Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2006 May 24; 128(20): 6745–6754. doi:10.1021/ja060812g.

Sequential Ru-Pd catalysis:

A two-catalyst one-pot protocol for the synthesis of N- and O-heterocycles

Barry M. Trost, Michelle R. Machacek, and Brian D. Faulk

Department of Chemistry, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Abstract

An atom economic, selective, and highly practical two-metal one-pot synthesis of heterocycles has been developed that efficiently affords enantio and diastereopure N- and O-heterocyclic products. Furthermore, use of a chiral catalyst in the two-metal procedure allows formation of all possible diastereomers, even those that are traditionally difficult to access via cyclization routes due to thermodynamics. Interestingly, the nature of the enantiodiscriminating event differs between the use of amine vs. alcohol nucleophiles. The method also affords heterocyclic products that are synthetically useful intermediates. Through the Z-vinylsilane a variety of stereodefined trisubstituted olefin products can be accessed including several all-carbon motifs. Finally, the utility of these heterocyclic products in total synthesis is demonstrated through concise syntheses of a kainoid intermediate, a constituent of oil of rose, and the ring B portion of bryostatin, a potent chemotherapeutic.

Keywords

Palladium catalysis; ruthenium catalysis; asymmetric synthesis of heterocycles; alkene alkyne coupling; allylic alkylation

1. Introduction

Functionalized chiral heterocyclic rings such as tetrahydrofurans, pyrans, pyrrolidines, and piperidines are found in a diverse array of bioactive natural products, ranging in complexity from the simple such as nicotine to the complex such as bryostatin. While several methods are available for the synthesis of these moieties, their formation often involves an intramolecular ring closure of a chiral intermediate, necessitating lengthy syntheses and isolation of the cyclization precursor. Furthermore, methods that offer selective access to all possible diastereomers, especially those that are thermodynamically disfavored, are less common. For example, cyclization methods for the formation of *cis*-2,6-substituted tetrahydropyrans are prevalent, but very few methods offer direct access to the thermodynamically unfavored *trans* pyrans in isomerically pure form.¹ With these challenges in mind, we envisioned developing a transition metal catalyzed synthesis of heterocyclic products that was: 1) efficient, generating multiple bonds in one pot, 2) regio- and stereoselective, allowing for all diastereomeric products to be selectively generated, and 3) practical, being experimentally simple and tolerant of multiple functional groups. The basis for our synthesis centered on the ruthenium catalyzed ene-yne coupling reaction. Employing [RuCp(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (**1**) to effect alkene/alkyne cross-coupling is a highly versatile and efficient strategy for diene synthesis.² We envisioned utilizing the coupling reaction to set up the necessary juxtaposition of reactive groups to induce an *in situ* cyclization to form heterocycles (Scheme 1). For example, when

the ene partner is a homoallylic group such as **3** and the yne partner contains a pendant nucleophile (**2**), the product of coupling, **4**, will contain a *newly formed* allylic group. Since palladium catalysts are known to promote ionization of allylic groups and induce asymmetry in the cyclization, we surmised that the resulting π -allyl complex could be trapped with the pendant nucleophile to form enantioenriched heterocyclic products (**6**) *without isolation of the 1,4-diene intermediate*.

To realize this tandem process, there were several issues that needed to be addressed. The first was the regioselectivity of the ruthenium catalyzed coupling reactions. In some instances, two isomeric products are generated - the “linear” product **5** and the “branched” product **4**. While both diene intermediates can undergo ionization, the *trans* double bond present in **5** precludes cyclization to five- and six-membered heterocyclic rings. Therefore, our initial goal was to control the regioselectivity of coupling for essentially all cases. The answer was found by utilizing silyl substituted alkynes (**7**) wherein steric interactions within the ruthenacycle intermediates favor reaction through **10** (Scheme 2).³ An additional feature of this strategy is that the resulting vinyl silane offers a pathway for further structural elaboration and differentiates the two resulting double bonds.⁴

With the first issue addressed, we focused on optimizing the conditions to induce tandem coupling and cyclization. While several metals are known to catalyze nucleophilic trapping of π -allyl species, palladium is one of the most general, forming rings that range in size from five-membered to large macrocyclic structures.⁵ Furthermore, a diverse set of nucleophiles are tolerated (C, N, S, O), thereby potentiating the type of products that can be formed. Finally, several chiral ligands have been developed for palladium catalyzed allylic substitution, offering the opportunity to develop an asymmetric process. However, incorporating asymmetric transition-metal catalysis into a one-pot process is a formidable goal.⁶ The key issue is compatibility of the two catalyst systems. The reagents or catalysts may interfere with each other by acting as non-dissociating ligands that shut down the catalytic cycle or distort the chiral pocket which is crucial for high enantioselectivity. In addition to these general issues, our system poses another challenge. In order to obtain high enantioselectivity in the cyclization step, it is important that only the chiral palladium catalyst effects ionization and cyclization of **8**. If the achiral ruthenium catalyst participates in this step, the product enantioselectivity would degrade.⁷

To address the issue of selective ionization, we embarked on finding a leaving group (X in **3**) such that ionization only occurred in the presence of the palladium catalyst. Initial studies indicated that allyl carbonates, nitrobenzoates, and acetates were readily ionized in the presence of ruthenium catalyst **1**. Furthermore, both coupling and ionization occurred at similar rates, making them impractical for the one-pot process. Reactions using less activated leaving groups such as phenol⁸ were not general and failed with routine nucleophiles, presumably due to the ability of phenol to also act as a nucleophile. Since *p*-nitrophenyl ether can also be ionized by palladium but is less nucleophilic, we chose this functional group as a starting point for our studies. The ease of accessing such aryl ethers by nucleophilic aromatic substitution further enhances the attractiveness of these leaving groups.

2.1 Enantioselective N-Heterocyclization Reactions

Our initial goal was the formation of N-heterocycles, utilizing *p*-nitrobenzenesulfonamide as the nucleophile. This group was desirable because of its compatibility with the ruthenium catalyst⁹ and for the mild conditions under which it can be removed.¹⁰ To induce asymmetry in the cyclization, we employed the diphenylphosphinobenzoic acid based chiral ligands (**L-1** - **L-4**). A first pass application of (*R,R*)-**L-1** afforded piperidine **13** in 72% yield and 74% ee. Even more encouraging was that the enantioselectivity and yield were similar regardless

of whether the reaction was performed in two separate operations or in one pot. This similarity implied that the intrinsic reactivity and enantioselectivity of the palladium-catalyzed cyclization were not affected by the presence of the ruthenium catalyst. Furthermore, no background reaction was seen when **12** was subjected to conditions for cyclization without palladium. These results indicate that the dual-catalyst concept is viable.

A screen of chiral ligands **L-1** - **L-4** showed that **L-1** reliably afforded product with higher enantioselectivity. Catalyst loading had mild effects on yield with either 2% or 5% **1** and 2% (Pd(η^3 -C₃H₅)Cl)₂ being ideal. Choice of reaction pH was crucial for the success of the cyclization. Reactions conducted under acidic or buffered conditions (Table 1, entry 3 and 4) led to significant amounts of triene products formed by elimination from the allyl intermediate. The type of base also had a dramatic impact with amine bases such as DBU and TMG showing the best yield and selectivity profiles. Fluoride bases such as TBAF afforded excellent yield but poor enantioselectivity (entry 7). Temperature also had an impact on the selectivity, with both increases and decreases from ambient temperature being deleterious. Clearly, the enantioselectivity is a delicate balance between the rate of ionization, π -allyl complex isomerization, and nucleophilic attack. While all three of these variables are affected by temperature, they may not all be cooperative. Finally, the effect of solvent was investigated. Though the preferred solvent for the ene-yne coupling is acetone, chlorinated solvents such as methylene chloride afforded the highest selectivities for the cyclization step (89% ee). While running the cross-coupling reaction in chlorinated solvents led to significantly reduced conversion, cyclization in a mixed solvent system (entry 13) maintained high enantioselectivity - thereby allowing for a simple injection of methylene chloride, base, and palladium catalyst to the reaction mixture after ene-yne coupling was complete. Lowering the ruthenium loading and accordingly the fraction of acetone present in the cyclization afforded nearly ideal selectivity, while slightly decreasing the yield (entry 14). Based on these results, the two mixed solvent systems were adopted as ideal.

Given our optimized conditions, we investigated the scope of the asymmetric one-pot reaction sequence (Table 2). Both pyrrolidines (**17**) and piperidines (**13**) are formed with good yield and enantioselectivity under the optimized conditions. Seven membered rings (**21**) are formed with lower efficiency accompanied by significant amounts of elimination to the triene product. Since cyclization to seven membered rings is kinetically slower, elimination becomes competitive. Interestingly, the enantioselectivity for formation of **21** also drops significantly. Alkyne **22** was synthesized to increase the cyclization rate, however, no ene-yne coupling was observed even under extended reaction times.

The absolute configuration of these heterocyclic products is assigned based upon correlation to a product of known absolute configuration (*vide supra*). Based upon our working model, ¹¹ ionization constitutes the enantiodiscriminating event. The predictions are based on literature precedent as well as experimental results. For example, chloride ion is known to increase the rate of isomerization of the palladium π -allyl intermediate, which should decrease the selectivity if ionization is the enantiodiscrimination event. In support of this, addition of tetrabutylammonium chloride to the cyclization reaction causes a precipitous drop in the selectivity.

2.2 Enantioselective O-Heterocyclization Reactions

Since many complex natural products contain chiral pyrans and furans, we were interested in extending the enantioselective mixed-metal process to oxygen containing heterocycles. However, in contrast to their phenolic and carboxylate counterparts, simple alkyl alcohols are known to be poor nucleophiles for enantioselective palladium π -allyl substitutions.¹² The poor nucleophilicity is attributed to the mismatch between the “hard” alcohol nucleophile and “soft”

palladium π -allyl complex. To overcome the inherent mismatch presented by alkoxy nucleophiles, previous solutions have relied on intramolecular closures,¹³ large excesses of alcohol, or using tin¹⁴, boron,¹⁵ silyl,¹⁶ or zinc¹⁷ ethers to “soften” the nucleophile. Furthermore, to our knowledge there were no reports of an *asymmetric* allylic substitution using simple alcohol nucleophiles without boron co-catalysis.^{18,19} Despite this significant challenge, we began a search for conditions that would yield an enantioselective cyclization of 1,4-diene intermediate **23** (Table 3).

Gratifyingly, the palladium catalyzed cyclization proceeds smoothly under several conditions. Similar to the sulfonamide cases, methylene chloride was found to be the optimum solvent both in terms of yield and selectivity. It was also apparent that Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃ afforded better yield and selectivity than the π -allyl chloride dimer. Furthermore, of all the bases tested, triethylamine gave the best yield and selectivity. Interesting temperature effects were also noticed, with the enantioselectivity displaying a prominent inverse dependence on temperature. As the temperature of the cyclization was lowered from 60 °C to 0 °C, there was a continuous increase in the selectivity of (+)-**24**. Temperatures below zero led to poor conversions and as such 0 °C was chosen as optimal, affording product in 94% ee.

With our optimized conditions in hand, we again tested the one-pot process for scope (Table 4). Furans and pyrans both form in good yield, with pyrans affording the highest selectivities. Attempted seven-membered ring formation was unsuccessful affording only the triene elimination product. The absolute configuration of these heterocyclic products was assigned to be opposite of that found in the sulfonamide cases, based upon subsequent correlation in one case to a known stereochemistry (*vide infra*). Based upon our working model,¹¹ now the nucleophilic addition constitutes the enantiodiscriminating event. This prediction is supported by the fact that addition of tetrabutylammonium chloride as a co-catalyst slightly increases the selectivity for furan formation (entry 2) and has no effect on the selectivity of pyran formation.

3. Diastereoselective Heterocyclization Reactions

Palladium catalysis allows for diastereo- as well as enantiocontrol. Given chiral starting materials, we investigated whether the chiral catalyst could control the diastereoselectivity in the cyclization, either by enhancing or overcoming the intrinsic substrate controlled preference. Gratifyingly, good diastereocontrol is exhibited by the catalyst (Table 5). With matched ligand/substrate pairs,²⁰ the selectivity is universally excellent. Furthermore, in every mismatched case, the non-natural diastereomer predominates indicating that the catalyst is able to override and control the geometry of cyclization. For example, utilizing an achiral ligand affords **38** as a 2:1 *cis:trans* diastereomeric ratio (entry 8). Employing the matched chiral ligand leads to exclusive formation of the *cis* isomer (entry 10), whereas when the mismatched ligand is used, the *trans* isomer predominates (entry 9). The advantage of catalyst control is clear as both diastereomers can be accessed from a single enantiomer of starting material simply by switching the ligand. Similar levels of control are seen for furan formation (entries 1-3). Increasing the steric demands of the substrate leads to increased selectivity in both the matched (23:1) and mismatched cases (1:4.5) (entries 4-6). Interestingly, the achiral dppp ligand consistently affords lower conversions than its chiral counterpart regardless of whether the chiral reaction involved a “matched” or “mismatched” stereochemical event indicating that the DPPBA-based ligand plays a dual role in the reaction - imparting selectivity and organizing the substrate such that cyclization is facilitated. Finally, entry 7 indicates that biaryl alkynes afford little to no conversion in the ene-yne coupling, potentially due to deactivation of the catalyst from bidentate coordination.

Dramatically, for pyran formation the selectivity is complete - the *cis* isomer is formed exclusively in matched cases and, more importantly, the *trans* isomer is formed exclusively in

the mismatched cases (Table 6).²¹ This is significant because while cyclization methods for the formation of *cis* 2,6-tetrahydropyrans are prevalent, very few methods offer direct access to the thermodynamically unfavorable *trans* pyran in isomerically pure form.¹ For this class of substrates the ability of the chiral ligands to control the relative stereochemistry is impressive and indicates the potential of this catalyst system.²² For example, several prominent and bioactive natural products such as the phorbaxazoles, salinomycin, and swinholide A contain a *trans*-2,6 disubstituted pyran and illustrate the possible utility of this method. Furthermore, we have successfully performed the two-metal one-pot procedure on large scale (as high as 20 mmol) indicating its practical nature and potential easy incorporation into total synthesis.²³

4. Absolute Stereochemical Analysis - Prediction and Proof

Given the mechanism of palladium catalyzed allylic alkylation, there are multiple steps that can be considered enantiodetermining. Both the substrate and the reaction conditions define which step or steps will be operating. Applying literature precedent to the sulfonamide substrates, ionization is expected to be enantiodetermining.²⁴ Matched ionization²⁵ to form *syn*-complex **53** is followed by fast intramolecular mismatched nucleophilic addition (Scheme 4). By tethering the nucleophile, and using conditions where the sulfonamide is fully deprotonated, the rate of mismatched attack becomes faster than equilibration and the (*S*)-stereochemistry is predicted from the (*R,R*)-ligand even though ring closure involves a “mismatched” event.

Further support for this interpretation comes from both optimization studies and substrate scope. If ionization is enantiodetermining, reactions in which the cyclizations of the heteroatom onto the allylpalladium intermediate is kinetically fast should give the highest selectivity. Indeed, pyrrolidine formation occurs with 92% ee, while the enantioselectivity drops to 88% and 17% for closure to six and seven membered rings respectively. Moreover, addition of 30% tetrabutylammonium chloride to the cyclization of **52** causes a precipitous drop in the enantioselectivity. Since chloride ion is known to increase the rate of equilibration of the intermediate π -allyl species, the rate of equilibration can become competitive with nucleophilic trapping, causing a decrease in the selectivity. Finally, if ionization is enantiodetermining, conditions in which the sulfonamide is fully deprotonated should show the highest selectivity. Experimentally, DBU afforded the best selectivity whereas weakly basic amines or buffered conditions resulted in poor selectivity.

Interestingly, cyclizations involving alcohol nucleophiles display the opposite selectivity pattern. For example, improved selectivity is obtained for pyrans over furans. Furthermore, the addition of exogenous chloride has a small but measurable positive effect on the overall selectivity. And finally, strong amine bases such as DBU afford lower selectivity than does the weakly basic triethylamine. This experimental evidence indicates that the nature of the nucleophile is crucial in defining the enantiodetermining step in asymmetric intramolecular cyclization reactions. Simple alcohols are notoriously poor nucleophiles for palladium catalyzed allylic substitutions. Therefore, the rate of addition is slower than equilibration of the palladium-allyl diastereomers and nucleophilic addition becomes enantiodetermining. Applying this model to 1,4-diene **54**, a matched ionization is followed by rapid equilibration of **55** and **56**. Matched nucleophilic attack through **56** leads to (*R*)-**26** when utilizing (*R,R*)-ligand (Scheme 5).

Unambiguous stereochemical proof was achieved through analog synthesis. Several proline derivatives have been used as building blocks for total synthesis. We envisioned intersecting a synthesis of the kainoids, a class of non-proteinogenic amino acids with activity as glutamate agonists,²⁶ through a concise synthesis of the known 4-oxoproline derivative **60**²⁷ (Scheme 6). The one-pot heterocyclization process using (*R,R*)-**L-1** proceeds very smoothly to afford

pyrrolidine **58** in 94% ee. Desilylation and oxidation of both olefins through ozonolysis followed by an oxidative work-up yielded the keto-acid with complete retention of stereochemistry at the 2-position. The crude acid was then directly capped as a *t*-butyl ester. Comparison of the optical rotation unambiguously determined the stereochemistry to be (*S*),²⁸ which matches the predictions made by our working model for ionization being the enantiodiscriminating event.

To establish the absolute stereochemistry of the products wherein an alcohol is involved in the nucleophilic addition, we turned to a synthesis of the important fragrance materials, the rose oil oxides.²⁹ Our synthesis began with a highly chemoselective cross metathesis of **24** with 2-methylpropene³⁰ to afford **61**. Subsequent desilylation³¹ (Scheme 7) provided **62**, whose optical rotation unambiguously confirmed our predictions.³² Finally, chemoselective hydrogenation with Wilkinson's catalyst completed the simple three-step approach to rose oil oxide. Thus, the nucleophilic addition is confirmed as the enantiodiscriminating event.

5. Synthetic Utility - A Concise Synthesis of Ring B of Bryostatin

The two-metal, one-pot ene-cyclization method described above provides a unique entry into enantio- and diastereopure substituted heterocycles. There are several key structural features associated with the products of this methodology that make them convenient building blocks for complex total synthesis including: a stereodefined trisubstituted exocyclic vinyl silane, two sterically differentiated olefins, and differentiated substituents on either side of the heteroatom. Given these features, a host of further synthetic transformations can be performed after the cyclization to afford highly functionalized compounds (Scheme 8). Several transformations can be envisioned that take advantage of the stereodefined trisubstituted exocyclic vinyl silane - the most powerful feature of these heterocyclic products. *Ips*o-substitution reactions such as Freidel-Crafts acylation³³ (path c) and iodination³⁴ (path b) proceed smoothly to afford products as single geometrical isomers. The stereodefined vinyl iodide products are useful intermediates for metal-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions,³⁵ however, the starting vinylsilane can also be used as a cross coupling partner.³⁶ When vinylbenzyl dimethylsilane is utilized as the activated silane partner, smooth cross-coupling to form all-carbon trisubstituted olefins is achieved (path f).³⁷ Furthermore, the exocyclic vinylsilane differentiates the two olefins such that chemoselective transformations can be achieved. For example, both cross-metathesis with isobutylene (path e) and a hydroboration (path d)³⁸ are highly selective for the monosubstituted alkene (path e). In contrast, oxidizing reagents such as *m*CPBA and osmium tetroxide preferentially oxidize the silyl-substituted olefin with osmium tetroxide affording mixtures of hydroxy and aldehyde products. Finally, the vinyl silane can ultimately be converted to the parent methylene by protodesilylation without olefin isomerization (path a).³⁹

The last feature of our heterocyclic products is the 2,4,6-substitution pattern, a motif that is found in a variety of complex natural products. Of these natural products, the bryostatin family was of particular interest to us given the importance of these compounds in both the biological and chemical community.⁴⁰ The bryostatins are potent antitumor agents against leukemia, B-cell lymphoma, ovarian carcinoma, and melanoma cell lines. In addition, they show interesting stimulatory effects on the immune and hematopoietic systems. Therefore, the bryostatins are attractive targets for total synthesis, and three total syntheses as well as several fragment syntheses have been accomplished.⁴¹ Most striking from the standpoint of the one-pot cross coupling and cyclization reaction we developed was the B ring portion (C10-C16). This highly conserved feature in the bryostatin family consists of a 2,6-disubstituted pyran ring with a stereodefined exocyclic olefin at the 4-position. Though a small portion of the molecule, this ring embodies two of the major synthetic challenges present in the molecule: the stereoselective installation of the trisubstituted exocyclic olefin and the enantioselective synthesis of pyran

rings. Our method nicely addresses both of these issues and as such we saw this ring as an excellent testing ground to explore its generality.

Our synthesis began with protection of commercially available (*S*)-glycidol as the *p*-methoxybenzyl ether (Scheme 10). The epoxide was then opened with lithium trimethylsilylacetylide to yield the alkyne coupling partner **71** for the ruthenium catalyzed ene-yne cross coupling reaction. The diene intermediate was cyclized to pyran **72** with complete syn selectivity in 52% yield over two steps. In this sequence, we opted to isolate the 1,4-diene intermediate because of purification issues as **72** co-eluted with the excess **15**.

Stereospecific transformation of the vinylsilane into the desired enoate was accomplished through iodination and subsequent palladium catalyzed carbonylation. Functionalization of the exocyclic vinyl group was accomplished through a hydroboration-oxidation sequence.⁴² This route afforded the fully functionalized ring B portion of bryostatin (**74**) in a short 7-step sequence with 12% overall yield. More importantly, the stereochemical integrity of the trisubstituted olefin created during the ene-yne cross coupling reaction was completely transferred to the stereochemistry of the exocyclic enoate. This synthesis represents the shortest route to the B ring of bryostatin⁴³ and introduces a novel approach to the stereospecific installation of the vinyl ester.

6. Conclusion

An atom economic, selective, and highly practical one-pot synthesis of heterocycles has been developed that efficiently affords enantio and diastereopure N- and O-heterocyclic products. Furthermore, use of a chiral palladium catalyst allows formation of all possible diastereomers, even those that are thermodynamically disfavored. This two-metal procedure also affords heterocyclic products that are synthetically useful intermediates. Through the *Z*-vinylsilane a variety of trisubstituted olefin substitution products can be accessed. Finally, the utility of these heterocyclic products was demonstrated through a concise synthesis of the ring B portion of bryostatin, a potent chemotherapeutic. In addition, through a combination of experimental evidence, application of the working model for palladium catalyzed AAA, and stereochemical proof, we demonstrated that the nature of the nucleophile is important for defining the enantiodetermining step of the asymmetric allylic cyclization reaction. Kinetic trapping of the initially generated π -allyl complex determines the stereochemistry for “soft” nucleophiles such as sulfonamides. In contrast, slow trapping of equilibrating π -allyl diastereomers, determines the selectivity for “hard” nucleophiles such as non-stabilized alcohols.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgment

We thank the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health (GM33049) for their generous support of our programs. Mass spectra were provided by the Mass Spectrometry Regional Center for the University of California-San Francisco, supported by the NIH Division of Research Resources. We thank Bristol-Meyers Squibb and Eli-Lilly for predoctoral support of M.R.M. We are indebted to Johnson-Matthey who generally provided palladium salts.

Appendix

Appendix

Experimental

General Procedures for the mixed metal synthesis of heterocycles

Condition A—[CpRu(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (4.3 mg, 0.01 mmol) was added to a flame-dried test tube under argon. A solution of alkyne (0.20 mmol) and alkene (0.35 mmol) in degassed acetone (1.0 mL) was added to the catalyst via cannula. The reaction was stirred at room temperature under argon for 3 h at which time it was diluted with 2.5 mL *degassed* DCM. DBU (32 mg, 0.21 mmol) was added followed by a solution of (Pd(π -allyl)Cl)₂ (1.5 mg, 0.004 mmol) and (*R,R*)-**L-1** (8 mg, 0.012 mmol) in 0.5 mL DCM. The resulting yellow solution was stirred for 1 h at room temperature at which point the mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, ether/petroleum ether, gradient).

Condition B—[CpRu(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (1.7 mg, 0.004 mmol) was added to a flame-dried test tube under argon. A solution of alkyne (0.20 mmol) and alkene (0.35 mmol) in degassed acetone (0.4 mL) was added to the catalyst via cannula. The reaction was stirred at room temperature under argon for 3 h at which time it was diluted with 3.6 mL *degassed* DCM. DBU (32 mg, 0.21 mmol) was added followed by a solution of (Pd(π -allyl)Cl)₂ (1.5 mg, 0.004 mmol) and (*R,R*)-**L-1** (8 mg, 0.012 mmol) in 0.5 mL DCM. The resulting yellow solution was stirred for 1 h at room temperature at which point the mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, ether/petroleum ether, gradient).

Condition C—[CpRu(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (5 mg, 0.012 mmol) was added to a flame-dried test tube under argon. A solution of alkyne (0.12 mmol) and alkene (0.19 mmol) in degassed acetone (0.6 mL) was added to the catalyst via cannula. The reaction was stirred at room temperature under argon for 3 h at which time it was diluted with 1.3 mL *degassed* DCM. DBU (18 mg, 0.12 mmol) was added followed by a solution of (Pd(π -allyl)Cl)₂ (0.9 mg, 0.0024 mmol) and (*R,R*)-**L-1** (5 mg, 0.007 mmol) in 0.5 mL DCM. The resulting yellow solution was stirred for 1 h at room temperature at which point the mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, 0-75 % ether/petroleum ether, gradient).

Condition D—[CpRu(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (8 mg, 0.02 mmol) was added to a flame-dried test tube under argon. A solution of alkyne (0.20 mmol) and alkene (1.2 mmol) in degassed acetone (1.0 mL) was added to the catalyst via cannula. The reaction was stirred at room temperature under argon for 3 h at which time it was directly concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purged with argon and dissolved in 1.3 mL *degassed* DCM. NEt₃ (0.22 mmol) was added followed by a solution of Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃ (0.004 mmol) and (*R,R*)-**L-1** (0.012 mmol) in 0.5 mL *degassed* DCM. The resulting red solution was stirred for 2 h at 0 °C at which point the mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, 0-75% ether/petroleum ether, gradient).

Compound 58—[CpRu(CH₃CN)₃]PF₆ (9 mg, 0.02 mmol) was added to a flame-dried test tube under argon. A solution of **57** (56 mg, 0.20 mmol) and **15** (67 mg, 0.35 mmol) in degassed acetone (1.0 mL) was added to the catalyst via cannula. The reaction was stirred at room temperature for 4 h at which time it was directly concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purged with argon and dissolved in 3.0 mL degassed dichloromethane. DBU (0.032 mL, 0.21 mmol) was added followed by a solution of (Pd(π -allyl)Cl)₂ (1.5 mg, 0.004 mmol) and (*R,R*)-**L-1** (8.3 mg, 0.012 mmol) in 1.0 mL DCM. The resulting yellow solution was stirred for 1 h at room temperature at which point the mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The resulting

oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, 0-60 % ether/petroleum ether, gradient) to yield 65 mg (92 %) of **58** as a light yellow oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be 94 % by chiral HPLC analysis (Chiralcel AD column, 99:1 heptane/iPrOH, flow rate = 0.5 mL/min, 254 nm, t_r : 39.31 (major), 48.46 (minor)). $[\alpha]_D + 99.46$ ($c = 0.81$, CHCl_3). $R_f = 0.61$ in 25 % diethyl ether/petroleum ether. IR (neat): 2955, 1639, 1351, 1163, 840 cm^{-1} . ^1H NMR (300 MHz CDCl_3) δ 7.70 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 2 H), 7.32 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 2 H), 5.76 (ddd, $J = 6.9, 10.2, 17.1$ Hz, 1 H), 5.40 (br s, 1 H), 5.21 (d, $J = 17.1$ Hz, 1 H), 5.09 (d, $J = 10.2$ Hz, 1 H), 4.11 (m, 1 H), 3.93 (m, 2 H), 2.43 (m, 2 H), 2.44 (s, 3 H), 0.05 (s, 9 H). HRMS Calc'd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{25}\text{NO}_2\text{SSi}$: 335.1375. Found: 335.1380.

Compound 72— $\text{CpRu}(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_3\text{PF}_6$ (0.15 g, 0.34 mmol) was added to a cooled (0°C) solution of **71** (0.99 g, 3.4 mmol) and **15** (3.6 g, 18.6 mmol) in 17 mL acetone. The resulting solution was stirred at 0°C for 5 min and then at room temperature for 3 h. The reaction was directly concentrated in vacuo and purified via flash chromatography (silica, ether/petroleum ether gradient) to yield 0.98 g of 1,4-diene coupling product. The 1,4-diene (0.99 g, 2.14 mmol) was dissolved in 42 mL *degassed* DCM and cooled to 0°C . Triethylamine (0.24 g, 2.4 mmol) was added followed by a solution of $\text{Pd}_2\text{dba}_3\cdot\text{CHCl}_3$ (44 mg, 0.04 mmol) and (*S,S*)-**L-1** (88 mg, 0.13 mmol) in 5 mL *degassed* DCM. The resulting solution was stirred for 2 h at 0°C at which time it was directly concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oily residue was purified via flash chromatography (silica, ether/petroleum ether gradient) to yield 0.64 g (86%) of **72** as a colorless oil. The diastereoselectivity was determined to be >97:3 *cis* by ^1H NMR analysis. $R_f = 0.8$ in 25% ether / petroleum ether. $[\alpha]_D + 5.35$ ($c = 6.90$, CH_2Cl_2). IR (film from CH_2Cl_2): 2953, 2895, 1622, 1514, 1248, 1100, 1038, 878 cm^{-1} . ^1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl_3) δ 7.31 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2 H), 6.91 (d, $J = 9.0$ Hz, 2 H), 5.93 (ddd, $J = 17.0, 10.5, 5.5$ Hz, 1 H), 5.32 (s, 1 H), 5.29 (d, $J = 17.0$ Hz, 1 H), 5.15 (d, $J = 10.5$ Hz, 1 H), 4.58 (d, $J = 12.0$ Hz, 1 H), 4.55 (d, $J = 12.0$ Hz, 1 H), 3.90 (m, 1 H), 3.83 (s, 3 H), 3.55 (m, 3 H), 2.48 (d, $J = 13.5$ Hz, 1 H), 2.24 (m, 2 H), 2.02 (t, $J = 12.0$ Hz, 1 H), 0.14 (s, 9 H). ^{13}C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl_3) δ 159.09, 152.68, 138.54, 130.37, 129.22 (2 C), 123.64, 115.21, 113.68 (2 C), 79.31, 77.29, 72.98, 72.80, 55.20, 45.19, 36.59, 0.26 (3 H). Anal calcd for $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{30}\text{OSi}$: C, 69.32%; H, 8.73%. Found: C, 69.15%; H, 8.55%.

References

- 1(a). Some notable exceptions: Evans PA, Cui J, Gharpure SJ, Hinkle RJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2003;125:11456. [PubMed: 13129322] (b) Marcotte S, D'Hooge F, Ramadas S, Feasson C, Pannecoucke X, Quirion J-C. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2001;42:5879. (c) McDonald FE, Singhi AD. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1997;38:7683. (d) Vares L, Rein T. *J. Org. Chem* 2002;67:7226. [PubMed: 12375948] (e) Williams DR, Clark MP, Berliner MA. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1999;40:2287. (f) Panek JS, Huang H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:9836.
- 2(a). Trost BM, Surivet J-P, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:15592. [PubMed: 15563189] (b) Trost BM, Shen HC, Pinkerton AB. *Chem. Eur. J* 2002;8:2341. (c) Trost BM, Pinkerton AB, Toste FD, Sperrle M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:12504. [PubMed: 11741413] (d) Trost BM, Surivet J-P, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:2897. [PubMed: 11456983] (e) Trost BM, Toste FD, Pinkerton AB. *Chem. Rev* 2001;101:2067. [PubMed: 11710241] (f) Trost BM, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:714. (g) Trost BM, Toste FD. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1999;40:7739.
3. Trost BM, Machacek MR, Schnaderback MJ. *Org. Lett* 2000;2:1761. [PubMed: 10880220]
- 4(a). Denmark SE, Choi JY. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:5821. (b) Hirabayashi K, Ando J, Mori A, Nishihara Y, Hiyama T. *Synlett* 1999:99. (c) Shibata K, Miyazawa K, Goto Y. *Chem. Commun* 1997:1309. (d) Gouda K-I, Hagiwara E, Hatanaka Y, Hiyama T. *J. Org. Chem* 1996;61:7232. [PubMed: 11667637] (e) Hatanaka Y, Hiyama T. *J. Org. Chem* 1989;54:268. (f) Tamao K, Kobayashi K, Ito Y. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1989;30:6051. (g) Hosomi A, Kohra S, Tominaga T. *Chem. Pharm. Bull* 1988;36:4622.
- 5(a). Trost BM. *Chem. Pharm. Bull* 2002;50:1. [PubMed: 11824567] (b) Trost BM, Crawley ML. *Chem. Rev* 2003;103:2921. [PubMed: 12914486]

- 6(a). Recent examples of dual transition metal processes: Jeong N, Seo SD, Shin JY. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:10220. (b) Doi T, Kobuko M, Yamamoto K, Takahashi T. *Org. Syn* 1998;63:428. (c) Lopez F, Castedo L, Mascarenas JL. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2002;124:4218. [PubMed: 11960444]
- 7(a). Ru is known to catalyze allylic ionization and allylic substitution reactions: Renaud J-L, Bruneau C, Demerseman B. *Synlett* 2003;3:408. (b) Trost BM, Fraisse PL, Ball ZT. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2002;41:1059. (c) Trost BM, Fraisse PL. unpublished results. (d) Onitsuka K, Matsushima Y, Takahashi S. *Yuki Gosei Kagaku Kyokaishi* 2002;60:752. (e) Matsushima Y, Onitsuka K, Kondo T, Mitsudo T, Takahashi S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:10405. [PubMed: 11603999] (f) Zhang S-W, Mitsudo T, Kondo T, Watanabe Y. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1993;450:197.
- 8(a). Takahashi K, Miyake A, Hata G. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn* 1972;45:230. (b) Takahashi K, Miyake A, Hata G. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn* 1973;46:1012. (c) Brady DG. *Chem. Commun* 1970:434. (d) Fiaud JC, Higon de Gournay A, Larchevegere M, Kagan HB. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1978;154:175. (e) Tsuji J, Kobayashi Y, Kataoka H, Takahashi T. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1980;21:3393.
9. Free amines are not compatible with the $\text{CpRu}(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_3$ catalyst.
- 10(a). Fukuyama T, Jow C-K, Cheung M. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1995;36:6373. (b) Fukuyama T, Cheung M, Jow C-K, Hidai Y, Kan T. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1997;38:5831. (c) Wuts PGM, Northuis JM. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1998;39:3889.
- 11(a). Trost BM, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:4545. (b) Trost BM. *Acc. Chem. Res* 1996;29:355.
- 12(a). Takahashi K, Miyake A, Hata G. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn* 1972;45:230. (b) Stork G, Poirier JM. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1983;105:1073. (c) Keinan E, Roth Z. *J. Org. Chem* 1983;48:1769. (d) Stanton SA, Felman SW, Parkhurst CS, Godleski SA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1983;105:1964. (e) Keinan E, Sahai M, Poth Z, Nudelman A, Herzig J. *J. Org. Chem* 1985;50:3558.
- 13(a). Trost BM, Tenaglia A. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1988;29:2927. (b) Lakhmiri R, Lhoste P, Sinou D. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1989;30:4669. (c) Thorey C, Wilken J, Henin F, Martens J, Mehler T, Muzart J. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1995;36:5527. (d) Fournier-Ngufack C, Lhoste P, Sinou D. *Tetrahedron* 1997;53:4353. (e) Hamada Y, Seto N, Takayanagi Y, Nakano T, Hara O. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1999;40:7791. (f) Lautens M, Fagnou K, Rovis T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:5650.
- 14(a). Trost BM, Bonk PJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1985;107:8277. (b) Trost BM, Tenaglia A. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1988;29:2931.
- 15(a). Trost BM, McEachern EJ, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1998;120:12702. (b) Trost BM, McEachern EJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:8649. (c) Trost BM, Brown BS, McEachern EJ, Kuhn O. *Chem. Eur. J* 2003;9:4442.
16. Suzuki T, Sato O, Hiramata M. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1990;31:4747.
17. Kim H, Lee C. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:4369. [PubMed: 12443100]
18. Enantioselective cyclization using boron co-catalysis has been achieved, see ref 15.
- 19(a). Low enantioselectivity has been reported: Fournier-Ngufack C, Lhoste P, Sinou D. *J. Chem. Res* 1988:105A. (b) Enantioselective allylic cyclizations of alkoxy nucleophiles were developed independently and concurrently with this work: (a) Jiang L, Burke SD. *Org. Lett* 2001;3:1953. [PubMed: 11405753] (b) Jiang L, Burke SD. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:3411. [PubMed: 12323031]
20. Matched implies that the catalyst reinforces the natural diastereoselectivity of the substrate and mismatched implies that the catalyst contradicts the natural diastereoselectivity.
21. For all substrates in Tables 5 and 6, the relative stereochemistry was determined by ^1H NMR techniques. In particular, the presence of a strong nOe (generally between 5 and 10%) for *cis* 2,6- and 2,5-disubstituted compounds was observed between protons adjacent to the heteroatom. The corresponding absence of this nOe confirmed the *trans* stereochemical assignment of the opposite diastereomer. Furthermore, since the absolute stereochemistry of the starting substrate is known, the absolute configuration of the newly created allylic stereogenic center is also known.
22. For a preliminary account of this work: Trost BM, Machacek MR. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2002;41:4693.
23. See Compound **85** in Supporting Information.
- 24a). Trost BM, Patterson DE. *J. Org. Chem* 1998;63:1339. (b) Trost BM, Patterson DE. *Chem. Eur. J* 1999;5:3279.
25. For definitions of matched and mismatched with respect to the working model see reference 11.

26. McGreer EG, Olney JW, McGreer DL. Kainic Acid as a Tool in Neurobiology. 1978 Raven Press New York and references cited therein.
27. Barraclough P, Hudhomme P, Spray CA, Young DW. *Tetrahedron* 1995;51:4195.
28. We are very grateful to Douglas W. Young for sending a copy of his original spectra.
29. Seidel F, Stoll M. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1959;42:1830.
30. Chatterjee AK, Sanders DP, Grubbs RH. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:1939. [PubMed: 12027652]
31. Oda H, Sato M, Morizawa Y, Oshima K, Nozaki H. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1983;24:2877.
32. Ohloff G, Giersch W, Schulte E, Karl H, Enggist P, Demoule E. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1980;63:1582.
- 33(a). Pillot J-P. *Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr* 1975;2143. (b) Colvin EW. *J. Chem. Soc. Rev* 1978;7:15. (c) Pillot J-P. *Synth. Commun* 1979;9:395.
- 34(a). Miller RB, Reichenbach T. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1974;15:543. (b) Piscopio AD, Minowa N, Chakraborty TK, Koide K, Bertinato P, Nicolaou KC. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun* 1993;7:617.
35. Diederich, F.; Stang, P.J., editors. *Metal Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions*. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim, Germany: 1998.
- 36(a). Colvin, EW. *Silicon in Organic Synthesis*. Butterworths; London: 1981. Weber, WP. *Silicon Reagents for Organic Synthesis*. Springer-Verlag; Berlin: 1983.
37. Vinyl BDMS cross coupling: Trost BM, Machacek MR, Ball ZT. *Org. Lett* 2003;5:1895. [PubMed: 12762680] Other activated vinyl silanes are not compatible with the $\text{CpRu}(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_3\text{PF}_6$ catalyst and thus are incompatible with our mixed-metal methodology.
38. Evans DA, Fu GC, Hoveyda AH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1992;114:6671.
- 39(a). O'Neil SV, Quickley CA, Snider BB. *J. Org. Chem* 1997;62:1970. [PubMed: 11671498] (b) Kano S, Yuasa Y, Mochizuki N, Shibuya S. *Heterocycles* 1990;30:263. (c) Wenkert E, Bookser BC, Arrhenius TS. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1992;114:644. (d) Honda T, Hoshi M, Tsubuki M. *Heterocycles* 1992;34:1515. (e) Keusenkothen PF, Smith MB. *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1* 1994:2485. (f) Wang C, Gu X, Yu MS, Curran DP. *Tetrahedron* 1998;54:8355.
- 40(a). Petit GR, Day JP, Hartwell JL, Wood HB. *Nature* 1970;227:962. [PubMed: 4393654] (b) Petit GR, Herald CL, Doubek DL, Herald DL, Arnold E, Clardy J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1982;104:6846.
- 41(a). Total Syntheses: Kageyama M, Tamura T, Nantz MH, Roberts JC, Somfai P, Whritenour DC, Masamune S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1990;112:7407. (b) Evans DA, Carter PH, Carreira EM, Prunet JA, Charette AB, Lautens M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:7540. (c) Ohmori K, Ogawa Y, Obitsu T, Ishikawa Y, Nishiyama S, Yamamura S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2000;39:2290.
42. Higher overall yields were obtained when the hydroboration was performed before carbonylation.
43. Other routes have accomplished syntheses of similar pieces with the exocyclic olefin stereochemistry installed in 14 steps Vakalopoulos A, Lampe TFJ, Hoffmann HMR. *Org. Lett* 2001;3:929. [PubMed: 11263918], 18 steps Hale KJ, Hummersome MG, Bhatia GS. *Org. Lett* 2000;2:2189. [PubMed: 10930240], and 8 steps Munt SP, Thomas EJ. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun* 1989;8:480.

Scheme 1.
Tandem Coupling Cyclization

Scheme 2.
The Regioisomer Solution

Scheme 3.
Catalyst Compatibility

Scheme 4.
Sulfonamides - Ionization is Enantiodetermining

Scheme 5.
Oxygen Nucleophiles - Nucleophilic Addition as Enantiodetermining

Scheme 6.
Synthesis of 4-oxyproline derivative

Scheme 7.
Completion of Rose Oil Oxide

Scheme 8.
Representative Further Synthetic Transformations

R = Ac; Bryostatin 1
R = H; Bryostatin 2

Scheme 9.
Bryostatin 1 and 2

Scheme 10.
Synthesis of Ring B

Table 1

Optimization of N-heterocyclization reaction

<div> </div>						
Entry	% 1	Cyclization T (°C)	Base	Cyclization Solvent	% yield ^a	% ee ^b
1	10	25	DBU	acetone	74	72
2	5	25	DBU	Acetone	80	78
3	5	25	AcOH;NBu ₄ OAc (2:1)	Acetone	14	10
4	5	25	AcOH	Acetone	0 ^c	----
5	5	25	TMG	Acetone	74	71
6	5	25	quinuclidine	Acetone	77	46
7	5	25	TBAF	Acetone	80	54
8	5	60	DBU	Acetone	84	68
9	5	0	DBU	Acetone	88	70
10	5	25	DBU	DCM	82	89
11	5	25	DBU	dioxane	80	78
12	5	25	DBU	DCE	66	83
13	5	25	DBU	DCM:acetone (3:1) ^d	90	84
14	2	25	DBU	DCM:acetone (10:1) ^{d,e}	83	88

^a All reactions run with 1.7:1 ratio of **15:14** with **1** in acetone at 0.2 M for 2 h at rt followed by addition of DBU, [Pd(η³-C₃H₅)Cl]₂, and (R,R)-**L-1** in acetone at 0.08 M and stirring for 2 h at given temp. Yields represent isolated yields after chromatography.

^b ee determined by HPLC.

^c Only elimination to triene was observed.

^d Ru-catalyzed reaction run in acetone only. Cyclization run in noted solvent mixture.

^e Ruthenium coupling run at 0.5M in acetone.

$ \begin{array}{c} \text{cat } \mathbf{1}, \text{ acetone, rt} \\ \hline \text{2\% [Pd}(\eta^3\text{-C}_3\text{H}_5\text{)Cl]}_2 \\ \text{6\% (R,R)-L-1} \\ \text{DBU, DCM, 25 }^\circ\text{C} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\hspace{1cm}} $		Cyclic Product		% Yield ^b	% ee ^c
Condition ^a					
A	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{15} \\ + \\ \text{cat } \mathbf{1}, \text{ acetone, rt} \\ \hline \text{2\% [Pd}(\eta^3\text{-C}_3\text{H}_5\text{)Cl]}_2 \\ \text{6\% (R,R)-L-1} \\ \text{DBU, DCM, 25 }^\circ\text{C} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\hspace{1cm}} $	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{TMS} \\ \\ \text{C1} \\ \\ \text{C2} \\ \\ \text{C3} \\ \\ \text{C4} \\ \\ \text{C5} \end{array} $ $ \begin{array}{c} \text{17} \\ \text{p-Ns} \end{array} $		90	91
B		17		78	92

Cyclic Product % Yield^b % ee^c

A

B

83

88

A

90

88

+	15	$\xrightarrow[\text{2\% [Pd}(\eta^3\text{-C}_3\text{H}_5\text{)Cl}]_2]{\text{cat 1, acetone, rt}}$ 6% (<i>R,R</i>)-L-1 DBU, DCM, 25 °C	Cyclic Product	% Yield ^b	% ee ^c
Condition ^a			Cyclic Product		
C			---	No Rxn	---

Hp-NS

J Am Chem Soc. Author manuscript

mol scale - i) 5% **1**, 1.0 mL acetone, rt, 2 h. ii) 2% [[Pd(η^3 -C₃H₅) η^3 -C₃H₅)Cl]₂, 6% (R,R)-L-1, 1 eq DBU, 3.6 mL DCM, rt, 2 h. CM, rt, 2 h.

Table 3

Optimizing Pyran Formation

Entry	Pd source	Solvent	Base	T (°C)	% yield ^a	% ee ^b
1	[Pd(η^3 -C ₃ H ₅)Cl] ₂	DCM	TBAF	25	42	---
2	[Pd(η^3 -C ₃ H ₅)Cl] ₂	DCM	TMG	25	61	---
3	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	THF	NEt ₃	60	73	72
4	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	THF	NEt ₃	25	86	77
5	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	THF	NEt ₃	0	83	81
6	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	THF	NEt ₃	-35	27	89
7	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	DCM	NEt ₃	0	80	94
8	[Pd(η^3 -C ₃ H ₅)Cl] ₂	DCM	NEt ₃	0	71	92
9	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ ·CHCl ₃	DCM	0.2 eq. NEt ₃	0	85	86

^a All reactions run in degassed solvent under argon with one equivalent of base for 2 h at 0.08 M at given temp. Yields represent isolated yields after chromatography.

^b ee determined by HPLC.

^c racemic dppp ligand used.

15	<p>i) 10% 1, acetone, rt ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃CHCl₃ 6% (<i>R,R</i>)-L-1 NEt₃, DCM, 0°C</p>	Cyclic Product	Condition ^a	Cyclic Product	% Yield ^b	% ee ^c
D		84	76
D ^d		85	79

Condition^a Cyclic Product % Yield^b % ee^c

D

80 94

DMPS

24

D

0 ---

29

^a All reactions run with 6:1 ratio of **15** to alkyne under inert atmosphere under the conditions listed below: **Condition D**: for 0.2 mmol scale - i) 10% **1**, 1.0 mL acetone, rt, 2 h. ii) conc. in vacuo then add 2% [Pd(η^3 -C₃H₅)Cl]₂, 6% (*R,R*)-**L-1**, 1 eq DBU, 4.0 mL DCM, 0 °C, 2 h.

^b Isolated yields after chromatography.

^c %ee measured by chiral HPLC.

^d 30% NBu₄Cl was added.

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	cis:trans ratio ^c
dppp	D		47	4:1
(R,R)- L-1	D		87	1:3.5
(S,S)- L-1	D		80	10:1
dppp	D		45	5:1

i) cat **1**, acetone
ii) 2% [Pd(η^3 -C₃H₅)Cl]₂
6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	<i>cis:trans</i> ratio ^c
(<i>R,R</i>)- L-1	D		53 ^d	1:4.5
(<i>S,S</i>)- L-1	D	34	57 ^d	23:1
(<i>R,R</i>)- L-1	C	---	No Rxn	---
dppp	A		37	2:1 ^e

J Am Chem Soc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2009 August 18.

Ligand	Condition ^d	Major Product	% Yield ^b	cis:trans ratio ^c
(<i>R,R</i>)- L-1	A		73	1:2 ^e
(<i>S,S</i>)- L-1	A		68	99:1 ^e

J Am Chem Soc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2009 August 18.

acetone, rt, 2 h. ii) 2% [Pd(η^3 -C₃H₅)Cl]₂, rt, 2 h. Condition
 q DBU, 3.6 mL DCM, rt, 2 h. Condition
 : alkyne - for 0.2 mmol scale - i) 10% **1**,

<div> <div>i) cat 1, acetone</div> <div>ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃</div> <div>6% ligand, DCM</div> </div> <div>Cyclic Product</div>			
Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	<div>% Yield^b <i>cis:trans</i> ratio^c</div>
<i>rac</i> - L-1	D		46 1.4:1
(<i>R,R</i>)- L-1	D		80 >97:3
(<i>S,S</i>)- L-1	D		80 <3:>97

i) cat **1**, acetone
 ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃
 6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	cis:trans ratio ^c
<i>rac</i> - L-1	D		54	3.6:1

i) cat **1**, acetone
 ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃
 6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	<i>cis:trans</i> ratio ^c
--------	------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------

(*R,R*)-**L-1**

D

<3:>97

60

<3:>97

(*S,S*)-**L-1**

D

44

58

>97:3

i) cat **1**, acetone
 ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃
 6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	cis:trans ratio ^c
<i>rac</i> - L-1	D		45	2.4:1

(*R,R*)-**L-1**
 (*S,S*)-**L-1**

D
 D

58
 58

>97:3
 <3:>97

i) cat **1**, acetone
 ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃
 6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	<i>cis:trans</i> ratio ^c
<i>rac</i> - L-1	D		38	4:1

<i>(R,R)</i> - L-1	D	50	58	>97:3
---------------------------	---	-----------	----	-------

i) cat **1**, acetone
 ii) 2% Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃
 6% ligand, DCM

Cyclic Product

Ligand	Condition ^a	Major Product	% Yield ^b	cis:trans ratio ^c
(<i>S,S</i>)- L-1	D		74	<3:>97

J Am Chem Soc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2009 August 18.

2 h, ii) conc. in vacuo, add 2% Pd2