Chem. 1988, 53, 48014807.
5. Schnermann, M. J.; Beaudry, C. M.; Egorova, A. V.; Polishchuk, R. S.; Sütterlin, C.; Overman, L. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 2010, 107, 6158-6163.
6. (a) Brady, T. P.; Wallace, E. K.; Kim, S. H.; Guizzunti, G.; Malhotra, V.; Theodorakis, E. A. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2004, 14, 5035-5039. (b) Guizzunti, G.; Brady, T. P.; Malhotra, V.; Theodorakis, E. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 4190-4191. (c) Guizzunti, G.; Brady, T. P.; Malhotra, V.; Theodorakis, E. A. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2007, 17, 320-325.
7. Schnermann, M. J.; Beaudry, C. M.; Genung, N. E.; Canham, S. M.; Untiedt, N. L.; Karanikolas, B. D. W.; Sütterlin, C.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 17494-17503.
8. (a) Lackner, G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 15342-15345. (b) Lackner, G. L.; Quasdorf, K. W.; Pratsch, G.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6012-6024. (c) Pratsch, G.; Lackner, G. L.; Overman, L. E. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 6025-6036.
9. Nawrat, C. C.; Jamison, C. R.; Slutskyy, Y.; Macmillan, D. W. C.; Overman, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 11270-1273.
10. van der Deen, H.; van Oeveren, A.; Kellogg, R. M.; Feringa, B. L. Tetrahedron Lett. 1999, 40, 1755-1758.
11. Justicia, J.; Campaña, A. G.; Bazdi, B.; Robles, R.; Cureva, J. M.; Oltra, J. E. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2008, 350, 571-576.
12. Dieskau, A. P. Unpublished results, UC Irvine.
13. An X-ray crystal structure of the para-nitrobenzoate derivative of this alcohol confirmed its relative configuration. See: Dieskau, A. P. Final Postdoctoral Report, UC Irvine.
14. (a) Lu, W.-J.; Chen, Y.-W.; Hou, X.-L. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2010, 352, 103-107. (b) Lu, W.-J.; Chen, Y.-W.; Hou, X.-L. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 10133-10136. (c) Tian, F.; Yao, D.; Liu, Y.; Xie, F. Zhang, W. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2010, 352, 1841-1845. (d) Lu, S.-M.; Bolm, C. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 8920-8923.
15. (a) Brady, T. P.; Kim, S. H.; Wen, K.; Theodorakis, E. A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2004, 116, 757-760. (b) Brady, T. P.; Kim, S. H.; Wen, K.; Kim, C.; Theodorakis, E. A. Chem. Eur. J. 2005, 11, 7175-7190.
16. A similar Diels-Alder approach was used in the synthesis of gracilins B and C, which also contain polycyclic lactone motifs. See: Corey, E. J.; Letavic, M. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1995, 117, 9616-9617.
17. Granger, K. M.; Snapper, M. L. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 2308-2311.
18. The cyclopropanation-hydrogenation approach has been previously used to stereoselectively construct bicyclooctanones. See: Weisser, R.; Yue, W.; Reiser, O. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 5353-5356 and references therein.
19. Garnsey, M. R. Unpublished results, UC Irvine.
20. (a) Calaza, M. I.; Hupe, E.; Knochel, P. Org. Lett. 2003, 5, 1059-1061. (b) Soorukram, D.; Knochel, P. Org. Lett. 2004, 6, 2409-2411. (c) Soorukram, D.; Knochel, P. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2006, 45, 3686-3689.
21. Sasaki, Y.; Niida, A.; Tsuji, T.; Shigenaga, A.; Fujii, N.; Otaka, A. J. Org. Chem. 2006, 71, 4969-4979.
22. Zhuo, X.; Xiang, K.; Zhang, F.-M.; Tu, Y.-Q. J. Org. Chem. 2011, 76, 6918-6924.
23. Unfortunately, conditions could not be found using either chiral GC or chiral HPLC to resolve the two enantiomers of rac-3.21. This analysis was especially complicated by the fact that 3.21 is relatively unfunctionalized and does not possess a suitable chromophore to facilitate HPLC analysis.
24. Maryanoff, B. E.; Reitz, A. B. Chem. Rev. 1989, 89, 863-927.
25. Neither olefin $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ nor tertiary alcohol $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ were suitable for analysis by chiral HPLC or chiral GC, so any olefin product $\mathbf{3 . 2 2}$ obtained via the Wittig reactions was carried through two additional steps before information was obtained regarding its enantiopurity.
26. The salt present in solution can affect the outcome of a Wittig reaction. See: Vedejs, E.; Cabaj, J.; Peterson, M. J. J. Org. Chem. 1993, 58, 6509-6512 and references therein.
27. In this procedure, the ylide is first generated by deprotonation of ethyltriphenylphosphonium bromide with sodamide in toluene at high temperature. After
ylide formation evidenced by a red color, the solution is allowed to cool to room temperature to precipitate the salt byproducts as well as unreacted sodamide. Filtration of the supernatant under an inert atmosphere then provides a solution of the ylide intermediate free from salt and excess base.
28. Horner, L.; Hoffman, H.; Wippel, H. G. Chem. Ber. 1958, 91, 61-63.
29. Julia, M.; Paris, J. M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1973, 4833-4836.
30. (a) Baudin, J. B.; Hareau, G.; Julia, S. A.; Ruel, O. Tetrahedron Lett. 1991, 32, 11751178. (b) Blakemore, P. R.; Cole, W. J.; Kocienski, P. J. Synlett 1998, 26-28.
31. Takai, K.; Nitta, K.; Utimoto, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1986, 108, 7408-7410.
32. Okazoe, T.; Takai, K.; Utimoto, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 951-953.
33. This optimization was carried out using rac-3.49 as the substrate. Identical results were obtained in all cases when enantioenriched vinyl iodide $\mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ was used in place of rac-3.49.
34. Tamao, K.; Sumitani, K.; Kumada, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc, 1972, 94, 4374-4376.
35. Milstein, D.; Stille, J. K.; J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1978, 100, 3636-3638.
36. Miyaura, N.; Suzuki, A. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1979, 866-867.
37. Baba, S.; Negishi, E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976, 98, 6729-6731.
38. This compound was stable when stored neat at $-20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and showed no signs of decomposition.
39. (a) Wu, J. Y.; Moreau, B.; Ritter, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 12915-12917. (b) Ely, R. J.; Morken, J. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 2534-2535.
40. Sodeoka, M.; Shibasaki, M. Synthesis 1993, 643-658.
41. The mechanism of catalyst turnover by this process is unclear, as previous experiments established that catalyst turnover requires a single-electron reduction of the substrate to regenerate the ground-state photocatalyst.
42. The relative configuration of the secondary methyl group of this intermediate was assigned based on analogy to the stereochemistry established by carbonyl-ene cyclization of ketal rac-3.22. The stereochemistry at the hydroxyl-bearing carbon was established by ${ }^{1}$ H NMR analysis, even though it is inconsequential in this case as the alcohol is oxidized in the next step.
43. Dess, D. B.; Martin, J. C. J. Org. Chem. 1983, 48, 4155-4156.
44. This $\beta, \gamma$-unsaturated ketone was prone to olefin isomerization, forming the respective $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated carbonyl compound under acidic or basic conditions or prolonged storage at room temperature. As a consequence, ketone $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ was always used immediately after preparation in the ensuing reactions.
45. Maruoka, K.; Itoh, T.; Yamamoto, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 4573-4576.
46. Jung, M. E.; Shishido, K.; Davis, L. H. J. Org. Chem. 1982, 47, 892-893.
47. (a) Jurkauskas, V.; Sadighi, J. P.; Buchwald, S. L. Org. Lett. 2003, 5, 2417-2420. (b) Bui The Thuong, M.; Sottocornola, S.; Prestat, G.; Broggini, G.; Madec. D.; Poli, G. Synlett 2007, 1521-1524.
48. For an informative review of seleno- and iodolactonizations, see: Ranganathan, S.; Muraleedharan, K. M.; Vaish, N. K.; Jayaraman, N. Tetrahedron 2004, 60, 5273-5308.
49. Surprisingly, the lactols 3.74 rapidly decomposed in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, likely from trace amounts of HCl present, so NMR analysis of $\mathbf{3 . 7 4}$ was conducted using $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$.
50. Rashid, S.; Bhat, B. A.; Mehta, G. Org. Lett. 2015, 17, 3604-3607.
51. Pandey, G.; Balakrishnan, M. J. Org. Chem. 2008, 73, 8128-8131.
52. Nikolic, N. A.; Beak, P. Org. Synth. 1997, 74, 23.
53. Singh, S.; Guiry, P. J. J. Org. Chem. 2009, 74, 5758-5761.
54. Uemura, M.; Minami, T.; Hirotsu, K.; Hayashi, Y. J. Org. Chem. 1989, 54, 469-477.
55. Hsung, R. P. Synth. Commun. 1990, 20, 1175-1179.
56. See Chapter 1 for the preparation of this radical precursor.

## Appendix A: NMR Spectra




sess -





T86. T





























[^0]



























O-2


























${ }_{\text {t92 }} \cdot 9 \mathrm{gt}$
z-restored spin-echo ${ }^{13 C}$ spectrum with 1 decoupling


















$\qquad$
$\xrightarrow{485 \cdot 9}$
${ }_{68 \%}$ -








\[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { z restored spin echo } 13 \mathrm{C} \text { spectrum with } 1 \mathrm{H} \text { decoupling } \\
\text { 呚合 }
\end{gathered}
$$
\]









1H spectrum




z restored spin echo 13 C spectrum with 1 H decoupling





















Toz'tit
889.02t ——
T66. รгT







z-restored spin-echo 13 C spectrum with 1 decoupling



















$\qquad$













-restored spin-echo 13 C spectrum with 1 H decoupling













z-restored spin-echo 13 C spectrum with 1 H decoupling



[^0]:    
    

