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## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Driving new applications of bioorthogonal 1,2,4-triazines and cyclopropenones

## By

Sean S. Nguyen<br>Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry<br>University of California, Irvine, 2020<br>Professor Jennifer A. Prescher, Chair

Bioorthogonal chemistry enables researchers to study biomolecules in their native environments without perturbing endogenous cellular processes. Over the past two decades, significant strides have been made in developing new, and refining existing, bioorthogonal reactions. The continuously expanding toolbox has opened avenues for tackling increasingly complex biological questions. Despite these advances, limitations remain. The majority of bioorthogonal chemistries follow similar mechanisms, and thus cannot be used simultaneously in multicomponent labeling applications. Bioorthogonal chemistry has also seen little use outside of biomolecule labeling and pull-down applications. To push bioorthogonal chemistry into new directions, I took advantage of two I scaffolds previously developed in the lab: the 1,2,4-triazine and the cyclopropenone.

In Chapter 1, I summarize recent advances made in the field of bioorthogonal chemistry. I focus on how physical organic principles can guide the iterative refinement of existing bioorthogonal transformations. Along the way, I also highlight advances
made in developing collections of bioorthogonal chemistries that can used in multicomponent labeling applications. In Chapter 2, I describe the use of bioorthogonal 1,2,4-triazines as surrogates for aromatic amino acid residues. These scaffolds are isosteric to phenylalanine, and in principle could be metabolized into the proteome by endogenous cellular machinery. The unique reactivity profile of 1,2,4-triazines also makes them strong candidates for developing mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal reactions. My efforts to develop a triplet set of bioorthogonal reactions is also highlighted. In Chapter 3, I discuss the use of bioorthogonal cyclopropenones as chemically triggered crosslinkers to capture biomolecule interactions. This reaction is robust enough to be conducted in the presence of bacterial cellular lysate. Chapter 4 showcases the use of the cyclopropenone as a synthon for accessing butenolide scaffolds. Butenolides are found in a variety of natural products, but existing routes to access them are not generalizable. The methodology is organocatalytic, and has a broad tolerance for functional groups and substitution patterns.

This thesis describes the use of bioorthogonal chemistry in underexplored applications. Outside of biomolecule labeling, these transformations can have utility in areas such as chemical crosslinking and synthetic methodology. Both the cyclopropenone and the 1,2,4-triazine are prime candidates for pushing the frontiers of bioorthogonal chemistry. These scaffolds exhibit remarkable stability in biological environments, and possess unique manifolds of reactivity that can be exploited in multiple settings outside of traditional biomolecule tagging.

## Chapter 1: Developing Bioorthogonal Probes to Span a Spectrum of Reactivities

Adapted from published work, with permission from Springer Nature: Nguyen, S. S.; Prescher, J. A. Nat. Rev. Chem. 2020, 4, 476-489.

### 1.1 Introduction

A comprehensive view of living systems requires tools and methods to probe biomolecules in their native habitats. Fluorescent proteins and other genetic tags have long been used in this capacity [1]. Although powerful, such tools are not amenable to direct monitoring of non-proteinaceous targets, including small-molecule metabolites. The need for more generalizable platforms has spurred the development of bioorthogonal chemistries - highly selective reactions that can be used to covalently tag targets in live cells and, in some cases, living organisms. For decades, bioorthogonal reactions have been used to visualize and profile diverse biomolecules. These studies have provided fundamental insights into various aspects of cell and organismal biology. Such studies also revealed limitations in the bioorthogonal toolkit, inspiring the development of more selective and finely tuned probes.

Central to all applications of bioorthogonal chemistry are reactions that are chemoselective and compatible with living systems. The development of such transformations can be difficult. The solvent and temperature are fixed, and the reactions must proceed in the midst of a multitude of interfering functionalities. The reactions often cannot be accelerated simply by heating up the subject or adding more reagent. Thus, the canonical rules for fine-tuning chemistries in round-bottom flasks often fail to translate to physiological environments, where few parameters can be varied [2]. Nonetheless, generations of chemists have been inspired to control bond
formation in live cells and organisms. Their efforts have provided transformations that can be executed without detriment in living systems.

This Chapter assesses the development of bioorthogonal reactions, with an emphasis on how mechanistic insights have driven the field. Like other areas of chemistry, no 'one-size-fits-all' transformation exists. Rather, each reaction has its pros and cons, with limitations that continue to propel new advances. In the first section, we provide a brief history of bioorthogonal chemistry and introduce the common tactics that facilitated early probe development. The bulk of the Chapter then showcases recent achievements in bioorthogonal reaction design. We also highlight efforts to engineer bioorthogonal chemistries that can be used concurrently for multicomponent labelling. These, and other, innovations will continue to expand the collection of biocompatible and mutually orthogonal reagents.

### 1.2 Setting the stage: Classic bioorthogonal transformations

Chemists rely on robust and versatile reactions to craft complex molecules. Synthetic routes are drafted with reagent accessibility, yields and selectivities in mind. Ideally, the transformations are fast, selective and applicable to a broad range of substrates. In reality, most reactions are not universally efficient and require tweaks to temperature, pH or stoichiometry in different contexts. Catalysts and solvents are also varied to optimize yields. Limitations in reaction scope often become the inspiration for new transformations. This iterative cycle of reaction discovery and refinement has provided a compendium of methods for controlling bond formation in various contexts.

In some cases, hundreds, if not thousands, of specialized reagents have been developed to address shortcomings in reaction scope.

Iterative refinement has also been used to tune reagents for use in living systems, with certain considerations in mind (Figure 1-1) [2-3]. Bioorthogonal functional groups must be both kinetically and metabolically stable, yet react rapidly with complementary probes under physiological conditions. The reactions must also be tolerant of water and other biological functional groups [4-6]. The constraints imposed by cells and tissues exclude many organic transformations. Several biological applications also demand reagents that impart a minimal steric 'footprint' $[7-8]$. Thus, developing chemistries that feature small reagents is another important goal.


Figure 1-1. Translating reactions from round-bottom flasks to living systems. Reactants (orange circle and arc) used in cells and tissues must be compatible with cellular functionality. Challenging applications continue to drive the refinement of bioorthogonal reactions. Optimization in either flasks or cells invokes similar principles, although variables that are easily controlled in flasks are often invariant in living systems.

So, where does one begin? Hunting for unusual functional groups in heterologous organisms is a good starting point. Microorganisms, plants and other species often have access to chemistries and functionalities not present in mammalian cells. These motifs can survive in biological environments and are immediately orthogonal to mammalian systems, making them attractive candidates for bioorthogonal chemistry. A classic example is the alkyne, a motif that is present in numerous microbial metabolites [9], but absent in higher eukaryotes. The alkyne has been applied as a bioorthogonal motif in numerous settings [2]. Popular bioorthogonal functional groups also include some unlikely candidates from synthetic chemistry [10-11]. Organic azides and strained alkynes were traditionally viewed as too unstable for use in living systems. However, careful tuning has provided reagents now recognized among the gold standards in the field. These examples provided important lessons for subsequent reagent development [12]. In this section, we provide a brief perspective on how some seemingly "misfit" functional groups became stalwarts of the two most common classes of bioorthogonal chemistry: polar reactions and cycloadditions (Figure 1-2). We highlight early obstacles and key advances in the development of these probes. Initial successes provided a roadmap for continued reagent refinement.

### 1.2.1 Polar reactions

Aldehydes and ketones were among the first reagents employed as bioorthogonal labels. These carbonyl groups were attractive for biomolecule tagging, owing to their small size and compatibility in living systems [13]. Moreover, these electrophiles also readily condense with $\alpha$-nucleophiles, such as hydrazides and aminooxy groups (Figure
$1-2 \mathrm{Ab})$. Aldehyde and ketone condensations have been used to label a wide variety of biomolecules [14-17]. However, the reactions are pH sensitive and quite slow in physiological settings. Aniline catalysts [18-21] can boost the rates, although the transformations remain difficult to execute in cellular environments.

Although aldehydes and ketones have been less widely used in cells, only a few other bioorthogonal functional groups rival their minimal size. Among the most influential has been the organic azide. This motif is abiotic and comprises just three atoms. Azides are remarkably inert in biological settings but exhibit unique manifolds of reactivity. For example, they can react with soft nucleophiles, including triarylphosphines (via Staudinger reduction). This reaction proceeds via an aza-ylide intermediate, which can be intercepted by a neighbouring electrophile. Bertozzi and colleagues capitalized on this feature, installing an ester on the phosphine to trap the aza-ylide (Figure 1.2Ad). The transformation ultimately linked the two reactants via an amide bond. This variant termed the Staudinger ligation - was amenable to tagging azides in a variety of complex environments, including live cells [22]. Early applications featured glycans and posttranslational modifications, although many other biomolecules have since been targeted [23-27]. The Staudinger ligation was also the first reaction of its kind to be used in live rodents, a particularly demanding environment [28].

The versatility of the Staudinger ligation propelled an entire field of reaction development. Many early studies were directed at increasing ligation speed [4-5]. Although the Staudinger ligation was robust enough to tag glycans and other biomolecules in vivo, the slow rate proved challenging for imaging studies in rodents and higher organisms. Large amounts of reagent were required to drive covalent bond
formation on reasonable timescales. Such quantities were not easily achieved, owing to the limited water solubility of many phosphine probes. These shortcomings generally sidelined the in vivo application of Staudinger ligation but helped to inspire other types of transformations with organic azides.

### 1.2.2 Cycloadditions

Cycloadditions are popular bioorthogonal transformations, owing to their exquisite chemoselectivity (Figure 1-2Ba). One of the earliest exploited was [3+2] cycloaddition with azides. In addition to being mild electrophiles, organic azides are 1,3dipoles that are subject to react with alkynes. As alkynes are rare in higher eukaryotes, they are suitably orthogonal. However, azide-alkyne cycloadditions typically require high temperatures or pressures to proceed, conditions that are not biocompatible. A key breakthrough was the recognition that the cycloaddition could be accelerated using $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ (Figure 1.2 Bb ). The copper-catalyzed azide-alkyne cycloaddition (CuAAC) is ubiquitous in chemical biology and other disciplines [29-30], and is still inspiring new transformations [31]. The cytotoxicity of $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ [32-34] has precluded the in vivo application of CuAAC in some cases, although more biofriendly catalysts have been developed. Many feature water-soluble ligands that stabilize $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ and prevent the formation of reactive oxygen species [35-38]. Polytriazole ligands, in particular, enabled CuAAC reactions to be conducted in live cells and zebrafish [36].

The constraints posed by copper catalysts also inspired chemists to devise new strategies to ligate 1,3-dipoles. One of the most fruitful approaches relied on strain energy - bending the alkyne from its normal linear geometry [39]. The smallest of the
stable cycloalkynes, cyclooctyne, was found to react with azides in the absence of a copper catalyst [40]. This work gave rise to an entire family of strain-promoted azidealkyne cycloadditions (SPAACs) (Figure 1-2Bc). Such reactions have been widely used in complex biological settings, including plants [41], C. elegans [42], and mice [43-46]. Although SPAAC reactions minimize toxicity in living systems, some of the alkynes react with biological thiols [47]. Moreover, the fastest reactions observed with the most reactive strained alkynes plateau at rates of $\sim 1 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, which are not suitable for some in vivo applications.

Other cycloadditions have been developed to address the need for fast-acting, biocompatible reagents. One notable class comprises inverse electron-demand DielsAlder (IEDDA) cycloadditions (Figure 1-2Bd). The IEDDA reaction between tetrazine and trans-cyclooctene (TCO), in particular, has gained prominence (Figure 1-2Be) [11,48-50]. This reaction pair boasts rates up to $10^{6}$ times faster than the most reactive SPAAC pair. Such rapid reactions have widespread use in cells and living organisms, as only small amounts of material are required to drive covalent bond formation. The kinetic profile of the tetrazine-TCO cycloaddition has enabled the exploration of new imaging platforms in vivo, including PET imaging [51-52] and other modalities [53-55]. Tetrazine-TCO reactions have also been widely employed to tag biomolecules, release prodrugs [56-59], and activate enzymes [60-62].
A Polar reactions
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B Cycloaddition reactions


Figure 1-2. Tuning transformations for biological application. Bioorthogonal chemistries largely fall into two categories: polar reactions and cycloadditions. Examples of how limitations (highlighted in red) have spurred the development of new reactions are shown.

### 1.3 Fine-tuning bioorthogonal reagents and reactions

Despite remarkable achievements in bioorthogonal reaction design over the past two decades, limitations remain. Many reagents are insufficiently stable for use in the most demanding biological settings. Others react too slowly to transition to in vivo applications. And although many of the reactions work well on single targets, most cannot be used in combination to label multiple targets, owing to cross-reactivity
concerns. Simultaneous tracking of multiple biomolecules thus remains a long-standing challenge. Collectively, these limitations underscore the need to not only develop new reactions but also to fine-tune existing chemistries. The next sections highlight recent approaches to address voids in the bioorthogonal toolbox and to broaden the diversity of reactivities (Figure 1-2).

### 1.3.1 Tuning polar reagents and reactions

As noted above, some of the earliest bioorthogonal transformations involved condensation reactions with carbonyls and $\alpha$-nucleophiles. The reversible nature of these reactions presented challenges in biomolecule labelling. Efforts to forge more stable adducts have been undertaken, including the use of proximal stabilizing groups [63-69]. A key example features boronic acids (Figure 1-2Ac). These functional groups can coordinate ligation adducts, including hydrazones [64] and oximes [65-66], preventing hydrolysis. Boronic acids have also been used to stabilize ligation adducts formed from other $\alpha$-nucleophiles [67-69], as well as tag $N$-terminal cysteine residues on peptides and small proteins [70-71].

Polar reactions with azides have also been tuned for specific applications. The Staudinger ligation was an early target for optimization, with efforts focused on increasing rates and reagent solubility. Introducing electron-withdrawing groups on the azide or electron-donating groups on the phosphine increased the ligation speed. For example, electron-deficient aryl azides with fluorine [72] and chlorine [73] substituents exhibited faster rates compared to their unsubstituted counterparts. Interestingly, the key aza-ylide formed in these cases was a stable adduct, obviating the need for an
electrophilic trap on the phosphine. Halogenated aryl azides have since been used to label glycans and proteins in live cells [72-73]. Generating suitable electron-rich phosphines for Staudinger ligation has been less straightforward. More nucleophilic scaffolds can reduce disulfide bonds in proteins and are prone to rapid oxidation. Despite this liability, numerous phosphine probes have been tuned for cellular, and other, applications [74-76].

Phosphine reagents have also been tuned for improved biocompatibility. For example, Ren and co-workers synthesized phosphines comprising a fluorosulfate group (Figure 1-2Ae) [77]. This handle functions similarly to the ester trap in the original Staudinger ligation, by intercepting the aza-ylide. After ejection of fluoride and hydrolysis, the ligation provides an aryl sulfamate ester. The modified phosphine displayed markedly improved water solubility compared to initial Staudinger ligation probes. The sulfamate ester products also mimic phosphate backbones present in many biomolecules and metabolites.

Entirely different phosphorus nucleophiles have also been examined for azide ligation. Phosphites [78-80] and phosphonites [81-83], for example, react similarly with aryl azides compared to the Staudinger ligation probes. The resulting phosphoramidate and phosphonamidite adducts (respectively) can serve as surrogates for phosphate ester backbones found in nucleotides and other biomacromolecules.

Tuned phosphines have been exploited in other chemical contexts. For example, hosphines can react with Michael acceptors to form stable phosphonium adducts. This transformation has been employed to label biomolecules. In one study, tris(2carboxyethyl)phosphine (TCEP), a water-soluble reductant widely used in biology, was
reacted with electron-deficient alkenes. This reaction was used to study protein glycosylation in live cells [84] and crotonylation patterns on histone proteins [85].

A more recent addition to the phosphine ligation kit comprises cyclopropenone derivatives (CpXs) [86-89]. In the case of cyclopropenones $(X=O)$, the ligation proceeds via an initial Michael-type addition, followed by ring-opening to form a reactive ketene-ylide (Figure 1-3). The ketene can be trapped by pendant nucleophiles on the phosphine to furnish $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated carbonyls. Mono-substituted CpOs were prone to react with biologically relevant thiols [86], but tuning has provided more bioinert scaffolds comprising dialkyl motifs [87]. These latter reagents can be used in live cells.


Figure 1-3. Cyclopropenone $(\mathrm{CpX})$ derivatives exhibit unique reactivities. Analogs featuring oxygen or sulfur atoms ( CpO and CpS , respectively) react with phosphines via ketene-ylide intermediates. By contrast, nitrogenous scaffolds $\left(\mathrm{CpN}^{+}\right)$react to form phosphonium bicycles.

The reactivity of CpOs can be further modulated through heteroatom replacement, a common strategy for probe tuning in bioorthogonal chemistry. The sulfur variant of CpO , cyclopropenethione $(\mathrm{CpS})$, also reacts rapidly with phosphines via thioketene-ylide intermediates [88]. The thiocarbonyl products are useful biophysical
probes to study protein stability and function [90-91]. Nitrogen CpO heteroanalogs, cyclopropeniminium $\left(\mathrm{CpN}^{+}\right)$ions, were also explored as bioorthogonal reagents. Interestingly, $\mathrm{CpN}^{+}$ions react with phosphines via a different mechanism than that of CpO or CpS derivatives. The initial Michael addition provides an enamine, which undergoes proton transfer instead of ring opening to give phosphonium bicycles [89] (Figure 1-3). Thus, small changes to a core scaffold can have profound effects on reactivity.

### 1.3.2 Tuning dipoles for bioorthogonal cycloaddition

The azide-alkyne cycloaddition remains one of the most popular 1,3-dipolar cycloadditions for examining biological systems. The success of this ligation has served as inspiration for exploring new 1,3-dipoles (Figure 1-4a). One example includes nitrones [92], reagents that can react more rapidly than azides with certain alkynes [9395]. Nitrone-alkyne cycloadditions, similar to their azide-alkyne counterparts, can be accelerated by copper catalysis. Such reactions have been used to image sugar metabolism and receptor-ligand interactions in mammalian cells, as well as peptidoglycan structures in bacteria [96-98].

Another newcomer to the bioorthogonal dipole set is sydnone [99]. This 1,3dipole reacts with alkynes to afford pyrazole adducts. Although initial applications required copper catalysis [100], subsequent work identified scaffolds that were also capable of copper-free reactions with strained alkynes [101]. Sydnones have undergone further modification to modulate their reactivity for biological application. Chlorine substituents were found to increase reaction rates (30-fold) with a popular strained
alkyne, bicyclo[6.1.0]nonyne (BCN) [102]. Fluorine substitution further boosted reaction rates of sydnones with a variety of strained alkynes [103].

Close relatives of organic azides, diazo compounds have been similarly tuned as dipoles for bioorthogonal application [104]. The small size of the diazo group makes it attractive for biomolecule labeling, but such motifs were long thought to be too reactive for cellular use. However, diazo motifs are stable when in conjugation with aryl systems or electron-withdrawing groups (e.g., esters, amides) [105-106]. They ligate strained alkynes with second-order rate constants similar to azides. Diazo-cyclooctyne reactions have been used to tag cellular glycans among other targets [107-108]. Importantly, the resulting pyrazole adducts are stable to a number of biological nucleophiles [109]. Further diazo tuning has provided scaffolds that react with acyclic electron-deficient alkenes, a transformation that can be performed in the presence of azides [110].

More reactive 1,3-dipoles have also been harnessed for bioorthogonal application. Most are masked until an external trigger (often light) is applied, enabling the reactant to be released "on demand" [106, 111-113]. One such class of dipoles comprises nitrile imines. These motifs react robustly with strained alkenes such as norbornene [114] and cyclopropene [115-116], but they are prone to rapid hydrolysis in the absence of a ligation partner. Nitrile imines can be caged as tetrazoles or sydnones, functional groups that are more stable in biological environs. UV irradiation can liberate the reactive species. The starting tetrazole chromophores can be tuned for photolysis and thus nitrile imine release - using different wavelengths of light [117-118]. This added layer of control has inspired the exploration of other "photo-click" reactions to
expand the compendium of bioorthogonal chemistries [119-121]. Nitrile imines have also been extensively tuned via electronic [122] and steric modification [123].

### 1.3.3 Tuning dipolarophiles for bioorthogonal cycloaddition

Tuning bioorthogonal cycloadditions is perhaps best exemplified in the context of the strained cycloalkynes as dipolarophiles [10,12]. Many efforts have been directed at modifying ring strain, with an eye towards increasing reaction rates or in cellulo stability. Examples include modulation of ring size or conformation [124-131], electronic perturbation [132-135], installation of endocyclic heteroatoms [136-138], and combinations thereof (Figure 1.4b) [139-140]. There have also been significant efforts to improve the water solubility of these relatively greasy probes. Towards this end, cycloalkynes featuring sulfamate backbones, as well as larger heterocyclic derivatives (up to 12-membered rings) have also been explored [141-146]. The heteroatom variants were generally more water soluble and stable. However, the benefits of ring expansion came at the cost of rate, a trade-off that is prevalent in bioorthogonal reagent tuning [2]. With the reactivity-stability axis in mind, one of the more impactful cycloalkynes has been BCN [131]. This scaffold has increased strain energy compared to the original cyclooctyne (due to the fused cyclopropane ring) [147], but is remarkably stable in cellular environments. Coupled with its synthetic accessibility, BCN has become a staple strained alkyne for cycloaddition chemistries in a number of fields. In a recent example, BCN-fluorophore conjugates were used for super-resolution imaging in live cells (Figure 1.4c,d) [148]. FtsZ, a protein involved in bacterial cell division, was enzymatically outfitted with an azide. Subsequent treatment with cell-permeable BCN
derivatives (comprising photoswitchable rhodamines) enabled protein localization patterns to be observed.
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Figure 1-4. An expansive set of reagents for dipolar cycloaddition. (A) Various 1,3 dipoles are available for bioorthogonal labeling. Organic azides were among the first to be exploited for cycloadditions in cells. More recently, diazo, sydnone, and nitrone motifs have been developed for biomolecule labeling. Highly reactive dipoles (including nitrile oxides, imines, and ylides) are also viable ligation partners and are typically produced "on demand" via photolysis or chemical uncaging. (B) Several classes of strained alkynes are available for bioorthogonal cycloaddition. These reagents derive from cyclooctyne, the firstreported variant. Extensive modifications to cyclooctyne provide a suite of reagents with varying reactivities. (C) Example application of bioorthogonal cycloadditions. FtsZ, a bacterial protein involved in cellular division, was outfitted with an azide handle. Subsequent ligation with BCN-photoswitchable fluorophore conjugates enabled super-resolution microscopy in live E. coli. (D) Diffraction-limited fluorescence (left) and super-resolution (right) microscopy images of FtsZ localization in live E. coli. The inset shows a bright-field image of the bacterial cell. Images were adapted with permission from ref. [148], The American Chemical Society.

Efforts to modulate cycloalkyne reactivity have been bolstered by computation. Calculations can readily predict combinations of steric and electronic features to tune scaffolds for desired outcomes. One well-established approach for modulating cycloaddition partners relies on the Distortion/Interaction model [149-150]. This analysis
computes the activation barrier for a given reaction by calculating the difference between a distortion energy (i.e., the energy required for reactants to adopt their ideal transition state geometries) and an interaction energy (i.e., favorable orbital overlap between the two reaction partners). The calculated activation energy is then correlated to a predicted rate constant, which can ultimately guide reagent tuning. One of the earliest demonstrations of the Distortion/Interaction model in bioorthogonal reagent design involved a series of biarylazacyclooctynone (BARAC) analogues. This study revealed structural features that impeded BARAC reactivity with azides and set the stage for improved cyclooctyne development [151]. Similar computational studies have been used to fine-tune sydnone-cycloalkyne reactions [152] and other bioorthogonal cycloadditions [149, 153-154].

### 1.3.4 Tuning dienophiles for bioorthogonal cycloaddition

Parallel developments in the realm of IEDDA have expanded the number of bioorthogonal chemistries in recent years. Reactions featuring TCO, in particular, have found widespread use in cells and in vivo [11]. Such transformations have also been the targets of extensive reagent tuning [155-159]. Many efforts have focused on pushing the kinetics of the tetrazine-TCO ligation (Figure 1-5). Increasing TCO strain was hypothesized to boost reaction rate, similar to the strained alkynes. Toward this end, Fox and coworkers designed scaffolds wherein TCO was forced to adopt a half-chair conformation (e.g., d-TCO [155] and s-TCO [155]). Such motifs were predicted to be $5.6-5.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ higher in energy relative to the more stable crown conformation of

TCO [160]. The more reactive d-TCO and s-TCO variants display bimolecular rate constants as high as $3 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$.

Similar to the strained alkynes, ring contraction strategies have been employed in the context of strained alkenes. Recently, trans-cycloheptene (TCH) analogs have been reported as voracious dienophiles in IEDDA cycloadditions with tetrazines [161-162]. TCH readily isomerizes under ambient conditions but can be isolated as a stable complex with $\mathrm{Ag}(\mathrm{I})$. In addition, incorporation of an endocyclic silicon atom provided a more stable seven-membered cycloalkene, sila-trans-cycloheptene (SiTCH). The longer Si-C bond lengths in SiTCH relieved some ring strain, enabling facile isolation. Computational studies further revealed that the activation barrier for SiTCH reactivity with diphenyltetrazine was significantly lower compared to s-TCO, enabling rapid ligation. The second-order rate constant for SiTCH and a model tetrazine was 1.14 x $10^{7} \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, the fastest bioorthogonal ligation on record. Despite their impressive rates, though, TCH and SiTCH degrade rapidly in the presence of cellular thiols [162].

1,3-Disubstituted cyclopropenes, alternative dienophiles for IEDDA reactions, have also been tuned for a variety of applications. We and others reported that these scaffolds react with tetrazines in biological environments [163-164]. Compared to TCO, the reaction between tetrazines and cyclopropenes is much slower. However, the small size and cellular stability of cyclopropenes have rendered them attractive for interrogating biomolecules in complex environments [165]. One notable example from the Chin lab showcased a cyclopropene-lysine analog to monitor nascent protein biosynthesis in Drosophila [166].


Figure 1-5. A collection of strained alkenes for IEDDA reactions. These reactions exhibit a range of rates with tetrazines. trans-Cyclooctene (TCO) was the original member of this group. TCO has since been modified to access faster and more biocompatible reagents. Some of the scaffolds feature endocyclic heteroatoms (DOTCO [156], OSi-TCH [161], oxoTCO [158]), conformational constraints (d-TCO [155], sTCO [155]), and contracted rings (SiTCH [162], TCH [162]). In general, the fastest reacting scaffolds exhibit the shortest half-lives in the presence of biological thiols.

The reactivity profile of the cyclopropene can be dramatically influenced by steric tuning. The Distortion/Interaction model predicted that increasing steric bulk at C3 on cyclopropene would drastically reduce its reactivity with tetrazines. Diminished reactivity was attributed to geometric constraints in the transition state. The poor orbital overlap between the cycloaddition partners was predicted to slow the ligation. Indeed, no reaction was observed even when 3,3-disbustituted cyclopropenes were subjected to a variety of functionalized tetrazines. Such cyclopropenes still reacted with nitrile imines, though, and this differential reactivity was exploited to label two proteins in tandem [116].

Further cyclopropene tuning was achieved upon introduction of spirocycles at C3. Based on crystallographic data, cyclopropene 1.2 exhibited a reduced bond angle between the two $\mathrm{C}^{3}$-groups compared to parent cyclopropene 1.1 (Figure 1-6). The decreased bond angle drove the substituents away from the incoming nitrile imine,
increasing ligation rates by 15 -fold [167]. Interestingly, the spirocyclic cyclopropenes also exhibited reactivity with some tetrazines, and have been used to label cell-surface receptors in live cells [168]. Heteroatoms within the spirocycle further boosted cyclopropene reactivity by lowering LUMO energies [169]. Spirocyclic cyclopropenes have recently been outfitted with light-sensitive cages. Upon uncaging, the scaffolds become available for IEDDA ligation. These masked reagents can be used for biomolecule labeling with spatiotemporal control, but their syntheses remain challenging [170-171].

Tetrazines have also been explored as reactants for other biocompatible cycloadditions. Recent work has featured transformations with isonitriles. These dienophiles react with tetrazines via [4+1] cycloaddition to provide imine products. With primary and secondary isonitriles, the imines undergo facile tautomerization and hydrolysis to liberate amines. Such isonitriles have proven useful as cages for amino fluorophores and small-molecule drugs [172-173]. Hydrolysis can be mitigated with appropriately tuned isonitriles [174-175]. For example, tertiary scaffolds react with tetrazines to form stable ligation adducts, with no subsequent reactions [175]. Because of their small size and versatility, isonitriles have been used to label biomolecules, including proteins [176] and glycans [177].

Simple vinyl groups have been shown to undergo IEDDA reactions with tetrazine probes. The small size of the vinyl motif is attractive for biomolecule tagging strategies. However, even with electron-rich vinyl reagents, most of the alkenes examined to date suffer from low aqueous solubility and slow rates [178-179]. Vinylboronic acids (VBAs) react significantly faster with tetrazines. The ligation liberates boronic acid, a major
driving force for the reaction [180]. Even more rapid cycloadditions can be achieved with electron-rich VBAs and tetrazines outfitted with hydroxy groups. These latter groups coordinate the boronic acid motifs [181-182]. The VBA-tetrazine ligation has been used to profile the efficacy of proteasome inhibitors in live cells [183]. Many other cyclic [184185] and acyclic [186] alkenes have been similarly explored as tetrazine ligation partners [187].

### 1.3.5 Tuning dienes for bioorthogonal cycloaddition

The second half of the IEDDA reaction, the diene (most often, tetrazine), has also been thoroughly modified to achieve altered stability and reactivity profiles (Figure 1.2Bf) [62, 182, 188-191]. In one example, the stability of the tetrazine probe was modulated using electronic perturbations. An amino acid comprising a tetrazine motif was initially found to hydrolyze in the cellular milieu. The hydrolysis was facilitated by a labile secondary amine linkage. The electron-donating amine group also slowed IEDDA rates. Simple removal of the amine handle addressed both of these limitations [190]. In another example, researchers synthesized a panel of tetrazines for amine uncaging with TCO. The tetrazines were screened with model enzymes bearing TCO-caged amino acids. The best tetrazines facilitated near quantitative uncaging in under 4 minutes with as little as $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ reagent [62].

The rates that some tetrazine ligations achieve are unparalleled. Such rates, though, often come at the cost of probe stability. Many of the most reactive tetrazines are known to react with thiols, which can lead to off-target effects and high background labeling in cells [192]. To address this liability, some groups have drawn inspiration from
caged bioorthogonal reagents. These efforts are focused on liberating the reactive tetrazine and take advantage of the redox properties of the motif. The reduced form, dihydrotetrazine, is unreactive towards dienophiles and stable in biological contexts. Dihydrotetrazines can then be oxidized to tetrazines in situ via enzymatic [193], or photocatalytic [193] approaches. Such strategies provide an avenue to employ even the most reactive tetrazines in biological environments. Caged tetrazines have also been employed to decorate electrode surfaces with biomolecules [194].
a


b

$k_{\text {rel }}=1.0$

Figure 1-6. Steric modifications tune cyclopropene reactivity. (A) The angle between $\mathrm{C}^{3}$-substituents is reduced in spirocyclic cyclopropene 1.2 compared to parent compound 1.1. (B) The decreased bond angle minimizes steric clashes in the transition state, resulting in faster reactions with nitrile imines. Part (A) was adapted with permission from ref. [167], The American Chemical Society.

The instability of some tetrazine motifs inspired pursuits of less electron-deficient dienes, including 1,2,4-triazines. Like its tetrazine counterpart, the triazine reacts via IEDDA with strained m-systems such as TCO and BCN [195-196]. While the rates of these reactions are markedly slower, the triazine is stable in the presence of biological thiols for over 24 hours at elevated pH . These scaffolds have since been installed in proteins [195,197], as well as enzymatically appended onto DNA in vitro [198-199]. 1,2,4-Triazines have also been electronically tuned to achieve faster kinetic
profiles [200-201]. For example, electron-withdrawing pyridinium groups have been used to improve cycloaddition rates. These scaffolds have been recently used to label mitochondria in live cells [200]. Subtle steric modifications to the triazine core also provided altered modes of reactivity with strained alkynes. In a recent study, the Distortion/Interaction model predicted that triazine substitutions at C3 and C6 would diminish reactivity with sterically encumbered strained alkynes [202]. Such reactions were predicted to remain facile with $\mathrm{C}^{5}$-substituted isomers, as steric clashes were minimized at the bond-forming centers (i.e., C3 and C6). The predictions were confirmed experimentally via simultaneous, dual labeling of two protein targets.

The number of dienes that can participate in IEDDA cycloadditions is also growing. A nitrogenous heterocycle, $4 H$-pyrazole, was recently shown to ligate the strained alkyne BCN [203]. At the outset, the pyrazole required further tuning to elicit robust reactivity. Addition of fluorine substituents was hypothesized to impart negative hyperconjugative effects on the pyrazole ring. This tuning would increase the antiaromatic character of the scaffold, resulting in destabilization of the pyrazole ring and more rapid ligation. Computational analyses verified that a gem-difluoro group decreased the LUMO values of the $4 H$-pyrazole, resulting in fast reactivity with BCN. Such antiaromaticity considerations along a reaction coordinate could be more generally exploited in bioorthogonal reaction design.

Another class of dienes comprises ortho-quinones. These motifs react with dienophiles via strain-promoted oxidation-controlled cyclooctyne-1,2-quinone (SPOCQ) cycloadditions [204]. Early iterations involved converting 1,2-catechols to the corresponding quinones using an exogenous oxidant [205]. SPOCQ reactions were
orders of magnitude faster than azide-alkyne cycloadditions (with second-order rate constants of $\sim 500 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ ), on par with some tetrazine-TCO ligations. Later studies demonstrated that genetically encodable tyrosine tags could be selectively oxidized to quinones in situ using tyrosinase. These motifs could then be used to append small molecules for antibody-drug conjugate formation. The strategy enabled control over the location and number of warheads that were appended to the antibody [206]. orthoQuinones were also found to react efficiently with strained alkenes, such as cyclopropenes [207]. However, the need to generate ortho-quinones in situ can impose constraints. ortho-Quinoline quinone methides were explored as more versatile alternatives, as these scaffolds can be generated in situ without any external triggers in biological environments. The motifs were found to react robustly with vinyl thioethers via hetero Diels-Alder cycloaddition. The unusual thioacetal adduct formed was found to be stable in aqueous solution at various pH values [208-209].

### 1.4 Combining mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal reactions

As evident from above, the past decade has seen a surge in the number of transformations available for biological application. Despite the expanded toolkit, it remains challenging to apply more than one reaction at a time [210]. New reaction development has largely focused on labeling single targets. Identifying collections of compatible bioorthogonal chemistries would enable multicomponent labeling studies, and allow a broader set of biological processes to be examined. Finding such combinations of reactions has historically been challenging, as many popular reagents
cross-react with one another. The search for orthogonal reactions has accelerated in recent years, aided by computational tools and reaction tuning.

Bioorthogonal reactions that feature unique mechanisms are well suited for multicomponent labeling studies. Reagents with distinct modes of reactivity can often mitigate incompatibility issues. For example, azide-alkyne cycloadditions can be used in tandem with hydrazine/ketone condensations [211], various IEDDA reagents [163, 178, 212-214], some 1,3-dipoles [98, 110], and other motifs [180, 215-217]. Efforts to employ three mutually compatible bioorthogonal groups have also been pursued [202, 213, 218-220]. One recent example featured azide-, cyclopropene-, and alkyne-containing sugars to study the heterogeneity of glycan metabolism in plant cells [219]. The ligations could not be performed simultaneously, though, owing to cross-reactivities among the reaction partners. Cumbersome washes were also required between ligations, eroding temporal resolution. Only three studies to date have been able to achieve simultaneous triple labeling [221-223]. One notable example features two tetrazines, one that is sterically encumbered and reacts selectively with a small isonitrile. The second tetrazine ligates TCO in a typical IEDDA cycloaddition. The tetrazine reactions were combined with an azide/strained alkyne pair in a triple labeling experiment. Three model proteins, containing either a bulky tetrazine, a less encumbered tetrazine, or an azide were mixed and reacted with isonitrile-, TCO-, and strained-alkyne fluorophores. The matched adducts were detected by in-gel fluorescence, with no evidence of cross-reactivity (Figure 1-7) [223]. While this study showcased triple component labeling in a model context, the reagents should be applicable in other biological settings.


Figure 1-7. Triple component protein labeling. (A) Three mechanistically distinct reactions - [4+1] tetrazine ( $\mathrm{Tz}_{1}$ )-isonitrile cycloaddition, [4+2] tetrazine (Tz2)-trans-cyclooctene (TCO) cycloaddition and [3+2] azide-dibenzocyclooctyne (DBCO) cycloaddition - were used to simultaneously label three model proteins (bovine serum albumin (BSA), ovalbumin (OVA) and lysozyme (LYSO)). (B) The covalent protein adducts were visualized through gel electrophoresis followed by fluorescence scanning. No crossreactivities were detected. Part (B) was adapted with permission from ref. [223], Wiley-VCH.

### 1.5 Exploring new genres of reactivity

Identifying additional genres of bioorthogonal chemistry will continue to bolster multicomponent labeling studies. Recent efforts to explore new areas of chemical space - coupled with additional tuning of existing ligations - are proving fruitful. Boron reagents are gaining traction. In recent work, a diboron probe was found to react
selectively with $N$-oxides. Importantly, the ligation proceeded efficiently inside cells, one of the harshest biological environments [224]. The unique mechanism of this reaction is further compatible with several existing bioorthogonal chemistries.

Perhaps the most noteworthy developments in polar reagent design involve sulfur(VI) fluorides. These motifs are remarkably stable in cellular environments, and react robustly with oxygen and nitrogen nucleophiles through sulfur(VI) fluoride exchange (SuFEx) chemistry [225-226]. SuFEx reagents have been used for drug design [227-228], activity-based profiling [229] and other protein targeting studies [230]. They have also been employed for examining protein-protein interactions via proximitydriven crosslinking [231-232]. SuFEx electrophiles also provide a mild and convenient method to introduce bioorthogonal azides onto a variety of amine targets, further exemplifying the utility of these motifs [233].

Explorations into new cycloaddition platforms are also expanding the bioorthogonal toolkit. One example involves the quadricyclane ligation [221]. This reaction is a formal $[2 \sigma+2 \sigma+2 \pi]$ cycloaddition with Ni-bis(dithiolene) complexes, a rather unique mode of reactivity. Quadricyclanes are highly strained molecules ( $\sim 80 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ of strain energy [234]), but can survive in aqueous conditions and in the presence of thiols for extended periods. Quadricyclanes have even been used for intracellular labeling applications via genetic code expansion [235]. The novelty of the quadricyclane reaction is likely to inspire continued exploration of other cycloaddition manifolds for bioorthogonal application.

Bioorthogonal platforms of reactivity have also expanded to include transition metals. These metals are virtually absent in the cellular milieu and can forge stable C-C
bonds, making them attractive for selective labeling applications. Focused reviews on this topic have been covered recently, but a few examples are described below [236237]. Water soluble $A u(I)$ complexes have been developed to drive covalent bond formation in aqueous media [238]. Gold nanoparticles have also been employed for imaging in zebrafish [239]. More reactive Au(III) species can be harnessed for selective amidation reactions, although the metal complexes must be associated with scaffolding proteins [240]. Inspired by copper catalysis, several groups have optimized ligands to form water soluble, minimally toxic palladium complexes. Some have been used for Suzuki-Miyaura [241-242] couplings in cells, along with Sonogashira reactions [243244], and alkynyl-carbamate deprotections [245-246]. Palladium nanoparticles [247] and assemblies [248] have also been developed for conducting various transformations in cellulo. Similar advances in ruthenium chemistry [249-251] and iridium photocatalysis [252] are enabling biomolecule targeting. New developments in protein bioconjugation are also being leveraged for more general bioorthogonal application. One example features aryl diazonium ions [253-254]. These electrophiles react robustly with electron-rich aromatic side chains such as tyrosine. Site-specific modification with aryl diazoniums was historically challenging owing to the abundance of tyrosine residues in proteins. Further exploration revealed a selective reaction between 5hydroxytryptophan (5HTP) and aryl diazonium reagents. The additional electron density in 5HTP enabled the use of less reactive diazonium reagents, preventing background labeling of other aromatic side chains. This reaction has since been used to label recombinant proteins and antibody derivatives [255], and additional targets are
anticipated. Further tuning of other protein-labeling strategies is likely to provide more bioorthogonal reagents [256-257].

### 1.6 Introduction to the Thesis

At its core, bioorthogonal chemistry is focused on controlling reactive functional groups in harsh environments. How does one design a pair of reagents to form a single adduct, in the confines of a cell or whole organism? The strict requirements imposed on these reactions have often forced researchers to explore unconventional handles. Historic work provided an initial set of reagents, many of which are still employed for examining biomolecules in vivo.

The toolbox has greatly expanded in recent years via iterative tuning of established probes. Some common themes from these studies have emerged. For example, the rates and stabilities of first-generation tools can be modulated for particular applications, drawing on common physical organic chemistry principles. The impacts of certain modifications can often be predicted computationally. Computational analyses can also be invaluable to the hunt for collections of mutually compatible transformations.

After decades of work on bioorthogonal chemistries, there is still no "one-size-fits-all" reaction. Rather, a spectrum of reactivities exists and the challenge lies in knowing how best to apply the probes. Recent successes in tuning highly reactive chemical handles suggest that other "fringe" functional groups can be harnessed for understanding biology. There is a further need for not just single-component reactions, but also collections of bioorthogonal chemistries that can be used in tandem [210]. The
continued exploration of unique modes of reactivity [256-260] will be useful in this regard.

This thesis showcases new applications of a bioorthogonal reaction developed in the Prescher lab between cyclopropenones (CpOs) and phosphines [86-87]. Upon incubation with a phosphine probe, CpOs can undergo ring-opening to unveil a highly electrophilic ketene-ylide intermediate. This reactive species can be trapped both interand intramolecularly with appropriate nucleophiles, and is the crux of the projects described herein. In Chapter 2, the unique reactivity of CpOs and phosphines was exploited to develop a collection of three mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal reactions. Because the majority of popular bioorthogonal reactions are cycloadditions, the $\mathrm{CpO}-$ phosphine ligation presented a unique opportunity to develop mutually exclusive bioorthogonal reactions. These ligations could be performed in a one-pot fashion without any evidence of cross-reactivity between probes. In Chapter 3, the $\mathrm{CpO}-$ phosphine reaction was optimized to capture protein-protein interactions with temporal resolution. Whereas previous iterations of the ligation featured intramolecular trapping, this rendition of the reaction was optimized for intermolecular events. The resulting crosslinking strategy was applied to a split protein system, and could be performed even in the presence of cell lysate. Finally, in Chapter 4, the CpO-phosphine reaction was coopted to develop a methodology for accessing substituted butenolides. The optimized conditions featured phosphine organocatalysis, and was applied to over 20 substrates bearing various functional handles. Collectively, this work will expand the capabilities of bioorthogonal reactions in previously underexplored applications.
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## Chapter 2: Driving new applications of bioorthogonal 1,2,4-triazines

Adapted from published work, with permission from the Royal Society of Chemistry: Kamber, D. N.; Nguyen, S. S.; Liu, F.; Briggs, J. S.; Shih, H.-W.; Row, R. D.; Long, Z. G.; Houk, K. N.; Liang, Y.; Prescher, J. A. Chem. Sci. 2019, 10, 9109-9114.

### 2.1 Abstract

As discussed in Chapter 1, the size and stability of a bioorthogonal reporter is a key consideration when choosing the right chemistry for a given application. Some of the most popular reagents are sterically demanding and have limited stability in cellular environments. Bioorthogonal chemistry has also largely been limited to studying single targets, owing to cross-reactivity between probes. In this Chapter, I discuss how the bioorthogonal 1,2,4-triazines can fill both of these voids.

### 2.2 Introduction

Interactions with host cells govern the pathology of many infectious agents, including the causative agents of botulism and cholera [1-2]. The initial stages of these infections, along with pathogen persistence, are driven by the secretion of virulence factors into the host cell [3]. Proteins and small peptides comprise a large fraction of the secreted effectors, and these biomolecules can disrupt normal cell function and promote infection [4]. While effector proteins have been identified from several organisms, a complete inventory of such factors remains unknown in most cases [5-6]. The interactions of secreted factors with host biomolecules, and the timing of these events, are also poorly understood. This is, in part, due to the lack of general molecular tools for tracking large collections of biomolecules in their native habitat.

In recent years, the bioorthogonal chemical reporter strategy has emerged as a powerful tool to visualize and identify secreted biomolecules in complex environments (Figure 2-1) [7]. In this strategy, target biomolecules can be labeled with building blocks containing unique chemical motifs using the cell's metabolic machinery [8-11]. The reporters must be small enough to maneuver through biosynthetic pathways, and stable enough to avoid degradation in the cell. Once incorporated, the reporters can be reacted with a second probe to label the target for visualization or isolation. Like the reporters, the secondary probes must also be inert to the cellular environment, and react only with their respective coupling partner. The bioorthogonal chemical reporter strategy has been widely used to visualize and profile entire proteomes, including those secreted from pathogens [12-13]. For example, Tirrell and coworkers used azidohomoalanine, homopropargylglycine, and azidonorleucine to examine proteins secreted by Yersinia enterocolitica and other pathogens [14-16]. These noncanonical amino acid reporters serve as surrogates for methionine, and are well tolerated by native enzymes because they closely resemble the native substrate. The labeled microbial proteins can then be detected using copper-catalyzed "click" chemistry.


Figure 2-1. Overall scheme for the bioorthogonal chemical reporter strategy. A building block reporter (e.g. a noncanonical amino acid) is incorporated into a biomolecule target (e.g. a protein) via metabolism. The reporter can be detected using a bioorthogonal reaction.

While azido and alkynyl amino acids have been widely employed in proteome labeling, they are not without limitations. Azides are prone to degrade to amines in the highly reducing conditions of the cell [7]. Terminal alkynes require cytotoxic copper catalysts for bioorthogonal detection, limiting their practicality in living systems [17]. Although strained alkynes mitigate this requirement, they are susceptible to thiolmediated degradation, and are too sterically demanding for use in native biological pathways [18-20]. Having access to additional small, stable noncanonical amino acids would be useful for protein labeling applications. Probes that exhibit unique modes of reactivity would also be beneficial for studies involving multiple secreted epitopes.

In 2015, the Prescher lab showed that 1,2,4-triazines are viable scaffolds for the bioorthogonal chemical reporter strategy. These motifs react robustly with strained $\pi$ systems, such as trans-cyclooctene (TCO, Figure 2-2A). Triazines are remarkably stable in the presence of thiols, a requirement for cellular use [21-22]. This observation is in stark contrast to the 1,2,4,5-tetrazine, a well-known and structurally related bioorthogonal handle that degrades rapidly in the presence of biological thiols [23]. The triazine's structural similarity to native aromatic amino acids makes it attractive for tagging newly synthesized proteins via native biosynthetic pathways. Previous work in the lab showed that triazine $\mathbf{1}$ could be utilized by engineered biosynthetic enzymes, but was too sterically demanding to be incorporated in endogenous pathways [21]. Smaller triazine amino acids 2-4 (Figure 2-2C) could potentially be more useful in this regard. Indeed, several small, aromatic amino acid derivatives such as 4-fluorophenylalanine and pyridyl amino acids are known to be metabolized and incorporated into bacterial proteins [24-25].
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Figure 2-2. Triazines are versatile bioorthogonal motifs. A) Triazine scaffolds have been shown to react robustly with trans-cyclooctene (TCO) via an inverse electron-demand Diels-Alder cycloaddition (IEDDA). B) Isomeric 1,2,4-triazines exhibit unique reactivities. Tuning the steric bulk around the heterocycle affords selective reactivity with different strained m-systems, such as tetramethylthiacycloheptyne 2.1 (TMTH). C) A panel of triazine amino acids. Eliminating the additional phenyl ring in noncanonical amino acid 2.1 affords minimalist motifs. Varying the substitution around the triazine scaffold would take full advantage of the differences in reactivity with TCO and TMTH for potential in tandem experiments.

In addition to its small size, the triazine also displays unique profiles of reactivity with depending on substitution pattern. Previous work by Dr. David Kamber showed that 5-substituted triazines react robustly with sterically encumbered alkynes such as tetramethylthiacycloheptyne (TMTH) (Figure 2-2B). Such scaffolds display no signs of reactivity with less reactive $\pi$-systems, such as the cyclopropene (Cp). This mode of reactivity set the stage for orthogonal reaction development between other popular bioorthogonal chemistries, such as the ligation between 1,2,4,5-tetrazines and Cps . Dr. Kamber demonstrated that the bioorthogonal [4+2] cycloadditions could be conducted in a one-pot fashion without evidence of cross reactivity. However, this result was obtained using organic solvent (Scheme 2-1). Whether the reactions could be used simultaneously in biological environments remained to be determined.

Scheme 2-1. Mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal cycloadditions.


Below I describe my efforts to translate 1,2,4-triazines and their associated reactions to cellular contexts. Specifically, I examined whether the triazine motif could be used as a surrogate for phenylalanine (Phe). I synthesized triazine noncanonical amino acids and evaluated their metabolic incorporation in bacteria. I also investigated whether the dual [4+2] cycloadditions could be performed in aqueous solution on the surface of proteins. Additionally, I determined whether a third reaction could be incorporated to create a triplet of mutually orthogonal, bioorthogonal reactions. To date, only two triple-component ligation strategies have been reported [26-27].

### 2.3 Results and Discussion

### 2.3.1 Triazine amino acids as surrogates for phenylalanine

The study of proteome dynamics has benefitted greatly from noncanonical amino acids. These tools allow researchers to differentiate newly synthesized proteins in response to changes in the cellular environment. Such probes typically feature bioorthogonal handles, such that newly synthesized proteins can be selectively tagged for downstream proteomic analyses. To be successful, the noncanonical amino acids must be incorporated throughout the entire proteome, usually at a specific residue [28].


Figure 2-3. Autodocking studies with triazine amino acids 2.3 (left) and 2.4 (right) in the E. coli PheRS active site (PDB ID: 3PCO) [29]. In addition to a potential hydrogen bond interaction with Ser 171, mstacking interactions may be possible between the triazine amino acids and two key phenylalanine residues (Phe 248, 250) that reside in the active site.

The most stringent enzymes involved this process have historically been the aminoacyltRNA synthetases (AARS). These enzymes are responsible for transporting amino acids to the ribosome, and typically have high affinity for their cognate substrate. This specificity emphasizes the need for minimally perturbed reporters.

We hypothesized that triazine amino acids would be ideal surrogates for aromatic amino acids. The small size and increased aqueous stability of triazine scaffolds gave us confidence that the candidate amino acids could be metabolized by the cell's native machinery. We reasoned that the AARS most relevant to triazine metabolism would be the phenylalanine aminoacyl-tRNA synthetase (PheRS), due to the triazine's structural similarity to the natural substrate. Indeed, modeling studies of triazine amino acids 2.3 and 2.4 using Autodock suggested that these motifs could retain favorable interactions in the active site of the PheRS (Figure 2-3) [29-30].

To capitalize on the unique features of triazines as metabolic reporters, a panel of "minimalist" triazine amino acids were designed (Figure 2-2C). The core structures differed from triazine probes developed previously in the group, which comprised only aryl substituents. We first sought to determine whether alkyl-substituted triazine scaffolds were stable in biological conditions. To this end, triazine reporters were appended nonspecifically to the model protein lysozyme using carbonate 2.10 (Scheme S2-1) and verified by mass spectrometry (Figures 2-4A and 2-4B). The labeled proteins were then reacted with a trans-cyclooctene probe bearing a biotin moiety (TCO-biotin) and analyzed via SDS-PAGE and Western blot. As depicted in Figure 2-4C-D, sufficient signal over background was observed after 2 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the reaction was dosedependent with respect to the TCO-biotin. Gratifyingly, the triazine-TCO reaction showed no nonspecific labeling in the presence of cell lysate, further demonstrating its utility in complex biological environments (Figure 2-4E).

After verifying the stability of alkyl-triazines, I proceeded to synthesize amino acids 2.3 and 2.4 using Negishi couplings between iodoalanine and functionalized triazines [31-33]. Commercially available L-serine methyl ester was protected with an Fmoc group. This base-labile protecting group was chosen due to the instability of 1,2,4-triazines under strongly acidic conditions. Compound 2.11 was iodinated using triphenylphosphine and iodine to access 2.12 (Scheme 2-2A). The triazine portions of the amino acids were derived from 3-amino-1,2,4-triazine (Scheme 2-2B). A Sandmeyer reaction followed by a Negishi coupling to $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ gave the fully protected 3-substituted triazine amino acid 2.14. Subsequent deprotection and HPLC purification gave amino acid 2.3. For the 6 -substituted amino acid, electrophilic substitution with bromine
followed by a Sandmeyer reaction gave triazine 2.15 . This product was not isolated, as it degraded upon purification. Triazine 2.15 was taken on directly to the Negishi coupling. The resulting amino acid 2.16 was deprotected to give amino acid 2.4.
A



Figure 2-4. Triazine motifs function in biologically relevant environments. A) Carbonate 2.10 was used to label surface-exposed lysine residues on the protein lysozyme. B) Triazine attachment was verified using mass spectrometry. C) Western blot analysis of triazine-labeled lysozyme treated with TCO-biotin ( 1 mM ) for $0-2 \mathrm{~h}$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. D) Western blot analysis of triazine-labeled lysozyme treated with up to 1 mM TCObiotin for 2 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. E) Western blot analysis of cell lysate ( $15 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ ) doped with triazine-labeled lysozyme $(5 \mu \mathrm{~g})$ and reacted with TCO-biotin $(1 \mathrm{mM})$ for $5-120 \mathrm{~min}$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Protein loading was verified with Coomassie staining.

Scheme 2-2. Synthesis of triazine noncanonical amino acids. A) Synthesis of the amino acid fragment. B) Synthesis of the triazine fragment and subsequent coupling.
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The aqueous stabilities of amino acids 2.3 and 2.4 were evaluated to determine whether these scaffolds would be suitable for use in biological studies. The compounds were first incubated in buffered solutions (pH 7.4) at elevated temperatures, and monitored via ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. No degradation was observed over seven days (See Appendix A). The amino acids were also subjected to high concentrations of Lglutathione, conditions that mimic the harsh intracellular environments encountered in vivo. After 24 h , the triazine amino acids showed no signs of degradation, suggesting that they are suitable for use in cellular studies (See Appendix A).


Figure 2-5. Metabolic labeling studies in BL21(DE3) E. coli cells. Cells were incubated in LB media with or without amino acid 2.3. After 24 h the cells were lysed, and the supernatant was collected. Isolated proteins were labeled with TCO-biotin ( 1 mM final concentration) for 24 h at room temperature. The labeled proteins were separated by gel electrophoresis and analyzed via Western blot (top). Protein loading was confirmed using Ponceau S stain (bottom). Sambucus Nigra Lectin-Biotin (SNA-Biotin) was used as a positive control for streptavidin binding.

Metabolic labeling studies were performed in bacterial cells to determine if amino acid $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ could be incorporated into proteins using native biosynthetic machinery. In an initial experiment, BL21(DE3) E. coli cells were incubated in rich media containing amino acid 2.3 or no amino acid supplement. After 24 h , the cells were harvested, lysed, and reacted with TCO-biotin for 24 h . The resulting protein samples were analyzed via Western blot. No signal was observed over background, suggesting that amino acid 2.3 is unable to compete with the large pools of endogenous substrate for incorporation (Figure 2-5). To minimize competition between Phe and amino acid 2.3,
an analogous labeling experiment was repeated using AF-IQ cells, a strain of E. coli that is auxotrophic for Phe [25]. Cells were incubated in M9 minimal media supplemented with Phe as a positive control, various concentrations of amino acid 2.3, or no amino acid. Periodic $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ measurements were taken to monitor cell growth. Over the course of 24 h , though, no significant growth was observed in the cultures containing amino acid 2.3 (Figure 2-6).


Figure 2-6. AF-IQ E. coli cells were treated with minimal media supplemented with phenylalanine, triazine amino acid 2.3, or no amino acid. $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ measurements were taken periodically over 28 h .
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Figure 2-7. Full chemical structures of 4-azidophenylalanine (AzPhe), pyridyl amino acid 2.17, cyclopropene sugar Ac4ManCCP, alkyne-biotin, TCO-biotin and Tz-biotin.

While these experiments suggest that triazine amino acid 2.3 is not effectively processed by native E. coli machinery, it could be a viable substrate for well-known mutant strains. Tirrell and coworkers have demonstrated that a single point mutation to the PheRS enzyme (A294G, denoted as PheRS*) can improve its ability to incorporate noncanonical amino acids by relaxing the specificity of the active site $[24,34]$. Relevant to my work, PheRS* was able to process a related pyridyl amino acid (2.17, Figure 2-7). To test whether the same synthetase could tolerate amino acid 2.3, I employed an auxotrophic E. coli strain expressing PheRS*, as well as murine dihydrofolate reductase (mDHFR), both under the control of the lac promoter [24]. The cells were incubated in M9 minimal media in the presence of pyridyl amino acid 2.17 (positive control), amino acid 2.3, Phe or no amino acid supplement. Western blot analyis showed no signal over background, suggesting that the mutant PheRS is also not tolerant of amino acid 2.3
(Figure 2-8A). Similar results were obtained with a mutant PheRS known to incorporate other Phe analogues (Figure 2-8B) [35].
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| AzPhe $(2 \mathrm{mM})$ | + | - | - | - | - |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Phe $(0.2 \mathrm{mM})$ | - | - | - | - | + |
| $2.3(\mathrm{mM})$ | - | 10 | 5 | 1 | - |

Figure 2-8. A) Metabolic labeling studies in AF-IQ[pQE-FS] E. coli cells. Cells were incubated in media containing Phe, triazine amino acid 2.3, or pyridyl amino acid 2.17 ( $250 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ ). Expression of the mutant PheRS and mDHFR was induced with isopropyl $\beta$-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG, 1 mM final). The cells were lysed after a 4 h induction period. Isolated proteins were labeled with TCO-biotin ( 1 mM final). The labeled proteins were analyzed by SDS-PAGE and Western blot. Coomassie staining was used to verify protein loading. B) Metabolic labeling studies in KY33[pKPY514] E. coli cells suggest triazine amino acid 2.3 is not incorporated via a mutant PheRS [35]. Cells were incubated in media containing various concentrations of triazine amino acid 2.3. Expression of the mutant PheRS was induced with IPTG (1 mM final). The cells were lysed after a 3 h incubation period. Isolated proteins were labeled with TCO-biotin (1 mM final) or alkyne-biotin ( $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final). The labeled proteins were separated by gel electrophoresis and transferred to nitrocellulose prior to Ponceau S staining.


Figure 2-9. Flow cytometry analysis suggests that amino acid 2.3 is not tolerated by mammalian cells. HEK293 cells were incubated with amino acid 2.3 (10 mM), cyclopropene sugar Ac4ManCCp [10] as a positive control $(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ or no supplement. Cells were fixed, permeabilized, and treated with TCO-biotin $(1 \mathrm{mM})$ or a tetrazine-biotin conjugate (Tz-biotin, $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ). Cells were then stained with an avidin-APC conjugate and analyzed. Mean fluorescence intensities (MFI) of each cell population. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean for three labeling reactions.

Although E. coli are well-characterized model systems, their cell wall could pose a challenge for the triazine amino acid 2.3 to cross into the intracellular space. We reasoned that mammalian cells would offer a less stringent barrier for triazine amino acids to cross, owing to their lack of cell walls [36]. To this end, HEK293 cells were treated with amino acid 2.3 for 72 h . The cells were fixed, permeabilized, treated with the TCO-biotin conjugate, and analyzed by flow cytometry (Figure 2-9) [10]. Similar to the labeling studies in bacterial cells, no significant signal was observed over background. Collectively, these metabolic labeling studies suggest that no incorporation occurred in both mammalian and bacterial systems using native machinery. Ongoing work is being dedicated to exploring cell-free protein synthesis as a strategy for
installing triazine amino acids [37]. We are also screening engineered PheRS variants that may tolerate triazine amino acids 2.3 and 2.4. The ability of the triazine scaffold to serve as a proxy for aromatic amino acids will open new avenues for studying complex protein environments and biophysical phenomena.

### 2.3.2 Developing a triplet of mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal reactions

As mentioned above, the unique reactivity profile of isomeric triazines suggested immediate opportunities for mutually orthogonal reaction development. Indeed, 5substituted triazines reacted robustly with TMTH (2.1), even in the presence of tetrazine and cyclopropene probes. The two cycloadditions could be executed simultaneously without evidence of cross-reactivity (Scheme 2.1). The exquisite mutual orthogonality of the reagents arises from the interplay of intrinsic reactivities and steric factors [38-39]. Tetrazines are more reactive than triazines with bioorthogonal dienophiles due to the lower LUMO+1 energies of the $\pi$-systems [40-42]. This intrinsic order of reactivity is manifested in the "Distortion/Interaction-Activation Strain Model" [43] analysis shown in Figure 2-10. The sterically unhindered cyclopropene reacts most slowly with triazine 2.5, and fastest with the tetrazine 2.7. These differences in reactivity arise from increased interaction energies that parallel the increasing electrophilicity across the series. The same behavior is observed with other sterically unhindered dienophiles, such as the highly reactive TCO. With a sterically hindered dienophile (e.g., TMTH), though, the opposite trend is observed. The more hindered tetrazine reacts most slowly with TMTH (2.1), while the less hindered 5-phenyl triazine (2.5) ligates most rapidly. TMTH reactivity is mainly controlled by distortion energies that are strongly influenced
by steric considerations. Balancing electronic interaction energies (that enhance reactivity) with steric effects (that increase distortion energies and thus decrease reactivity) is a general approach for developing mutually orthogonal bioorthogonal reactions [39, 44-45].


Figure 2-10. Distortion/interaction analysis of factors controlling mutually orthogonal cycloadditions. Black arrows are activation potential energies, green and blue arrows are distortion energies of dienophile and diene, respectively, and red arrows are interactions energies. All values are given in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

Encouraged by the computational and experimental analyses, we examined whether the orthogonal cycloadditions could be used in more complex settings. As mentioned previously, the dual cycloadditions were only performed in organic solvent. To transition these chemistries to more biologically relevant environments, we attempted the labeling reactions in concert with two model proteins (Figure 2-11, GFP and NanoLuciferase, Nluc). We attached a single 5 -substituted triazine to Nluc using
cysteine-maleimide chemistry (Figure 2-12, Scheme S2-2). In this case, Nluc was engineered to harbor a single cysteine at residue 180 [46]. The resulting conjugate (Nluc-Triazine) was readily ligated with TMTH (2.1, Figure 2-13). We further prepared a cyclopropene-GFP (GFP-Cp) conjugate via genetic code expansion (Figure 2-13) [47]. The model proteins were combined 1:1 in PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.3,2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration). The mixture was then treated with TMTH (2.1) and tetrazine 2.7. After 3 h , full consumption of the starting proteins was observed via mass spectrometry (Figure 2-13). No crossreactivities were observed, suggesting that the cycloadditions can be used to label two biological targets simultaneously. The orthogonal [4+2] cycloadditions could also be performed in the presence of lysate, conditions that closely mimic cellular environments (Figure 2-14). The cycloadditions were also compatible with polar bioorthogonal reactants, such as the cyclopropenone ( CpO )-phosphine ligation. The unique reactivity of the CpO ligation placed it outside of the cycloaddition regime, immediately enabling simultaneous, triple-component ligations (Figures 2-15 and 2-16). Collections of three mutually orthogonal reactions are rare [26-27, 48].


Figure 2-11. Orthogonal [4+2] cycloadditions enable dual protein labelling. Nluc-Triazine and GFP-Cp were mixed 1:1 in PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.3,2 \mathrm{mM}$ ), and subsequently treated with TMTH (9) and tetrazine 3 (1 mM).


Figure 2-12. ESI-MS analysis of unlabeled Nluc (G180C, black) and Nluc-Triazine (blue). The expected masses were observed, in addition to masses corresponding to proteins with oxidized methionine residues and/or N -terminal methionine deletions. The observed and expected mass values for each species are tabulated below.

| Species | Expected Mass (Da) | Observed Mass (Da) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nluc - Met + 2 Met[O] | 21239.3 | $21238.7 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc - Met + 3 Met[O] | 21255.3 | $21255.5 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc - Met + 4 Met[O] | 21271.3 | $21272.5 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc + 1 Met[O] | 21354.5 | $21353.2 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc + 2 Met[O] | 21370.5 | $21369.5 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc + 3 Met[O] | 21386.5 | $21385.8 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc + 4 Met[O] | 21402.5 | $21402.6 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc + 5 Met[O] | 21418.5 | $21419.6 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine - Met + 2 Met[O] | 21562.4 | $21561.8 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine - Met + 3 Met[O] | 21578.4 | $21578.5 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine - Met + 4 Met[O] | 21594.4 | $21595.0 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine + 1 Met[O] | 21677.6 | $21676.9 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine + 2 Met[O] | 21693.6 | $21692.3 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine + 3 Met[O] | 21709.6 | $21709.1 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine + 4 Met[O] | 21725.6 | $21725.5 \pm 1$ |
| Nluc-Triazine + 5 Met[O] | 21741.6 | $21742.5 \pm 1$ |
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Figure 2-13. ESI-MS of orthogonal [4+2] cycloadditions on proteins. (A) Masses of starting proteins before exposure to small molecule probes (black). (B) Nluc-Triazine reacts upon treatment with TMTH 2.1 (blue) with a peak at $21848.9 \pm 1 \mathrm{Da}$, which corresponds to the cycloadduct plus three oxidized methionine residues (expected mass 21849.7 Da). A secondary peak at $21718.0 \pm 1 \mathrm{Da}$ corresponds to the cycloadduct, plus three oxidized methionine residues, and cleavage of the $N$-terminal methionine residue (expected mass 21718.5 Da ). GFP-Cp remains unreacted (expected mass 27951.4 Da). (C) GFP-Cp reacts upon treatment with tetrazine 2.7 (green) with a major peak at $28159.2 \pm 1 \mathrm{Da}$ (expected mass 28159.5 Da$)$. A secondary peak at $28027.7 \pm 1$ Da corresponds to loss of the $N$-terminal methionine residue (expected mass 28028.3 Da ). Nluc-Triazine is unreacted. (D) Addition of both small molecules leads to quantitative conversion to two distinct cycloadducts. No cross-reactivity adducts are observed.


Figure 2-14. Orthogonal [4+2] cycloadditions were performed in cell lysate. (A) Triazine 2.2, Cp 2.18, tetrazine 2.7 and TMTH 2.1 were converted to their respective cycloadducts in the presence of cell lysate (blue). (B) No adducts were observed in the absence of the requisite reaction partners (black). The reactions were analyzed by absorbance (top) and extracted ion chromatographs (middle, m/z 298; bottom, $m / z$ 426).







MeCN, $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~h}$
one-pot tricomponent reaction



Figure 2-15. Tricomponent, one-pot bioorthogonal reaction. Triazine 2.5, Cp 2.18, cyclopropenone 2.19, TMTH 2.1, phosphine 2.20 and tetrazine 2.21 were mixed at equimolar concentrations in $\mathrm{MeCN}(1 \mathrm{mM}$ final concentration for all reagents). The reaction was monitored by LC-MS. Three distinct ligation products were observed, corresponding to the matched reaction partners. No cross-reactivity was observed. Individual traces and reference reactions are shown in Figure 2-14 below.
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Figure 2-16. LC-MS traces of starting bioorthogonal reagents and corresponding ligated adducts. (A) Triazine 2.5 and TMTH 2.1 were mixed in a $1: 1$ ratio ( 1 mM final concentration) in MeCN, then the reaction was monitored by LC-MS for the formation of ligation adduct 2.8. (B) Cp 2.18 and tetrazine 2.21 were mixed in a $1: 1$ ratio ( 1 mM final concentration) in MeCN, then the reaction was monitored by LC-MS for the formation of ligation adduct 2.22. Product 2.22 can further rearrange over the course of the experiment [49]. (C) Cyclopropenone 2.19 and phosphine 2.20 were mixed in a $1: 1$ ratio (1 mM final concentration) in MeCN, then the reaction was monitored by LC-MS for the formation of ligation adduct 2.23 and its regioisomer. Phosphine 2.20 oxidized over the course of the reaction ( 2.20 + [O]). In all cases, the reaction trace is shown on the far right. The first two traces correspond to starting materials only.

### 2.4 Conclusions

The size and stability of the 1,2,4-triazine made it an ideal candidate for metabolic labeling applications. Its potential as a phenylalanine surrogate opens interesting avenues for exploring dynamic biophysical processes, such as protein folding. Key to the success of this goal was the development of small, alkyl-triazine amino acids with robust aqueous stability. In this work, I verified that alkyl-substituted 1,2,4-triazine scaffolds were stable in aqueous environments, and reacted robustly with their TCO reaction partner in the presence of cell lysate. A panel of "minimalist" triazine amino acid probes were synthesized and shown to be stable in aqueous environments. They were evaluated for their ability to serve as surrogates for Phe through proteome labeling studies in bacterial and mammalian systems.

We also identified isomeric triazine scaffolds that exhibit unique cycloaddition profiles. Computational and experimental analyses of triazine reactivity were performed. Isomeric triazines were found to react robustly with TCO, but only the least sterically encumbered isomers (5-substituted) reacted with other dienophiles. Notably, 5substituted 1,2,4-triazines reacted efficiently with TMTH, one of the most sterically encumbered strained alkynes reported to date. The cycloaddition was successfully used in combination with another popular IED-DA reaction, the tetrazine ligation with 1-
methylcyclopropene. These mutually compatible reactions can be used in tandem to tag protein targets in biologically relevant environments. Future work will address the need for functional TMTH conjugates. TMTH has been historically difficult to outfit with fluorophores and other reporter groups, although new strategies for derivatization are being pursued. A panel of easily accessible reagents will further enhance multicomponent labeling applications.

### 2.5 Materials and Methods

### 2.5.1 General Information

All reagents were obtained from commercial sources and used without further purification. Reactions were run under ambient conditions, unless otherwise indicated. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether ( $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, dimethylformamide (DMF), and acetonitrile (MeCN) were degassed with argon and run through two $4 \times 36$ inch columns of anhydrous neutral A-2 (8 x 14 mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated under a flow of argon at $350{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h$)$. Thin-layer chromatography was performed using Silica Gel $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$-coated glass plates $(0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ thickness), and visualization was performed with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ stain and/or UV irradiation. Chromatography was accomplished with $60 \AA$ (240-400 mesh) silica gel, commercially available from Sorbent Technologies. Organic solutions were concentrated under reduced pressure using a Büchi rotary evaporator. HPLC purifications were performed on a Varian ProStar equipped with 325 a Dual Wavelength UV-Vis detector. Analytical runs were performed using an Agilent C18 Scalar column ( $4.6 \times 150 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) with a 1 $\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, and visualized with 210 nm wavelength. NMR spectra were collected
on a Bruker DRX400 (400 MHz ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, 376.5 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ ), a Bruker DRX500 equipped with a cryo probe ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 125.7 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ), or a Bruker AVANCE600 equipped with a cryo probe $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right)$. All spectra were collected at 298 K. High-resolution mass spectrometry was performed by the University of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Center. Protein mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) experiments were performed on a Waters Xevo LV-G2 Q-TOF instrument.

### 2.5.2 Molecular Docking Studies

Conformational predictions of triazines 2.3 and 2.4 were performed using Autodock Vina [30]. The E. coli PheRS crystal structure was prepared for docking by removing all water molecules and cocrystallized ligands [29]. The AARS input file was generated using Autodock Tools [50]. All residues in the AARS were kept rigid, and grid coordinates were generated to define the sampling space for conformational analysis (Table 2-1). The unnatural amino acid ligands were constructed in Spartan Student Edition, and molecular geometries were optimized using the B3LYP(6-31G*) basis set. Rotational and torsional degrees of freedom for the minimized ligands were defined in Autodock Tools. The exhaustiveness parameter was set to 100 . The threshold for potential polar contacts was defined as any interaction that was separated by less than $4 \AA$, the upper limit for a typical hydrogen bond.

Table 2-1. Grid coordinates used for docking amino acids 2.3 and 2.4 in the PheRS and predicted binding energies.

|  | Amino Acid <br> $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | Amino Acid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ |  |  |
| Center_X | -25.431 | -25.431 |
| Center_Y | -10.192 | -10.192 |
| Center_Z | 54.417 | 54.417 |
| Size_X | 42 | 42 |
| Size_Y | 18 | 18 |
| Size_Z | 30 | 30 |
| Exhaustiveness | 100 | 100 |
| Binding Energy $(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ | -6.8 | -6.5 |

### 2.5.3 M9 Minimal Media Recipes

M9 Minimal Medium A: In double-distilled water, $6.8 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ sodium phosphate dibasic anhydrous, $3 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ potassium phosphate monobasic, $0.5 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ sodium chloride, $1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ ammonium chloride, 1 mM magnesium sulfate heptahydrate, 0.1 mM calcium chloride, $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ thiamine hydrochloride, $0.2 \%$ (w/v) glucose, $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ chloramphenicol, and 20 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ of the following reagents: L-alanine, L-cysteine, L-aspartic acid, L-glutamic acid, glycine, L-histidine, L-isoleucine, L-lysine, L-leucine, L-methionine, L-asparagine, Lproline, L-glutamine, L-arginine, L-serine, L-threonine, L-valine, L-tryptophan.

M9 Minimal Medium B: In M9 minimal medium B, add $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ of the following reagents: L-phenylalanine, L-tyrosine.

M9 Minimal Medium C: Follow recipe for M 9 minimal medium A, but add $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ ampicillin instead of $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ chloramphenicol.

M9 Minimal Medium D: In double-distilled water, $6.8 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ sodium phosphate dibasic anhydrous, $3 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ potassium phosphate monobasic, $0.5 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ sodium chloride dihydrate, 1 $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ ammonium chloride, 2 mM magnesium sulfate heptahydrate, 0.1 mM calcium chloride, $35 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ thiamine hydrochloride, 20 mM glucose, and $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ of the following reagents: kanamycin sulfate, L-alanine, L-cysteine, L-aspartic acid, L-glutamic acid, glycine, L-histidine, L-isoleucine, L-lysine, L-leucine, L-methionine, L-asparagine, Lproline, L-glutamine, L-arginine, L-serine, L-threonine, L-valine, L-tryptophan, L-tyrosine.

M9 Minimal Medium E: In M9 minimal medium D, $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ L-phenylalanine.

### 2.5.4 Cell Lysis Methods

Method A: Cells were harvested via centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 10 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The cells were resuspended in PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.4,100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and treated with Halt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (ThermoFisher Scientific, 1X final concentration) and phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF, Gold Biotechnology, 0.5 mM final concentration). The cells were then lysed via sonication using a Sonic Vibra Cell VC 130 Ultrasonic Cell Disruptor, and the debris was pelleted by centrifugation at $14,500 \mathrm{rpm}$ for 10 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Protein concentrations in the remaining supernatant were quantified using a Pierce ${ }^{T w}$ BCA Protein Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher).

Method B. Cells were harvested by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 15 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), and the pellets were stored at then lysed using a urea buffer ( 8 M urea, $100 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaH}{ }_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}, 10$ mM Tris-base, $\mathrm{pH}=8.0$ ) and treated with Halt ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Protease Inhibitor Cocktail
(ThermoFisher Scientific, 1X final concentration) and phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF, Gold Biotechnology, 0.5 mM final concentration). The samples were subjected to five freeze/thaw cycles using a dry ice/acetone slurry, and the debris was pelleted by centrifugation (14400 rpm, $20 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Protein concentrations in the resulting supernatant were normalized to $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ measurements after the 4 h induction period.

### 2.5.5 Labeling Studies Using BL21(DE3) E. coli cells

An overnight culture of BL21(DE3) E. coli cells was grown in LB media supplemented with $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ kanamycin sulfate. Aliquots of the overnight culture (500 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ ) were treated with amino acid $2.3(0.1,0.5,1,5,10$, and 50 mM ) or no amino acid. The resulting cultures were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 250 rpm ) for 24 h . Lysis method A was used to prepare samples for Western blot analysis.

### 2.5.6 Labeling Studies Using AF-IQ E. coli cells

An overnight culture of AF-IQ E. coli cells [25] was grown in freshly prepared M9 minimal media $B$. The cells were pelleted by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 10 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and washed twice with ice-cold $0.9 \%(w / v)$ sodium chloride. The cells were resuspended in minimal media $A(5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and aliquots of the resulting culture $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ were used to inoculate either minimal media $B$, minimal media $A$, or minimal media $A$ supplemented with amino acid 2.3 (1, 2, 5, and 10 mM ). The cells were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 250 rpm ) for $28 \mathrm{~h} . \mathrm{OD}_{600}$ measurements were taken periodically over the course of the experiment.

### 2.5.7 Labeling Studies Using AF-IQ[pQE-FS] E. coli cells

An overnight culture of AF-IQ[pQE-FS] E. coli cells [25] was grown in LB media supplemented with $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ampicillin and $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ chloramphenicol. The cells were pelleted by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 10 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and washed twice with ice-cold $0.9 \%$ $(w / v)$ sodium chloride. The cells were resuspended in minimal media $B$, and aliquots of the resulting culture $(150 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ were used to inoculate fresh minimal media $B(2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The cultures were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 250 rpm ) until reaching a target $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ of 0.8-1.0. The cells were pelleted by centrifugation (4700 rpm, $10 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and washed twice with ice-cold $0.9 \%$ (w/v) sodium chloride. The cultures were resuspended in minimal media $B$ (ampicillin instead of chloramphenicol), minimal media $C$, or minimal media C supplemented with either amino acid $2.3(250 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ or $2.17(250 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$. The cells were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 250 rpm ) for 20 min . Protein expression was induced by the addition of 1 M isopropyl $\beta$-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) to a final concentration of 1 mM . After 4 h of agitation at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, cells were harvested by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 15 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), and the pellets were stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Lysis method B was used to prepare samples for Western blot analysis.

### 2.5.8 Labeling Studies Using KY33[pKPY514] E. coli cells

An overnight culture of KY33[pKPY514] E. coli cells [35] was grown in LB media supplemented with $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ kanamycin sulfate. Aliquots of the overnight culture (125 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ ) were used to inoculate freshly prepared M9 minimal media $E(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The cells were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 250 rpm ) until reaching an $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ of 0.5 . Cells were pelleted by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 15 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and washed twice with ice-cold $0.9 \%$
$(w / v)$ sodium chloride. The resulting pellets were resuspended in M9 minimal medium $D$ supplemented with either 4-azidophenylalanine ( 2 mM ), amino acid $2.3(1,2,5$, and 10 mM ) or phenylalanine ( 0.2 mM ). The cells were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking (250 rpm) for an additional 30 min. Then, expression of the mutant PheRS was induced by the addition of 1 M IPTG to a final concentration of 1 mM . After 3 h of agitation at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, cells were harvested by centrifugation ( $4700 \mathrm{rpm}, 15 \mathrm{~min}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), and the pellets were stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Lysis method A was used to prepare samples for Western blot analysis.

### 2.5.9 Western Blot Analyses

Protein samples ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ protein in $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ total volume) were treated with TCObiotin (1 mM) for 24 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for BL21(DE3), or 2 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for auxotrophic strains. Azide-containing proteins were treated for 1 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a "click" chemistry cocktail comprising the following reagents: alkyne-biotin (100 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ); sodium ascorbate ( 1 mM ); tris[(1-benzyl-1-H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)methyl]amine (TBTA, $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ); $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4} \cdot 5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1$ mM ). To precipitate proteins, ice-cold methanol ( 1 mL ) was added and the samples were stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Protein precipitates were centrifuged at $14,500 \mathrm{rpm}$ for 10 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, aspirated, and air-dried for 1 h . The protein isolates were then resuspended in $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ buffer ( $4 \%$ SDS, $150 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaCl}, 50 \mathrm{mM}$ triethanolamine, pH 7.4 ) and treated with SDS-PAGE loading buffer (10 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a 2 X stock containing 20\% glycerol, $0.2 \%$ bromophenol blue, $0.4 \% \beta$-mercaptoethanol). The samples were heated at $95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , separated by gel electrophoresis using $10 \%$ polyacrylamide gels, and then electroblotted to nitrocellulose membranes ( $0.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}$; Bio-Rad). Transfer
efficiency was analyzed with Ponceau S staining. The membranes were rinsed with water and incubated with blocking buffer (7\% bovine serum albumin in PBS containing $1 \%$ Tween $® 20$, PBS-T) for 1 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, followed by IRDye ${ }^{\circledR} 800 \mathrm{CW}$ streptavadin (LICOR Biosciences; 1:10,000 dilution in blocking buffer) for 2 h at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The membranes were subsequently washed with PBS-T (every $10 \min x 6$ ) and PBS (pH 7.4, every 5 min $x$ 2), then imaged using an Odyssey infrared imaging system (LI-COR Biosciences, Odyssey Version 3.0).

For labeling studies using AF-IQ[pQE-FS] E. coli cells, the samples were treated with TCO-biotin ( 1 mM final) and diluted with PBS to a total volume of $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, then incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $5-120 \mathrm{~min}$. The reactions were quenched with $3,6-\mathrm{di}-2-\mathrm{pyridyl}$ -1,2,4,5-tetrazine ( $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of 50 mM DMSO stock) and analyzed via SDS-PAGE using $15 \%$ acrylamide gels and Western blot as outlined above.

### 2.5.10 Metabolic Labeling Studies in Mammalian Cells

Metabolic labeling studies were performed following a procedure outlined by Patterson, et al., with some modifications [10]. HEK293 cells were plated at $\sim 400,000$ cells/well in 2 mL DMEM media (Corning) supplemented with 10\% FBS, penicillin (100 $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{mL}$ ), and streptomycin ( $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ). Cells were incubated with triazine amino acid 2.3 $(10 \mathrm{mM})$ or cyclopropene sugar $\mathrm{Ac}_{4} \mathrm{ManCCp}(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ for 72 h in a $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$, watersaturated incubator at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The cells were rinsed with PBS containing $1 \%$ bovine serum albumin (FACS buffer, $3 \times 500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), then fixed with a $4 \%$ solution of paraformaldehyde in FACS buffer ( $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 15 \mathrm{~min}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The cells were subsequently pelleted (3400 rpm, $3 \mathrm{~min}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), washed with FACS buffer ( $3 \times 500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), and
permeabilized with a $0.2 \%$ solution of Tween® 20 in PBS $\left(200 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 30 \mathrm{~min}, 23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The cells were pelleted (3400 rpm, $3 \mathrm{~min}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), washed with FACS buffer ( $3 \times 500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), and reacted with either TCO-biotin ( $1 \mathrm{mM}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) or Tz-biotin ( $10 \mu \mathrm{M}, 30 \mathrm{~min}, 37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The cells were pelleted ( $3400 \mathrm{rpm}, 3 \mathrm{~min}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), washed with FACS buffer ( $3 \times 500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), and stained with streptavidin-APC (eBioscence, 1:100 dilution in FACS buffer) for 1 h on ice in the dark. The cells were pelleted ( $3400 \mathrm{rpm}, 3 \mathrm{~min}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and washed with additional FACS buffer ( $3 \times 500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), then analyzed by flow cytometry on an LSRII flow cytometer (BD Biosciences). For each sample, data were acquired for 5,000 events. Cells were analyzed in triplicate. Cellular fluorescence data were analyzed using FloJo software (Tree Star, Inc.).

### 2.5.11 Preparation of triazine-labeled of NanoLuciferase (Nluc-Triazine)





S-2.10
E. coli BL21(DE3) cells were transformed with pCold-His6-NLuc(G180C) [46] and used to inoculate 50 mL of LB broth containing ampicillin ( $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ). The culture was incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 225 rpm ) for 16 hr . A $15-\mathrm{mL}$ aliquot of the starter culture was used to inoculate 1 L of LB broth containing ampicillin ( $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ), and the resulting culture was incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 225 rpm ). At $\mathrm{OD}_{600}=0.6$, the flask was cooled in an ice water bath for 20 min. Protein expression was induced by adding 1 M isopropyl $\beta$-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) to a final concentration of 1 mM , and the culture was incubated at $16{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 225 rpm ) for 20 h .

Cells were collected via centrifugation ( $3500 \times g$ for 10 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The pellet was resuspended in 30 mL of buffer ( 50 mM sodium phosphate, 20 mM imidazole, pH 7.8) and treated with Halt ${ }^{\top M}$ Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Thermo Scientific). The cells were lysed via sonication, and the lysate was centrifuged ( $4500 \times g$ for 45 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The lysate was passed through a $0.22 \mu \mathrm{M}$ PES membrane syringe filter (Olympus), and the desired protein was purified by $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$-affinity chromatography (eluting with 250 mM imidazole in 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer). Fractions containing the desired protein were combined and dialyzed against 50 mM sodium phosphate $(\mathrm{pH} 7.8)$ overnight. The final protein concentration was determined using a Jasco V-730 UV-Vis spectrophotometer and a predicted extinction coefficient of $24750 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (ProtParam).

Dithiothreitol (DTT) was added to the Nluc (G180C) sample from above (1 mM final concentration). The sample was diluted to a final protein concentration of $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ with phosphate buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.3), then treated with triazine S-2.10 (10 mM stock in DMSO, 1 mM final concentration). The sample was incubated at room temperature for 2 h , and aliquots were analyzed by mass spectrometry. Once complete conversion was observed, the sample was concentrated via spin filtration (3 kDa MW cutoff, Millipore) and washed with PBS (pH 7.3, $3 \times 400 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). After the final wash, the sample was concentrated to a final volume of $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Protein concentrations were determined as previously described.

### 2.5.12 Preparation of GFP-Cp


E. coli TOP10 cells transformed with pULTRA-WTPyIRS/pBAD-GFP-150 were used to inoculate 3 mL of LB broth containing spectinomycin ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) and ampicillin $(100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$. After 16 h , the starter culture $(250 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was used to inoculate autoinduction expression media (AIM, 25 mL , Table 2-2) containing 1 mM S -2.13, spectinomycin (50 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ), and ampicillin ( $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) [51]. The culture was incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking (225 rpm) for 48 h .

Cells were collected via centrifugation ( 4500 rpm for 20 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The pellet was resuspended in 5 mL of $\operatorname{PBS}(\mathrm{pH} 7.3)$, then treated with phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF, $500 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration) and a protease inhibitor cocktail (Sigma Aldrich). The cells were lysed via sonication and the lysate was centrifuged (14500 rpm for 30 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The lysate was passed through a $0.45 \mu \mathrm{M}$ PES membrane syringe filter (Olympus) and was added to Profinity ${ }^{\top \mathrm{M}}$ IMAC resin (BioRad, $400 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ bed volume). The slurry was gently rocked for 1 h at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then washed with wash buffer ( 20 mM imidazole in PBS, pH 7.3, 8 mL ). GFP-Cp was eluted using 1 mL of elution buffer ( 250 mM imidazole in PBS, pH 7.3). The protein was concentrated via spin filtration (3 kDa MW cutoff, Millipore), washed with PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.3,500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), then concentrated again. This was repeated three times to remove excess imidazole. On the final wash, the protein was concentrated to a final volume of $40 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. The final protein concentration was
determined by measuring the absorbance value at 488 nm using a Jasco V-730 UV-Vis spectrophotometer and an extinction coefficient of $88300 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ [52]. Successful incorporation of amino acid S-2.13 was verified through mass spectrometry.

Table 2-2. Autoinduction expression media components. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Aspartate (5\%) | 2.5 mL |
| :--- | :--- |
| Glycerol $(40 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 0.625 mL |
| Glucose $(40 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $62.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ |
| L-Arabinose $(20 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 0.125 mL |
| Lactose $(10 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 0.1 mL |
| 25X 18 Amino Acid Mix | 2 mL |
| $50 X$ M-Salts | 1 mL |
| 1 M MgSO 4 | 0.1 mL |
| 5000X Trace Metals | $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ |
|  |  |

${ }^{a}$ Final volume of $50 \mathrm{~mL}, \mathrm{pH}$ adjusted to 7.3
${ }^{b}$ Percentage weight by volume

### 2.5.13 One-pot, dual labeling reaction on model proteins

Nluc-Triazine and GFP-Cp were mixed $1: 1$ in PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.3,2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration for each protein conjugate). The resulting mixture was treated with TMTH 2.1 ( 25 mM stock in DMSO, 1 mM final concentration) and tetrazine 2.7 ( 10 mM stock in DMSO, 1 mM final concentration). The solution was briefly vortexed and then incubated at room temperature for 3 h . Aliquots of the reaction solution $(10 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ were analyzed by mass spectrometry over time. Signal intensities of the individual cycloadducts were normalized to their respective unreacted starting materials.

### 2.5.14 One-pot, dual labeling reaction in cell lysate

An overnight culture of $E$. coli TOP10 cells ( 25 mL , LB Broth) was pelleted (3500 $x g$ for 10 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and re-suspended in PBS ( $\mathrm{pH} 7.3,200 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The suspension was
treated with PMSF (500 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration) and a protease cocktail inhibitor (Sigma Aldrich), then lysed via sonication. The lysate was clarified (14500 rpm for 30 min at 4 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and the supernatant was collected. Total protein concentrations were determined using a Pierce ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ BCA protein assay kit (Thermo Fisher).

Clarified bacterial cell lysate ( $30 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ ) was treated with triazine 2.5 ( 10 mM stock in MeCN), cyclopropene 2.18 (10 mM stock in MeCN), tetrazine 2.21 ( 10 mM stock in MeCN), and TMTH 2.1 ( 50 mM stock in MeCN ). The mixtures were diluted with PBS ( pH 7.3) to a final volume of $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}(1 \mathrm{mM}$ final concentration for all bioorthogonal reagents), then allowed to stand at ambient temperature for 3 h . The reactions were diluted with $50 \% \mathrm{MeCN}$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and concentrated via spin filtration (14500 rpm for 30 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) using a 3 kDa MW cutoff spin filter (Millipore) to a final volume of $\sim$ $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. The filtrates were analyzed by LC-MS.

### 2.5.15 One-pot, triple labeling reaction

Triazine 2.5 (10 mM stock in MeCN), cyclopropene 2.18 ( 10 mM stock in MeCN ), cyclopropeneone 2.19, TMTH 2.1 ( 50 mM stock in MeCN), tetrazine 2.21 ( 10 mM stock in MeCN ), and phosphine 2.20 ( 10 mM stock in MeCN ) were mixed at equimolar ratios, then diluted with MeCN to a final volume of $200 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ( 1 mM final concentration for all reagents). The reaction was allowed to stand at ambient temperature for 18 h , then analyzed by LC-MS. Control reactions were conducted analogously using different reaction partners.

### 2.5.16 Synthetic Procedures

Compounds 2.1 [53], 2.5 [54], 2.6 [55], 2.11 [56], 2.12 [57], 2.13 [21], 2.15 [21],
2.21 [58], S-2.1 [59], S-2.2 [60], S-2.5 [61], S-2.9 [62], S-2.11 [10], S-2.12 [63], and S2.13 [47] were synthesized as previously reported.

Scheme S2-1. Synthesis of triazine-carbonate probe 2.10.



## 3-(3-((tert-Butyldimethylsilyl)oxy)propyl)-1,2,4-triazine (S-2.3)

To a $25-\mathrm{mL}$ round-bottom flask was added zinc powder ( $0.329 \mathrm{~g}, 5.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and the zinc was gently flame-dried under vacuum. After cooling to ambient temperature, anhydrous DMF ( 0.7 mL ) was added, followed by 1,2-dibromoethane (0.03 $\mathrm{mL}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})$. The Zn slurry was stirred at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for one min, then cooled to ambient temperature. This cycle was repeated once more. Chlorotrimethylsilane ( $0.01 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.08$
mmol.) was added, and the slurry was stirred at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min . After cooling to ambient temperature, a solution of S-2.2 ( $0.232 \mathrm{~g}, 0.772 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in anhydrous DMF (0.7 mL ) was added dropwise. The resulting slurry was stirred at $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until TLC indicated full consumption of S-2.2 (2:1 hexanes:EtOAc). The reaction mixture was cooled to ambient temperature. $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(92.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0799 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ was added, followed by a solution of 2.13 in anhydrous DMF ( 1.6 mL ). The reaction mixture was stirred at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The resulting dark brown solution was diluted with EtOAc and washed with brine $(4 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude brown oil was dry-loaded on Celite and purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 35\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-2.3 (51 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 26 \%$ ) as a dark orange oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, CDCl 3 ): $\delta 9.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11$ (quint, $J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.03$ (s, 6H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 170.9,148.8,147.7,62.5,34.2,31.2,26.1,18.5$, -5.2. HRMS (ESI+) m/z calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{OSiNa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$276.1508, found 276.1513.


## 3-(1,2,4-Triazin-3-yl)propan-1-ol (S-2.4)

To a scintillation vial containing S-2.3 ( $50.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.200 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added anhydrous THF ( 0.7 mL ). Tetrabutylammonium fluoride (TBAF, 1 M solution in THF, $0.30 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the reaction was stirred at ambient temperature
for 22 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo, and the resulting brown oil was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $2 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give S-2.4 (16 mg, $0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 58 \%)$ as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 9.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $3.28\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$ ), 2.16 (quint, $J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.00(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta$ 170.6, 148.8, 147.8, 62.1, 34.2, 30.8. HRMS (ESI+) m/z calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{ONa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$162.0643, found 162.0651.


## 3-(1,2,4-Triazin-3-yl)propyl (4-nitrophenyl) carbonate (2.10)

To a flame-dried 10-mL round-bottom flask was added S-2.4 (10.5 mg, 0.0754 mmol ) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$. Anhydrous pyridine ( $0.04 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Then, 4-nitrophenylchloroformate ( 55.6 mg , 0.276 mmol ) was added, and the solution was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min . The solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and allowed to stir for an additional 2 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude yellow solid was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $2 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give 2.10 ( $7.6 \mathrm{mg}, 25 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 33 \%$ ) as a light orange oil. Trace amounts of
grease and 4-nitrophenol were observed, likely from hydrolysis of the carbonate product during purification.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 9.16$ (s, 1H), $8.60(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.38$ (d, $J=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40$ (quint, $J=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): ~ \delta .155 .6,152.6,149.0,148.1,145.2,125.5,122.0$, 68.6, 33.6, 26.7. HRMS (ESI+) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 327.0705$, found 327.0703.


## N-[(9-Fluorenylmethoxy)carbonyl]-L-3-(1,2,4-triazin-3-yl)propanoate (2.14)

To a round-bottom flask was added zinc powder ( $0.831 \mathrm{~g}, 12.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and the zinc was gently flame-dried under vacuum. After cooling to ambient temperature, anhydrous DMF ( 2 mL ) was added, followed by 1,2-dibromoethane ( $0.07 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.8$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. The Zn slurry was stirred at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for one min, then cooled to ambient temperature. This cycle was repeated once more. Chlorotrimethylsilane ( $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1$ mmol.) was added, and the slurry was stirred at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min . After cooling to ambient temperature, a solution of $2.12(0.957 \mathrm{~g}, 2.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ in anhydrous DMF (7.5 mL ) was added dropwise. The resulting slurry was stirred at $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until TLC indicated full consumption of 2.12 (2:1 hexanes:EtOAc). The reaction mixture was then cooled to ambient temperature. To a separate, flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\operatorname{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(0.253 \mathrm{~g}, 0.219 \mathrm{mmol})$ and a solution of compound $2.13(0.530 \mathrm{~g}, 2.54 \mathrm{mmol})$
in anhydrous DMF ( 5 mL ). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ for 10 min . The resulting yellow suspension was added dropwise to the Zn slurry, and the reaction mixture was stirred at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The reaction mixture was then diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(75 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with brine $(4 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered, then dry-loaded onto Celite and passed through a silica plug (eluting with $20-50 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give a yellow oil. Product 2.14 contained inseparable triphenylphosphine oxide impurities, and was used without further purification.


## (S)-2-Amino-3-(1,2,4-triazin-3-yl)propanoic acid (2.3)

To a scintillation vial containing 2.14 ( $0.227 \mathrm{~g}, 0.561 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added $20 \%$ 4methylpiperidine in DMF (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ until full consumption of starting material was observed by TLC (1:1 hexanes:EtOAc, ninhydrin stain). A solution of $\mathrm{LiOH}(1 \mathrm{M}, 0.73 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.73 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise, and the reaction was stirred for 5 h at ambient temperature. The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was concentrated and purified by HPLC, eluting with a gradient of 0-95\% MeCN in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+0.1 \% \mathrm{HCl}$ over 30 min . The desired fractions were collected and lyophilized to give the chloride salt of 2.3 ( $60 \mathrm{mg}, 0.29 \mathrm{mmol}, 13 \%$ over two steps) as a light yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, D2O): $\delta 9.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.09(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=7.8,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.5,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.53(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.5,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ): $\delta$ 167.0, 151.2, 148.4, 110.0, 54.2, 39.4. HRMS (ESI+) m/z calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$191.0545, found 191.0554.


## N-[(9-Fluorenylmethoxy)carbonyl]-L-3-(1,2,4-triazin-6-yl)propanoate (2.14)

To a round-bottom flask was added zinc powder ( $0.196 \mathrm{~g}, 3.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and the zinc was gently flame-dried under vacuum. After cooling to ambient temperature, anhydrous DMF ( 0.45 mL ) was added, followed by 1,2-dibromoethane ( $0.02 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.2$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. The Zn slurry was stirred at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for one min, then cooled to ambient temperature. This cycle was repeated once more. Chlorotrimethylsilane ( $0.01 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.08$ mmol ) was added, and the slurry was stirred at $80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min . After cooling to ambient temperature, a solution of 2.12 ( $0.217 \mathrm{~g}, 0.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in anhydrous DMF ( 2 mL ) was added dropwise. The resulting slurry was stirred at $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until TLC indicated full consumption of 2.12 ( $2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc). The reaction mixture was cooled to ambient temperature. $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(57.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0494 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ was added, followed by the solution of 2.15 diluted in anhydrous DMF ( 0.5 mL ). The reaction mixture was stirred at $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(75 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with brine ( $4 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The brown crude oil was dry-loaded onto Celite and passed through a silica
plug (eluting with $25-40 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give a yellow oil. Product 2.16 contained inseparable triphenylphosphine oxide impurities, and was used without further purification.


## (S)-2-Amino-3-(1,2,4-triazin-6-yl)propanoic acid (2.4)

To a scintillation vial containing 2.16 was added $20 \%$ 4-methylpiperidine in DMF ( 1 mL ). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ until full consumption of starting material was observed by TLC (1:1 hexanes:EtOAc, ninhydrin stain). A solution of $\mathrm{LiOH}(1 \mathrm{M}, 0.19 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise, and the reaction was stirred at ambient temperature for 9 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \mathrm{x} 5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was concentrated in vacuo and purified by HPLC, eluting with a gradient of $0-95 \% \mathrm{MeCN}$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+0.1 \% \mathrm{HCl}$ over 30 min . The desired fractions were collected and lyophilized to give the chloride salt of 2.4 ( $10 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \%$ over three steps) as a light yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right): \delta 9.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98$ (app $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63-3.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right): \delta 159.7,155.67$, 155.65, 151.9, 54.6, 36.1. HRMS (ESI-) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}$167.0569, found 167.0577.

Scheme S2-2. Synthesis of triazine-maleimide probe S-2.10.
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## Ethyl 4-(3-amino-1,2,4-triazin-5-yl)benzoate (S-2.6)

To a round-bottom flask was added S-2.5 (0.912 g, 4.42 mmol$)$ and EtOH (60 $\mathrm{mL})$. Aminoguanidine hydrochloride ( $0.491 \mathrm{~g}, 4.44 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1.12 \mathrm{~g}, 13.3$ mmol ) were added, and the mixture was stirred at reflux overnight. The resulting green solution was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and EtOAc $(40 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layer was washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 75 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 50$ mL ), and the combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The solution was filtered and concentrated in vacuo, then dry-loaded on silica and purified by flash
chromatography (eluting with $10-20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give $\mathrm{S}-2.6$ ( $73.8 \mathrm{mg}, 7 \%$ ) as a bright yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right): \delta 9.28(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.31(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{brs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.36(\mathrm{q}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right): \delta 165.2,163.1,153.8,138.4,137.2,132.4,129.7,127.6,61.2,14.2$. HRMS (ESI $\left.{ }^{+}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 245.1039$, found 245.1045.


S-2.6


THF, $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$


## Ethyl 4-(1,2,4-triazin-5-yl)benzoate (S-2.7)

To a flame-dried Schlenk tube under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added a solution of $\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{2 . 6}$ (70.9 mg, 0.290 mmol ) in anhydrous THF ( 10 mL ). Isoamyl nitrite ( $0.39 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the Schlenk tube was sealed and stirred at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The yellow solution was diluted with EtOAc ( 20 mL ) and was washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( $1 \times 30$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc ( $1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was dry-loaded on silica and purified by flash chromatography (eluting with 10\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-2.7 (27 mg, 41\%) as a yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 9.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 9.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.27-$ $8.22(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.43(\mathrm{q}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}(125 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 165.8,157.7,154.7,147.0,134.2,130.7,127.7,61.7,29.8,14.4 . \mathrm{HRMS}$ $\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 230.0930$, found 230.0929.


## 4-(1,2,4-Triazin-5-yl)benzoic acid (S-2.8)

To a round-bottom flask was added S-2.7 (23.6 mg, 0.102 mmol ) and EtOH (5 mL ). A solution of sodium hydroxide ( 0.52 mL of a 1 M solution) was added, and the solution was stirred at room temperature under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ overnight. The reaction was acidified with 1 M HCl to pH 2, then diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{EtOAc}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc ( $2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The mixture was filtered and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The crude solid was dry-loaded on silica and purified by flash chromatography (eluting with $1-5 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give $\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{2 . 8}$ ( $7.6 \mathrm{mg}, 37 \%$ ) as a beige solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, (CD3)2SO): $\delta 13.35$ (br s, 1H), $10.18(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 9.86(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right): \delta 166.7,157.3,153.7,147.6,136.8,130.0,127.9 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}$200.0460, found 200.0455.


## N-(2-(2,5-Dioxo-2,5-dihydro-1H-pyrrol-1-yl)ethyl)-4-(1,2,4-triazin-5-yl)benzamide (S-

### 2.10)

To an oven-dried round-bottom flask under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added a solution of S-2.8 (5.8 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.0288 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry DMF ( 0.5 mL ). Diisopropylethylamine ( $0.03 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and HCTU ( $15.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0372 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added. After $2 \mathrm{~min}, \mathbf{S}-2.9(12.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0484 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry DMF ( 0.25 mL ) was added dropwise, and the solution was stirred under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ overnight. The reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layer was washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{LiCl}(4 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude yellow solid was purified by flash chromatography (eluting with $1 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give $\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{2 . 1 0}(2.9 \mathrm{mg}, 31 \%)$ as a yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.600 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right): \delta 10.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 9.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 8.78 (t, J = $5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.41$ (d, J = $8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 3.61 (t, $J=5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 3.44 (apparent $q, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 150 MHz , $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right): ~ \delta 171.1,165.7,157.3,153.8,147.6,137.8,135.4,134.6,128.0,127.7,37.7$, 37.1. HRMS (ESI $\left.{ }^{+}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 346.0916$, found 346.0911 .


## (2-Methylcycloprop-2-en-1-yl)methyl benzylcarbamate (2.18)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added S-2.11 ( $83 \mathrm{mg}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$. $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-Diisopropylethylamine (DIPEA, $180 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and benzylamine ( $110 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added, and the reaction was stirred at ambient temperature for 16 h . The mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$, then washed with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was purified on silica (eluting with $10-25 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes), then further purified by HPLC (10-90\% MeCN in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ over 15 min ). The desired fractions were combined and lyophilized to give 2.18 as a white solid (39 mg, 54\%).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.35-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.56(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.38(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$ $=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.01-3.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.93(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.0,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.67-1.64 (m, 1H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (150 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 157.0,138.9,128.8,127.7,127.6$, 102.3, 72.6, 45.2, 17.4, 11.8. HRMS $\left(E \mathrm{ES}^{+}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ 240.1001, found 240.0995 .


## N-Benzyl-4-(2-methyl-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)butanamide (2.19)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added S-2.12 (63 mg, 0.20 mmol ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$. Anhydrous pyridine ( $24 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and benzylamine (11 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added, and the reaction was stirred at ambient temperature overnight. The resulting solution was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, acidified to $\mathrm{pH} \sim 1$ with 1 M HCl , and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was purified on silica (eluting with 0-100\% acetone in EtOAc), then further purified by HPLC (10-90\% MeCN in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ over 15 min ). The desired fractions were combined and lyophilized to give $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ as a white solid (11 mg, 23\%).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.32-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.74$ (br s, 1H), $4.41(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.61(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.38(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.24(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 2.02 (quint, $J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.8,160.9,160.4,156.9$,
 $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$266.1157, found 266.1149.
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# Chapter 3: Chemically triggered crosslinking with bioorthogonal cyclopropenones 

Adapted from published work, with permission from the Royal Society of Chemistry: Row, R. D.; Nguyen, S. S.; Ferreira, A. J.; Prescher, J. A. Chem. Commun. 2020, 56, 10883-10886.

### 3.1 Abstract

The bioorthogonal ligation between cyclopropenones (CpOs) and phosphines features a key ketene-ylide intermediate. In the first iteration of this chemistry, the Prescher lab demonstrated that this electrophile could be trapped in an intermolecular fashion with exogenous amines. The reaction only proceeded when large concentrations of the nucleophilic trap were present. While this was initially seen as a limitation, we began to wonder whether this requirement for intermolecular trapping could be exploited for capturing biomolecule interactions. The high concentrations of trapping nucleophile required for effective ligation could be achieved locally between two interacting partners. In this Chapter, I highlight how CpOs were optimized as chemically triggered crosslinkers to capture protein-protein interactions.

### 3.2 Introduction

Covalent crosslinkers are valuable tools for examining biomolecule interactions in physiologically relevant environments. Such tools typically fall into two categories: photocrosslinkers [1] and chemical crosslinkers. Popular photocrosslinkers include diazirines [2-3], aryl azides [4-5], benzophenones [6-7], and aryl carboxytetrazoles [8]. These groups are routinely used in vitro to monitor interactions between proteins and other biomolecules [9-15]. When exposed to intense UV light, the motifs photolyze to
provide high-energy intermediates; these species can be trapped by neighboring biomolecules to forge covalent adducts. UV light can be delivered to samples on demand, enabling both spatially and temporally controlled crosslinking. Furthermore, the small size of most photocrosslinkers ensures that they are compatible with a variety of cellular targets and pathways for installation [9, 11-12, 16-18].

While widely employed, photocrosslinkers also have limitations. Many suffer from high levels of background signal due to off-target labeling [19]. Additionally, the requisite UV light precludes applications in thick tissues and live organisms-environments that are either refractory to light delivery or sensitive to irradiation [20-21]. These issues can be avoided using chemical crosslinkers, such as $\alpha$-haloacetamides or other chemical warheads for covalent trapping [22-28]. However, such electrophiles are permanently "on" and not responsive to external stimuli, contributing to non-specific labeling. Efforts to tune the specificity of these probes have come at the expense of versatility, as less potent electrophiles react with a more limited set of nucleophiles [26, 29].

To develop more general and triggerable crosslinkers, we investigated cyclopropenones (CpOs) as chemically activated motifs. These scaffolds undergo bioorthogonal reactions with functionalized phosphines [30-31]. The reaction proceeds through a ketene-ylide intermediate, which can be trapped by a variety of nucleophiles to produce covalent adducts (Figure 3-1). Nucleophile trapping is typically accomplished in an intramolecular fashion using ortho-substituted phosphines. We hypothesized that intermolecular trapping would afford biomolecule crosslinks. Upon phosphine treatment, CpOs positioned near targets of interest would be activated for covalent adduct formation.


Figure 3-1. Cyclopropenones as chemically triggered crosslinkers. Cyclopropenones generate keteneylides upon treatment with bioorthogonal phosphines. These intermediates can be trapped by neighboring nucleophiles to form covalent crosslinks or hydrolyze to give innocuous byproducts.

We previously showed that ketene-ylides form upon phosphine incubation with CpOs, and that such intermediates can be trapped with alkylamines [30]. Large concentrations (>10 mM) of nucleophile were required to outcompete ketene hydrolysis (Figure 3-1). We hypothesized that such features would be ideal for biomolecule crosslinking. High local concentrations of trapping residues would only be achieved with interacting biomolecules. In all other cases, hydrolysis would dominate, generating an innocuous byproduct and minimizing non-specific crosslinking. Most protein binding interfaces also comprise residues amenable to trapping electrophiles and thus affording stable crosslinks [32].

### 3.3 Results and Discussion

To test whether a broad range of residues could suffice for intermolecular trapping, Dr. Drew Ferreira from the group incubated a model cyclopropenone (CpO 3.1, Table 3-

1) with a panel of amino acids. CpO 3.1 was activated for trapping via treatment with a water-soluble triarylphosphine (TPPTS, 3.2), and the reactions were monitored by LCMS.

Crosslinked products were observed in the presence of Ser, Cys, Lys, and Tyr (Figures $3-2-3-5$ ), but only when excess amino acid was used (Table 3-1). The hydrolyzed product was the major species formed in each case. These results suggested that CpO -mediated crosslinks could be forged at protein interfaces, where local concentrations of amino acids can exceed 100 mM [33].

Table 3-1. Phosphine-Mediated Crosslinking of CpO with Amino Acids.
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Figure 3-2. Chemically triggered CpO trapping with serine. (A) CpO 3.1 was incubated with phosphine 3.2 and Fmoc-protected serine 3.3. Conversion to the crosslinked product was monitored via (B) UV absorption spectroscopy and (C) mass spectrometry.



Figure 3-3. Chemically triggered CpO trapping with cysteine. (A) CpO 3.1 was incubated with phosphine 3.2 and Fmoc-protected cysteine 3.4. Conversion to the crosslinked product was monitored via (B) UV absorption spectroscopy and (C) mass spectrometry.
A



Figure 3-4. Chemically triggered CpO trapping with lysine. (A) CpO 3.1 was incubated with phosphine 3.2 and Fmoc-protected lysine 3.5. Conversion to the crosslinked product was monitored via (B) UV absorption spectroscopy and (C) mass spectrometry.
A



Figure 3-5. Chemically triggered CpO trapping with tyrosine. (A) CpO 3.1 was incubated with phosphine 3.2 and Fmoc-protected tyrosine 3.6. Conversion to the crosslinked product was monitored via (B) UV absorption spectroscopy and (C) mass spectrometry.


Figure 3-6. Chemically triggered crosslinking of split luciferase probes. (A) Bioorthogonal crosslinking of LgBiT and SmBiT to form Nanoluciferase (Nluc). (B) Crystal structure of Nluc (PDB 5IBO), with SmBiT highlighted in blue. Potential trapping residues are shown in red. (C) CpO-functionalized SmBiT-CpO 3.8 was prepared via solid-phase peptide synthesis. (D) Covalent crosslinking of LgBiT and SmBiT-CpO 3.8 with phosphine 3.2. Crosslinked Nluc was observed by SDS-PAGE analysis (top) and mass spectrometry (bottom). The crosslinking yield (33\%) was determined by ImageJ analysis. (E) SmBiT-CpO 3.8 does not form covalent adducts with off-target proteins. LgBiT ( $40 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) or HEWL ( $40 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and SmBiT-CpO 3.8 (1 mM ) were incubated in PBS ( pH 7.4 ) in the presence of phosphine $3.2(1 \mathrm{mM})$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 h . Samples were analyzed by SDS-PAGE. The crosslinking yield (31\%) was determined by ImageJ analysis.

We proceeded to examine CpO crosslinking using a model protein interaction: split Nanoluciferase (Nluc, Fig. 3-6A) [34]. Split Nluc comprises a short C-terminal peptide (SmBiT) and a larger engineered fragment (LgBiT). LgBiT and SmBiT bind readily and can reconstitute the full-length, light-emitting enzyme in aqueous buffers. Examining the Nluc crystal structure, we hypothesized that CpO appended to the N -terminus of SmBiT could access a handful of potential trapping residues when bound to LgBiT (Figure 36B) [35]. To prepare the functionalized peptide, alumnus Dr. David Row first synthesized CpO amino acid 3.7. This Fmoc-protected variant could be prepared in gram-scale quantities, and was amenable to solid-phase peptide synthesis. CpO 3.7 was installed at the $N$-terminal position of SmBiT to provide the desired conjugate (SmBiT-CpO 3.8,

Figure $3-6 \mathrm{C}$ ). Importantly, $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO} 3.8$ was still capable of binding LgBiT to produce a light-emitting enzyme (Figure 3-7) [34].

Dr. David Row then demonstrated that the functionalized peptide could form a covalent crosslink with LgBiT. LgBiT and peptide 3.8 were incubated in phosphate buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.4 ) and treated with phosphine 3.2. SDS-PAGE analysis revealed a higher molecular weight band, indicating that crosslinked Nluc was formed. The identity of the product was verified via mass spectrometry (Figure 3-6D). Hydrolysis products were also observed after 3 h , along with cyclized SmBiT (due to intramolecular trapping). Unreacted $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO}$ was still present at this point, though, and available for crosslinking.


[SmBiT-CpO 3.8] ( $\mu \mathrm{M}$ )

Figure 3-7. $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO} 3.8$ and LgBiT associate to form a functional, light-emitting enzyme. Furimazine (50X dilution, Promega) was added to wells containing SmBiT-CpO 3.8 (1-2000 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and LgBiT ( 40 pM ). Light emission was quantified and error bars represent the standard error of the mean for $n=3$ experiments. Sample images are shown.



Figure 3-8. LC-MS characterization of SmBiT-CpO peptides 3.9, 3.8, and 3.10. The peptides were synthesized on solid phase and purified via HPLC.

To test whether crosslinking was specific to interacting fragments, we performed the reaction in the presence of a non-target protein, hen egg-white lysozyme (HEWL). HEWL is similar in size to LgBiT. Both proteins also comprise >20 surface-exposed nucleophiles that could potentially trap the activated cyclopropenone [36]. When SmBiT-

CpO 3.8 was incubated with HEWL, though, no crosslinked products were observed upon phosphine treatment (Figure 3-6E). These data suggest that the crosslinking strategy can provide a selective readout on productive interactions.


Figure 3-9. Phosphine-triggered crosslinking tracks with affinity. (A) SmBiT-CpO peptides (covering a range of LgBiT affinities [34]) were accessed via SPPS. (B) Crosslinking is most pronounced with high affinity interactions. $\mathrm{LgBiT}(40 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO}$ peptides $(120 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were incubated with phosphine 3.2 $(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . Samples were analyzed by SDS-PAGE. The crosslinking yields (3-20\%) were determined by ImageJ analysis.

We further examined whether the approach could distinguish among interactions of variable affinity. We synthesized two additional SmBiT-CpO peptides (3.9 and 3.10, Figure 3-8) comprising sequences known to exhibit different degrees of binding to LgBiT [34]. We hypothesized that the range of binding affinities would manifest in variable degrees of crosslinking. The SmBiT peptides were mixed with LgBiT , and the CpO residues were activated with phosphine 3.2. SDS-PAGE analysis revealed a clear trend in crosslinking efficiency (Figure 3-9). The highest affinity peptide (3.10) provided the largest number of LgBiT crosslinks, while no adducts were observed with the weakest
binder (3.9). Importantly, $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO} 3.10$ (i.e., the highest affinity peptide) also did not form covalent crosslinks with off-target proteins (Figure 3-10).


Figure 3-10. SmBiT-CpO 3.10 does not form covalent adducts with HEWL. LgBiT ( $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) or HEWL ( 20 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ), SmBiT-CpO $3.10(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$, and phosphine 3.2 ( $500 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) were added to PBS ( pH 7.4 ). Samples were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h , then denatured with urea ( 1.6 M final concentration) and analyzed by SDSPAGE. The crosslinking yield ( $20 \%$ ) was determined by ImageJ analysis.


Figure 3-11. Crosslinking is time-dependent with phosphine 3.2. LgBiT ( $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and SmBiT-CpO 3.10 (50 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ) were combined in PBS ( pH 7.4 ). Phosphine $3.2(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ was added, and the reactions were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $15-240 \mathrm{~min}$. Reactions were then quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(1 \%$ final concentration) prior to SDSPAGE analysis. Crosslinking yields (1-4\%) were determined by ImageJ analysis.

While split luciferase adducts were captured upon CpO activation, maximal crosslinking was not achieved until 4 h post-phosphine addition (Figure 3-11). We hypothesized that crosslinking speed could be improved by tuning the phosphine trigger. Alkyl substituents are well known to increase the nucleophilicity of phosphines, but can render the probes susceptible to oxidation [37]. However, monocyclohexyl diaryl phosphines are bench stable and have been used in biological environments [31].
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Figure 3-12. Improved crosslinking with an optimized trigger. (A) Phosphine 3.11 was designed as a more nucleophilic, water-soluble probe. (B) Rapid crosslinking was observed with optimized phosphine. LgBiT $(40 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and SmBiT-CpO $3.10(120 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were incubated with phosphine $3.11(1 \mathrm{mM})$. Samples were analyzed by SDS-PAGE. The crosslinking yields (5-16\%) were determined by ImageJ analysis. (C) Crosslinking reactions were dose-dependent with phosphine 3.11. (D) Crosslinking in cell lysate. LgBiT (40 $\mu \mathrm{M})$ and SmBiT-CpO $3.10(120 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were incubated in PBS ( pH 7.4 ) containing bacterial lysate $(30 \mu \mathrm{~g})$ and phosphine 3.11 ( 1 mM ). Samples were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min , then analyzed by SDS-PAGE. The crosslinking yields in the presence (13\%) and absence (5\%) of lysate were determined by ImageJ analysis.

Thus, we reasoned that phosphine 3.11 would strike a balance between increased reactivity and stability toward oxidation, and also be water-soluble (Figure 3-12A) [38-40]. Phosphine 3.11 was easily accessed from commercially available starting materials using standard sulfonation chemistries. When 3.11 was used to activate SmBiT-CpO 3.10 in
the presence of LgBiT, crosslinked products were observed in as little as 10 minutes (Figure 3-12B). The probe could also activate CpO motifs for crosslinking in a dosedependent manner (Figure 3-12C). No adducts were observed with triarylphosphine 3.2 over the same time period, and prolonged reaction times were required for robust crosslinking signal (Figure 3-13A).

The crosslinking approach was further examined in bacterial cell lysate. In this complex environment, many proteins could potentially outcompete LgBiT for trapping activated CpOs . LgBiT and $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO} 3.10$ were added to freshly prepared lysate, then treated with phosphine 3.11. The expected crosslinked product was observed after 30 min of incubation at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Fig. 3-12D). Interestingly, SDS-PAGE analysis suggested that crosslinking was more efficient in lysate than in buffer alone. A similar result was observed with the less nucleophilic phosphine 3.2 (Figure 3-13B). Macromolecular crowding likely facilitates biomolecular association-and thus more effective crosslinking-in heterogeneous environments [41].

Having demonstrated successful crosslinking with split luciferase probes, we were curious about the nature of the covalent linkage. We initially suspected LgBiT residues K124 or K136 were involved in CpO trapping (Figure 3-6B). However, when these sites were mutated to alanine, no decrease in crosslinking efficiency was observed (Figure 314). Mass spectrometry analyses of tryptic digests revealed LgBiT fragment (residues 16-64) involved in the trap (Figure 3-15). Further attempts to localize the crosslink (via MS/MS analysis) were inconclusive, though, possibly due to non-specific cleavage of the crosslink. Within the LgBiT fragment, Tyr16, Ser28, and Ser29 were the most likely traps based on predicted proximity to bound SmBiT (Fig. 3-6B). We prepared LgBiT mutants

Y16F, S28A, and S29A to probe their participation in CpO trapping. Only mutant Y16F exhibited reduced crosslinking efficiency not attributed to impaired LgBiT binding (Figures

3-16 and 3-17). Few chemical crosslinkers target tyrosine or other less potent nucleophiles, highlighting the versatility of our approach.


Figure 3-13. (A) Slower crosslinking reactions were observed with less nucleophilic phosphine 3.2. LgBiT $(40 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and SmBiT-CpO $3.10(120 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were combined in PBS ( pH 7.4 ). Phosphine $3.2(1 \mathrm{mM})$ was added, and the reactions were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $10-120 \mathrm{~min}$. Reaction samples were denatured with urea (1.6 M final concentration) prior to SDS-PAGE analysis. (B) Crosslinking observed in bacterial lysate using phosphine 3.2. $\mathrm{LgBiT}(20 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO} 3.10(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were incubated in the presence or absence of bacterial lysate ( $25 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ ) and phosphine $3.2(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$. Reactions were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h , then denatured with urea (1.6 M final concentration) and analyzed by SDS-PAGE. Crosslinking yields in the presence (20\%) and absence (19\%) of lysate were determined by ImageJ analysis.


Figure 3-14. LgBiT residues K124 and K136 are not necessary for crosslinking. WT LgBiT, or LgBiT mutants K124A or K136A ( $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) were combined with SmBiT-CpO $3.10(50 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and phosphine 3.2 (500 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ). Samples were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h , then denatured with urea ( 1.6 M final concentration) and analyzed by SDS-PAGE. Crosslinked products were observed with both mutants. The crosslinking yields for $\operatorname{LgBiT}(15 \%)$ and the K124A (11\%) and K136A (14\%) mutants were determined by ImageJ analysis.
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expected $[\mathrm{M}+5 \mathrm{H}]^{+5} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z} 1098.00$
observed m/z 1098.00

Figure 3-15. Site of Nluc crosslink analyzed via tryptic digest. (A) A peptide matching residues 1-43 (green) showed a mass shift corresponding to the addition of the first 6 residues of SmBiT-CpO peptide 3.10 (blue). Residues bearing potential trapping sidechains are highlighted in red. B) Primary sequence of Nluc in the pCOLD construct. The residues 16-64 are highlighted in green. Potential nucleophilic side chains within the sequence are highlighted in red.

| LgBiT $(20 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | + | - | - | - | + | - | - | - |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LgBiT Y16F $(20 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | - | + | - | - | - | + | - | - |
| LgBiT S28A $(20 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | - | - | + | - | - | - | + | - |
| LgBiT S29A $(20 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | + |
| $3.10(50 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| $3.2(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + |
| 20 kDa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 3-16. Diminished crosslinking is observed with LgBiT mutants Y16F and S28A. WT LgBit, or LgBiT mutants comprising Y16F, S28A, or S29A ( $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) were combined with SmBiT-CpO 3.10 ( $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and phosphine $3.2(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$, then incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . Samples were denatured with urea ( 1.6 M final concentration), then analyzed by SDS-PAGE. The crosslinking yields for LgBiT (12\%) and the Y16F (6\%), S28A (5\%), and S29A (22\%) mutants were determined by ImageJ analysis.

The CpO crosslinking strategy was also compared to a common photocrosslinking approach with diazirine (Dz) motifs. Upon UV irradiation, diazirines form carbenes that can react with a variety of protein residues to afford covalent adducts. A diazirinefunctionalized SmBiT peptide (SmBiT-Dz, 3.12) was synthesized. The Dz linker was one carbon shorter than the corresponding CpO probe, but was pursued based on the synthetic tractability of a precursor amino acid (S-3.1). SmBiT-Dz (3.12) was incubated with LgBiT, and the sample was irradiated with UV light (312 nm). Crosslinked adducts were observed via SDS- PAGE analysis (Figure 3-18A). Prolonged irradiation times resulted in more crosslinked adducts, but also promoted LgBiT degradation. The crosslinking efficiency of $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{Dz}$ was also examined alongside $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO}$ (3.10). Each peptide was incubated with LgBiT. Samples containing SmBiT-CpO were exposed to phosphine 3.11 for chemical crosslinking, while samples containing SmBiT-Dz were irradiated with UV light for photocrosslinking. Crosslinked products were observed in both cases (Figure 3-18B), with the chemically triggered reaction providing more adducts.


Figure 3-17. Dissociation constants for SmBiT-CpO 3.10 and either native (WT) or mutant LgBiTs. Apparent $K_{D}$ values for mutants Y16F and S29A are comparable to WT. Error bars represent standard error of the mean for $\mathrm{n}=3$ experiments.
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Figure 3-18. (A) Prolonged UV irradiation promotes photocrosslinking. LgBiT $(40 \mu \mathrm{M})$ was combined with SmBiT-Dz 3.12 ( 1 mM ) in PBS ( pH 7.4 ). The samples were spun down and left to equilibrate ( 10 min ) at room temperature. The samples were then placed on a transilluminator ( 312 nm ) for the indicated time. Crosslinking was further confirmed via mass spec analysis. LgBiT degradation was observed upon prolonged UV exposure. Crosslinking yields ranged from $1-5 \%$, as determined by ImageJ analysis. (B) CpO chemical crosslinking is more efficient than diazirine photocrosslinking. LgBiT $(80 \mu \mathrm{M})$ was combined with either SmBiT-CpO $3.10(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ or SmBiT-Dz $3.12(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ in PBS ( pH 7.4 ). For chemical crosslinking samples (lanes 2-4), phosphine 3.11 ( 1 mM ) was added, and the reactions were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min . For photocrosslinking reactions (lanes 6-8), samples were irradiated with UV light (312 nm ) for 10 min . All reaction samples were denatured with urea ( 1.6 M final concentration) prior to SDSPAGE analysis. The crosslinking yields for $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{CpO}(22 \%)$ and $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{Dz}(1 \%)$ were determined by ImageJ analysis. (C) Dissociation constants for native (WT) LgBiT and either SmBiT-CpO 3.10 or SmBiTDz 3.12. Apparent Ko values for both SmBiT peptides are comparable. Error bars represent standard error of the mean for $\mathrm{n}=3$ experiments.

While quantitative comparisons cannot be made due to differences in probe structure, SmBiT-Dz and SmBiT-CpO exhibited similar affinities for LgBiT (Figure 3-18C), suggesting that the observed differences in crosslinking were not simply due to altered binding interactions. They could instead be due to differences in probe reactivity. Carbenes are formed irreversibly upon diazirine photolysis. These high-energy intermediates exhibit relatively short half-lives ( $\mathrm{ns}-\mu \mathrm{s}$ ) and can insert into a variety of different bonds [2]. As a consequence, carbenes can trap even weakly associated offtarget molecules, leading to false positives. Ketene-ylides, by contrast, are formed reversibly from cyclopropenones and phosphines. They have relatively long half-lives and react with a smaller subset of biological functional groups [30, 42]. Such differences likely influence the degree and specificity of crosslinking observed.

In principle, the CpO crosslinking strategy can be extended to capture other biomolecule interactions (Figure 3-19A). Nucleic acids, for example, have been implicated in regulating many biological processes through interactions with protein partners. Misregulation of these events are at the core of many human diseases [43]. To explore the possibility of capturing RNA-mediated interactions, we required a method to install CpOs into the transcriptome of the cell. We drew inspiration from recent work from Spitale and coworkers, who demonstrated that azide-containing adenosine nucleotides were enzymatically incorporated into nascent RNA in cellulo [44]. We reasoned that CpO analogues could also undergo metabolism into the cell's RNA based on the small size of the CpO scaffold (Figure 3-19B).
A




Figure 3-19. (A) CpO crosslinkers can be applied to capturing RNA-mediated interactions. (B) CpOadenosine analogues with various linker lengths were targeted. Similar probes containing azide handles at the $N^{6}$ position were incorporated at the transcriptome level in cellulo.

Adenosine analogues containing modifications at the $N^{6}$ position are typically accessed through $S_{N} A r$ transformations with 6-chloroadenosine [44-46] (Table 3-2). Under conditions employed by Spitale et al., no conversion to the desired analog was observed (entry 1). Elevated temperatures led to decomposition of CpO-amine 3.17 (entry 2). The use of inorganic base resulted in no conversion to analog 3.16, but did not destroy CpO 3.17 (entry 3). Alternative solvent and base were evaluated, but were also unsuccessful (entry 4).

Table 3-2. Synthesis of CpO-adenosine analogues via $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{Ar}$ Transformations.


Table 3-3. Alternative strategy to access CpO-adenosine analogues.


Adenosine derivatives modified at $N^{6}$ have also been accessed from inosine precursors such as 3.18. Such transformations typically involve activation of $O^{6}$ using coupling agents containing 1-hydroxybenzotriazole motifs [47-48]. Literature conditions using BOP as a coupling agent (Table 3-3, entries 1 and 2) resulted in the formation of 6dimethylamino adenosine as the major product. The dimethylamine likely resulted from partial hydrolysis of the BOP reagent. To circumvent this off-target pathway, alternative coupling agents were screened (entries 3-5). In all cases, little conversion to product 3.16 was observed. The identity of the coupling agent appeared to only affect the amount of starting amine 3.17 that was recovered.

### 3.4 Conclusions

In conclusion, we demonstrated that cyclopropenones can be chemically activated by phosphines to forge biomolecule crosslinks. Both the phosphine and cyclopropenone reagents are readily accessible, biocompatible, and easy to handle. Using a model split reporter, we showed that the triggered crosslinking reaction is specific and proceeds readily in physiological buffers and in the presence of cell lysate. CpO probes are complementary to photocrosslinkers and add to the growing arsenal of tools for capturing protein contacts. Phosphine accessibility to CpO probes will dictate the full scope of targets, and is the subject of ongoing work. The ability to robustly and site-specifically encode CpO motifs will also provide additional opportunities for interrogating protein binding in cells [49-50]. These experiments, as well as exploration into RNA-protein interactions are underway [51].

### 3.5 Materials and Methods

### 3.5.1 General information

All reagents and solvents were used as received, unless otherwise specified. Anhydrous organic solvents were prepared by degassing with argon and passing through two $4 \times 36 \mathrm{in}$. columns of anhydrous neutral A2 ( $8 \times 12$ mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated at $350^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h under a flow of argon). Column chromatography was carried out using SiliCycle $60 \AA$ (230-400 mesh) silica gel. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was carried out with Agela Technologies 200 mm silica gel MF254 plates, and plates were visualized using UV light or $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ stain. Organic solutions were concentrated under reduced pressure using a Büchi rotary evaporator. HPLC purifications were performed on
an Agilent Technologies 1260 Infinity II equipped with a multiple wavelength detector, using an Agilent Eclipse XDB-C18 semiprep column ( $9.4 \times 250 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) and a $3 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, and ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR spectra were obtained using either a Bruker DRX400 or a Bruker AVANCE600 instrument equipped with a cryo probe. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were acquired at $600 \mathrm{MHz},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were acquired at 150 MHz , and ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR spectra were acquired at 162 MHz . Spectra were internally referenced to residual solvent signals $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ was referenced to 7.27 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and 77.16 ppm for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ was referenced to 2.50 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and 39.52 ppm for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was referenced to 4.79 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ ). All spectra were acquired at 298 K . Chemical shifts are reported in ppm, and coupling constants $(J)$ are reported in Hz . Mass spectra were acquired at the University of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility.

### 3.5.2 LC-MS Analysis of CpO Trapping with Amino Acids

Trapping of phosphine-activated cyclopropenone ( CpO ) 3.1 was performed with amino acids 3.3-3.9. Conversion to crosslinked products was analyzed by LC-MS. Each amino acid ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 5 mM stock in $50 \% \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{PBS}, 0.5 \mathrm{mM}$ final concentration) was combined with a solution CpO 3.1 ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 10 mM stock in $50 \% \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{PBS}, 0.25 \mathrm{mM}$ final concentration) and phosphine 3.2 (2.5 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a 10 mM stock in 50\% MeCN/PBS, 0.25 mM final concentration). The resulting solution was diluted to $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ with PBS (12 mM, $\mathrm{pH} 7.4)$. Reactions were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Samples were then analyzed on a Waters ACQUITY UPLC with an ACQUITY QDa Mass Detector, using a C18 column and
eluting with a gradient of $10-90 \% \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (containing $0.1 \%$ formic acid) over 5 min with a flow rate of $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$.

Trapping reactions with amino acids $3.3-3.6$ were also examined at higher concentrations. Amino acids 3.3-3.6 (200 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of 10 mM stock solutions in $50 \%$ MeCN/PBS, 4 mM final concentration) were combined with CpO 3.1 (100 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a 10 mM stock in $50 \%$ MeCN/PBS, 2 mM final concentration) and phosphine 3.2 (100 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a 10 mM stock in $50 \% \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{PBS}, 2 \mathrm{mM}$ final concentration). The resulting solutions were then diluted to $500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ with PBS (12 mM, pH 7.4). Reactions were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Samples were analyzed on a Waters ACQUITY UPLC with an ACQUITY QDa Mass Detector, using a C 18 column and eluting with a gradient of $10-90 \% \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (containing $0.1 \%$ formic acid) over 15 min with a flow rate of $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$.

Percent crosslinking was calculated by comparing the integrations of the Fmocprotected amino acids and product using UV absorbance at 264 nm ( $\lambda_{\max }$ for product). The ratio was scaled to account for the stoichiometric ratio of the amino acid (2 equivalents).

$$
\% \text { crosslink }=\frac{I_{P}}{I_{a a}+I_{P}} \times 100 \times 2
$$

$I_{P}=$ product integration at 264 nm
$I_{a a}=$ Fmoc-protected amino acid integration at 264 nm

### 3.5.3 Molecular Cloning and Plasmid Construction

LgBiT point mutants (Y16F, S28A, S29A, K124A, and K136A) were constructed using overlapping circular polymerase extension cloning (CPEC). [52] Two PCR reactions (PCR1 and PCR2) were used to assemble the insert containing the mutation of interest, using primers listed in Table 3-4. The insert was then integrated into a linearized pCOLD vector using primers outlined in Table 3-5. The resulting plasmid was transformed into BL21 E. coli for protein expression and purification.

Forward primers for each mutant and Insert-For1 (for Y16F, S28A, and S29A) or Insert-For2 (for K124A and K136A) (PCR1), along with reverse primers for each mutant and Insert-Rev1 (for Y16F and S29A), Insert-Rev2 (for S28A), or Insert-Rev3 (for K124A and K136A) (PCR2), were used to construct individual halves of each mutant gene product. The PCR1 and PCR2 reactions were assembled using appropriate Insert-For and Insert-Rev to give the fully constructed mutant gene product (Tables 3-4 and 3-5). PCR products from all insert reactions were analyzed using $1 \%$ agarose gels and GelRed $^{\mathrm{TM}}$ (Biotium, Inc.) staining. The bands of interest were excised, and DNA was isolated following incubation at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min in ADB buffer ( $400 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, Zymo Research Company). DNA products were purified using a ZymoPURE Plasmid Miniprep Kit (Zymo Research Company), eluting with Nanopure water ( $30 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ).

The constructed mutant gene products were ultimately inserted into a pCOLD vector backbone. The pCOLD vector was linearized by amplification using primers pCOLD-vector-For1 and pCOLD-vector-Rev (for Y16F and S29A), pCOLD-vector-For2 and pCOLD-vector-Rev (for S28A), or pCOLD-vector-For3 and pCOLD-vector-Rev2 (for

K124A and K136A, Table 3-5). Q5 ${ }^{\circledR}$ High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (New England BioLabs) was used in the amplifications. The linearization reaction was analyzed and purified as above. The resulting linear vector was combined in a $4: 1$ volumetric ratio with the constructed mutants described above. The insert and vector were combined via CPEC using the following conditions: 1X Q5 ${ }^{\circledR}$ High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase reaction buffer, $1 \times$ Q5 ${ }^{\circledR}$ High GC Enhancer buffer, dNTPs ( 0.8 mM ), and Q5 ${ }^{\circledR}$ High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase ( 1 U ) in a total volume of $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. The following thermal cycling conditions were used: initial denaturation at $95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 60 s , then 24 cycles of denaturation $\left(95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$, 30 s), annealing ( $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for insert construction, $68^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for vector linearization and full vector amplification), and extension ( $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 60 \mathrm{~s}$ for insert construction, $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 180 \mathrm{~s}$ for vector linearization and full vector amplification). The fully constructed plasmid was purified using a ZymoPURE Plasmid Miniprep Kit (Zymo Research Company) and eluted with Nanopure water ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The full elution volume was used for transformation into TOP10 E. coli cells via electroporation.

### 3.5.4 Primer Lists

All primers were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc. (San Diego, CA) and are written in the $5^{\prime} \rightarrow 3^{\prime}$ direction. Bases highlighted in red denote the target position for site-directed mutagenesis.

Table 3-4. Forward and reverse primers used to generate mutant LgBiT plasmids.

| Forward Primers |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Y16F | GAACAGACAGCCGCCTTTAACCTGGACCAAG |
| S28A | CTTGAACAGGGAGGTGTGGCGAGTTTGCTGCAGAATC |
| S29A | CTTGAACAGGGAGGTGTGTCCGCGTTGCTGCAGAATC |
| K124A | CGTGTTCGACGGCAAAGCGATCACTGTAACAGGGACC |
| K136A | CTGTGGAACGGCAACGCGATTATCGACGAGCG |
| Reverse Primers |  |
| Y16F | CTTGGTCCAGGTTAAAGGCGGCTGTCTGTTC |
| S28A | GATTCTGCAGCAAACTCGCCACACCTCCCTGTTCAAG |
| S29A | GATTCTGCAGCAACGCGGACACACCTCCCTGTTCAAG |
| K124A | GGTCCCTGTTACAGTGATCGCTTTGCCGTCGAACACG |
| K136A | CGCTCGTCGATAATCGCGTTGCCGTTCCACAG |

Table 3-5. Primers used to generate gene inserts and vector backbones.

| Insert Construction and <br> Amplification Primers |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Insert-For1 | CTTCCACTTTTTCCCGCGTTTTCGCAGAAAC |
| Insert Rev1 | GGGTTCCGATTTAGTGCTTTACGGCACCTCGACCCCAA <br> AAAACTTGATTTG |
| Insert Rev2 | CAAATAAAAAAATCCCCGCCAAATGGCAGGGATCTTAG <br> ATTC |
| Insert-For2 | CCAGTGTAGTAAGGCAAGTCCCTTCAAGAGTTATCGTT <br> GATACCCCTCGTAG |


| Insert-Rev3 | GGGTTCCGATTTAGTGCTTTACGGCACCTCGACCCCAA <br> AAAACTTGATTTG |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vector Linearization |  |
| pCOLD-vector-For1 | CCGTAAAGCACTAAATCGGAACCCTAAAGGGAGCCCCC <br> GATTTAGAG |
| pCOLD-vector-Rev1 | GAAAAAGTGGAAGCGGCGATGGCGGAGCTGAATTACAT <br> TC |
| pCOLD-vector-For2 | GGCGGGGATTTTTTTATTTGTTTTCAGGAAATAAATAAT <br> CGATC |
| pCOLD-vector-For3 | CCGTAAAGCACTAAATCGGAACCCTAAAGGGAGCCCCC <br> GATTTAGAG |
| pCOLD-vector-Rev2 | TGAAGGGACTTGCCTTACTACACTGGATATGCGCTAGC <br> ACATCAAATTG |

### 3.5.5 Protein Expression and Purification

E. coli TOP10 cells expressing plasmids pZER09 (pCOLD-WT_LgBiT), pDR15 (pCOLD-LgBiT K136A), pDR16 (pCOLD-LgBiT K124A), pSN09 (pCOLD-LgBiT Y16F), pSN10 (pCOLD-LgBiT S28A), or pSN11 (pCOLD-LgBiT S29A) were used to inoculate 50 mL of Luria-Bertani broth (LB) containing ampicillin (100 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ). After overnight incubation at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking ( 225 rpm ), 15 mL of each starter culture was used to inoculate 1 L of LB containing ampicillin $(100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$. The cultures were incubated at 37 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking until an $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ of $\sim 0.6$ was achieved. The cultures were then chilled in an ice bath for 20 min . IPTG was added ( 1 mM final concentration) to induce protein expression, and cultures were incubated at $16{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking (225 rpm) for 20 h .

Cells were collected via centrifugation at 4000 rpm for $20 \mathrm{~min}\left(4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The supernatant was decanted and the pellets were suspended in 25 mL of 50 mM phosphate buffer ( pH 7.8). Protease inhibitor cocktail (Sigma-Aldrich) and phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF, Gold Biotechnology, $500 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration) were added to each suspension. Each sample was sonicated, and the lysate was centrifuged at 10000 rpm for $40 \mathrm{~min}\left(4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The clarified lysates were filtered using $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ filters (Olympus). Profinity ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ IMAC resin (BioRad, 5 mL bed volume) was added to each clarified lysate, and the mixtures were rocked at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min . For each sample, the resin was rinsed with wash buffer ( 50 mM phosphate, 20 mM imidazole, $\mathrm{pH} 7.8,50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and proteins were isolated with elution buffer ( 50 mM phosphate, 250 mM imidazole, $\mathrm{pH} 7.8,3 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The fractions were analyzed via SDS-PAGE, and those containing the desired protein were combined and concentrated via spin filter centrifugation ( 3 kDa MW cutoff). Protein concentrations were determined using a Pierce ${ }^{\text {T"M }}$ BCA Protein Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher) or by absorbance at 280 nm using a JASCO V730 UV-Vis spectrophotometer and an extinction coefficient of $19940 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (calculated using ExPASy ProtParam).

### 3.5.6 Peptide $K_{D}$ Measurements

All bioluminescence imaging experiments were performed in black 96 -well plates (Greiner Bio-One). Plates containing luminescent reagents were imaged in a light-proof chamber with an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) CCD camera chilled to $-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The stage was kept at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during the imaging session, and the camera was controlled using Living Image software. The exposure time was set to 30 s , with data binning levels set to
medium. Regions of interest were selected for quantification and total flux values were analyzed using Living Image software.

Peptide affinities for LgBiT were measured as previously reported. [34] SmBiTCpO $3.8(1-2000 \mu \mathrm{M})$ or $3.10(0.5 \mathrm{nM}-2 \mathrm{mM})$ was combined with native LgBiT (WT, 40 pM ) or mutant LgBIT ( 40 pM ) and samples were incubated at room temperature for 30 min. Furimazine (Promega, $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 50X dilution of the commercial stock) was then added, and bioluminescence output was measured.

### 3.5.7 Crosslinking Reactions with Split Nluc

All crosslinking experiments were carried out in PBS (pH7.4) at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. For chemical crosslinking experiments, $\mathrm{LgBiT}(10-80 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration) or hen eggwhite lysozyme (HEWL, $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) was combined with SmBiT-CpO peptides 3.8, 3.9, and $3.10(50 \mu \mathrm{M}-1 \mathrm{mM})$. Phosphine $3.2(500 \mu \mathrm{M}-1 \mathrm{mM})$ or $3.11(1 \mathrm{mM})$ was then added, and the reactions were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $10 \mathrm{~min}-16 \mathrm{~h}$.

For photocrosslinking reactions, LgBiT ( $80 \mu \mathrm{M}$ final concentration) was combined with $\mathrm{SmBiT}-\mathrm{Dz}$ peptide $3.12(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and incubated at room temperature for 10 min . The samples were irradiated with UV light (312 nm for 10 min ) using an FBTIV-816 Transilluminator (Fisher Scientific).

All samples were denatured with urea (1.6 M final concentration) for 30 min at 25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then analyzed by SDS-PAGE (BioRad $4-20 \%$ gels, $130 \mathrm{~V}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 70-80 \mathrm{~min}$ ). Gel staining was accomplished using Coomassie Blue. In Figure S9, excess phosphine was
quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ (1\% final concentration) prior to SDS-PAGE analysis. The percentages of crosslinked products were determined via gel scanning and calculating the area of protein bands using ImageJ software.

### 3.5.8 Crosslink Analysis via Trypsin Digestion

LgBiT (20 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ) was incubated with SmBiT-CpO $3.10(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and phosphine 3.2 $(500 \mu \mathrm{M})$ for 4 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Samples were then analyzed via SDS-PAGE. Bands corresponding to the crosslinked product were excised and destained ( $50 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NH} 4 \mathrm{HCO}_{3}$ in $50 \% \mathrm{MeCN}, 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The destain buffer was removed, and the sample was washed with MeCN ( $1 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). After drying, the samples were incubated with Trypsin Gold, Mass Spectrometry Grade (Promega, $50 \mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{L}, 1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Peptides were eluted in $0.1 \%$ formic acid and analyzed via LC-MS.

### 3.5.9 Synthetic Procedures

Compounds 3.18 [48], S-3.2 [53], S-3.3 [54] and S-3.4 [55] were synthesized as previously described.




## N-Benzyl-4-(2-methyl-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)butanamide (3.1)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask under a nitrogen atmosphere was added S3.2 ( $192 \mathrm{mg}, 0.600 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(6 \mathrm{~mL})$, anhydrous pyridine (72 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol})$, and benzylamine ( $33 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The solution was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h , then diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was passed through a silica plug (eluting with $0-100 \%$ acetone in EtOAc), then further purified by HPLC (eluting with $10-90 \% \mathrm{MeCN}+0.1 \%$ TFA in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+0.1 \%$ TFA over 15 min ). The desired fractions were collected and lyophilized to give 3.1 as a colorless oil (18 mg, 25\%).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.31-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.74(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.41$ (d, J = 5.8 Hz, 2H), 2.62 (t, J = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 2.38 (t, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 2.24 (s, 3H), 2.02 (quint, $J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 171.8,160.9,160.4,156.9,138.4$, 128.8, 128.0, 127.6, 43.7, 35.0, 25.2, 22.1, 11.4. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ 266.1157, found 266.1149.


## Cyclopropenone amino acid (3.7)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask under a nitrogen atmosphere was added a solution of S-3.2 (298 mg, 0.932 mmol ) in anhydrous DMF ( 2 mL ), followed by DIPEA ( $0.97 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). A solution of $\mathbf{S} \mathbf{- 3 . 3}$ ( $886 \mathrm{mg}, 1.84 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in anhydrous DMF ( 2 mL ) was added dropwise, and the reaction was stirred at room temperature overnight. The solution was transferred to a separatory funnel containing $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(\sim 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted into $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was diluted with toluene ( 100 mL ) and concentrated in vacuo to remove residual DMF. This dilution-concentration sequence was repeated twice. The resulting residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with a gradient of $2-10 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give 3.7 as an off-white solid ( 0.27 $\mathrm{g}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol})$. This material was used in solid-phase peptide synthesis without further purification. A small portion was further purified by HPLC (40-90\% MeCN + 0.1\% TFA in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+0.1 \%$ TFA over 15 min ) for characterization. The desired fractions were collected and lyophilized.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.83(\mathrm{t}, J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.72$ (d, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.42(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.33(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.22(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.90(\mathrm{td}, J=9.2,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04-$ $3.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83$ (quint, $J$ $=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.27(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (150
$\left.\mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 174.0,171.1,160.6,158.1,157.3,156.2,143.8,140.7,127.6,127.1$, 125.3, 120.1, 65.6, 53.7, 46.7, 38.2, 34.4, 30.4, 28.7, 25.3, 23.1, 21.9, 11.1. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 527.2158 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 527.2162.


## Sodium 3,3'-(cyclohexylphosphanediyl)dibenzenesulfonate (3.11)

Compound 3.11 was prepared using a previously reported procedure [40], with some modifications. To a round-bottom flask under a nitrogen atmosphere was added oleum (18-24\% free $\mathrm{SO}_{3}, 1.25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and the solution was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Cyclohexyldiphenylphosphine ( $268 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in portions over 5 min , and the resulting solution was allowed to warm to room temperature. The solution was then heated at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 hours until starting material was consumed. The reaction was diluted with cold water ( 70 mL ), then triisooctylamine $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and toluene ( 10 mL ) were added. The resulting biphasic mixture was stirred for 1 h at room temperature. In order to separate the product from impurities, the crude mixture was extracted at different pH levels. To the mixture was added a deoxygenated $5 \% \mathrm{NaOH}$ solution until pH 3 was reached. The solution was transferred to a separatory funnel and the aqueous layer was discarded. Additional deoxygenated $5 \% \mathrm{NaOH}$ solution was added to the separatory funnel containing the organic layer with periodic agitation until the aqueous layer reached pH 6. The aqueous layer was then discarded. To the separatory funnel containing the
organic layer was carefully added a deoxygenated $5 \% \mathrm{NaOH}$ solution with periodic agitation until the aqueous layer reached pH 8 . The organic layer was then discarded and the aqueous layer was collected and concentrated in vacuo. The conversion was measured by ${ }^{31}$ P NMR ( $86 \%$ desired product, $14 \%$ corresponding oxide). This material was further purified as needed by HPLC (10-50\% MeCN in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ over 15 min ) to obtain the desired product as a white crystalline solid (trace amounts of phosphine oxide present in $\left.{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} N M R\right)$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.82(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.70(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.54(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.32$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR (162 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta-2.2 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ $\delta 142.7$ (d, $J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 136.9(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 136.5(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 130.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=21$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 129.4(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 126.3,34.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 29.0(\mathrm{~d}, J=13.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 26.1(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ 11.8 Hz), 25.9. HRMS (ESI-) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NaO}_{6} \mathrm{PS}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{-} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 449.0275$, found 449.0277.


## Diazirine amino acid (S-3.1)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask under an argon atmosphere was added succinimidyl 4,4 '-azipentoate ( $38 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and Fmoc-Lys-OH ( $93 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). Anhydrous DMF ( 0.56 mL ) was added, and the solution was stirred at ambient
temperature overnight. The reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined and washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and sat. $\mathrm{LiCl}(1 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give compound S-3.1 as a white solid ( $61 \mathrm{mg}, 75 \%$ ).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 500 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.52-$ $7.56(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}$, rotamer), $7.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.83(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 0.4$ H , rotamer) $5.77-5.72(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}), 4.51$ (br s, 0.4 H , rotamer) 4.44-4.34 (m, 3H), 4.21 (t, J = 6.9 Hz, 1H), 3.30-3.22 (m, 2H), $1.97(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.94-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 1.59-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-$ $1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 174.8,172.3,156.5,144.0$ (rotamer), 143.8, 141.5, 127.9, 127.3, 125.3, 120.2, 67.3, 53.6, 47.3, 39.3, 31.9, 30.8, 29.0, 25.6, 22.3, 20.0. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 501.2114 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 501.2117 .


## Pent-3-yn-1-yl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate (S-3.5)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of 3-pentyn-1-ol (0.20 $\mathrm{mL}, 2.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(12 \mathrm{~mL})$. 4-Dimethylaminopyridine (DMAP, $27.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.223 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.103$ equiv.) and anhydrous triethylamine ( $E t_{3} \mathrm{~N}, 0.36 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.6$ mmol, 1.2 equiv.) were added, and the resulting solution was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .4$ -

Toluenesulfonyl chloride (TsCl, $0.658 \mathrm{~g}, 3.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.59$ equiv.) was added, and the reaction was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The solution was diluted with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting crude residue dry-loaded on silica, then purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-3.5 (0.47 g, 91\%) as a colorless oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [56].


## Hex-4-yn-1-yl 4-methylbenzenesulfonate (S-3.6)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added anhydrous DMSO (5.4 mL) and 5-hexyn-1-ol ( $0.50 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.). Potassium tert-butoxide (KOtBu, 1.064 g , 9.478 mmol, 2.090 equiv.) was added, and the solution was stirred overnight. The resulting yellow solution was diluted with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 x$ $40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, and washed with brine $(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$, then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated under partial vacuum on an ice-water bath. The resulting volatile alcohol was used immediately without further purification.

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of crude alcohol in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$. DMAP ( $55.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.454 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.100$ equiv.) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ( $0.76 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2$ equiv.) were added, and the resulting solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{TsCl}(1.723 \mathrm{~g}, 9.072 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.000$ equiv.) was added, and the reaction was slowly
warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The solution was diluted with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting crude residue dry-loaded on silica, then purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-3.6 ( $0.53 \mathrm{~g}, 46 \%$ over two steps) as a light yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [57].


## Di-tert-butyl pent-3-yn-1-yliminodicarbonate (S-3.7)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added di-tert-butyl-iminodicarboxylate ( $\mathrm{Boc}_{2} \mathrm{NH}, 0.995 \mathrm{~g}, 4.58 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.50$ equiv.) and potassium carbonate $\left(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, 0.850 \mathrm{~g}\right.$, $6.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.01$ equiv.). A solution of $\mathbf{S}-3.5$ ( $0.728 \mathrm{~g}, 3.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous DMF ( 3.0 mL ) was added, and the resulting slurry was stirred at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. The mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined and washed with brine $(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$, then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 5\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-3.7 ( $0.54 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%$ ) as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.70(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.51 (s, 18H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 152.5,82.5,77.1,75.9,45.5,28.2$, 19.3, 3.7. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(E \mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 306.1681 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 306.1684 .


## Di-tert-butyl hex-4-yn-1-yliminodicarbonate (S-3.8)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{Boc}_{2} \mathrm{NH}(0.673 \mathrm{~g}, 3.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.49$ equiv.) and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ ( $0.577 \mathrm{~g}, 4.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.01$ equiv.). A solution of $\mathrm{S}-3.6$ ( $0.524 \mathrm{~g}, 2.08$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.) in anhydrous DMF ( 2.0 mL ) was added, and the resulting slurry was stirred at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. The mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined and washed with brine $(2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$, then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 5\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give S3.8 ( $0.55 \mathrm{~g}, 88 \%$ ) as a pale yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 3.64(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.72(\mathrm{~m}$, $5 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 152.6,82.3,78.4,75.9,46.0,28.6,28.2$, 16.5, 3.6. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 320.1838 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 320.1843 .

## General procedure A for the synthesis of CpO-ammonium compounds

To a flame-dried Schlenk tube was added sodium iodide (Nal, 1.8-2.5 equiv.). The reagent was gently flame-dried under vacuum, then resuspended in a solution of alkyne (1 equiv.) in anhydrous THF ( 0.25 M alkyne). Trifluoromethyltrimethylsilane (TMSCF 3 , 22.2 equiv.) was added, and the vessel was sealed and stirred vigorously at ambient temperature for 2 d . The slurry was diluted with water ( 30 mL ) and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and
concentrated in vacuo. The resulting crude difluorocyclopropene was used immediately without further purification.

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of crude difluorocyclopropene in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(\sim 0.25 \mathrm{M}$ w.r.t. alkyne), followed by trifluoroacetic acid (TFA, 5-8.6 equiv.). The solution was stirred overnight, then concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was resuspended in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected and lyophilized to give the desired CpO-ammonium as the TFA salt.


## (2-Methyl-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)methanaminium trifluoroacetate (S-3.9)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: S-3.4 (0.221 g, 0.821 mmol, 1.00 equiv), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.277 \mathrm{~g}, 1.84 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.25\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.24 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 3.3 mL ); TFA ( $0.54 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 8.6$ equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (4.0 mL). Compound S-3.9 (91 mg, 52\% over two steps) was isolated as a yellow residue.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 8.46(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.20(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.31(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta-73.5 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 158.2,155.2,155.0,36.5$, 11.4. HRMS could not be acquired for this compound.


## 2-(2-Methyl-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)ethan-1-aminium trifluoroacetate (S-3.10)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: S-3.8 (0.319 g, 1.13 mmol, 1.00 equiv), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.383 \mathrm{~g}, 2.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.27\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.33 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); TFA ( $0.43 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.0$ equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (4.0 mL). Compound S-3.10 (0.17 g, 68\% over two steps) was isolated as a reddish-brown residue.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 7.74(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.17(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (565 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta-73.5 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 159.0,157.3,157.2,36.0,24.8,11.4$. HRMS could not be acquired for this compound.


3-(2-Methyl-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)propan-1-aminium trifluoroacetate (3.17)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: S-3.9 (0.144 g, 0.483 mmol, 1.00 equiv), $\mathrm{Nal}(0.170 \mathrm{~g}, 1.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.36$ equiv. $), \mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.14 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.97 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); TFA ( $0.43 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.0$ equiv.), anhydrous
$\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (4.0 mL). Compound 3.17 ( $0.080 \mathrm{~g}, 69 \%$ over two steps) was isolated as a yellow residue.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 7.72(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.87(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.69(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.90$ (quint, $J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F} \mathrm{NMR}\left(565 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta-$ 73.5. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 159.9,158.0,157.4,38.3,23.7,23.0,11.1 . \mathrm{HRMS}$ could not be acquired for this compound.

## SmBiT peptides: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{CpO})$ VTGWRLSERILA-NH $\mathrm{N}_{2} \quad$ (3.8), $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}-$ K(CpO)VTGWRLFEEIL-NH2 (3.9), $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{CpO})$ VSGWRLFKKISN-NH2 (3.10), and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}-$ K(Dz)VSGWRLFKKISN-NH2 (3.12).

To a fritted glass reservoir was added NovaPEG Rink Amide resin ( $0.46 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{g}$, $110-220 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05-0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ respectively). Throughout the synthesis, the resin was agitated by bubbling $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ through the reservoir. The resin was initially swelled and washed with DMF (2 x $15 \mathrm{~mL}, 15 \mathrm{~min}$ per cycle), then treated with $20 \%$ 4-methylpiperidine/DMF ( $10 \mathrm{~mL}, 20 \mathrm{~min}$ ) for Fmoc removal. After the first deprotection step, the resin was washed with DMF ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \mathrm{~min}$ ). Protected amino acids were then coupled in the following manner: Fmoc-protected amino acid ( 0.30 mmol ), HCTU (120 mg, 0.30 mmol ), and diisopropylethylamine ( $160 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were dissolved in 3.0 mL of DMF. The solution was mixed thoroughly, incubated at room temperature for $\sim 3 \mathrm{~min}$, and then added to the deprotected resin. Each coupling step was performed at room temperature for a minimum of 45 min . The resin was then washed with DMF ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \mathrm{~min}$ ). Subsequent Fmoc deprotection was achieved by incubating the resin with 10 mL of $20 \%$ 4-
methylpiperidine/DMF ( 20 min ). The resin was then washed with DMF ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \mathrm{~min}$ ) prior to the next coupling step. Repeated cycles of amino acid coupling and deprotection were used to achieve the desired peptides. After the final cycle, the resin was washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \mathrm{~min})$. Peptides were then isolated by incubating the resin with 95:2.5:2.5 trifluoroacetic acid (TFA):triisopropylsilane: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}, 30 \mathrm{~min}$ ). The cleavage solutions were combined, concentrated in vacuo, and treated with 40 mL cold diethyl ether. The precipitate was then collected via centrifugation ( $3000 \times \mathrm{g}, 5 \mathrm{~min}$ ) and dried under vacuum. The peptides were purified by HPLC (eluting with 40-90\% MeCN containing $0.1 \%$ TFA over 15 min ), and the purified products were lyophilized. Product identity and purity were assessed via LC-MS. Peptide stocks were prepared in PBS (pH 7.4), and concentrations were determined using a Pierce ${ }^{T M}$ BCA Protein Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher) or by absorbance at 280 nm using an extinction coefficient of $5500 \mathrm{M}^{-1}$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ (calculated using ExPASy ProtParam).
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## Chapter 4: Butenolide synthesis from functionalized cyclopropenones

Adapted from published work, with permission from the American Chemical Society: Nguyen, S. S.; Ferreira, A. J.; Long, Z. G.; Heiss, T. K.; Dorn, R. S.; Row, R. D.; Prescher, J. A. Org. Lett. 2019, 21, 86958699.

### 4.1 Abstract

The stringent requirements placed on bioorthogonal reagents - high chemoselectivity, broad functional group tolerance, generalizability - are also traits highly sought after in methodology development. We envisaged that the cyclopropenone (CpO)phosphine ligation could be optimized to access a class of cyclic lactones known as butenolides. Retrosynthetically, these scaffolds could be accessed from the $\mathrm{CpO}-$ phosphine ligation via intramolecular trapping of the ketene-ylide intermediate. Whereas previous renditions of this reaction featured an intramolecular trap on the phosphine probe, this strategy would require the intramolecular trap on the CpO reagent. In this Chapter, I discuss the development of a method to synthesize highly substituted butenolides from bioorthogonal CpOs .

### 4.2 Introduction

Butenolides are found in a variety of natural product scaffolds and possess desirable bioactive properties [1]. For example, linderalactone (Figure 4-1A) can protect hepatocytes from oxidative damage [2]. Other butenolides, including (-)-incrustoporin, are potent inhibitors of pathogenic fungi [3]. These and related scaffolds [4] have inspired chemists to develop efficient syntheses of $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated lactones. While several
methods now exist [5-9], most are limited in terms of substitution pattern, functional group tolerance, or starting material accessibility. More general methods to build butenolides are therefore needed.

Cyclopropenones (CpOs) are attractive synthons for butenolide formation. These microcycles map readily onto the target structures and are easily accessible from alkyne precursors [10]. CpOs have only recently been exploited for lactone synthesis, though [11-13]. The groups of Lin and Sun developed methods to convert symmetric CpOs to functionalized butenolides (Figures $4-1 \mathrm{~B}$ and $4-1 \mathrm{C}$ ). Both transformations proceed via intermolecular 1,2-addition of carbonyls into the CpO scaffold, followed by ring opening. The resulting vinyl anion intermediates subsequently cyclize to deliver the desired lactones. While robust, both methods require electron-rich carbonyl fragments. The vinyl anion intermediates are also not compatible with a range of functional groups, limiting the scope of these chemistries. Furthermore, the intermolecular nature of the reactions can present regioselectivity challenges when unsymmetrical CpOs are employed.

We hypothesized that an intramolecular reaction could convert CpOs to functionalized butenolides and potentially broaden the scope of accessible products. Toward this end, we drew inspiration from our previous work on bioorthogonal CpOs [1415]. These motifs undergo conjugate addition reactions with phosphines, producing ketene-ylide intermediates upon ring fragmentation [16]. The electrophiles can be readily trapped by pendant nucleophiles on the phosphine (Figure 4-2A) to afford covalent adducts. We surmised that pendant nucleophiles on the CpO - rather than the phosphine - could also trap the ketene (Figure 4-2B). If the nucleophile was part of a hydroxymethyl
tether, the products would comprise lactones. Subsequent ylide protonation and phosphine elimination could ultimately deliver functionalized butenolides. Since the proposed method involves bioorthogonal reagents, it would likely be compatible with a variety of functional groups. The proximity of the hydroxy group on the CpO would also promote intramolecular cyclization, outcompeting any exogenous nucleophile in the trapping step [15].
A) Bioactive natural products comprising butenolides

linderalactone

(-)-incrustoporin

tuberostemoamide
B) Lin (2017)

C) Sun (2018)


Figure 4-1. (A) Butenolides (blue) are common motifs in bioactive natural products. Recent work by (B) Lin [11] and (C) Sun [12] featured intermolecular reactions between CpOs and carbonyls to generate functionalized butenolides.

## A) Phosphine-triggered CpO ligation



## B) This work



Figure 4-2. CpOs react with bioorthogonal phosphines to reveal ketene ylides. These intermediates can be trapped with A) pendant nucleophiles on phosphines or B) hydroxy group nucleophiles on CpO scaffolds. In the latter case, phosphine addition at C2 affords butenolides (top). Phosphine addition at C3 could provide undesired $\beta$-lactones (bottom).

The regioselectivity of the proposed reaction was further considered. Phosphine addition at C2 (i.e., the carbon bearing the hydroxymethyl tether) would likely provide the desired products. However, phosphine addition at C3 could give undesired $\beta$-lactones. Cyclization en route to the $\beta$-lactone (4-exo-dig) is disfavored according to Baldwin's rules, but notable examples exist [17-19]. We reasoned that butenolide formation could still predominate in the reaction, even if the phosphine attacked C3. Ketene-ylide formation is reversible in the absence of trapping nucleophiles [14,20], and cyclization en route to the $\beta$-lactone would likely be slower than the reverse reaction to reform the CpO . Thus, the reaction could funnel to a butenolide product, regardless of the initial site of phosphine addition.

### 4.3 Results and Discussion

To examine the overall strategy, model CpO 4.1a was synthesized and treated with a panel of phosphines. The reactions were performed in various solvents and monitored using ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy (Table 4-1, See Appendix B). 1,3,5-Triaza-7phosphaadamantane (PTA) was initially selected due to its potent reactivity and stability in protic solvents. When combined stoichiometrically with 4.1a, PTA afforded rapid conversion to the desired butenolide (entry 1). The reaction slowed significantly when the catalyst loading was reduced to $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ (entry 2). Notably, no intermolecular solvent trapping was observed even at the longer reaction times. Sluggish reactivity was not general to all alkyl-substituted phosphines. When 4.1a was treated with cyclohexyldiphenylphosphine (CyDPP), rapid formation of 4.2a was observed even at low catalyst loadings (entry 3).

Anticipating that alkyl phosphines would be prone to oxidation and thus less general, we further investigated triarylphosphines. We were particularly drawn to tri(otolyl)phosphine, as this reagent would likely be sufficiently nucleophilic to add into the CpO core, but be reasonably air stable. When CpO 4.1 a was treated with tri(otolyl)phosphine, though, no conversion to butenolide 4.2a was observed (entry 4). No butenolide was formed even with longer reaction times or elevated temperatures (See Appendix B). The increased steric bulk surrounding the phosphine likely precluded efficient conjugate addition. Indeed, this phosphine is rarely used in Michael-type reactions and is primarily employed as a metal ligand [21-23].

Table 4-1. Optimization of butenolide cyclization.

|  |  | $\xrightarrow[\text { solvent, } 23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}]{\text { phosphine }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entry | phosphine ( $\mathrm{mol} \%$ ) | solvent | time | conversion (\%) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 1 | PTA (100) | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 10 min | > 95 |
| 2 | PTA (10) | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 2 h | 67 |
| 3 | CyDPP (5) | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 2.5 h | 90 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}\left(0\right.$-tolyl) ${ }_{3}(5)$ | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 2.5 h | 0 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100)$ | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 10 min | > 95 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100)$ | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 22 h | > 95 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5)$ | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 24 h | 16 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100)$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ | 1 h | > 95 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5)$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ | 24 h | 94 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(10)$ | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 1.5 h | > 95 |
| 11 | $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5)$ | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 2.5 h | > 95 |
| 12 | PTA (1) | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 2 h | 9 |
| 13 | PTA (5) | $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 2.5 h | 52 |
| 14 | $\mathrm{P}(0 \text {-tolyl) })_{3}(5)$ | $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ | 21 h | 0 |
| $15^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(0\right.$-tolyl) ${ }_{3}(5)$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ | 18 h | 0 |

${ }^{\text {a Reaction conditions: }} \mathrm{CpO}(15 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, TMS-acetylene ( $3 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), solvent ( $600 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ )
${ }^{b}$ NMR conversion, calculated from integral ratios between starting CpO and butenolide product
${ }^{c}$ Reaction conditions: $\mathrm{CpO}(0.36 \mathrm{mmol})$, solvent ( 14.4 mL ), $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

We next tested a less sterically encumbered reagent, triphenylphosphine ( $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ). $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ is commercially available, inexpensive, and bench stable, making it attractive for methods development. When 4.1a was treated with stoichiometric amounts of $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$, rapid conversion to butenolide 4.2a was observed (entry 5). Efficient cyclization occurred even at reduced catalyst loadings (entries 10-11) with no evidence of intermolecular solvent trapping. Additionally, in the realm of phosphine organocatalysis, few reactions feature catalyst loadings below $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$, and even fewer use air-stable, commercially available reagents [24]. We were also surprised that low catalyst loadings
afforded rapid butenolide formation, considering the diminished nucleophilicity of $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$. We hypothesized that the polar protic solvent accelerated the reaction via hydrogen-bond activation of the starting CpO . Similar observations were made when CpOs were tuned for bioorthogonal ligation [15]. When the cyclizations were performed in DMSO-d $d_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$, longer reaction times or stoichiometric amounts of $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ were required for full conversion (entries 6-9).

We aimed to test the optimized reaction conditions with a variety of hydroxymethyl CpOs. Such probes can be readily accessed via appropriately functionalized alkynes [10]. We thus prepared a variety of alkyl- and aryl-substituted alkynes via acetylide addition to formaldehyde or Sonogashira cross-coupling reactions, respectively (Scheme 4-1). Each alkyne also comprised a THP-protected hydroxymethyl tether. The alkyne products were subjected to difluorocarbene, a reagent generated in situ via the conditions of Olah [25] (Scheme 4-2). The resulting difluorocyclopropenes were then hydrolyzed and deprotected to furnish the desired hydroxymethyl CpOs (Scheme 4-2). The carbene insertion and hydrolysis sequence was not compatible with alkynes bearing nitrogen heterocycles, and attempts to isolate the corresponding CpOs resulted in decomposition. These results are in stark contrast to heterocyclic alkenes, which undergo robust difluorocarbene insertion [26-27].

Scheme 4-1. General synthesis of functionalized alkynes with masked hydroxymethyl tethers. (A) Alkylfunctionalized alkynes were accessed via acetylide addition to formaldehyde, followed by THP protection. (B) Aryl-functionalized alkynes were prepared via Sonogashira cross coupling reactions with THP-protected propargyl alcohols and aryl halides.

A


B


The panel of hydroxymethyl-tethered CpOs was subjected to butenolide formation conditions (Scheme 4-2). As anticipated, the cyclization was tolerant of a broad range of functional groups. $\alpha$-Alkyl-substituted CpOs (4.2a-d), including branched (4.2b), and cyclic (4.2c) substrates, were efficiently converted. The reaction also proceeded in the presence of competing nucleophiles (4.2d), albeit with lower yields. $\alpha$-Aryl substituted CpOs also generated butenolides in the presence of $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$. Both electron-donating (4.2eI) and electron-withdrawing ( $4.2 \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{u}$ ) groups were examined, along with thiophene heterocycles (4.2I). Notably, robust product formation was observed even in the presence of electrophilic esters (4.2t) and cyano groups (4.2q). The reaction was also tolerant of different substitution patterns on the aryl ring (4.2f-j, 4.2s).

The CpO-phosphine reaction further enabled access to more highly substituted butenolides. As noted above, the cyclization is tolerant of numerous $\alpha$-substituents (Scheme 4-2). These groups are positioned away from the ketene, and thus minimally interfere with trapping. Additional substituents on the hydroxymethyl tether provided access to $\alpha, \gamma$-disubstituted butenolides (4.2m-o). Compound 4.2 n , in particular,
comprises the $\alpha, \gamma$-substitution pattern present in incrustoporin and related natural products (Figure 4-1A). While the CpO reaction cannot provide $\beta$-substituted butenolides, such scaffolds are readily accessible post-cyclization. Cycloadditions [28-29] and Heck couplings [30] can be used in this regard, along with several other methods [31-32]. Notably, functionalized butenolides can also serve as gateways to butyrolactones [33-36] and other interesting scaffolds [37-38].

Scheme 4-2. Diverse butenolides were synthesized from substituted $\mathrm{CpOs}^{\mathrm{a}, b}$



[^0]Our collective results demonstrated that butenolides are favored in the hydroxymethyl CpO -phosphine reaction. All but one of the cyclizations proceeded with no competing $\beta$-lactone formation. Such side products were observed only when CpO 4.1 m was subjected to low catalyst loadings in methanol (Figures 4-3A). The gem-dimethyl groups on 4.1m likely promoted phosphine addition to the more accessible C 3 position and accelerated $\beta$-lactone cyclization to provide 4.3a-b [39]. An appreciable amount of product 4.2 m was still formed under these challenging conditions, though, supporting the original hypothesis that butenolide formation can predominate, despite the potential for competing pathways.

We carried out additional experiments to examine the propensity for hydroxymethyl CpOs to form butenolides. The observed product distributions likely reflect the faster rate of five- versus four-membered ring cyclization following ketene formation (Figure 4-2B). An alternative explanation is that phosphine attack is favored at C 2 . To investigate these possibilities, we devised a competitive trapping experiment with diol 4.1d. This compound comprises two hydroxy group tethers, and is capable of cyclizing to five- or six-membered rings, depending on the ketene formed. We anticipated that 4.1 d would provide a mixture of $\gamma$ - and $\delta$-lactones upon phosphine treatment, as the steric environments around C2 and C3 are similar and unlikely to bias phosphine addition. Additionally, five- or six-membered ring formation (post-ketene generation) should be similarly facile. When diol 4.1d was treated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$, a mixture of $\gamma$-lactones was observed, in addition to butenolide 4.2d (See Appendix B). No $\delta$-lactone (4.5) formed, though, to our surprise (Figure 4-3B). The ketene en route to 4.5 was capable of forming and cyclizing, as demonstrated with a CpO probe outfitted with a single hydroxyethyl tether (See Appendix B). These data suggest
that phosphine addition to C 2 could be preferred when CpO s are functionalized with hydroxymethyl appendages. The exact mechanism is the subject of ongoing work, but the tether could promote internal hydrogen-bond activation, preorganizing the CpO for C 2 attack.


4.1 m
$\xrightarrow[\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}]{\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)}$
4.2m, 39\%

$4.3 a+4.3 b, 60 \%$

B


Figure 4-3. Mechanistic studies involving butenolide formation. (A) Upon phosphine treatment, CpO 4.1 m formed $\beta$-lactone products $4.3 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}$. The additional steric bulk at C 2 likely disfavored phosphine addition. (B) $\delta$-Lactone 4.5 was not observed when diol- CpO 4.1 d was treated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$. This reaction produced a mixture of $\gamma$-lactones (4.4a-b), in addition to the desired butenolide 4.2d. For (A)-(B), percent conversion values (from NMR analyses) are reported.

### 4.4 Conclusions

In conclusion, we developed a method to prepare substituted butenolides using mild and bioorthogonal reagents: hydroxymethyl-tethered cyclopropenones and aryl phosphines. This method features mild reaction conditions and low catalyst loadings, and can produce a variety of targets. The reaction exhibits wide functional group tolerance, typical of biocompatible reagents. The reported transformation is complementary to existing methods that furnish $\alpha, \gamma$-substituted butenolides [40-49], but is potentially more generalizable. Importantly, the requisite hydroxymethyl CpOs can be derived from propargyl alcohols, widely used and available materials in organic synthesis. We further
anticipate that CpOs and other bioorthogonal reagents will continue to inspire the development of useful methodologies.

### 4.5 Methods and Materials

### 4.5.1 General Information

Reactions were run at ambient temperature under a nitrogen atmosphere, unless otherwise indicated. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether ( $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, dimethylformamide (DMF), and acetonitrile (MeCN) were degassed with argon and run through two $4 \times 36$ inch columns of anhydrous neutral A-2 ( $8 \times 14$ mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated under a flow of argon at $350^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h$)$. Thin-layer chromatography was performed using Silica Gel $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254 \text {-coated glass plates ( } 0.25 \mathrm{~mm} \text { thickness), and }}$ visualization was performed with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ stain and/or UV irradiation. Chromatography was performed with $60 \AA$ (240-400 mesh) silica gel, commercially available from Sorbent Technologies. Organic solutions were concentrated under reduced pressure using a Büchi rotary evaporator. NMR spectra were collected on a Bruker DRX400 instrument ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 376 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}, 162 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ ), a Bruker DRX500 instrument equipped with a cryo probe (500 MHz ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ ), or an AVANCE600 instrument equipped with a cryo probe (600 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 151 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right)$. Spectra were internally referenced to residual solvent signals $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ was referenced to 7.26 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and 77.16 ppm for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ was referenced to 3.31 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and 49.0 ppm for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ was referenced to 7.16 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and 128.06 ppm for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ was referenced to 2.50 ppm for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was referenced to 4.79 ppm for $\left.{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right) .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ and ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR spectra were referenced by indirect absolute chemical shift to residual protio solvent signals. All spectra were collected at 298 K unless stated otherwise. High resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) was performed by the University
of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility. Crystallographic data were acquired and processed by the University of California, Irvine X-Ray Crystallography Facility.

### 4.5.2 Optimization of butenolide cyclization conditions

Reaction conditions were analyzed using ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. Cyclopropenone 4.1a ( 25 mM ) and phosphine (1-100 mol \%) were incubated in the presence of air at ambient temperature. NMR spectra were acquired over 24 h , or until full conversion was observed.

### 4.5.3 Crystallization of compound 4.2 m

A scintillation vial containing compound $4.2 \mathrm{~m}(\sim 60 \mathrm{mg})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and concentrated in vacuo using a Büchi rotary evaporator. The resulting residue was placed under reduced pressure $(\sim 0.1 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg})$. After 2 h , crystals were serendipitously found deposited onto the needle. Crystals were transferred to a new scintillation vial, parafilmed, and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until diffraction.

X-ray crystal structure of compound 4.2 m


A colorless crystal ( $0.169 \times 0.306 \times 0.408 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) was mounted on a glass fiber and transferred to a Bruker SMART APEX II diffractometer. The APEX2 [50] program package was used to determine the unit-cell parameters and for data collection (15 sec/frame scan time for a sphere of diffraction data). The raw frame data was processed using SAINT [51] and SADABS [52] to yield the reflection data file. Subsequent calculations were carried out using the SHELXTL [53] program. The diffraction symmetry was $2 / m$ and the systematic absences were consistent with the monoclinic space groups $\mathrm{C} 2, \mathrm{Cm}$ and $C 2 / m$. It was later determined that space group $C 2 / m$ was correct.

The structure was solved by direct methods and refined on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ by full-matrix leastsquares techniques. The analytical scattering factors [54] for neutral atoms were used throughout the analysis. Hydrogen atoms were located from a difference-Fourier map and refined ( $x, y, z$ and $U_{\text {iso }}$ ). The molecule was located on a mirror plane.

Least-squares analysis yielded wR2 $=0.0922$ and Goof $=1.062$ for 74 variables refined against 920 data $(0.74 \AA$ ), $\mathrm{R} 1=0.0341$ for those 864 data with $\mathrm{I}>2.0 \sigma(\mathrm{I})$.

### 4.5.4 Synthetic Procedures

## Compounds S-4.1 [15], S-4.5 [55], S-4.6 [56], S-4.7 [57], S-4.8 [58], S-4.9 [59], S-

 4.10 [60], S-4.11 [61], and S-4.12 [62] were synthesized as previously described. All other reagents were obtained from commercial sources and used without further purification.

## 2-((4,4-Dimethylpent-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.14)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added 3,3-dimethylbut-1-yne ( 0.50 mL , $4.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.) in anhydrous THF ( 8.0 mL ). The solution was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and n-butyllithium ( 2.5 M in hexanes, $1.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.) was added dropwise. The solution was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . Paraformaldehyde ( $0.145 \mathrm{~g}, 4.83 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.20$ equiv.) was added in one portion, and the reaction was stirred at ambient temperature. When full consumption of the alkyne was observed (as determined by TLC), the solution was quenched with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(90 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered. The solvent was concentrated in vacuo, and the resulting crude oil (S-4.13) was used in the next step without further purification.

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added 4-toluenesulfonic acid monohydrate ( $\left.\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 5.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.040 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right)$ and a solution of $\mathrm{S}-4.13$ (0.798 g, $4.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 8.0 mL ). After cooling to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 3,4-$ dihydro-2H-pyran (DHP, $0.39 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.) was added dropwise, and the
solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting dark solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 5\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.14 (0.65 g, 81\% over two steps) as a clear, viscous oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.86(\mathrm{t}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.25(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=15.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.5,9.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.49(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.79(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 1.75-1.70 (m, 1H), 1.64-1.56 (m, 2H), 1.55-1.48 (m, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 96.4,94.8,74.2,62.0,54.6,31.0,30.4,27.4,25.4,19.2 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 219.1361 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 219.1360 .


## 2-((3-Cyclohexylprop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.15)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.027 \mathrm{mmol}$, $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) and a solution of S-4.5 ( $0.354 \mathrm{~g}, 2.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3 mL ). After cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHP ( $0.24 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.) was added dropwise, and the solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting dark solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ (1 $x 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude
residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound S-4.15 ( $0.46 \mathrm{~g}, 81 \%$ ) as a colorless oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.83(\mathrm{t}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=15.3,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23$ (dd, $J=15.3,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.6,9.4,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.48$ (m, 12H), 1.46-1.40 (m, 2H), 1.34-1.24 (m, 3H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 96.7, 90.9, 75.7, 62.1, 54.8, 32.8, 30.5, 29.3, 26.0, 25.6, 25.0, 19.3. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 245.1517 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 245.1512 .


## 2-((3-Phenylprop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.16)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(28.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.151 \mathrm{mmol}$, $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$, and 3-phenyl-2-propyn-1-ol ( $1.86 \mathrm{~mL}, 15.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv.). After cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHP ( $1.28 \mathrm{~mL}, 15.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) was added dropwise, and the solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting dark solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 05\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.16 (2.80 g, 85\%) as a pale yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [63].


## N,N-Diethyl-4-iodobenzamide (S-4.17)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added 4-iodobenzoic acid (0.496 g, 2.00 mmol, 1.00 equiv. $)$, $\mathrm{EDC} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(0.461 \mathrm{~g}, 2.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.20$ equiv. $)$, and $\mathrm{HOBt} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.367$ g, 2.40 mmol, 1.20 equiv.). Anhydrous THF ( 3.0 mL ), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2.0 mL ), and diethylamine ( $0.62 \mathrm{~mL}, 6.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.0$ equiv.) were added, and the solution was stirred at ambient temperature overnight. The reaction was concentrated in vacuo and the crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $0-2 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound S-4.17 (0.58 g, 96\%) as a white powder. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [64].


## 1-Methyl-4-(3-((tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)-1H-pyrazole (S-4.18)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(12.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0641$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 6 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ and a solution of S-4.6 ( $0.152 \mathrm{~g}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3.0 mL ). After cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHP ( $0.18 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.8$ equiv.) was added dropwise, and the solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the
organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 20\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.18 (0.18 g, 74\%) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 7.64(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.97(\mathrm{t}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=15.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{ddd}, J=13.5,11.0,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.41-$ $3.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.02(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.30-1.18 (m, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 142.2,132.8,103.2,96.6,86.7,78.0$, $61.5,54.9,38.2,30.6,25.8$, 19.2. HRMS $\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $243.1109 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 243.1106 .


## 2-Bromo-6-(3-((tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)pyridine (S-4.19)

Compound S-4.19 was synthesized following the general procedure of Duffey, et al [56]. To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of $\mathbf{S 7}$ ( $0.201 \mathrm{~g}, 0.947$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3.0 mL ). DHP ( $0.17 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0$ equiv.) was added dropwise, followed by pyridinium $p$-toluenesulfonate (PPTS, $14.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0577$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 6 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$. The solution was stirred at ambient temperature overnight. The reaction was poured into a separatory funnel containing sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$, then extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography
(eluting with $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.19 ( $0.21 \mathrm{~g}, 76 \%$ ) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.50(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.39(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.87(\mathrm{t}, J=3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H ), 3.86 (ddd, $J=11.5,9.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $3.57-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-$ $1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 143.4$, 141.8, 138.4, 127.9, 126.2, 97.2, 87.3, 83.9, 62.2, 54.6, 30.3, 25.5, 19.1. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 318.0106 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 318.0094.

### 4.4.4a General procedure A for Sonogashira Coupling

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (1 mol \%), copper (I) iodide (Cul, 2-3 mol \%), anhydrous triethylamine ( $E t_{3} \mathrm{~N}, 0.25-0.31 \mathrm{M}$ aryl halide), aryl halide (1.0 equiv.), and alkyne (1.0-1.1 equiv.). The mixture was stirred at ambient temperature overnight. The resultant slurry was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with hexanes/EtOAc) to afford pure product.


## 2-((3-(p-Tolyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.20)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 4-iodotoluene ( 0.654 $\mathrm{g}, 3.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathbf{S}-4.8$ ( $0.42 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(21.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0299 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $\operatorname{Cul}(12.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0630 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(12 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1-8\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.20 (0.67 g, 96\%) as a yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [63].


## 2-((3-(m-Tolyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.21)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 3-iodotoluene (0.13 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathbf{S}-4.8$ ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.2 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, Cul ( $4.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.023 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1-3\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.21 (0.19 g, 80\%) as a light brown oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.28-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.19(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{t}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89$ (ddd, $J=11.9,9.0,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.32(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.70-$ 1.54 (m, 4H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 138.0,132.5,129.4,129.0,128.3,122.7$, 96.9, 86.1, 84.9, 62.1, 54.9, 30.4, 25.5, 21.3, 19.2. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 253.1205 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 253.1195 .


## 2-((3-(o-Tolyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.22)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 2-iodotoluene ( 0.13 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1.0 equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8.1 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.012 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul ( $4.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.022 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.22 ( $0.18 \mathrm{~g}, 78 \%$ ) as a yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [63].


2-((3-(4-Methoxyphenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.23)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 4-iodoanisole (0.235 $\mathrm{g}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{S}-4.8$ ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.2 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, Cul ( $4.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.022 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1-3\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.23 (0.22 g, 89\%) as a yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [65].


## 2-((3-(2-methoxyphenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.24)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 2-iodoanisole (0.26 $\mathrm{mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.31 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(14.1 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0199 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $\mathrm{Cul}(7.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.039 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(8.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 2-3\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.24 (0.44 g, 89\%) as a brown oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [63].


2-((3-(4-(Methylthio)phenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.25)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 4-iodothioanisole ( $0.250 \mathrm{~g}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{S}-4.8$ ( $0.14 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( $7.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul ( $3.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.020 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0$ mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 99:0:1-93:6:1 hexanes:EtOAc: $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ ) to give compound S-4.25 (0.24 g, 92\%) as an offwhite solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3 $) ~ \delta ~ 7.36-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.16-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.87(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{ddd}, J=12.0,8.8,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.57-3.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 139.5, 132.1, 125.7, 119.0, 96.8, 85.6, 85.2, 62.0, 54.8, 30.3, 25.4, 19.1, 15.3. HRMS $\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 285.0925 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 285.0925 .


2-((2-Methyl-4-phenylbut-3-yn-2-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.26)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: iodobenzene ( 0.41 mL , 3.7 mmol, 1.0 equiv.), S-4.9 ( $0.683 \mathrm{~g}, 4.06 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.10$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(25.2 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0359 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $\mathrm{Cul}(16.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0878 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(12 \mathrm{~mL})$.

The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.26 (0.65 g, 72\%) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.43-7.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.32-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.16-5.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 4.02-3.97 (m, 1H), 3.56-3.50(m, 1H), 1.92-1.82 (m, 1H), 1.79-1.71 (m, 1H), $1.63(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{~s} .3 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 131.8,128.4,128.3$, 123.1, $96.5,91.8,84.1,71.7,63.6,32.2 .30 .9,30.1,25.6,20.8$. HRMS $\left.^{(E S I}{ }^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 267.1361 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 267.1360.


## 2-((3-(4-(Trifluoromethyl)phenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.27)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 4-iodobenzotrifluoride ( $0.15 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathrm{S}-4.8$ ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (7.6 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{Cul}(5.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.029 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $1-2 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.27 ( $0.18 \mathrm{~g}, 63 \%$ ) as a pale yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.56-7.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{t}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.8,9.3,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.54(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 1.89-1.53 (m, 6H). ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (376 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-63.1 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 132.1,130.1(\mathrm{q}, J=32.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 126.7\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{app}}, J=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 125.3(\mathrm{q}, J=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 124.0(\mathrm{q}, J$
$=272.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 97.1, 87.9, 84.5, 62.1, 54.7, 30.4, 25.5, 19.1. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 307.0922$, found 307.0920.


## 2-((3-(4-Chlorophenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.28)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 1-chloro-4iodobenzene ( $0.242 \mathrm{~g}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, Cul ( $6.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.033 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ( 4.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $2-5 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound $\mathrm{S}-4.28$ ( 0.19 g , $76 \%$ ) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.44(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{ddd}, J=12.0$, $9.4,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.56(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 134.6, 132.2, 128.8, 121.5, 97.2, 86.4, 84.8, 62.2, 54.9, 30.5, 25.6, 19.2. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{ClO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 273.0658$, found 273.0660 .


2-((3-(3-Methoxyphenyl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.29)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: 3-iodoanisole (0.12 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathrm{S}-4.8$ ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.1 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, Cul ( $3.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.020 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 1-5\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.29 (0.18 g, 71\%) as a yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [63].


## Ethyl 4-(3-((tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)benzoate (S-4.30)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: ethyl 4-iodobenzoate ( $0.26 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathbf{S}-4.8$ ( $0.14 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.0$ $\mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul ( $4.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 98:1:1 84:15:1 hexanes:EtOAc: $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ ) to give compound $\mathrm{S}-4.30(0.24 \mathrm{~g}, 82 \%)$ as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.00-7.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.52-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.36(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.88$ (ddd, $J=12.0,8.8,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61-3.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 1.38(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 166.0, 131.7, 130.0, 129.4, 127.3, 97.0, 88.2, 85.1, 62.0, 61.1, 54.7, 30.3, 25.4, 19.0, 14.3. HRMS (ESI $)$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $311.1259 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 311.1264.


## N,N-Diethyl-4-(3-((tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)benzamide (S-4.31)

General procedure A was used with the following reagents: S-4.17 (0.542 g, 1.8 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.28 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( $13.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul ( $8.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.045 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(8.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 50\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.31 ( $0.56 \mathrm{~g},>99 \%, 97 \%$ purity).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.6$, $9.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.53(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.23(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.70-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.23(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ б 170.7, 137.2, 132.0, 126.5, 123.8, 97.1, 86.5, 85.3, 62.2, 54.9, 43.4, 39.5, 30.4, 25.5, 19.2, 14.3, 13.0. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 338.1732 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 338.1734 .

### 4.4.4b General procedure B for Sonogashira Coupling

To a flame-dried Schlenk tube was added $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$ ( $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), copper (I) iodide (Cul, $5-8 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), a solution of aryl halide ( 1.0 equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 0.25 M aryl halide), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ (3.0-6.0 equiv.), and alkyne (1.1 equiv.). The tube was sealed, and the solution was stirred at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight). After cooling to ambient temperature, the reaction was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with hexanes/EtOAc) to afford pure product.


## 2-((3-(Thiophen-2-yl)prop-2-yn-1-yl)oxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (S-4.32)

General procedure B was used with following reagents: 2-bromothiophene (0.10 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(56.8 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0492 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $\mathrm{Cul}(15.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0819 \mathrm{mmol}, 8 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.44 \mathrm{~mL}$, 3.1 mmol, 3.0 equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $2 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S4.32 ( $0.13 \mathrm{~g}, 57 \%$ ) as a yellow oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [66].


## 4-(3-((Tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)benzonitrile (S-4.33)

General procedure B was used with the following reagents: 4-bromobenzonitrile ( $0.203 \mathrm{~g}, 1.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.17 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$ ( 64.5 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.0558 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $\mathrm{Cul}(11.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0583 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.47$ $\mathrm{mL}, 3.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, 3.0 equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $3-5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound S-4.33 (0.22 g, 82\%) as an amber oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.87(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88$ (ddd, $J=12.0$, $9.4,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.74(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 132.5,132.1,127.8,118.6,112.0,97.2,90.0,84.3,62.2,54.8,30.4,25.5$, 19.1. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{FI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{NO}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+} 241.1103 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 241.1106 .


## 2-(3-((Tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)pyridine (S-4.34)

General procedure B was used with the following reagents: 2-bromopyridine (0.10 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(60.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0519 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul (11.0 mg, $0.0578 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.44 \mathrm{~mL}$,
3.2 mmol, 3.0 equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 10-50\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.34 ( $0.13 \mathrm{~g}, 56 \%$ ) as a brown oil. NMR spectra matched those previously reported [67].


## 3-(3-((Tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)pyridine (S-4.35)

General procedure B was used with the following reagents: 3-bromopyridine ( 0.10 $\mathrm{mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv.), $\mathrm{S}-\mathbf{4} .8$ ( $0.16 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(60.4 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.0523 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Cul ( $10.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0551 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ( 0.88 mL , $6.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 6.3$ equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 2-5\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.35 (0.12 g, 51\%) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.68$ (dd, $\left.J=1.9,0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 8.53(\mathrm{dd}, J=4.9,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7.72 (dt, $J=7.8,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23$ (ddd, $J=7.9,4.9,0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{t}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 4.54 (d, $J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88$ (ddd, $J=11.8,9.3,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.59-3.55 (m, 1H), 1.90-1.81 (m, 1H), 1.80-1.74 (m, 1H), 1.70-1.52 (m, 4H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 152.6,148.9,138.9,123.1,120.0,97.2,88.8,82.6,62.2,54.8,30.4$, 25.5, 19.1. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(E \mathrm{El}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 218.1181 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 218.1181 .


## 5-(3-((Tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-yl)oxy)prop-1-yn-1-yl)pyrimidine (S-4.36)

General procedure B was used with the following reagents: 5-bromopyrimidine ( $0.159 \mathrm{~g}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), S-4.8 ( $0.15 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(59.2$ $\mathrm{mg}, 0.0512 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{Cul}(15.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0830 \mathrm{mmol}, 8 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.42$ $\mathrm{mL}, 3.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.0$ equiv.), anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 90:9:1-85:14:1 hexanes:EtOAc:PhMe) to give compound S-4.36 ( $0.15 \mathrm{~g}, 68 \%$ ) as a light yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 9.11(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.77(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.54(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{ddd}, J=11.5,9.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.58-$ $3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.79-1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69-1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 159.1,157.1,119.4,97.3,92.8,79.1,62.2,54.6,30.3,25.4,19.0 . \mathrm{HRMS}$ $\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 219.1134 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 219.1131 .

### 4.4.4c General procedure C for substituted hydroxymethylcyclopropenones

To a flame-dried Schlenk tube was added sodium iodide (Nal, 1.8-2.5 equiv.). The reagent was gently flame-dried under vacuum, then resuspended in a solution of alkyne (1 equiv.) in anhydrous THF ( 0.25 M alkyne). Trifluoromethyltrimethylsilane (TMSCF ${ }_{3}$, 22.2 equiv.) was added, and the vessel was sealed and stirred vigorously at ambient temperature for 2 d . The slurry was diluted with water ( 30 mL ) and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$
( $3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting crude difluorocyclopropene was used immediately without further purification.

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of crude difluorocyclopropene in anhydrous MeOH ( $\sim 0.5 \mathrm{M}$ w.r.t. alkyne), followed by Amberlyst15 resin ( $\sim 70-80 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mmol}^{-1}$ alkyne). The mixture was stirred until starting material was fully consumed (as observed by TLC, $1: 1 \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ : EtOAc ). The mixture was filtered to remove the Amberlyst-15 resin, then concentrated in vacuo. If necessary, the crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography to afford pure product.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-methylcycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1a)

General procedure C was used with following reagents: S-4.10 (1.08 g, 7.00 mmol , 1.00 equiv.), $\operatorname{Nal}\left(2.31 \mathrm{~g}, 15.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.20\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $2.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 15 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.2$ equiv.), anhydrous THF (28 mL); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.150 g ), anhydrous MeOH (5 mL). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $0-50 \%$ acetone in EtOAc) to give compound 4.1a ( $0.44 \mathrm{~g}, 64 \%$ over two steps) as a brown oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 4.67(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 162.4, 160.5, 157.6, 58.5, 10.4. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 121.0266$ $m / z$, found 121.0264 .


## 2-(tert-Butyl)-3-(hydroxymethyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1b)

General procedure $C$ was used with the following reagents: $\mathbf{S}-4.14$ ( $0.647 \mathrm{~g}, 3.30$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.937 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.90\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.2 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 8.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.200 g ), anhydrous MeOH ( 6.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 25\% acetone in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound $4.1 \mathrm{~b}(0.25 \mathrm{~g}, 55 \%$ over two steps $)$ as a pale yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.69(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.49(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 166.1, 158.5, 158.3, 57.8, 33.8, 28.0. HRMS (ESI+) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 163.0735 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 163.0733 .


## 2-Cyclohexyl-3-(hydroxymethyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1c)

General procedure $C$ was used with the following reagents: S-4.15 (0.218 g, 0.980 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.324 \mathrm{~g}, 2.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.20\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.29 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 83.4 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ).

The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 25-50\% EtOAc in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound $4.1 \mathrm{c}(0.11 \mathrm{~g}, 65 \%$ over two steps) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 4.66(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.90-2.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-$ $1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD$\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 163.7, 161.2, 160.8, 58.1, 36.9, 30.9, 26.7, 26.0. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}{ }^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 189.0892 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 189.0898 .


## 2-(2-Hydroxyethyl)-3-(hydroxymethyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1d)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0086 \mathrm{mmol}$, $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) and a solution of S-4.11 ( $0.160 \mathrm{~g}, 0.868 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 2.0 mL ). After cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHP ( $0.083 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.95 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.) was added dropwise, and the solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting dark solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue passed through a plug of silica (eluting with 30\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give S-4.37, which was used immediately without further purification.

General procedure $C$ was used with the following reagents: $\mathbf{S}-4.37$ ( $0.892 \mathrm{~g}, 3.33$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.945 \mathrm{~g}, 6.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.90\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.3 \mathrm{mmol}$,
2.2 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 7.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.300 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(7.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.1 d ( $0.27 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%$ over three steps) as an orange oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.78(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 160.5,157.7,157.5,58.7,58.3,29.7$. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 151.0371 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 151.0371 .


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-phenylcycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1e)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.16 (2.68 g, 12.4 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(4.10 \mathrm{~g}, 27.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.20\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(3.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 25 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0$ equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 52 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.750 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 0-100\% acetone in EtOAc) to give compound 4.1 e ( $1.5 \mathrm{~g}, 74 \%$ over two steps) as a peach solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.53(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 155.5,154.4,154.0,133.1,132.4,129.4,123.0,58.9$. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 183.0422 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 183.0422 .


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(p-tolyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1f)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.20 (0.194 g, 0.842 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.278 \mathrm{~g}, 1.85 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.20$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.145 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. After filtration, the resulting solution was concentrated in vacuo to give compound 4.1 f ( $83 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ over two steps) as a dark brown solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.26(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{~s}$, 2H), $2.40(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 155.9,153.5,153.0,144.1,132.5,130.0$, 120.2, 58.6, 22.0. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0570.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(m-tolyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1g)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.21 (0.183 g, 0.794 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.273 \mathrm{~g}, 1.82 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.29$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.23 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 80.8 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ).

After filtration, the solution was concentrated in vacuo to give 4.1g (91 mg, 66\% over two steps) as a brown solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 7.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.82-7.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.47-7.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.85$ (s, 2H), 2.43 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 157.9,156.3,154.2,140.6,135.0$, 133.8, 130.6, 130.3, 123.8, 58.4, 21.2. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0577 .


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(o-tolyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1h)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.22 (0.183 g, 0.796 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.265 \mathrm{~g}, 1.77 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.22\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.24 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 77.0 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ). After filtration, the solution was concentrated in vacuo to give compound 4.1 h ( 92 mg , 67\% over two steps) as a peach solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 8.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.49(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7.40-7.33 (m, 2H), $4.88(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.64(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 157.7,155.5$, 153.5, 142.9, 134.5, 134.1, 131.7, 127.6, 124.1, 58.4, 20.6. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0587.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(4-methoxyphenyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1i)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.23 (0.219 g, 0.890 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.299 \mathrm{~g}, 1.99 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.24$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.26 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ). After the difluorocarbene insertion, the residue was passed through a plug of silica (eluting with $15-50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) and used in the next step without further purification. Amberlyst-15 (71.2 mg), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. After filtration, the solution was concentrated in vacuo to give compound 4.1 i ( $55 \mathrm{mg}, 33 \%$ over two steps) as a tan solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{~s}$, 2H), 3.85 (s, 3H), 3.66 (br s, 1H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 163.4,155.5,153.0$, 150.4, 134.5, 115.7, 114.7, 58.5, 55.6. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 191.0708$ $m / z$, found 191.0704 .


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(2-methoxyphenyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1j)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.24 (0.435 g, 1.77 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.538 \mathrm{~g}, 3.59 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.03$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.52 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.5 \mathrm{mmol}$,
2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 7.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.136 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $5 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ to give compound $4.1 \mathrm{j}(0.22 \mathrm{~g}, 66 \%$ over two steps) as an off-white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.62(\mathrm{t}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.10(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 161.0,157.9,154.4,150.1,136.9,113.1,112.7,59.0,56.5 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 213.0528 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 213.0530.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(4-(methylthio)phenyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1k)

General procedure $C$ was used with the following reagents: S-4.25 (0.239 g, 0.912 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.308 \mathrm{~g}, 2.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.25\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.27 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv. ), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 72.6 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ). After filtration, the solution was concentrated in vacuo to give compound 4.1 k ( 0.15 g , $79 \%$ over two steps) as a light beige solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 7.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{~s}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.55(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 157.4,154.3,153.5,148.4,133.7,126.6$, 119.7, 58.3, 14.5. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SNa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 229.0299 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 229.0291.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(thiophen-2-yl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1I)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.32 (0.132 g, 0.601 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.221 \mathrm{~g}, 1.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.45\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.19 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.2 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 80.9 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 25-50\% EtOAc in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give 4.1 l ( $61 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$ over two steps) as a brown solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 8.00(\mathrm{dd}, J=5.1,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=3.7,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.30(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.1,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 154.5$, 149.1, 146.9, 138.1, 137.0, 129.9, 124.9, 58.2. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}{ }^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SNa}$ [M+Na] ${ }^{+} 188.9986 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 188.9989.


## 2-(2-Hydroxypropan-2-yl)-3-methylcycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1m)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added a solution of S-4.12 (1.00 g, 5.96 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) in anhydrous THF ( 12 mL ). The solution was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and $n$ butyllithium was added dropwise ( 2.5 M in hexanes, $2.6 \mathrm{~mL}, 6.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.). The solution was stirred at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min , then methyl iodide was added dropwise ( 0.45
$\mathrm{mL}, 7.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2$ equiv.). The solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The solution was quenched with sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(90 \mathrm{~mL})$, then extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil S-4.38 was used in the next step without further purification.

General procedure C was employed using the following amounts of reagents: S4.38 ( $1.05 \mathrm{~g}, 5.76 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(1.91 \mathrm{~g}, 12.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.21\right.$ equiv.), TMSCF $_{3}$ (1.7 $\mathrm{mL}, 12 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0$ equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 12 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.385 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.1 m ( $0.39 \mathrm{~g}, 52 \%$ over three steps) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 2.33(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 166.0, 160.2, 156.3, 71.2, 28.1, 10.1. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $149.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 149.0577 .


## 2-(1-Hydroxyethyl)-3-phenylcycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1n)

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \bullet \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.016 \mathrm{mmol}$, $0.6 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) and a solution of 4-phenyl-3-butyn-2-ol ( $0.369 \mathrm{~g}, 2.52 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.) in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 5.0 mL ). After cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, DHP ( $0.24 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv.)
was added dropwise, and the solution was slowly warmed to ambient temperature and stirred overnight. The resulting dark solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with sat. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layers were combined, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 5$10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound S-4.39 (0.56 g, 97\%) as a colorless oil. The mixture of diastereomers was used in the next step without further purification.

General procedure $C$ was employed using the following amounts of reagents: S4.39 ( $0.460 \mathrm{~g}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.568 \mathrm{~g}, 3.78 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.89\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.69 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.2$ equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.100 g ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(5.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 5-20\% acetone in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound $4.1 \mathrm{n}(0.21 \mathrm{~g}$, $59 \%$ over two steps) as a tan solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.97-7.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.58-7.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.14(\mathrm{qd}, J=6.9,4.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 156.9, 155.9, 153.1, 133.0, 132.5, 129.3, 123.0, 65.0, 21.4. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for C${ }_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0570 .


## 2-(2-Hydroxypropan-2-yl)-3-phenylcycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.10)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.26 (0.620 g, 2.54 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.853 \mathrm{~g}, 5.69 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.24$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.75 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF (4.0 mL); Amberlyst-15 (0.173 g), anhydrous MeOH (4.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 25 $50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.10 ( $0.35 \mathrm{~g}, 74 \%$ over two steps) as a light brown solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right)$ б 8.03-8.00 (m, 2H), 7.67-7.62 (m, 1H), 7.60-7.56 (m, 2H), 1.61 (s, 6H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD ${ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 160.4,157.9,152.6,134.4,133.7,130.5$, 123.9, 71.3, 28.4. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 211.0735 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 211.0728.


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1p)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.27 (0.183 g, 0.644 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.229 \mathrm{~g}, 1.53 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.37$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.19 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ); Amberlyst-15 (78.6 mg), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ).

The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 25-50\% EtOAc in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.1 p ( $45 \mathrm{mg}, 31 \%$ over two steps) as an off-white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 8.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~s}$, 2H). ${ }^{19}$ F NMR (376 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta-65.0 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 160.2,157.2$, 152.9, $135.0(\mathrm{q}, J=32.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 133.9,127.3(\mathrm{q}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 127.2\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{app}}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 125.1$ (q, $J=271.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 58.7. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$229.0476, found 229.0472.


## 4-(2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)benzonitrile (4.1q)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.32 (0.217 g, 0.901 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}\left(0.303 \mathrm{~g}, 2.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.24\right.$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.27 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF (4.0 mL); Amberlyst-15 (75.2 mg), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 50-100\% EtOAc in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.1q ( $45 \mathrm{mg}, 27 \%$ over two steps) as a light tan solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3} \mathrm{SO}\right) \delta 8.07(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.02(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3} \mathrm{SO}\right) ~ \delta 161.7,153.5,151.0,133.4,132.0,126.3,118.1$, 114.4, 57.8. HRMS $\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 208.0374 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 208.0374 .


## 2-(4-Chlorophenyl)-3-(hydroxymethyl)cycloprop-2-en-1-one (4.1r)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.28 (0.194 g, 0.773 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.258 \mathrm{~g}, 1.72 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.22$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.23 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.5 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 4.0 mL ). The crude residue was passed through a plug of silica (eluting with $10-20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) and used in the next step without further purification. Amberlyst-15 (77.0 mg), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ). After filtration, the solution was concentrated in vacuo to give compound 4.1 r ( $35 \mathrm{mg}, 23 \%$ over two steps) as an off-white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 8.01$ (m, 2H), 7.61 (m, 2H), 4.85 (s, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 157.3,157.2,153.0,140.5,134.9,130.8,122.6,58.5 . \mathrm{HRMS}^{(E S I}{ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{ClO}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 217.0032 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 217.0031 .


## 2-(Hydroxymethyl)-3-(3-methoxyphenyl)cycloprop-2-ene-1-one (4.1s)

General procedure C was used with the following reagents: S-4.29 (0.176 g, 0.714 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.236 \mathrm{~g}, 1.57 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.21$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ ( $0.21 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.0 equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 2.9 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 60.1 mg ), anhydrous MeOH ( 2.0 mL ).

After filtration, the solution was concentrated to give compound $\mathbf{4 . 1 s}(83 \mathrm{mg}, 66 \%$ over two steps) as a dark yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 7.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 7.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 160.0$, 155.7, 154.7, 153.7, 124.8, 123.7, 119.7, 116.6, 58.73, 55.6. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 213.0528 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 213.0529 .


Ethyl 4-(2-(hydroxymethyl)-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)benzoate (4.1t)

General procedure $C$ was used with the following amounts of reagents and modifications: S-4.30 ( $0.224 \mathrm{~g}, 0.777 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{Nal}(0.257 \mathrm{~g}, 1.71 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.20$ equiv.), TMSCF $_{3}$ ( $0.23 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0$ equiv.), anhydrous THF ( 3.0 mL ). The reaction was sealed and stirred at $85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Amberlyst-15 (75.0 mg), anhydrous MeOH (4.0 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $0-5 \%$ acetone in EtOAc) to give compound 4.1 t ( $0.11 \mathrm{~g}, 46 \%$ over two steps) as a light brown solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) б $8.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.11(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 166.8$, 159.6, 157.4, 153.2, 135.3, 133.3, 131.2, 127.5, 62.7, 58.7, 14.5. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 255.0633 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 255.0632 .


## N,N-Diethyl-4-(2-(hydroxymethyl)-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)benzamide (4.1u)

General procedure $C$ was used with the following reagents: $\mathbf{S}-4.31$ ( $0.564 \mathrm{~g}, 1.79$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Nal ( $0.508 \mathrm{~g}, 3.39 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.89$ equiv.), $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}(0.61 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.2 equiv. ), anhydrous THF ( 3.6 mL ); Amberlyst-15 ( 0.200 g ), anhydrous MeOH ( 3.6 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give $4.1 \mathrm{u}(0.18 \mathrm{~g}, 38 \%$ over two steps) as a clear orange oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.41(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{q}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.16(\mathrm{q}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.23(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.4$, 157.3, 155.3, 152.7, 140.5, 132.6, 126.7, 123.5, 58.4, 43.5, 39.7, 14.1, 12.8. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 282.1106 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 282.1107 .

### 4.4.4d General procedure $D$ for substituted butenolides

To a scintillation vial containing substituted 2-hydroxymethyl-cyclopropenone (1.0 equiv.) was added anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.25 \mathrm{M})$ or anhydrous $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}(0.25 \mathrm{M})$, followed by triphenylphosphine $\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right.$, unless otherwise stated). The reaction was stirred at ambient temperature, and monitored until full consumption of starting material was observed (as determined by TLC, $1: 1 \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{EtOAc}$ ). The mixture was concentrated in vacuo, then purified by flash column chromatography to afford pure product.


## 3-Methylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2a)

General procedure D was employed using the following reagents: 4.1a (48 mg, 0.49 mmol, 1.0 equiv.), triphenylphosphine ( $\left.\mathrm{PPh}_{3}, 6.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.024 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in $n$-pentane) to give compound 4.2 a ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 62 \%$ ) as a clear oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.13(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 174.9, 145.1, 130.0, 70.1, 10.8. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $121.0266 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 121.0266 .


## 3-(tert-Butyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2b)

General procedure $D$ was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{~b}(0.177 \mathrm{~g}, 1.26$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), triphenylphosphine ( $16.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0629 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(5.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \%$ EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 b ( $0.12 \mathrm{~g}, 69 \%$ ) as a clear oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, CDCl 3 ) $\delta 7.05$ (s, 1H), 4.71 (s, 2H), 1.26 (s, 9H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 172.7, 142.6, 142.5, 69.3, 31.7, 28.2. HRMS (ESI') calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 163.0735 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 163.0731 .


## 3-Cyclohexylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2c)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1c (0.105 g, 0.633 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(8.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.033 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{c}(95 \mathrm{mg}, 91 \%)$ as a pale yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.03$ ( $\left.\mathrm{q}_{\text {app, }} \mathrm{J}=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 4.75(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.35$ (toctapp, $J=11.6,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.97-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 1.26-1.15 (m, 3H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.1,142.7,139.5,70.2,35.0,31.6$, 26.2, 26.1. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 189.0892 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 189.0893 .


## 3-(2-Hydroxyethyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2d)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1d (0.102 g, 0.790 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(42.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.160 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 20\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound 4.2d ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%$ ) as a clear oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.30$ (quint, $\left.J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right) 4.83(\mathrm{q}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.85$ $(\mathrm{q}, J=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{tq}, J=5.8,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{t}, J=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.0,146.8,131.8,70.7,60.6,29.1 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 151.0371 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 151.0370 .

Compound 4.4a (11 mg), was isolated as a colorless oil [68]. Further attempts at purification led to decomposition. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.80\left(\mathrm{tt}_{\text {app }}, J=5.4,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, 1H) 4.40-4.36 (m, 4H), 2.98 (dddd, $J=9.8,5.0,4.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.4,138.0,126.1,65.8,61.0,25.5 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}{ }^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 151.0371 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 151.0367 .

Compound 4.4b ( 8.0 mg ), was isolated as a colorless oil [68]. Further attempts at purification led to decomposition. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.46\left(\mathrm{tt}_{\text {app }}, J=5.7,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $1 \mathrm{H}) 4.60(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.8,3.2,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.42(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dddd}, J=9.7,5.1$, 4.6, $2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.4,142.4,126.3,66.5,59.1,28.9$. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 151.0371 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 151.0368 .


## 3-Phenylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2e)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathbf{e}(15.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0966$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(1.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0050 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.4 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{e}(10 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%)$ as a pale yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.87-7.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44-7.36(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 172.3, 144.4, 131.9, 129.7, 129.5, 128.8, 127.1, 69.7. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 183.0422 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 183.0421.


## 3-(p-Tolyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2f)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{f}(79.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.457$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(12.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0458 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 f ( $65 \mathrm{mg}, 82 \%$ ) as a while solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.58(\mathrm{t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{~d}, J$
 $\left.143.4,139.6,131.6,129.5,126.9,126.8,69.6,21.5 . \mathrm{HRMS}^{(E S I}{ }^{+}\right)$calcd. for $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ $197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0585 .


## 3-(m-Tolyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2g)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{~g}(86.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.498$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $26.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.100 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 g ( $61 \mathrm{mg}, 70 \%$ ) as an off-white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.67(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64-7.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.31(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.39(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) б 172.4, 144.2, 138.5, 132.0, 130.3, 129.6, 128.7, 127.7, 124.2, 69.6, 21.6. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0572 .


## 3-(o-Tolyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2h)

General procedure $D$ was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{~h}(86.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.497$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.099 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.0 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{~h}(73 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%)$ as a clear oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.45(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.35(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32-7.27$ (m, 2H), $7.25-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.7,147.8,136.7,133.6,130.7,129.64,129.60,129.2,126.0,70.1,20.5$. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0570 .


## 3-(4-Methoxyphenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2i)

Using Procedure D. The following amounts of reagents were used: 4.1i (54.6 mg, $0.287 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $7.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.028 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous MeOH ( 1.2 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 20\% $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathbf{i}(47 \mathrm{mg}, 85 \%)$ as a pale-yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, CDCl $)^{2}$ ) 172.6 , 160.6, 142.0, 131.2, 128.5, 122.3, 114.2, 69.6, 55.5. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(E S I^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}$ [M+Na] ${ }^{+} 213.0528 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 213.0520 .


## 3-(2-Methoxyphenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2j)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1 j ( $20.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.106$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $5.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous MeOH ( 0.42 mL ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography using deactivated silica
(deactivated with $1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, then eluting with $15 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 j ( $8.6 \mathrm{mg}, 43 \%$ ) as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.15(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.35(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.04(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.2,157.8,148.4,130.3,130.8,129.6,126.9,120.8$, 118.7, 110.9, 69.8, 55.6. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 213.0528 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 213.0527.


## 3-(4-(Methylthio)phenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2k)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{k}(0.142 \mathrm{~g}, 0.689$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $18.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0694 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{k}(0.12 \mathrm{~g}, 82 \%)$ as a yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{t}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.27(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.3$, 143.3, 140.6, 131.2, 127.4, 126.2, 126.16, 69.6, 15.5. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SNa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 229.0299 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 229.0305 .


## 3-(Thiophen-2-yl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.21)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.11 ( $58.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.352$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 85 \%$ ) as an off-white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.47(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$ $=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{dd}, J=5.0,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 171.5, 140.5, 131.6, 127.9, 127.5, 127.3, 126.7, 70.1. HRMS (ESI+) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{SNa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 188.9986 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 188.9989 .


## 3,5,5-Trimethylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2m)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{~m}(0.101 \mathrm{~g}, 0.800 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $10.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0404 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $3-4 \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound 4.2 m ( $47 \mathrm{mg}, 46 \%$ ) as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) ~ \delta 6.98-6.97(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.8,154.1,128.3,84.3,25.8,10.6 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{CI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+} 126.0681 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 126.0675 .

Compound 4.3a ( $5.4 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \%$ ) was isolated as a volatile, colorless oil. [69] ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.83(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 164.1,142.5,129.2,83.8,25.6,14.7 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 127.0759 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 127.0760 .

Compound 4.3b ( $5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \%$ ) was isolated as a volatile, colorless oil. [69] ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.30(\mathrm{q}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 163.8,142.8,127.2,84.0,25.0,13.3 . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 127.0759 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 127.0761 .


## 5-Methyl-3-phenylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2n)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1n $7.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.039$ mmol, 1.0 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0076 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 20\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{n}(4.8 \mathrm{mg}, 72 \%)$ as a clear oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.54(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 7.43-7.37$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), 5.15 ( $\mathrm{qd}, J=6.8,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 171.8, 149.1, 131.6, 129.7, 129.5, 128.8, 127.2, 76.8, 19.3. HRMS (ESI+) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 197.0578 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 197.0579 .


## 5,5-Dimethyl-3-phenylfuran-2(5H)-one (4.2o)

General procedure $D$ was used with the following reagents and modifications: 4.10 ( $50.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.267 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $3.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.014 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}(1.1 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $5-10 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $\mathbf{4 . 2 0}(28 \mathrm{mg}, 55 \%)$ as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.50(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.56 (s, 6H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.2,153.1,130.2,129.7,129.4,128.8$, 127.2, 83.5, 25.9. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 211.0735 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 211.0736.


## 3-(4-(Trifluoromethyl)phenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2p)

General procedure $D$ was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{p}(44.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.196$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $2.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0099 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.78 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 50\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{p}(28 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%)$ as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.78(\mathrm{t}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.69(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(376 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-63.1 .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.8,146.3,133.0(\mathrm{q}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 131.4(\mathrm{q}, J=32.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 130.9$, $\left.125.8(\mathrm{q}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 124.0(\mathrm{q}, J=272.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 69.8 . \mathrm{HRMS}^{(E S I}\right)$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-} 227.0320 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 227.0323 .


## 4-(2-Oxo-2,5-dihydrofuran-3-yl)benzonitrile (4.2q)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1q $(26.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.145$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0072 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.60 \mathrm{~mL})$.

The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $75 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $\mathbf{4 . 2 q}(17 \mathrm{mg}, 62 \%)$ as a pale yellow solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.4,147.1,133.8,132.6,130.5,127.7$, 118.5, 113.1, 69.8. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{-}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{NO}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-} 184.0399 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 184.0397.


## 3-(4-Chlorophenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2r)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{r}(29.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.154$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(4.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.015 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound 4.2 r ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 41 \%$ ) as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ ס 7.87-7.79 (m, 2H), $7.66(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44-7.37(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.1,144.6,135.6,130.8$, 129.1, 128.4, 128.1, 69.7. HRMS (ESI $)$ calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-} 193.0056 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 193.0064.


## 3-(3-Methoxyphenyl)furan-2(5H)-one (4.2s)

General procedure $D$ was used with the following reagents: 4.1s $(83.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.436$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $12.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0458 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 50\% EtOAc in hexanes) to give compound $\mathbf{4 . 2 \mathrm { s }}$ ( $30 \mathrm{mg}, 36 \%$ ) as a yellow oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.64(\mathrm{t}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 7.44(\mathrm{t}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.2,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2 H ), 3.83 (s, 3H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.2,159.8,144.8,131.4,130.8,129.7$, 119.4, 115.1, 112.4, 69.5, 55.4. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 213.0528$ $m / z$, found 213.0524 .


## Ethyl 4-(2-oxo-2,5-dihydrofuran-3-yl)benzoate (4.2t)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: 4.1 t ( $27.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.116$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $1.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0057 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(0.46 \mathrm{~mL})$.

The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 20-50\% $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in hexanes) to give compound $\mathbf{4 . 2 t}(14 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%)$ as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.12-8.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.99-7.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.77(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{q}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.9,166.2,146.2,133.7,131.2,131.1,130.0,127.0,69.8,61.3$, 14.5. HRMS $\left(E S^{+}\right)$calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 255.0633 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 255.0635 .

$\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-Diethyl-4-(2-(hydroxymethyl)-3-oxocycloprop-1-en-1-yl)benzamide (4.2u)

General procedure D was used with the following reagents: $4.1 \mathrm{u}(0.110 \mathrm{~g}, 0.424$ mmol, 1.00 equiv.), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(11.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0419 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.7 \mathrm{~mL})$. The crude residue was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 10\% acetone in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to give compound $4.2 \mathrm{u}(50 \mathrm{mg}, 45 \%$ ) as a white solid.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.69(\mathrm{t}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.43(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.26(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.25(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.12$ (bs, 3H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 172.1, 170.7, 145.3, 138.2, 132.2, 132.1, 131.1, 130.3, 128.64, 128.56, 127.1, 126.8, 69.7, 43.4, 39.4, 14.4, 13.0. HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 282.1106 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$, found 282.1107.
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## Appendix A: NMR Spectra for Chapters 2 and 3


$t=7 \mathrm{~d}$

Figure S2-1. Triazine amino acid $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ is stable in aqueous solution over 7 d . Compound 2.3 ( 5 mM ) was incubated in $d$-PBS ( pH 7.4 ) at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and monitored via ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.


Figure S2-2. Triazine amino acid 2.3 is stable to L-glutathione over 24 h . Compound 2.3 ( 5 mM ) and L-glutathione ( 5 mM ) were incubated in $d$-PBS ( pH 7.4 ) at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and monitored via ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.


Figure S2-3. Triazine amino acid 2.4 is stable in aqueous solution over 7 d. Compound 2.4 ( 5 mM ) was incubated in $d$-PBS ( pH 7.4 ) at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and monitored via ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. Deuterium exchange was observed over time.


Figure S2-4. Triazine amino acid 2.4 is stable to L-glutathione over 24 h . Compound 2.4 ( 5 mM ) and L-glutathione ( 5 mM ) were incubated in $d$-PBS ( pH 7.4 ) at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and monitored via ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. Deuterium exchange was observed over time.
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## Appendix B: NMR Spectra for Chapter 4



$$
\mathrm{t}=60 \mathrm{~min}
$$


1a


Figure S4-1. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with PTA ( $100 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-2. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with PTA ( $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-3. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. $\mathrm{CpO} 4.1 \mathrm{a}(25 \mathrm{mM}$, blue triangle) was incubated with cyclohexyldiphenylphosphine (CyDPP, $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle).


Figure S4-4. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{P}(o \text {-tolyl })_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. No conversion to butenolide 4.2a was observed.


Figure S4-5. Solvent screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in DMSO- $\mathrm{d}_{6}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2 a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-6. Solvent screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in DMSO- $\mathrm{d}_{6}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-7. Solvent screen for butenolide formation. $\mathrm{CpO} 4.1 \mathrm{a}(25 \mathrm{mM}$, blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-8. Solvent screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-9. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-10. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-11. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-12. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with PTA ( $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle). TMS-acetylene ( 5 mM , green star) was added as a reference.


Figure S4-13. Solvent screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with PTA ( $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy for the formation of butenolide 4.2a (red circle).


Figure S4-14. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. CpO 4.1 a ( 25 mM , blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{P}(o \text {-tolyl })_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored periodically by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. No conversion to butenolide 4.2 a was observed.


Figure S4-15. Phosphine screen for butenolide formation. $\mathrm{CpO} 4.1 \mathrm{a}(35.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.361 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv., blue triangle) was incubated with $\mathrm{P}(\text { o-tolyl })_{3}(5.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(14.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at reflux. After 18 h , the reaction was cooled to ambient temperature and concentrated. The crude mixture was analyzed (in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. No conversion to butenolide 4.2a was observed (* residual methanol).


Figure S4-16. $\beta$-Lactone products were only observed with 4.1 m . $\mathrm{CpO} 4.1 \mathrm{~m}(25 \mathrm{mM})$ was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\left(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right.$ ) in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ at ambient temperature. The reaction was monitored by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy until full consumption of starting material was observed. CpO 4.1m gave a mixture of butenolide 4.2 m (red circle) and $\beta$-lactones 4.3a [1] (blue triangle) and 4.3b [1] (green star) in an approximate 1.5 : 1.2 : 1.0 molar ratio. Splitting of the $\beta$-lactone methyl peaks was attributed to vinylic coupling to deuterium.
[1]. Danheiser, R. L.; Choi, Y. M.; Menichincheri, M.; Stoner, E. J. J. Org. Chem. 1993, 58, 322-327.



Figure S4-17. Mechanistic study on butenolide cyclization. Diol-CpO 4.1d was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( 5 mol $\%$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$. The reaction was concentrated, and the crude mixture was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. A mixture of lactones 4.2 d (red circle), 4.4a (blue triangle) [2], and 4.4b (green star) [2] was formed in an approximate $3.9: 2.0: 1.0$ ratio. No $\delta$-lactone 4.5 (purple square) [3] was observed.
[2]. Merritt, A. T.; Pouwer, R. H.; Williams, D. J.; Williams, C. M.; Ley, S. V. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2011, 9, 4745-4747.
[3]. Fumiyama, H.; Sadayuki, T.; Osada, Y.; Goto, Y.; Nakao, Y.; Hosokawa, S. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2016, 26, 4355-4357.


Figure S4-18. Mechanistic study on ketene-ylide formation. $\mathrm{CpO} \mathrm{S}-4.1$ ( 25 mM ) was incubated with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ ( $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$. The reaction was concentrated, and the crude mixture was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. A mixture of lactones S-4.2 (red circle) [4], S-4.3 (blue triangle) [2], and S-4.4 (green star) [2] was observed. This experiment demonstrates that both ketene-ylides can be formed and trapped.
[4]. D'Annibale, A.; Ciaralli, L.; Bassetti, M.; Pasquini, C. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 6067-6074.



























































































































[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ Reaction conditions: $\mathrm{CpO}\left(1\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, methanol ( 0.25 M ). ${ }^{b}$ Isolated yields. ${ }^{c} 10 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{PPh}_{3} .{ }^{d} 20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{PPh}_{3} .{ }^{e} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}(0.25 \mathrm{M})$ was used.

