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## ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION <br> THE TOTAL SYNTHESIS OF (-)-PARAHERQUAMIDE A

The first stereocontrolled total synthesis of $(-)$-paraherquamide A is described in 48 chemical steps. The synthesis is a convergent one, starting from ethyl glycinate, ethyl acrylate and vanillin. The longest linear route is 35 steps. Vanillin was acetylated and nitrated to provide nitrovanillins ( $\mathbf{9 4}$ and $\mathbf{9 5}$ ). These were converted to the azalactones, hydrolyzed to the $\alpha$-ketocarboxylic acids, oxidatively decarboxylated to acids 99 and 108. Compound 99 was reductively cyclized to oxindoles 100 , which was then demethylated to give pure oxindole 101 . The oxindole was regioselectively prenylated, epoxidized, and subjected to a key seven-membered ring forming procedure to provide the unique dioxepin 104. Compound 104 was reduced to indole 105 and indoline 106 which was converted to $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ by reaction with DDQ. Indole $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ was protected and subjected to a Mannich reaction to afford the gramine derivative $\mathbf{6 0}$. The Michael adduct 150 from ethyl glycinate and ethyl acrylate was protected, intramolecularly condensed and reduced with Baker's yeast to give cis- $\beta$-hydroxy proline ester 129. Stereoselective $\alpha$-alkylation of 129, protection, deprotection, bromoacetyl amide formation, aminolysis, cyclization and dimethoxycarbonylation provided diketopiperazine (DKP) 91. DKP 91 was alkylated with compound $\mathbf{6 0}$ to provide indoles $\mathbf{3 0 3}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 4}$, which were then individually decarbomethoxylated to afford four separable diastereomers anti-305 ( $\mathbf{3 0 5 E} / \mathbf{Z}$ ) and syn- $\mathbf{3 0 6}(\mathbf{3 0 6 E} / \mathbf{Z})$. These four diastereomers were individually converted to the corresponding $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ substrates through lactim ether formation, protection of the indole nitrogen, deprotection, allylic chloride formation and TBS ether formation. $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ cyclization of these four $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ substrates individually provided the same product 327 .

Cyclization of lactim ether 327, ring opening of the lactim ether moiety and ring closure afforded DKP 338. Selective amide group reduction of 338, N-methylation, MOM ether deprotection, oxidation, bis-deprotection by TFA provided indole-ketone 344. Oxidative spirooxidation of $\mathbf{3 4 4}$ followed by dehydration gave ketone-olefin 43. Stereoselective methyl addition to 43 afforded (-)-paraherquamide A.

Jianhua Cao<br>Chemistry Department<br>Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523<br>Summer 2000

## Acknowledgments

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the faculty and staff of the Department of Chemistry, Colorado State University for supporting me during my course as a graduate student. Without their support, it would be impossible for me to finish the requirements for my $\mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D}$. degree. Mr. Don Dick gave me great support by providing both the low resolution and high resolution mass spectrum.

Dr. Tomas Glinka and coworkers in the Williams group laid a basic foundation for this project by finishing the total synthesis of (-)-brevianamide B. Dr. Tim Cushing and Professor Juan. F. Sanz-Cervera beautifully finished the synthesis of (+)paraherquamide B, which serves as a more solid foundation for this work. Their input into this project was invaluable.

In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Hedekazu Tsujishima. Without his involvement at the end of this project, this work would not have born such delicious fruit. His great synthetic skill was fully expressed through the last stage synthesis of this work.

I would like to pay special thanks to Dr. Andy Fray, who gave me a lot of help during my first couple of years at Colorado State University. Dr. Scott Rajski spent a lot of time proofreading my oral proposal. I appreciate his help and kindness very much. A special thanks to Drs. Pauline Ting and Michael Wong for proofreading my thesis. I want to thank my wife for her help with typing some of my thesis. I also wish to thank Dr. Alfredo Vazquez for assistance with purification and characterization of synthetic paraherquamide.

I wish to extend a special thanks to all of my colleagues past and present in the Williams group. Bob Kause and John Clark spent some time helping me make the oxindole precursors, and their support was very helpful.

Finally, I would like to thank Professor Robert M. Williams for his support and guidance as my advisor. His intellectual and creative input are the key to the success of this work.

## Table of Contents

Page
Chapter One
Introduction ..... 1
1.1 Background and Significance ..... 1
1.2 Physical-Chemical and Structural Characteristics ..... 3
1.3 Relatives of the Paraherquamides ..... 5
1.4 Pharmacology ..... 7
1.5 Chemical Modification of (-)-Paraherquamide A ..... 10
1.5.1 Merck's Modification ..... 10
1.5.2 Pharmacia and Upjohn's Modification
The First Formal Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A ..... 16
1.6 The Total Synthesis of $(-)$-Brevianamide B ..... 19
1.7 Total Synthesis of (+)-Paraherquamide B ..... 21
1.8 The Synthetic Strategy towards (-)-Paraherquamide A ..... 24
Chapter Two
The Total Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A ..... 30
2.1 The Improved Large Scale Synthesis of the Dioxepin-indole of Paraherquamide A ..... 30
2.11 Introduction ..... 30
2.12 The Synthesis of Dioxepin-indole 60 Optimized from 14
Steps to 13 Steps ..... 32
2.13 Synthetic Investigation of the Transformation of Nitro-Aldehyde 93 to Azalactone 97 ..... 34
2.14 Different Approaches for the Synthesis of Oxindole 100from Nitrophenyl Acetic Acid 9936
2.15 Investigation of the Selective 7-Hydroxy Prenylation
Reaction of 6,7-Dihydroxy Oxindole 101 ..... 38
2.16 Epoxidation Investigation of Olefin-Containing
Oxindole 102 ..... 40
2.17 Investigation of the Reduction of Oxindole 104 to Indole 105
and Indoline 106 ..... 41
2.18 Optimization Investigation of the Hydroxyindole 105
t-Butyldimethylsilylation Reaction ..... 43
2.19 McWhorter's Route to 6,7-Dihydroxyindole 101 ..... 45
2.2 The Synthesis of Diketopiperazine Subunit ..... 49
2.21 Retrosynthetic Analysis of the Proline Derivative 125 ..... 49
2.22 Known Synthetic Methods Related to Proline Subunit 125 ..... 50
2.23 Racemic Synthesis of Proline Subunit 125 ..... 52
2.24 Asymmetric Synthesis of Proline Subunit 125 ..... 60
2.24.1 Lactone Alkylation Approach ..... 60
2.24.2 Asymmetric $\alpha$-Alkylation of Proline $\beta$-Keto Ester via Chiral Enamine Intermediate ..... 61
2.24.3 Intramolecular Epoxide Opening-Amination Approach and Intramolecular Amido-Mercuration Approach ..... 65
2.24.4 $\alpha$-Alkylation Approach of
$\beta$-Hydroxy Proline Ester 129 ..... 69
2.3 Two Connecting Methods between Indole-dioxpin Subunit and
Proline Derivatives ..... 84
2.31 Dipeptide Cyclization to Diketopiperazine Method ..... 84
2.32 The Coupling between Benzyl Ether Substituted DKP and Gramine Derivative via Somei/Kamatani Coupling Reaction ..... 94
2.33 The Coupling between MOM Ether Substituted DKP and Gramine Derivative via Somei/Kamatani Coupling Reaction
The Successful Synthesis of (-)-Parherquamide A ..... 99
2.4 Summary of the Total Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A ..... 121
Chapter Three
Experimental ..... 128
Reference and Footnotes ..... 311
X-Ray Data of Compound 220e ..... 321"Tetrahedron Letters, 1996, 37, p 5441~5444".Studies on the Total Synthesis of Paraherquamide A. Stereocontroled,Asymmetric Synthesis of $\alpha$-Alkyl- $\beta$-Hydroxyproline Derivatives
R. M. Williams and Jianhua Cao ..... 333
"Journal of American Chemical Society, 1991, 113, p 6976~6981"
Asymmetric Synthesis of 2,6-Diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic Acid
Assignment of Stereochemistry
R. M. Williams, M. N. Im, and Jianhua Cao ..... 337

## List of Abbreviations

$\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
AcOH
Bn
BOC
$(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}$
BSTFA
Bz
18-C-6
CAN
Cbz
Collidine
m-CPBA
CSA
DABCO
DBU
DCC
DCU
DDQ
DIBAL
DKP
DMAP
DME
DMEA
DMF
DMPU
acetic anhydride
acetic acid benzyl
tert-butoxycarbonyl
di-tert-butyl dicarbonate
bis(trimethylsilyl)trifluoroacetamide benzoyl

1,4,7,10,13,16-hexaoxacyclooctadecane ceric ammonium nitrate benzyloxycarbonyl

2,4,6-trimethylpyridine meta-chloroperbenzoic acid camphorsulfonic acid

1,4-diazabicyclo[2.2.2]octane
1,8-diazobicyclo[5.4.0]undec-7-ene
1,3-dicyclohexylcarbodiimide
1,3-dicyclohexylurea
2,3-dichloro-5,6-dicyano-1,4-benzoquinone
diisobutylaluminum hydride
diketopiperazine
4- $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylaminopyridine
1,2-dimethoxyethane
dimethylethyl amine
$\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide
1,3-dimethyl-3,4,5,6-tetrahydro-2( $1 H$ )pyrimidinone

DMS
DMSO
EtOAc
EtOH
HMPA
im
LDA
2,6-Lutidine
MeOH
MOM
Ms
MTPI
NCS
pMB
PPTS
PTLC
pv
Py
TBDMS
t-BDMSCl
t-BDMSOTf
TBAF
TBDPS
TBS
t-BuOH
Tf
TFAA
dimethyl sulfide
dimethyl sulfoxide
ethyl acetate
ethanol
hexamethylphosphoramide
1-imidazolyl
lithium diisopropylamine
2,6-dimethylpyridine
methanol
methoxymethyl
methanesulfonyl(mesylate)
methyl triphenoxyphosphonium iodide
N -chlorosuccinimide
p-methoxybenzyl
pyridinium p - toluenesulfonate
preparative thin layer chromatography
pivaloyl
pyridine
tert-butyldimethylsilyl
tert-butyldimethylsilyl chloride
tert-butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate
tetrabutylammonium fluoride
tert-butyldiphenylsilyl
tert-butyldimethylsilyl
tert-butanol
trifluoromethanesulfonate
trifluoroacetic anhydride

TFA
THF
THP
TLC
TMS
TMSI
TS
trifluoroacetic acid
tetrahydrofuran
tetrahydropyran
thin layer chromatography
trimethylsilyl
trimethylsilyl iodide
toluenesulfonyl

## CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background and Significance

Paraherquamide A (1), a toxic metabolite, was first isolated from the mold Penicillium paraherquei in 1980 by Yamazaki and Okuyama. ${ }^{1}$ Relevant data (NMR, IR, UV, MS) was obtained, including a single crystal X-ray structural analysis that firmly established the structure and relative stereochemistry of this molecule. In 1989 an investigation by researchers at Merck Sharp \& Dohme ${ }^{2}$ conclusively established the absolute configuration of paraherquamide A (Scheme 1).

## Scheme 1



1, (-)-paraherquamide A
In 1990 a group at Merck isolated paraherquamide A (1) and six structurally related compounds (paraherquamides B-G) from the fermentation broth of Penicillium charlesii (ATCC 20841). ${ }^{3}$ A similar group from SmithKline Beecham discovered paraherquamide A (1) and three of the six previously mentioned paraherquamides from an organism found in the soil of Kemer, Turkey. ${ }^{4}$ This strain was later identified as a Penicillium species. The growing interest in paraherquamide A (1) (and the other paraherquamides) has resulted
from the discovery of its potent anthelmintic activity. ${ }^{5}$ After this revelation, paraherquamide A (1) was intensively studied, in an attempt to elucidate both the chemical and pharmacological properties of this molecule. To date, a number of patents relating to the culture and isolation have been published (Scheme 2).

## Scheme 2



1, ( - -paraherquamide A


3, (-)-paraherquamide C


5, (-)-paraherquamide E


2, (-)-paraherquamide B


4, (-)-paraherquamide D


6, ( - )-paraherquamide F


7, (-)-paraherquamide G

The importance of a new antinematodal (anthelmintic) agent cannot be overstated. Helminths or intestinal nematodes infect large numbers of livestock world wide and result in sickness or death of the host animal. This devastation on the farmer or stock owner is immeasurable. It not only causes financial loss, but also increased human suffering. This is particularly painful to those people who depend entirely on their animals for sustenance. Today, there are essentially three classes of broad spectrum anthelmintics: the benzimidazoles, the levamisoles/morantel and the avermectins/milbemycins. Unfortunately, the first two groups have lost much of their original anthelmintic activity because of the resistance built up by the helminths. ${ }^{6}$ More recently, the third group has also started to lose effectiveness against various parasites. ${ }^{7}$ Paraherquamide A and the other paraherquamides represent a brand new class of antiparasitic agents. They could play a large role in supplanting or complementing the anthelmintics currently on the market.

### 1.2 Physical-Chemical and Structural Characteristics

Yamazaki and Okuyama ${ }^{1}$ reported the following characteristics of paraherquamide A (1): colorless prisms, $m p=244-247{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomposition); $[\alpha] \mathrm{D}^{22}=-28^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=0.43$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right) ; \mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{e} 493)$; UV $\lambda \max (\mathrm{EtOH}) \mathrm{nm}(\varepsilon): 226$ (32400), 260 (6100), 290 (1600); IR (KBr) 3510, 3430, 3245, 1714, $1650 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \cdot{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $0.86(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ; 1.10(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ; 1.45(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ; 1.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=15 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 1.77-2.40(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;$ $2.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 2.58\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exch.); $2.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=15 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 2.93-3.25$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ; 3.03(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ; 3.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 4.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 6.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8$ $\mathrm{Hz}) ; 6.64(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 6.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}) ; 8.33\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exch.). A Dragendorf test gave a positive color. Crystals were grown in ethyl acetate and an X-ray diffraction pattern was obtained which established the relative stereochemistry. Later, workers at Merck \& Company published data from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra taken in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}$. They also reported data from a ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} N M R$ spectrum in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. They made the carbon and proton assignments from these spectra and also a one-bond ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ - ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ chemical shift correlation experiment (HETCOR); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(400 \mathrm{MHz})\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) \delta 0.84(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 23-$
H); $1.08(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 22-\mathrm{H}) ; 1.41(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 27-\mathrm{H}) ; 1.43(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 28-\mathrm{H}) ; 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 17-\mathrm{H}) ;$ $1.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 19-\mathrm{H} \beta) ; 1.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.8,10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 19-\mathrm{H} \alpha)$; $1.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, 15-\mathrm{H} \alpha) ; 1.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 10-\mathrm{H} \beta) ; 2.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 10-$ $\mathrm{H} \alpha) ; 2.66\left(1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br s, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ exch, $\left.14-\mathrm{OH}\right) ; 2.96(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $\mathrm{J}=2.0,10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 20-\mathrm{H}) ; 2.99$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 29-\mathrm{H}) ; 3.17(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, 16-\mathrm{H} \beta) ; 3.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12-\mathrm{H} \beta) ; 4.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}$ $=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 25-\mathrm{H}) ; 6.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 24-\mathrm{H}) ; 6.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5-\mathrm{H}) ; 6.84$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4-\mathrm{H}) ; 7.5\left(1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br s, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ exch, $\left.1-\mathrm{H}\right)$, (proton assignments as numbered according to Chemical Abstracts) (Scheme 1). They reported a UV $\lambda \max$ (methanol) of $225 \mathrm{~nm}(\log \varepsilon=4.50)$ and a Rf value of 0.51 using Whatman KC 18 F reverse phase TLC: methanol/ $/ \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8 / 2)$. Mass spectral data was also reported; $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5} 493$ m/e M+(493) (165) (163). They found paraherquamide A (1) soluble in methanol, ethyl acetate, acetone, and dimethylsulfate but essentially insoluble in water. Paraherquamide A responded to iodine and $50 \% \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. Workers at SmithKline Beecham performed similar work including a $2 \mathrm{D},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and COSY NMR experiment and obtained the same structural assignments as the Merck group. The absolute configuration for paraherquamide A (1) was established via an X-ray crystal analysis of a bromine atom-containing semisynthetic analog. The Merck workers performed detailed spectroscopic work (COSY, HETCOR, NOE, MS) on the other paraherquamides (C-G) and obtained the structures shown in Scheme 2. They reported similar spectral characteristics for all seven compounds. As would be expected, the only major change in the NMR spectra stemmed from the signals contained on the proline ring (except for paraherquamides E-F). The chemical shifts of the other signals were quite close This can be gleaned from a perusal of the proton NMR spectral data of paraherquamide A and B. The conclusions reached by the Merck group, were independently confirmed by the SmithKline workers for paraherquamides A and E-G. They concluded that the relative stereochemistry must be the same for all seven analogs. The Merck group also reported that the absolute stereochemistry for the other six products was the same as for paraherquamide A (1).

### 1.3 Relatives of the Paraherquamides

The paraherquamides are structurally very similar to the marcfortines (A-C), and the brevianamides (A-B) )Scheme 3). Marcfortines A, ${ }^{8} \mathrm{~B}$ and C were isolated from Penicillium roqueforti (strain B26) in 1980 by Polonsky. ${ }^{9}$ The similarities between the paraherquamides and the marcfortines is striking. The only difference between paraherquamide $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{2})$ and marcfortine A is that marcfortine A contains a pipecolic residue instead of a proline unit. The marcfortine structures were solved by X-ray diffraction. Patterns were obtained for both marcfortines A and C. This data confirmed that the paraherquamides and marcfortines have the same relative stereochemistry. As would be expected, the published NMR data for marcfortine A is similar to that of the paraherquamides (A-E). Similarly, marcfortine C has the identical pyran ring system as in paraherquamides F and G (and similar NMR characteristics), but marcfortine B and C lack the N -methyl group found in marcfortine A and all the paraherquamides. The paraherquamides also have structural features reminiscent of the brevianamides. ${ }^{10}(+)$ Brevianamide $\mathrm{B}(\mathbf{1 1 b})$ is similar to the paraherquamides in that it contains the same proline moiety as well as the bicyclo [2.2.2] ring structure. Interestingly, the bicyclo [2.2.2] ring system of (+)-brevianamide A (11a) possesses the opposite absolute configuration relative to (+)-brevianamide B, the paraherquamides and marcfortines (Scheme 3). In addition, other paraherquamide relatives such as sclerotamide ( $\mathbf{8 f}$ ), ${ }^{11}$ aspergamide $\mathrm{A}(\mathbf{1 0 a})$ and B (10b), ${ }^{12}$ VM55596 (8a), VM55587 (8b), SB203105 (8c), SB200437 (8d), VM55595 (8e), and VM55599 (12) ${ }^{133, b}$ asperparaline A and VM55598 (13a), ${ }^{14}$ as well as SB202327 (13b) have been described.

The paraherquamides, marcfortines, brevianamides, aspergamides and asperparaline belong to a large group of natural products containing a diketopiperazine moiety, produced from the condensation of two amino acid subunits. This group includes such notable toxins as the echinulins, gliotoxins and the sporidesmins.

## Scheme 3




8a, VM55596, $\mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}_{3}=\mathrm{H}_{2}, X=\mathrm{N}^{+}-\mathrm{O}^{-}, \mathrm{R}_{4}=\mathrm{H}$
8b, VM55597, $R_{1}=O H, R_{2}=M e, R_{3}=H_{2}, X=N, R_{4}=H$
8c, $S B 203105, R_{1}=H, R_{2}=M e, R_{3}=H_{2}, X=N, R_{4}=O H$
8d, SB200437, $R_{1}=H, R_{2}=M e, R_{3}=H_{2}, X=N, R_{4}=H$


8e, VM55595, $R_{1}=H, R_{2}=M e, R_{3}=H_{2}, X=H_{2}, R_{4}=H$
8f, , sclerotamide, $R_{1}=R_{2}=R_{3}=H_{2}=R_{4}=H, X=0$

9a, (-)-marcfortine $A, R=M e$ 9b, (-)-marcfortine B, $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}$


9c, (-)-marcfortine C


10a, aspergamide $A$


11a, (+)-brevianamide A


11b, (+)-brevianamide B


13a, asperparaline $A\left(X=H_{2}\right)$ aspergillimide (VM55598)

13b, SB202327 ( $X=0$ )


10b, aspergamide $B$


12, VM55599

### 1.4 Pharmacology

Originally, paraherquamide A was tested on a simple animal model (gerbils). The results showed that paraherquamide $\mathrm{A}(1)$ has strong activity against a benzimidazole- and avermectin-resistant helminth (Trichustiogylus colubriformis), Paraherquamide A (1) was well-tolerated by the gerbils even at a high dose $\left(200 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}\right)^{5}$ (Table 1).

## Table 1

Efficacy of paraherquamide A against immature Trichstrongylus colubriformis in gerbils and a comparison to some other anthelmintics.

| Treatment | Dosage <br> (mg/kg) | Number of <br> Animals | Efficacy \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Placebo | - | 8 | - |
| Paraherquamide A | 200 | 3 | 100 |
|  | 100 | 3 | 100 |
|  | 50 | 3 | 100 |
|  | 6.25 | 5 | 100 |
|  | 3.12 | 4 | 99.7 |
|  | 1.56 | 3 | 98.1 |
|  | 0.78 | 3 | 96.5 |
|  | 0.39 | 3 | 66.3 |
| Thiabendazole | 200 | $3-6$ | 85 |
|  | 100 | $3-6$ | 72.3 |
|  | 50 | $3-6$ | 44.1 |
| Levamisole | 6.25 | $3-6$ | 100 |
| hydrochloride | 3.125 | $3-6$ | 80.3 |
|  | 1.562 | $3-6$ | 40.7 |
| Avermectin $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{a}$ | 0.125 | $3-6$ | 79.4 |
|  | 0.0625 | $3-6$ | 57.4 |
| Avermectin $\mathrm{A}_{2} \mathrm{a}$ | 0.0312 | $3-6$ | 99.8 |
|  | 0.125 | $3-6$ | 90.1 |
|  | 0.0625 | $3-6$ | 55.9 |
| Avermectin $\mathrm{B}_{1} \mathrm{a}$ | 0.0312 | $3-6$ | 100 |
|  | 0.0312 | $3-6$ | 75.4 |
|  | 0.0078 | $3-6$ | 18.8 |
| Avermectin $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{a}$ | 0.0312 | $3-6$ | 95 |
|  | 0.0156 | $3-6$ | 75.7 |

A subsequent animal study was performed on various nematode-infected sheep. Seven different species, larval and adult, were presented to the sheep including an
avermectin-resistant strain (Haemochus contortus) and an avermectin/benzimidazoleresistant strain (Trichostrongylus colubriformis). Paraherquamide A (1) showed good activity against these organisms, in doses ranging from $2.00-0.25 \mathrm{mg}$ of paraherquamide A per kg of sheep body weight. In almost all cases the efficacy was $99 \%$ or greater; however, 1 was ineffective against Oesophagostomum columbianum (zero percent efficacy at the $0.25 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}$ level). Another study demonstrated the safety and efficacy of paraherquamide A in cattle. Calves were infected with nine different species of nematode larvae and then treated with paraherquamide $A$ at doses ranging from $4 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}$ to $0.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}$. The only nematode that was not affected was C. punctata (zero percent efficacy at the $0.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}$ level). The other eight parasites were killed with $>95 \%$ efficacy at the $1.0 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{kg}^{-1}$ level. It was reported that the calves suffered no ill effects. Problems arose when 1 was fed to dogs at doses much lower than those used on calves and sheep. The mixed breed dogs showed acute toxicity reactions ${ }^{15}$ and because of this, a toxicity profile was undertaken comparing paraherquamide $A(1)$ to avermectin using mice as the animal vector. ${ }^{16}$ It was concluded that not only is paraherquamide A more toxic than avermectin but it has a different mode of toxicity. The mice fed paraherquamide A suffered respiratory distress followed by death. In contrast, the mice fed avermectin suffered ataxia, coma and then death.

A Merck group performed a study ${ }^{17}$ that reported a membrane binding site of paraherquamide A (1) in a membrane preparation from Caenohabditis elegans. This was done by synthesizing $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ paraherquamide $\left({ }^{3} \mathrm{H} \text { incorporated at position } 24\right)^{18}$ and incubating it with membranes obtained from macerated C. elegans worms. A Scatchard plot analysis of the binding data pointed to one particular high affinity binding site for paraherquamide A . The dissociation constant $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}=263 \mu \mathrm{M}$ was found that compared favorably with $268 \mu \mathrm{M}$ obtained from a kinetic binding study. This value $\mathrm{k}_{-1} / \mathrm{k} 1=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}$ was found by examining the effect of excess unlabeled paraherquamide $A(1)$ incubated with the ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}$ paraherquamide A membrane complex and measuring the rate of decline of the [ ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}$ ] paraherquamide over time (giving $\mathrm{k}_{-1}=1.1 \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$ ). The specificity of paraherquamide A to
this binding site was also examined. Various analogs of paraherquamide A were tested to see how well they inhibited paraherquamide A binding. While none of the analogs bound as strongly to this site as paraherquamide A itself, there was an almost one-to-one correlation between the binding and the motility assay (Ec50 ug/mL ) for C.elegans, indicating that this binding site is indeed the active site for biological activity. Another experiment was done to determine if the membrane binding site of paraherquamide A is the same as that for other anthelmintic agents. While all of the compounds tested showed antinematode activity, only the phenothiazine analogs had any specific inhibitory effects at the paraherquamide A binding site. This was an interesting result indicating that both types of compounds interact at a common or close binding site. The mode of action of phenothiazine is not known, though it does possess both anthelmentic and antiprotozoal activity. The Merck group concluded that paraherquamide A interacts (interferes) with a specific ligand-receptor that could be the same as for the phenothiazines. The nature of this site remains to be determined.

The Merck group did extensive semi-synthetic work in modifying paraherquamide A. They reported making over 100 different analogs of this compound. Unfortunately, paraherquamide A was the most active. Additionally, of the natural paraherquamides, paraherquamides A (1) is the most active (Table 2).

## Table 2

Antinematodal activity of the natural paraherquamides against C.elegans.

## Compound

(-)-paraherquamide A (1)
(-)-paraherquamide B (2)
(-)-paraherquamide C (3)
(-)-paraherquamide $\mathrm{D}(4)$
(-)-paraherquamide E (5)
$(-)$-paraherquamide $\mathrm{F}(6)$
(-)-paraherquamide G(7)

## $\mathbf{L D}_{50}(\mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$

2.5 1004016016066520

### 1.5 Chemical Modification of (-)-Paraherquamide A

### 1.5.1 Merck's Modification

As part of a program directed at searching for more potent and less toxic antiparasitic analogs of (-)-paraherquamide A, Blizzard and coworkers at Merck Sharp \& Dohme investigated the chemical properties of (-)-paraherquamide A by modifying its chemical structure at different positions. The following is a brief review of the chemistry done by the researchers at Merck towards (-)-paraherquamide A. The chemical properties of (-)-paraherquamide A will provide key information for our design of a synthetic plan towards (-)-paraherquamide A.

Blizzard et al., ${ }^{19}$ (Scheme 4) treated 1 with phosgene and quenched the reaction with MeOH , expecting to provide the methyl carbonate, but instead, several by-products were obtained. By quenching with aqueous base instead of MeOH , they produced the cyclic carbamate 15.

Scheme 4
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This interesting product (15) was presumably formed by chloride ion induced opening of a strained, reactive intermediate 14 , which is believed to be formed by attack of the tertiary nitrogen at the initially produced chloroformate, since paraherquamide analogs
lacking the C-14 hydroxyl group did not undergo ring cleavage under identical reaction conditions.

5-Bromoparaherquamide $A$ (17) was prepared by treating 1 with two equiv. of bromine followed by zinc reduction of the intermediate tribromide 16 (Scheme 5). When four equiv. of $\mathrm{Br}_{2}$ was allowed to react with 1 , and then followed by zinc dust reduction, compounds 17 and 18 were formed. Compound 18 was first treated with KH to form the amide anion and alkoxide. Subsequent addition of t - BuLi resulted in halogen-metal exchange, and the incipient carbon anion was quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to provide 19. The structure of 19 was confirmed by chemical correlation. Platinum-catalyzed air oxidation of paraherquamide A also afforded compound 19 (Scheme 6).

## Scheme 5
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17
Blizzard and coworkers ${ }^{20}$ reported that when 1 was reacted with DAST, the major product formed was the exo-olefin 20 in $38 \%$ yield (Scheme 7). Bromination of $\mathbf{2 0}$ using two equiv. of bromine selectively added to the enol ether double bond and the 5-position of the oxindole instead of the C -14 exo-double bond due to their different reactivities. The tribromide 21 was synthesized in order to protect the enol ether double bond in the ozonolysis step. Ozonolysis of $\mathbf{2 1}$ in acidic methanol solution (to protonate the tertiary
amine ) with dimethyl sulfide workup followed by zinc dust reduction afforded the desired ketone 22.
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## Scheme 9
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 24a } \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{CH}_{3} \\
& \text { 24b } \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \\
& \text { 24c } \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{7} \\
& \text { 24d } \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CH}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

When ketone 22 was treated with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$, epimeric adducts 23a and 23b $(\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H})$ were obtained in a $40: 60$ ratio, with 23a being the desired epimer (Scheme 8). Methylmagnesium bromide addition to $\mathbf{2 2}$ provided a $1: 2$ ratio of products while ethylmagnesium bromide gave a $3: 1$ ratio of products, favoring the desired isomer.

However, introduction of a benzyl group formed only $\mathbf{2 3 b}$ with the epi-stereochemistry at C-14.

Blizzard and coworkers ${ }^{21}$ studied the chemical behavior of the vinyl ether double bond in PA (1). Acid-catalyzed alcohol addition to the olefin failed to provide the desired product 24. By using an indirect two-step approach, compounds 24a-24d were obtained. Selective addition of bromine to PA 1 gave the dibromide intermediates, which were treated with DBU/ROH to produce the alkoxy analogs 25a-25d. Reductive debromination with $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ led to the ketal analogs 24a-24d (Scheme 9).

As outlined in Scheme 10, Blizzard et al. also explored ozonolysis of the vinyl ether as a source of new analogs.

Scheme 10
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a)DAST
b) HF-pyridine

a) DAST, R = OTBS, 29
b) HF-pyridine, $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{OH}, 30$

Brief treatment ( 5 min ) of a solution of PA (1) in acidic methanol with ozone at -78 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ workup cleanly afforded compound $\mathbf{2 6}$. However, ozonolysis of 1 in MeOH gave a mixture of products, presumably due to oxidation of the free tertiary amine. The 14-O-trimethylsilyl PA 27, made by reaction of 1 with BSTFA, was treated with ozone to provide hemiketal 28. Reaction of $\mathbf{2 8}$ with DAST resulted in the formation of fluoride 29, and deprotection with $\mathrm{HF} /$ pyridine/THF afforded the fluoride compound 30 (Scheme 10).

The same Merck group led by Blizzard ${ }^{22}$ attempted to introduce substitutents at the $\mathrm{C}-14-\mathrm{O}$ position. They found that under all the conditions they tried, the $1-\mathrm{NH}$ group was significantly more reactive than the $\mathrm{C}-14-\mathrm{OH}$ group toward electrophiles. For example, reaction of 1 with excess KH in $\mathrm{THF}\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}\right)$ followed by addition of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{I}(10 \mathrm{eq}, 5$ min ) afforded 1-N-methyl-PA 31a as the major product ( $65 \%$ ) along with a small amount of the $1-\mathrm{N}, 14-\mathrm{O}$-bis alkylated product. None of the $14-\mathrm{O}$-methyl analog was observed (Scheme 11).

Scheme 11


They also found that the amide nitrogen could be selectively acylated (Scheme 12) to give product 32 .

## Scheme 12



### 1.5.2 Pharmacia and Upjohn's Modification

## The First Formal Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A

In 1997, Lee and Clothier ${ }^{23}$ at Pharmacia and Upjohn reported the first formal synthesis of (-)paraherquamide A from (-)-paraherquamide B (Scheme14 and 15), which came from the conversion of marcfortine A (Scheme 13). Marcfortine A, reported by Polonsky et al., ${ }^{8}$ is a fungal metabolite of Penicillium roqueforti and is structurally related to paraherquamide B, the sole difference occurring in ring G. Paraherquamide B contains a five-membered G -ring, and the G -ring of marcfortine A is six-membered. Opening the Gring of marcfortine A , oxidatively removing one carbon atom, and reclosing the ring was expected to give paraherquamide B. This approach was accomplished in six steps as depicted in Scheme 13. Von Braun reaction of $\mathbf{8}$ with cyanogen bromide provided bromide 33, which was converted to selenide 34 in the presence of diphenyl diselenide and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$. Oxidation of 34 with $\mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ followed by elimination of the resulting selenol in refluxing benzene gave alkene $\mathbf{3 5}$. Hydrolysis of alkene $\mathbf{3 5}$ produced compound $\mathbf{3 6}$ that under osmylation conditions, provided diol $37(70 \%)$. Cleavage of the diol with $\mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ followed by reductive amination gave ( - --paraherquamide B. ( - --Paraherquamide B and ( - )paraherquamide A both have the same stereochemistry, but paraherquamide A also has a tertiary alcohol moiety at the $\mathrm{C}-14$ position. The formal synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A was completed in seven steps starting with $(-)$-paraherquamide $B$ according to the synthetic pathway illustrated in Scheme 14 and 15.

## Scheme 13






2, (-)-paraherquamide B
Oxidation of paraherquamide B with $\mathrm{I}_{2} / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ gave lactam 38. The $\alpha, \beta$ unsaturated lactam 39 was formed by treatment of 38 with $\mathrm{LDA} / \mathrm{PhSeCl}$ followed by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ oxidation (58\%). Stereoselective epoxidation followed by epoxide ring-opening with $\mathrm{SmI}_{2}$ provided alcohol 41. Selective reduction of one of the amide groups in 41 with LAH gave 42, which was then oxidized to the C-14 ketone 43 (71\%). A slightly modified procedure (THF, 3 M MeMgBr in ether, $50 \%$ yield based on recovered starting material) relative to the original method $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{MeMgBr}\right.$ in THF $)$ by the Merck group was used to
introduce the methyl group and resulted in almost exclusively the desired isomer with only a trace amount of epimer.

## Scheme 14
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### 1.6 The Total Synthesis of (-)-Brevianamide B

In 1988 Williams et al. ${ }^{24}$ completed the total synthesis of $(-)$-breviamide B in 20 steps from L-proline based on a model study developed by the same group ${ }^{25}$ (Scheme 16 ). The formation of $\mathbf{4 7}$ from L-proline (44) was based on the procedure developed by Seebach ${ }^{26}$. Proline was condensed with pivaldehyde to give aminal 45, which was stereospecifically alkylated with allylic bromide to provide 46 . Ring-opening of $\mathbf{4 6}$ by the preformed amide anion afforded amide 47. Reaction of 47 with bromoacetyl bromide and subsequent cyclization provided diketopiperazine 48. Ozonolysis of $\mathbf{4 8}$ (dimethylsulfide work-up) followed by a Wittig reaction gave aldehyde $\mathbf{5 0}$ (Scheme 17). Reduction of the aldehyde to the corresponding alcohol followed by TBS ether protection and further introduction of the methoxycarbonyl group provided the key intermediate 51.

## Scheme 16
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Scheme 17


Compound 51 was treated with gramine in the presence of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ in refluxing $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ to give only the syn-diastereomer 53 (Scheme 18). Decarbomethoxylation, protection of the indole nitrogen as the t -BOC derivative, deprotection of the TBS ether moiety, and allylic chloride formation ( $\mathrm{MgCl}, \mathrm{LiCl}, \mathrm{DMF}$ collidine, $85 \%$ ) led to the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$, precursor 54. Intramolecular $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ cyclization of $\mathbf{5 4}$ was best carried out in refluxing THF with $18-\mathrm{C}-6$ and NaH to provide the anti-isomer 55 . Treatment of compound $\mathbf{5 5}$ with HCl in dioxane induced electrophilic cyclization to give indole 56. Oxidation of $\mathbf{5 6}$ with m CPBA resulted in the formation of hydroxy indolenine 57, which was immediately treated with NaOMe in MeOH to effect a stereoselective pinacol-type rearrangement, yielding the rdesired indoxyl 58. Removal of the para-methoxy benzyl group in $\mathbf{5 8}$ provided (-)brevianamide B (59) in 40\% yield.

Scheme 18
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### 1.7 Total Synthesis of (+)-Paraherquamide B

In 1993, Cushing, Sanz-Cervera and Williams ${ }^{27 a, b}$ finished the total synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B in 42 chemical steps. This synthesis was a convergent one, which coupled two key pieces together using the same Somei/Kametani reaction used during the synthesis of (-)-brevianamide B.

The synthetic approach after the Somei/Kametani coupling step is shown in Scheme 19. Gramine derivative 60 was coupled with diketopiperazine $\mathbf{6 1}$ by catalysis with 0.5 equiv. of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ to give the syn-stereoisomer 62 in $73 \%$ yield. Decarbomethoxylation, lactim ether formation, indole nitrogen protection with $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{DMAP}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and removal of both TBS ether protecting groups gave diol 64. Conversion of the allylic alcohol to the allylic chloride under Corey-Kim conditions followed by reprotection of the secondary alcohol as its t-butyldimethylsilyl ether, led to the precursor $\mathbf{6 5}$ for the key $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ reaction. Compound 65 was treated with NaH in refluxing benzene to give the cyclization product 66 in a stereoselective fashion. Stoichiometric $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$-mediated reaction followed by reduction with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ provided the heptacyclic product 67 . Selective reduction of the tertiary amide, N -methylation, and subsequent deprotection of both the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ and the t butyldimethylsilyl ether gave the indole-alcohol 68 . Oxidative Pinacol-type rearrangment of 68 afforded oxindole 69. Dehydration of 69 was effected with MTPI in DMPU to give paraherquamide B in $83 \%$ yield.
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1 a) $\mathrm{AlH}_{3}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{Al}$, THF, toluene
b) $\mathrm{NaCNBH}_{3}, \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{AcOH}$
2) $\mathrm{NaH}, \mathrm{Mel}, 94-99 \%$
3) TFA, THF, $87-99 \%$
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### 1.8 The Synthetic Strategy towards (-)-Paraherquamide A

Our synthetic strategy is based on the success of the synthetic approaches to (-)breviamide B and (+)-paraherquamide B. The key intermediate for our synthesis of (-)paraherquamide A is similar to the key intermediates used in the (-)-breviamide B and (+)paraherquamide B work. This intermediate is diketopiperazine 70 (Scheme 21).

According to the retrosynthetic design for (-)-paraherquamide A shown in Scheme 21 , compound 70 can be constructed in two different ways. The first approach is to connect bond a between the two fragments 71 and 60 using the same Somei/Kametani coupling reaction found in the (-)-breviamide B and (+)-paraherquamide B syntheses. Cyclic dipeptide formation between 73 and 74 should provide 72 , and 71 will be obtained upon further functionalization of 72 . The second approach is the disconnection of bond $\mathbf{b}$,
and this will lead to an acyclic dipeptide 75, which can come from the coupling between diphenyl imine compound 76 and gramine derivative 60 (Scheme 21). The retrosynthetic analysis and the synthetic details for compounds 73 and 76 will be discussed in Chapter 2.

Our final retrosynthetic analysis of paraherquamide A is summarized in Scheme 22. (-)-Paraherquamide A contains a tertiary methyl alcohol moiety at the C-14 position, and paraherquamide B lacks this structural feature at the C-14 position. In order to carry out the synthesis of paraherquamide A , there are different and challenging problems that we need to carefully consider. First, we need to find a way to asymmetrically synthesize the chiral intermediate 73 in a practical and efficient manner, and then further transform 73 into diketopiperazine 71. Second, when do we introduce the tertiary methyl alcohol functionality at C-14? If we decide to introduce this moiety as a secondary alcohol and convert it into the tertiary methyl alcohol at the final stage of the synthesis, what kind of protecting group will we need to use for the secondary alcohol? Third, and most importantly, will the newly introduced functional group at the C-14 position affect the stereochemistry at the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ reaction step and at the Pinacol-type rearrangement step (both steps create a new chiral center)?

In our retrosynthetic plan, we have decided to put a protected secondary alcohol at the C-14 position instead of the tertiary methyl alcohol. During the final stage of our synthesis, the protected hydroxy group at the $\mathrm{C}-14$ position will be deprotected and oxidized to provide a ketone. Methyl addition to the ketone should lead straightforwardly to the tertiary methyl alcohol.

## Scheme 21
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There are four reasons for this particular synthetic plan. First, we want to ensure that the group at the C-14 position is sterically as small as possible, in order to mimic the steric situation at the $\mathrm{C}-14$ position of (+)-paraherquamide B . (+)-Paraherquamide B has two hydrogens at this position. If we place the tertiary alcohol at the $\mathrm{C}-14$ position, and protect this alcohol, the groups at the C-14 position will be quite large. Second, from the chemical modification studies of $(-)$-paraherquamide A, we know that the tertiary alcohol moiety at the $\mathrm{C}-14$ position of paraherquamide A is very unreactive, and therefore
protection of this alcohol will be difficult. Third, construction of the methyl alcohol will use the known reaction of methylmagnisum bromide addition to a ketone group. This reaction should be feasible in terms of yield, stereoselectivity and scale. Merck's procedure for the methylmagnesium bromide addition to the C-14 ketone group gave products in a ratio of 1:2, favoring the wrong stereoisomer. The modified procedure of Upjohn provided almost exclusively the desired isomer in $50 \%$ yield. At the early stage of a long synthesis, any low yield and/or poor diastereoselectivity in a single step will be a disaster to the whole project. Finally, the formation of the ketone at the final stage of our synthesis will provide us with a handle to make different analogs of paraherquamide A (PA). Interestingly, when Lee and Clother published the first formal synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A (Scheme 14 and 15) in 1997, they used the same synthetic strategy at the last two steps (from 42 to $\mathbf{4 3}$, then to PA) that we plan to use.

The first synthetic plan for $(-)$-paraherquamide A proposed by Professor Williams is illustrated in Scheme 23. Comparison of this synthetic route with our actual final synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A shows that the two are very similar.

## Scheme 22 The Retrosynthetic Analysis of (-)-Paraherquamide A
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1) $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuCl}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$
2) $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{AcOH}$
3) $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{CPBA}$
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## CHAPTER TWO

## THE TOTAL SYNTHESIS OF (-)-PARAHERQUAMIDE A

### 2.1 The Improved Large Scale Synthesis of the Dioxepin-indole of Paraherquamide A

### 2.11 Introduction

Dioxepin-indole $\mathbf{6 0}$ is one of the two key intermediates required for our proposed synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A (Scheme 24).

Scheme 24


In the course of the (+)-paraherquamide B synthesis, ${ }^{27 a . b}$ Tim Cushing synthesized 60 in fourteen chemical steps (Scheme 25). Developing a synthetic approach to make compound 60 on a large scale ( $30-40$ grams) practically and efficiently is critical for the successful synthesis of $(-)$ paraherquamide A since the proposed synthetic approach would require an additional 21 steps starting from the coupling between $\mathbf{6 0}$ and 91 .

Cushing made a tremendous effort in discovering the above approach for the construction of $\mathbf{6 0}$, which was successfully used for the synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B. There are several advantages in the above synthetic approach to compound $\mathbf{6 0}$. There are no column chromatographies necessary until the purification of compound 102. Most of the chemical steps do not require special equipment and give reproducible results.

Scheme 25


However, there are also some disadvantages which exist in this synthetic route, creating an obstacle for quick and efficient large-scale synthesis of $\mathbf{6 0}$. Therefore, I have further optimized our synthetic route towards compound $\mathbf{6 0}$, and in the following sections, I will discuss the details of these improvements.

### 2.12 The Synthesis of Dioxepin-Indole 60 Optimized from 14 Steps to 13

 StepsAs shown in Scheme 25, vanillin (92) was acetylated with acetic anhydride to provide acetate 93 , which was then treated with fuming nitric acid to afford 94 , the desired regioisomer, and 95 , the undesired isomer, in a $\sim 10: 1$ ratio. TLC showed that 94 had a lower $R_{f}$ and 95 had the exact same $R_{f}$ as the starting material 93 . Flash column chromatography was used to give a nice separation of $\mathbf{9 4}$ and $\mathbf{9 5}$. However, in the course of our (-)-paraherquamide A synthesis, more than 6.3 kg of the nitro-substituted acetate 94 and 95 was needed, and flash column chromatography is not the optimal method for separating large amounts of $\mathbf{9 4}$ and $\mathbf{9 5}$. The original method used to separate compounds 94 and 95 is as follows: the mixture of $\mathbf{9 4}$ and 95 was hydrolyzed in a solution of $\mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to give the phenoxide mixture, which was then neutralized with HCl to provide free phenol 96 and the phenol corresponding to 95 . The two phenol isomers were then taken up in EtOH at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resulting mixture, due to the high solubility of $\mathbf{9 6}$ and the low solubility of the by-product phenol, was filtered to give a filtrate containing almost pure phenol 96. This filtrate was concentrated, and the residue was recrystallized in water to give the pure product 96 .

Scheme 26


A comparison of our new improved approach and the originl approach is outlined in Scheme 26. The new approach avoids the $\mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ hydrolysis step and the crude product recrystallization process. Instead, it directly used the mixture of nitro-acetaldehydes 94 and 95 . After a three-step transformation, 94 provided the desired acid 99, and 95 provided the undesired acid 108. The next step is the hydrogenation of the nitro group to
the corresponding amine at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in acetic acid. Compound 99 cyclized into oxindole 100 , but 108 was simply reduced to amino acid 109 , which cannot undergo the intramolecular cyclization reaction due to geometric restriction. Demethylation of 100 and 109 using $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ provided oxindole 101 and acid 110 . The work-up procedure for this reaction requires quenching the reaction mixture with water, and produced hydrobromic acid $(\mathrm{HBr})$. The resulting HBr reacted with the amino group of $\mathbf{1 1 0}$, forming a water soluble salt. In contrast, compound 101 was insoluble in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (the reaction solvent). Filtration of the acidic mixture and washing the solid product pad (101) with water provided a very pure solid product $101 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and TLC showed that intermediate 101 had the same purity as the batches which were made by the old approach. The advantages of this new approach were significant. The yield of $\mathbf{9 6}$ increases from $54 \%$ to more than $80 \%$ (94). Considering that over 6.3 kg of 94 and 95 has been used, removing the $\mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ hydrolysis step and the recrystallization process lowers the cost of making 60, increases the overall yield, and more importantly saves time.

### 2.13 Synthetic Investigation of the Transformation of Nitro-Aldehyde 93 to Azalactone 97

The synthesis of azalactone 97 from 93 or 96 takes eight days and the yields are not reproducible. The yield ranges from 25-52\% (Scheme 27).
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From a retrosynthetic point of view, azalactone 97 can also be made from aldehyde 93 and azalactone 111 (Scheme 28).
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Mukerjee and coworkers ${ }^{28}$ reported a very similar reaction which is depicted in Scheme 29. These researchers started with N -acetylglycine and treated it with $\mathrm{ClCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ to give azalactone 111, which coupled with benzaldehyde in situ to provide the $\alpha, \beta$ unsaturated azalactone 112. According to the above procedure, aldehyde 96 was treated with ethyl N -acetylglycinate and $\mathrm{ClCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ in the presence of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$. However, none of the desired product $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ was formed. The only product was the ethyl carbonate 113 (Scheme 29).

Scheme 29


We believe that if N -acetylglycine was used instead of ethyl N -acetyl glycinate, the desired azalactone $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ might be formed because the N -acetyl-glycine could be activated by
$\mathrm{ClCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ to form a mixed anhydride which will be a much better leaving group than the ethyl ester and therefore facilitate cyclization to azalactone $\mathbf{1 1 1}$.

In 1998, Das and coworkers ${ }^{29}$ reported an interesting synthesis of azalactone 116 (Scheme 30). A variety of aromatic aldehydes were treated with glycine derivative $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ in the presence of $1: 1 / \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{BO}_{3}$ and provided 116 in very good yields ( $81-91 \%$ ). The reaction time was short, and the work-up was easy. This protocol should be a feasible method to make 97.

Scheme 30


### 2.14 Different Approaches for the Synthesis of Oxindole 100 from

## Nitrophenyl Acetic Acid 99

The reaction conditions illustrated in Scheme 31 are the original ones used for the synthesis of (+) paraherquamide B. It is a very good method in terms of reaction set-up, work-up and yield.

## Scheme 31
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The only disadvantage is that only 23 grams of 99 can be used in each batch because the hydrogenation is a heterogeneous reaction. Too much starting material will give by-products that are only partially reduced, and the product will not be pure. The following three different methods were attempted (Scheme 32) in order to solve the scale-up problem, but none of them proved to be as good as the original method.
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For the catalytic hydrogen transfer reduction, two conditions were used. One used HOAc as the solvent while the other used EtOH as the solvent and was heated at reflux for 3 days. Both methods gave the desired compound 100, but there was always some starting material 99 remaining no matter how long the reaction was run and how many equivalents of cyclohexene were used. The third method involved the mild $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl} / \mathrm{Fe}$ reflux condition. This reaction has been run several times, and the yield was between $70-80 \%$. The drawbacks are the lower yield and the work-up is more complex and time consuming.

### 2.15 Investigation of the Selective 7-Hydroxy Prenylation Reaction of

 6,7-Dihydroxy Oxindole 101Scheme 33


The reaction shown in Scheme $\mathbf{3 3}$ is the original conditions to synthesize the desired compound 102. Two by-products 117 and 118 were formed. The drawback for this reaction is that the $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{s}$ of $\mathbf{1 0 2}, \mathbf{1 1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ are very close, and the separation is very difficult. The reason for the selective prenylation of the 7-hydroxy position is due to the ortho alkylcarbonylamino group which has a net electron-withdrawing effect ( $\sigma>0.14$ ). ${ }^{30}$ This electron-withdrawing effect applies to both hydroxy groups, but the effect at the 7 hydroxy group is greater than at the 6-hydroxy group. Therefore, the acidity of the 7 hydroxy moiety is larger than that of the 6-hydroxy moiety.

Scheme 34


As diagrammed in Scheme 34, $\mathrm{k}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{2}$, the rate constants for each productdetermining steps, are smaller than $\mathrm{k}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{4}$. Compounds 119, 101, 120 are in equilibrium with each other. Anion $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ is more stable than anion $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ (acidity difference), therefore $\mathrm{k}_{1}>\mathrm{k}_{2}$, which in turn determines the ratio of products. In my own investigation of this reaction, employing $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ as the base makes no difference. However, when $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ is used, both yield and selectivity of $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ are slightly higher. For the separation of compounds 102, 117 and 118, phenols 102 and 118 have a free phenol group while 117 does not have a free phenol group. Using a basic extraction, the phenoxide salts of $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ should stay in the aqueous layer. The separated aqueous layer containing $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ can be acidified to give back 102 and $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ as the free forms. This removal of by-product $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ made the flash column purification much easier, and this proved to be successful. The mixture of $\mathbf{1 0 2}, \mathbf{1 1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ was treated with 1 N NaOH ( 3 times) and the separated aqueous portion acidified with $0.8 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ to afford a mixture of only $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ and 118, which were separated by a short flash column chromatography.

### 2.16 Epoxidation Investigation of Olefin-Containing Oxindole 102

Scheme 35


The original epoxidation of olefin $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ with m-CPBA was very fast, but the yield was moderate, usually around $64 \%$ yield. An undesired six membered ring by-product formed which resulted from the intramolecular hydroxy attack of the epoxide at the lesssubstituted carbon. The by-product formation is promoted by factors such as the presence of acid, strong base and water. A summary of the conditions which were examined is collected in Table 3. According to the results in Table 3, entry JC-384 gave the best result. Magnesium sulfate was added to remove any water which promotes the by-product formation.

Table 3

| Entry | Solvent | Conditions, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Results | Yield(\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JC-379 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | once $\mathrm{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \mathrm{eq})$, 1 h twice $\mathrm{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, 2 \mathrm{~h}$ | some byproduct, mainly desired | 64 |
| JC-381 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | once $\operatorname{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1.5 \mathrm{eq})$, 1 h twice $\operatorname{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1.5 \mathrm{eq}),>2 \mathrm{~h}$ | byproduct +SM+product | not calculated |
| JC-382 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{No} \mathrm{NaHCO} \end{aligned}$ | once $\mathrm{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \mathrm{eq}), 1 \mathrm{~h}$ twice $\mathrm{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \mathrm{eq}),>2 \mathrm{~h}$ | byproduct +SM+product | not calculated |
| JC-384 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \\ & \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{MgSO}_{4} \end{aligned}$ | once $\mathrm{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}($ 1eq), 1 h twice $\operatorname{mCPBA}(1 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1 \mathrm{eq}), 3 \mathrm{~h}$ |  | 87 |
| JC-386 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \\ & \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{MgSO}_{4} \end{aligned}$ | mCPBA $(2.5 \mathrm{eq}) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(5 \mathrm{eq}), 35 \mathrm{~min}$ then,SM, 1h |  | 54.6 |
| JC-387 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \\ & \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}, \mathrm{MgSO}_{4} \end{aligned}$ | mCPBA $(2.5 e q) / \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(5 \mathrm{eq}), 35 \mathrm{~min}$ $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$,filtered, then, $\mathrm{SM}+\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ (1eq) |  | 50 |

### 2.17 Investigation of the Reduction of Oxindole 104 to Indole 105 and

 Indoline 106Scheme 36


105/106, 4:1 to $2: 1$
When oxindole 104 is treated with $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ in THF, there are two products formed. Indole $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ is the desired compound and indoline $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ is the undesired compound (Scheme 36). This reaction developed by Cushing is a very challenging one, considering the very restricted requirement of the reducing agent and the substrate being an N -unsubstituted oxindole. When other reducing agents ( $1.0 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{BH}_{3}$ in THF) were used, there was no reaction. Unfortunately, the ratio of $\mathbf{1 0 5 / 1 0 6}$ can vary in different batch reactions from $4: 1$ to $2: 1$. Since this reaction is the 12 th step of a 14 step synthesis, the loss of compound 106 as a by-product is a very big problem. Indoline 106 is presumably formed from the reduction of iminium 121 with excess $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ (Scheme 37).

Therefore, we believed that minimizing the amount of reducing agent would be helpful for maximizing the formation of the desired indole 105. $\mathrm{LiAl}(\mathrm{OtBu})_{3} \mathrm{H}$ has been examined as the reducing agent since each molecule of $\mathrm{LiAl}(\mathrm{OtBu})_{3} \mathrm{H}$ can only contribute one hydride as the reducing agent. Unfortunately, there was no reaction occurring for different equivalents of $\mathrm{LiAl}(\mathrm{OtBu})_{3} \mathrm{H}$ alone or in combination with $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. For the $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ reducing condition, the real mechanism of this reaction is still not clear. One possibility is that the actual reducing agent is $\mathrm{BH}_{3}$, which can be formed in situ from the reduction of $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$. Another possibility is that the Lewis acid properties of $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ activate the oxindole to reduction and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ or a similar species
actually does the reduction. During the $\mathrm{LiAl}(\mathrm{OtBu})_{3} \mathrm{H}$ experiment, the oxindole amide hydrogen may react with the hydride of $\mathrm{LiAl}(\mathrm{OtBu})_{3} \mathrm{H}$, giving off $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ to yield an amide anion-aluminum salt, which is inert to further reduction.

Scheme 37



The question remains, can we find a way to convert $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ and solve this problem in an indirect manner? Tim Cushing treated 106 with salcomine, bubbling $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ through the reaction solution, but unfortunately, no reaction occurred. There are some reports in the literature ${ }^{31}$ mentioning that DDQ can oxidize an indoline to an indole but no reaction conditions are reported. When a solution of $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was treated with solid DDQ, the color of the solution changed instantly. After $10-15 \mathrm{~min}$, all the starting material 106 was converted into the desired compound 105 . On a small scale, when $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was used as a solvent, the yield was quantitative. On a large scale, THF is the best solvent, and the reaction usually gives greater than $90 \%$ yield (Scheme 38).

## Scheme 38




### 2.18 Optimization Investigation of the t-Butyldimethylsilylation Reaction of Hydroxyindole 105

Scheme 39


Tim Cushing found that when 105 was treated with TBSCI and imidazole in DMF at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was very slow, because the secondary hydroxy group of $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ is adjacent to a gemdimethyl substituted carbon. When the mixture was warmed to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\operatorname{TBSCl}(2 \mathrm{eq})$ and imidazole ( 7 eq ) were used, the yield was $82 \%$. Initially, when I repeated this reaction on a small scale, there was always starting material remaining and the reaction was very slow. The yield is about $40 \%$. TBSOTf is a more reactive silylating
reagent and reacts with indole $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ to give very little desired product. TLC shows many products including the $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}$-double silylation product. (Scheme 40).
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It has been shown that TBS ether formation of hindered alcohols is very sensitive to the concentration of the reactants. Therefore, if we increase the equivalents of TBSCl and decrease the amount of DMF used, the yield will be higher. The optimized conditions found are: $\mathrm{TBSCl}(3 \mathrm{eq})$, imdazole ( 7 eq ) and at $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $\mathrm{SM}: \mathrm{DMF} / 1 \mathrm{mmol}: 2 \mathrm{~mL}$. The latter provides product 107 with greater than $95 \%$ yield.

### 2.19 McWhorter's Route to 6,7-Dihydroxyindole 101

In 1996 McWhorter and $\mathrm{Savall}^{32}$ reported a short and efficient synthesis of 6,7Dihydroxyindole (101) (Scheme 41) which was the intermediate for the synthesis of dioxepin-indole sub-unit (60) (Scheme 25). They used the methodology of Gassman and co-workers to form 101 in four steps with an overall yield of $35 \%$ from a commercially available starting material 2,3-dimethoxybenzoic acid (121).

2,3-Dimethoxybenzoic acid (121) was converted to 2,3-dimethoxyaniline by the Yamada modification of the Curtius rearrangement followed by hydrolysis of the resulting urethane (Scheme 41). 2,3-Dimethoxyaniline (122) was converted to 3-(methylthio)-6,7dimethoxyoxindole (123) by means of a modified Gassman oxindole synthesis. Ethyl methylthioacetate was chlorinated with sulfuryl chloride and reacted with 2,3dimethoxyaniline (122) in the presence of 1,8-bis(dimethylamino)naphthylene to produce an azasulfonium salt, which was in turn treated with triethylamine to bring about the rearrrangement of the azasulfonium ylide to afford the ethyl ester of 2-amino-3,4-dimethoxy-a-(methylthio)benzeneacetic acid. This acic was treated with acetic acid to yield oxindole (123) in $80 \%$ overall yield. This oxindole (123) was desulfurized with Raney nickel to give 6,7-dimethoxyoxindole (124) in 62\% yield. 6,7-Dimethoxyoxindole (124) was demethylated with $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ to produce of 6,7-Dihydroxyindole (101) in $86 \%$ yield.

The McWhorter's route is short and give overall high yield. This approach may be the optimal method for the synthesis of dihydroxyindole (101). However, the experimental part of this work only demonstrated relatively small scale synthesis. In Cushing's route to oxyindole 101, each step except the hydrogenation one can be carried out on about hundred gram-scale without chromatography purification and provides $\sim 40$ grams of 6,7dihydroxyindole (101) in a single run. According to our experience, if we need to make $30-40$ grams of compound 60, about 200 grams of 6,7-dihydroxyindole (101) is required.
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Scheme 42 Cushing's Synthetic Route to Dioxepin-indole 60








Scheme 43 The Improved Synthesis of Dioxepin-indole Subunit 60


### 2.2 The Synthesis of Diketopiperazine Subunit

According to the retrosynthetic plan for (-)-paraherquamide A illustrated in Scheme21, the coupling between diketopiperazine (DKP) subunit 71 and the dioxepinindole subunit 60 can lead to the synthesis of compound 70. Here we will discuss the synthesis of DKP 71.

### 2.21 Retrosynthetic Analysis of the Proline Derivative 125

DKP 71 and its analogs can be synthesized from proline derivative 125 (a representative of compound $\mathbf{7 3}, \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{Bn}$ ) and glycine derivative 74. The benzyl ether group at the $\beta$-position of the proline ring in compound 125 was our first generation protecting group. The synthetic route using intermediate 125 with the benzyl ether protecting group did not lead to the successful synthesis of $(-)$-paraherquamide $A$. The successful route used a MOM ether as the protecting group. In order to present the research results in a logical way, we chose compound $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ as the example in our retrosynthetic analysis (Scheme 44).


Basically, there are two different places where we can disconnect the bonds in compound $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ from a retrosynthetic point of view. One position is bond a, and the other is bond $\mathbf{b}$. Each of them can lead to either racemic or asymmetric syntheses of the proline subunit 125. The details of our investigation of the synthetic approaches to $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ depicted in Scheme 44 will be discussed in the following sections.

## Scheme 44
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### 2.22 Known Synthetic Methods Related to Proline Subunit 125

In 1983, Seebach and coworkers ${ }^{26}$ developed a method to make optically active $\alpha$ substituted proline derivatives (Scheme 45 ). The enolate formed from aminal 45 reacted with a variety of alkylating reagents to produce the $\alpha$-substituted aminal 46 and its analogs. These products can only be hydrolytically cleaved with $15 \%-48 \% \mathrm{HBr}$ at refluxing temperature to give the $\alpha$-substituted proline derivative. Compound 46 and its analogs react with lithium amide to give the $\alpha$-substituted amide 47 and its analogs. They also
found that the enolate formed from $\mathbf{4 5}$ only reacted with activated alkylating reagents. Comparing the $\alpha$-substituted proline derivatives made by Seebach's method with the required compound $\mathbf{1 2 5}$, which has the $\beta$-benzyl ether group, the acid-labile TBS ether group and double bond, obviously this method can not be used to synthesize this intermediate of (-)-paraherquamide A.
Scheme 45


The initial Ph.D. project of Cushing ${ }^{33}$ in the Williams group was to synthesize (-)paraherquamide A . He investigated the racemic synthesis of analogs of $\mathbf{1 2 5}$, and the results are outlined below (Scheme 46). A mixture of diastereomers 136, synthesized from the Michael addition of $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ to methyl vinyl ketone, was treated with different bases and an excess of allyl iodide. Cushing hoped to alkylate both the $\alpha-\mathrm{C}$ position and the tertiary alcohol at the same time, since an allyl ether protecting group can be easily removed. In spite of his efforts, this approach was unsuccessful due to there being no $\alpha$-alkylation. Apparently, the proline derivative 136 is sterically too congested for the reaction to take place.

## Scheme 46



To avoid this problem, he thought it might be easier to incorporate the allyl group prior to the cyclization. Compound 138 was made from 2-amino-4-pentenoic acid in two steps in $66 \%$ yield and was subjected to the same cyclization conditions as ester 135 , however none of the desired compound 139 was found. The only material isolated was the N alkylated derivative 140 (Scheme 47).

Scheme 47


The attempted alkylation of racemic oxazolone $\mathbf{8 2}$ with methyl vinyl ketone gave ketone 141, and none of the cyclization product 142 was formed (Scheme 48).

Scheme 48


### 2.23 Racemic Synthesis of Proline Subunit 125

Our goal was the stereocontrolled asymmetric synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A. Two methods relating to the synthesis of proline subunit $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ are reviewed in section 2.22. Although these methods can provide us with important information, none of them can be used for the synthesis of compound 125. Basically, there is no known synthetic method available for the construction of this type of compound. Generally, developing a racemic synthetic method should be easier than developing an asymmetric one. According to this idea, we decided to carry out a racemic synthesis of $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ and then use $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ as an
intermediate to further make DKP $71(\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{Bn})$. This racemic approach can give us very useful information and guidelines for the asymmetric synthesis of compound $\mathbf{1 2 5}$. The retrosynthetic analysis of racemic proline subunit $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ is shown in Scheme 49.

Scheme 49.


Compound 125 can be obtained from ketone 143 through the reduction of the ketone to the corresponding alcohol, protection of the alcohol as the benzyl ether followed by deprotection of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group. If the enolate, formed from $\beta$-ketoester 131, undergoes alkylation with iodide 127 , it will provide the $\alpha$-substituted $\beta$-ketoester 143 . Theoretically, this racemic approach can also be used to make the optically active proline derivatives 144 a and 144 b. $\beta$-Ketoester 144 can be treated with a chiral organic acid

HA* to provide a mixture of diastereomeric salts of 145 a and 145 b . Separation of 145 a and $\mathbf{1 4 5 b}$ and subsequent neutralization with ammonia will provide the optically active compounds 144 a and 144 b.

Westermann and coworkers ${ }^{34}$ reported a method which used pig liver esterase (PLE) to affect a kinetic resolution of $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$-ketoester 146 (Scheme 50). In a pH 8 phosphate buffer media and at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, PLE hydrolyzed one of the enantiomers of compound 146 much faster than the other one. After a certain period of time (depending on different substrates, the required time is different), the reaction was quenched and work-up provided the optically active $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$-ketoester 147. Theoretically, the $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$-ketoester 143 or 144 can also be used to undergo a PLE-catalyzed kinetic resolution to provide the required optically active $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$-ketoester, which can then be utilized for the synthesis of (-)paraherquamide A .

Scheme 50


Condition: pH 8, phosphate buffer, $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

| R | $\underline{e e \%}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 99 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{7}$ | 70 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ | 99 |
| $\mathrm{PhCH}_{2}$ | no reaction after 48 h |

At the initial stage of the racemic synthesis, optimization of the synthesis of allyl iodide derivative 127 was not our top priority. Our focus is to quickly find a route for the synthesis of proline derivative 125 and its analogs and further convert them into the corresponding diketopiperazines (DKP). Prenyl bromide is a commercially available reagent and structurally similar to allylic iodide derivative 127 . Therefore, prenyl bromide

## Scheme 51



158
was used as the alkylation reagent for $\beta$-ketoester 131. A model synthetic study for $\alpha$ -prenyl- $\beta$-methoxylmethyl ether diketopiperazine $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ is depicted in Scheme 51.

At the time when compound $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ was our target, there was no known method for its preparation of 131. Rapport et al. ${ }^{35}$ in 1964 reported a similar synthesis of compound

163 (Scheme 52). Compound 160 has an ethyl carbamate protecting group at the nitrogen. When 160 was treated with KOtBu in toluene at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, two regioisomers 161

## Scheme 52



and 162 were formed. The synthesis of 163 used a more complex route than the one shown in Scheme 51 for our synthesis of 131. We proposed a Michael addition and N-tBOC protection approach. In order to successfully synthesize $(-)$-paraherquamide $A$, these two steps should be feasible in terms of yield, scale and require no flash column chromatography. Michael addition of ethyl glycinate to ethyl acrylate in the presence of EtOH and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ provided 150 in $67 \%$ yield, and this was the best condition among eight different conditions examined. Compound 150 can be made on a several hundred gramscale using vacuum distillation as the purification process. t-BOC protection of $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ gave 151 in $95 \%$ yield which again was purified by vacuum distillation. Dieckman condensation of 151 by treatment with $\mathrm{KOt}-\mathrm{Bu}$ in toluene at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (a slightly modified condition of Rapport) provided the desired isomer 131 and the by-product $\mathbf{1 5 2}$, which were separated by extracting 152 with pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer. The principle of this separation is as follows: because of the steric interaction between $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group at the $\mathrm{N}-1$ position and the ethoxycarbonyl group at the $\mathrm{C}-2$ position of compound $\mathbf{1 3 1}$, it is not easy to form an enolate for 131 under pH 10 condition, and therefore it can not be extracted by the sodium carbonate buffer. For compound 152, there is no 1,2 -interaction as in compound

131, and the $\beta$-ketoester moiety can be easily deprotonated and reacted with pH 10 carbonate buffer to form an enolate which is water soluble. A lot of effort was invested to run this reaction successfully on a large scale in a practical manner. The purified intermediate 131 (distilled) still contained some starting material 151 and was used as a mixture in the following alkylation step as well as in the Baker's yeast reduction procedure which will be discussed at a later stage. Six different conditions were examined for the alkylation, and the reaction conditions $\left(\mathrm{NaH} / \mathrm{DME}, 45-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ was the best one to provide 153. Several conditions were examined for the deprotection of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group in 153 , including TFA/ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ or room temperature), $3.28 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl} / \mathrm{EtOAc}$ (at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ or room temperature) and $\mathrm{ZnBr} / 2 / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, but only $\mathrm{TFA} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ conditions provided the desired compound in about $10 \%$ yield. We decided to reduce the ketone moiety and protect the formed alcohol before deprotecting the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group, in hopes of solving this problem. Ketone ester 153 was treated with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ in MeOH to provide 154 as a diastereomeric mixture, which was reacted with MOMCl to afford methoxymethyl ether 155 in $66 \%$ yield. There are three reasons that we chose the methoxymethyl ether as our protecting group. First, it can withstand many different reaction conditions required during the synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A (the benzyl ether protecting group may be even better than the methoxymethyl ether in terms of stability). Second, the methoxymethyl ether can be introduced easily, and third, it can be deprotected under mild conditions. The protocol $\left(\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ developed by Nigam et al. ${ }^{36}$ can be used to selectively deprotect a secondary amine $t$-BOC group in the presence of a primary amine $t$-BOC group in a mild and almost neutral manner. When 155 was treated with $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ at room temperature, the desired amine 156 was obtained in $50 \%$ yield. At the later stage of this project when the optimal work-up procedure was used, usually greater than $95 \%$ yield can be obtained for other similar substrates. Compound 156 was then treated with bromoacetyl bromide to give 157 in $97 \%$ yield under Schotten-Baumann condition. Displacement of the bromine with ammonia in methanol solution followed by in-situ cyclization of the amino-
ester intermediate provided racemic trans-DKP149. The cis-(ester group and MOM ether group are in a cis-relationship) compound 158 could not cyclize to give the corresponding DKP compound. A possible explanation will be discussed later.

After the successful synthesis of DKP 149, the real synthetic target 171 was made following a similar route (Scheme 53). Epoxide 165, commercially available or made from the epoxidation of isoprene by m-CPBA, was treated with $n-\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NI}$ and TBSCl to provide iodide 127 as a $\sim 5 / 1$ mixture of $E / Z$ isomers in $58 \%$ yield. Alkylation of $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ by treatment with NaH and iodide 127 afforded 166 , which was then reduced to the alcohol with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ followed by benzyl ether formation to give intermediate 169 as a diastereomeric mixture. Bromide 170 was obtained from 169 through a two-step process involving the deprotection of the N -t-BOC group by $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ (in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) followed by bromoacetate formation. Aminolysis of the bromide $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ with a solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ in MeOH gave the trans -isomer DKP 171 and the cis-isomer aminoester compound 172. DKP 171 was produced from the cyclization of the in situ formed trans amino ester compound. However, the cyclization of aminoester 172 to the corresponding DKP requires much stronger conditions, and therefore 172 was obtained as an aminoester.

The synthetic approach to racemic DKP 171 was completed in 12 steps. The majority of the transformations proceed in very good yield and under mild classical conditions. We not only learned that racemic 125 can be made from the alkylation approach of proline $\beta$-ketoester 131, but also that this alkylated compound can be transformed into DKP 171, a proposed key intermediate for the synthesis of paraherquamide A .

Scheme 53






### 2.24 Asymmetric Synthesis of Proline Subunit 125

### 2.24.1 Lactone Alkylation Approach

We first investigated the lactone (83) alkylation approach illustrated in Scheme 54.
Scheme 54



Williams lactone 173, discovered in the Williams group for the synthesis of $\alpha$ amino acids, was treated with TFA to provide amine 82. Theoretically, Michael addition of 82 to methyl acrylate or reaction with $\beta$-halogen propionate should provide 174 . We examined a variety of Michael acceptors, various bases, different temperatures, and solvents, but none of these reactions gave the desired compound. It is presumably the sterically hindered environment which renders this secondary amine less nucleophilic. The only successful Michael addition reaction is shown in Scheme 55. Compound 141 was formed by the reaction of $\mathbf{8 2}$ with methyl vinyl ketone, but the subsequent aldol reaction to form 142 did not occur.

Scheme 55


An alternative synthetic plan is depicted in Scheme 56 . but did not have time to investigate this approach. Addition of the boron enolate formed from CBz-lactone 175 to aldehyde $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ can provide alcohol 177. This type of reaction is presented in a paper published by Miller et al. ${ }^{37}$ Alcohol 177 is then treated with TBAF to provide a diol which can be selectively mesylated at the primary alcohol. Deprotection of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CBz}$ group and in situ cylization of the amino mesylate intermediate will afford alcohol 178. Oxidation of 178 should provide compound 83 , and a similar reaction was done by myself for a different substrate in good yield. Finally, the $\alpha$-alkylation of $\mathbf{8 3}$ with iodide $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ is expected to give the desired compound 179.

Scheme 56



### 2.24.2 Asymmetric $\alpha$-Alkylation of Proline $\beta$-Ketoester via Chiral Enamine Intermediate

According to the retrosynthetic analysis, a chiral nonracemic compound $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ can be synthsized from the $\alpha$-alkylation of compound $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ in which there is a chiral functional group ( $\mathrm{FG}^{*}$ ) introduced at the $\beta$-position of the proline ring (Scheme 57). Based on this idea, a chiral enamine moiety was introduced at the $\beta$-position of $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ which is an equivalent of $\mathbf{1 8 2}$, an intermediate formed from the chiral enamine $\mathbf{1 8 3}$ with $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$.

Scheme 57
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In 1984, Koga and coworkers ${ }^{38}$ developed methodology for the asymmetric alkylation of $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$-ketoesters to form $\alpha, \alpha$-dialkyl- $\beta$-ketoesters by using enamine 184 as the chiral intermediate. One of their substrate was the cyclohexanone ester derivative 184 (Scheme 58). The bases, solvents, solvent/cosolvent ratio, alkylating reagents and reaction temperature all affect the diastereoselectivity of the products.

## Scheme 58



At first we proposed to use $\alpha$-methyl benzyl amine as the chiral auxiliary in compound 183. After Koga and coworker's paper was considered, we decided to follow their protocol. The synthetic investigation towards chiral nonracemic $\mathbf{1 8 9}$ is diagrammed in Scheme $59 . \beta$-Ketoester 131 was condensed with S -valine t -butyl ester by using $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, $\mathrm{TsOH}, \mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ in refluxing benzene to provide $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ in almost quantitative yield. Enamine 186 is not very stable. When purified by silica gel chromatography, compound 186 decomposes to starting material. Even when stored at room temperature for 1-2 days, 186 decomposes slowly. A solution of $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ in toluene/HMPA at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was treated with $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$ followed by addition of prenyl bromide providing a mixture of several compounds on TLC. After preparative TLC purification, one of the major spots was obtained as an oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR indicated that it contained all the required peaks corresponding to the desired compound 188. Due to the presence of rotamers and/or possible diastereomers, the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR is very complex, and interpretation was difficult. The stereochemistry of $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ was assigned arbitrarily. Surprisingly, when 188 was treated with $\mathrm{HOAc} / \mathrm{NaOAc}(\mathrm{pH} 4)$ or 1 N HCl , typical conditions ${ }^{39}$ for the cleavage of an imine, no reaction took place. However, when $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ was condensed with hydroxylamine catalyzed by $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, oxime 189 was formed very cleanly. The racemic version of 189 , was also synthesized through a two-step process from 131. It turned out that both of these products from two different routes showed the same mobility on TLC and the same ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. The approach shown in Scheme 59 demonstrates that the $\beta$-ketoester alkylation method through a chiral enamine intermediate can result in the asymmetric synthesis of $\alpha$-alkyl- $\beta$ substituted proline derivatives. There are several drawbacks which prevent this method from being used in the real synthesis of $(-)$-paraherquamide A. First, enamine $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ is not stable enough to be stored for even two days. Second, the diastereoselectivity of the asymmetric alkylation product depends on too many factors, and this is not good news for an asymmetric synthesis, especially on large scale. Third, imine 188 is too stable to be hydrolyzed into the corresponding ketone.
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### 2.24.3 Intramolecular Epoxide Opening-Amination Approach and

 Intramolecular Amido-Mercuration ApproachThese two approaches have some similarity and are discussed here in the same section. For the intramolecular epoxide opening-amination approach (Eq I), there is one literature example published in $1993 .{ }^{40}$ (Scheme 60). The N-t-BOC protected epoxide 192 was treated with HCl to remove the t -BOC group and gave the corresponding amine hydrochloric acid salt. Neutralization with NaOH allowed the free amino group to attack the epoxide and provided pyrrolidine 193.

The synthetic plan for chiral nonracemic compound $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ is outlined in Scheme 61. The synthesis of aldehyde 197 and ester 199 should be straightforward. The coupling reaction between 197 and 199 (Horner-Emmons reaction) ${ }^{41,42,43}$ should proceed without any problem. The only uncertainty is the olefin $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ selectivity. The required isomer $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ is the Z configuration, and there are several factors which influence the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ selectivity.

Scheme 60
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By examining all the possible factors, the desired Z isomer 200 can be obtained as the major isomer. Imidate cleavage with hydrazine followed by protection of the nitrogen as its t-BOC derivative will provide compound 201. Sharpless epoxidation using (-)-DET can give epoxide 202, which is then treated with $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to induce cyclization on the epoxide and provide the desired diol 203.

## Scheme 61








A model study was carried out and is summarized in Scheme 61 and 62. A solution of 194 and 195 in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ was refluxed to provide alcohol 196 which was then oxidized to aldehyde 197. Compound 204 was obtained in $65 \%$ yield from the alkylation of $\mathbf{1 9 8}$ by the treatment of NaH in DMF. Horner-Emmons reaction between 204 and 197 gave a mixture of $\mathbf{2 0 5}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ in a 1:4 ratio. The required Z isomer $\mathbf{2 0 5}$ was the minor isomer. Since this approach has too many steps and the set-up for the Sharpless epoxidation reaction is not very convenient ${ }^{44,}$ this is therefore not the best approach for the total synthesis of paraherquamide $A$. We decided to dismiss this approach. With further optimization, a practical but longer synthetic route based on this intramolecular epoxide opening-amination approach might prove feasible.

Scheme 62



205



198


206

In Eq II (Scheme 60), a similar strategy using an intramolecular amido-mercuration approach to build diol 191 is depicted. Takahata and coworkers ${ }^{45}$ reported a similar case (Scheme 63) in 1997.

Scheme 63



Sharpless kinetic resolution of racemic alcohol 207 provided the optically active compounds 208 (36\%) and 210 (33\%). Olefin 208 was subsequently used for the intramolecular amido-mecuration reaction to give intermediate 211 followed by work-up with $\mathrm{O}_{2} / \mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ in DMF to provide diol 212 in $64 \%$ yield. According to this idea, a synthetic plan for compound 219 is illustrated in Scheme 64.

The synthesis of aldehyde 216 will follow normal procedures and should have no problems. The addition of boron enolate, formed from Evans oxazalone 215, to aldehyde 216 is expected to give alcohol 217 . The transformation of 217 to amino alcohol 218 follows a similar four-step process ${ }^{46}$. The last three steps follow the procedure developed by Takahata and coworkers ${ }^{45}$ as shown in Scheme 63. Due to the success of the $\alpha$ alkylation of cis- $\beta$-hydroxy proline ester $\mathbf{1 2 9}$, we did not attempt to investigate this plan.

Scheme 64
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1) $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}$
2) MOMCl
3) $\mathrm{Hg}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$
4) $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}, \mathrm{O}_{2}$, DMF
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### 2.24.4 $\alpha$-Alkylation Approach of $\beta$-Hydroxy Proline Ester 129

Scheme 65


The retrosynthetic analysis of this approach is illustrated in Scheme 65. Amino ester 125 can be obtained from alcohol 220a by several functional group transformations. These transformations were done previously during the racemic series synthesis. Aminoester $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ can be used to synthesize the corresponding diketopiperazine (DKP)
which was designed to be the key intermediate for the total synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A. The methodology which remains to be developed is the $\alpha$-alkylation of cis- $\beta$ hydroxyproline ethylester 129. By using this method, compound 220a and analogs can be made. The idea for the stereoselective $\alpha$-alkylation of ester $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ is as follows: when the dianion of compound 129 reacts with alkylating reagents, the alkoxide at the $\beta$-position of 129 will induce the incoming alkyl group anti-to the alkoxide due to the 1,2 -induction and therefore provide the desired stereoisomer 220a. The regioselectivity issue, whether $\alpha-\mathrm{C}$ or $\beta-\mathrm{O}$ alkylation occurs, can be answered only by experimental result. However, from literature reports, ${ }^{52.53}$ the ratio of polar aprotic solvent in a co-solvent reaction media has a profound effect on the ratio of $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{O}$ alkylations.

A literature search found reports by Frater and coworkers, ${ }^{47,48}$ in which the investigation of $\alpha$-alkylation of chiral cis-ethyl-2-hydroxy-cyclohexanecarboxylate 221 (Scheme 66) was carried out. The cis (222) and trans (223) compounds were obtained in a $94.5 / 5.5$ ratio with a combined $72 \%$ yield. The conditions are as follows: to a LDA (2.5 eq) solution at $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in THF was added a solution of $\mathbf{2 2 1}$ in THF, and the reaction mixture was stirred at $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min to give a dianion solution of $\mathbf{2 2 1}$. At this time, a mixture of allylic bromide in HMPA ( 4.2 eq ) was added to the above dianion solution. After the reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min at $32{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, it was quenched with a $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution followed by normal work-up to provide $\mathbf{2 2 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 2 3}$ in $\mathbf{7 2} \%$ yield.

## Scheme 66



First, we needed to make chiral nonracemic proline ester 129. Three different groups have reported the synthesis of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ through yeast-mediated bio-transformation (Scheme 67). The method ${ }^{49}$ in Eq I gave 225 in $80 \%$ yield with $>99 \%$ e.e., but the yeast

Dipodascus sp was not available. Sibi et al. ${ }^{50}$ (Eq II) used the CBz substrate 226 and immobilized baker's yeast as the reducing reagent to synthesize the corresponding CBzalcohol in $85 \%$ yield (I repeated this reaction in $40 \%$ yield). CBz cleavage $\left(\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$ ) and in-situ protection of the amine using $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}$ gave 129 in $90 \%$ yield. For the immobilized baker's yeast reduction conditions, the work-up process was much easier than the normal yeast conditions. The only drawbacks are the low yield of this reaction and the extra protection step needed to make 129. The method ${ }^{51}$ we used for the synthesis of (-)paraherquamide A is shown in Eq III. Although it gave 129 in $90 \%$ e.e., it usually provides 129 in high yields ( $80-83 \%$ ) on a large scale.

## Scheme 67
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Table 4 tabulates the results of our study of the $\alpha$-alkylation reaction. First, we have used prenyl bromide as our model alkylating reagent. When the same reaction conditions as reported by Frater was used, only the O-alkylation product was produced. We believe this result was due to the excess molar equivalents of HMPA used. When the
quantity of HMPA used was 10 eq or 8.4 eq again only O-alkylation occurred. Once the molar equivalents of HMPA was lowered to 2.3 eq or 1 eq , the desired $\alpha$-C-alkylation product was obtained in $73 \%$ yield, and only a minor amount of O-alkylation was produced. For entry 5, the real allylic iodide derivative 127 was the alkylating reagent, and the desired product 220a was obtained in $45-70 \%$ yield. Employing $\mathrm{NaN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$ as the base did not give any desired product. Other polar apotic solvents such as DMPU and TMEDA were also examined. DMPU was not as good as HMPA in terms of yield, and for TMEDA there was no reaction. In summary, we found that the absence of HMPA produced no alkylation reaction while an excess of HMPA gave only O-alkylation product.

## Table 4

Entry

THF:HMPA (3:1), $\mathrm{NaN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$
1
$-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h} ; 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}$



THF, LDA,SM, $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
2
$-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min} ; 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min}$
$-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{Br} \sim=<_{\mathrm{Me}}^{\mathrm{Me}}+\mathrm{HMPA}(2.3 \mathrm{eq})$
$23-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 70 \mathrm{~min}$
THF, LDA, SM, $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
$-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min} ; 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min}$
3
,
$23-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 70 \mathrm{~min}$

major minor

THF, LDA,SM, $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 3-4 \mathrm{~min}$
$-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min} ; 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 7 \mathrm{~min}$
$4 \quad 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
$23-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 60 \mathrm{~min}$
OA only

THF, LDA,SM, $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
$-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{~min} ; 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5 \mathrm{~min}$
$-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$,

$0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 50 \mathrm{~min} ; \mathrm{rt}, 4 \mathrm{~h}$


1) LDA is the required base
2) Reverse addition of starting material is required
3) No HMPA, no reaction

Too much HMPA, only O-alkylation
$1-3$ eq is good for C-alkylation
4) HMPA is the best solvent
5) Only one diastereomer is formed

Scheme 68
Simplified conditions for the formation of compound 220a


> *different batches of 129 required distinct equiv. of HMPA ranging from $1.5,4.5,9.7$ to 13.7 eq.

| Entry | RX | \% Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a | $\square \mathrm{Me}$ | 70\% |
| $b$ |  | 73\% |
| c |  | 53\% |
| d | $1-\mathrm{CH}$ | 57\% |
| e |  | 49\% |

After the successful synthesis of 220 a and 220 b, we decided to extend this methodology to other activated or nonactivated alkylating reagents. The results are shown in Scheme 68. Compounds 220c-e were obtained in good yield. The simplified condition was used only for the large scale synthesis of 220a. The difference between the two conditions is in the procedure for forming the dianion while the work-up is the same. The simplified condition (LDA in THF at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, addition of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ in THF, then at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 35 min ) to form the dianion of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ is much simpler than the old one. Therefore, the simplified condition to form the dianion can also be used for the $\alpha$-alkylation of other alkylating agents. In each case, only one diastereomer was formed, and little or no O-monoalkylated or O-, C-dialkylated by-products were produced. These highly stereoselective alkylation reactions all proceeded with net retention of configuration giving a single diastereomer as
evidenced by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and other analytical data including the X-ray analysis of 220 e (Figure 1) and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of the t -BOC-deprotected derivative of compound 220a. The relative and absolute stereochemistry of the alkylation products was rigorously secured through a single crystal X-ray analysis for $\mathbf{2 2 0 e}$ (Figure 1). Chemical correlation was used to determine the relative and absolute stereochemistry of 220a (Scheme 69). We also attempted to use a NOE method to determine the relative stereochemistry of all the $\alpha$ alkylated products, but the results were inconclusive. The relative, and thus, absolute stereochemistry was assigned based on similarities in nmr spectroscopic characteristics and optical rotation.

The dianion 227 derived from 129 is expected to have a concave shape due to a Li coordinated bicyclic [4.3.0] ring system geometry. Alkylation from the convex face opposite the alkoxy substituent is the expected (and observed) diastereofacial bias.


The chemical correlation method used for the absolute and relative stereochemistry determination of 220a is outlined in Scheme 69. Barton deoxygenation of 220a through a two-step process provided ester 229 , which was then treated with $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ to remove the N t -BOC group followed by reaction with bromoacetyl bromide to afford bromide 231. Aminolysis of 231 and in-situ cyclization resulted in DKP 232. Aldehyde 233, a known compound synthesized during the synthesis of $(+)$-paraherquamide $B$, was converted to DKP 235, an enantiomer of 232. DKP 232 and 235 have the exact same ${ }^{1} H$ NMR, IR and mobility on TLC. These facts indicate that DKP 232 and 235 have the same relative stereochemistry. DKP 232 has an optical rotation of $[\alpha]^{D_{25}}=+51.4$ (c 0.36, EtOAc) and DKP 235 has an optical rotation of $[\alpha]^{D_{25}}=-62.5$ (c 0.39, EtOAc). These opposite
optical rotations indicate that DKP 232 and 235 are enantiomers. Since DKP 232 is contaminated with a very minor amount of the Z isomer, we can not use the optical rotation of 232 to calculate its enantiomeric excess.

Scheme 69


Figure 1 The molecular structure of 220 e through X-ray analysis


Herein we will discuss the issue of $\alpha$-alkylation diastereoselectivity in more detail. In Scheme 70, chiral nonracemic DKP 240 was synthesized from compound 220a. In the aminolysis step ( $\mathbf{2 3 8}$ to $\mathbf{2 3 9}$ ), the amino ester compound $\mathbf{2 3 9}$ did not cyclize to give DKP 240 because it is the cis-isomer. However, the corresponding trans-isomer, which was made in the synthesis of the racemic series of compounds, can cyclize to give the corresponding DKP 171 (Scheme 72) under the aminolysis conditions. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of DKP 171 is very unique. For all the aminolysis reactions, the measured ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMRs of 239 and its analogs showed no formation of DKP 171 and its analogs. Based on these results, it was concluded that no trans-isomer was formed in the $\alpha$-alkylation step. Since the process of producing the dianion of compound 129 did not touch the hydroxy-attached chiral center at the $\beta$-position of 129 and only one stereoisomer was formed, the enantiomeric excess of all the $\alpha$-alkylated products should be the same as that of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ ( $>90 \%$ ee).

The total synthesis of paraherquamide A required large scale synthesis of 220a. There was a very interesting and unique phenomenon discovered during this large scale synthesis of 220 a . The first batch of compound 129 was synthesized on a 1.5 gram scale and was used to develop the $\alpha$-alkylation methodology. For this batch of $\mathbf{1 2 9}, 1.4$ equivalents of HMPA were found to be sufficient to make the alkylation reaction take place. If greater than four equivalents of HMPA were used, only the O-alkylation product was observed. The second batch of compound 129 was made on a 5 gram scale. The exact same conditions were used for the alkylation, but no reaction occurred and only starting material was recovered. After two weeks of investigation, it was discovered that 4.5 equivalents or more of HMPA were needed to make the alkylation reaction successful. Interestingly, the remaining $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ of the first batch only required 1.4 equivalents of HMPA in the same alkylation reaction. The third batch of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ was synthesized on a 30 gram scale, and 13.7 equivalents of HMPA were found to be necessary for the alkylation procedure. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR, IR ,TLC and specific optical rotation of these three batches of 129 were
identical. For the second batch of 129, this compound was repurified by distillation or column chromatography. However, the alkylation still required 4.5 equivalents or more of HMPA and showed no difference from the non-repurified same batch of 129. The reason ${ }^{54}$ for this phenomenon is still not clear. We also found that the yield of a 3 gram versus 2 gram scale reaction of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ were the same and the recovered starting material did not undergo the alkylation.

With enough 220a in hand, DKP 240 was synthesized from 220a according to the route shown in Scheme 70. Protection of the secondary alcohol of 220a as the benzyl ether ( $73 \%$ ), and subsequent deprotection of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group with $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ ( $99 \%$ ) followed by treatment with bromoacetyl bromide provided bromide 238 ( $78 \%$ ). Aminolysis of $\mathbf{2 3 8}$ was accomplished by the syringe pump-mediated addition of $\mathbf{2 3 8}$ in MeOH to an ammonia solution in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5.76 \mathrm{M})$ to avoid the formation of by-products such as the secondary and tertiary amines.

Scheme 70
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The amide formation step turned out to be quite difficult. In Scheme 71, the reaction conditions examined are illustrated. When toluene or EtOH was used as the solvent under room temperature or reflux, there was no reaction. DKP 240 was obtained in about $35 \%$ yield with the addition of NaH in THF. Toluene was a superior solvent compared to THF, and the yield was $53-60 \%$. However, there were some disadvantages for the toluene $/ \mathrm{NaH}$ ( 8 eq ) conditions. This reaction was not reproducible. Sometimes it was complete in 2 h , and sometimes there was no reaction even after 24 h . Eight equivalents of NaH were definitely required. The difficulty of this intramolecular amidation reaction lies in the sterichindrance of the $\alpha, \alpha$-disubstituted ethyl ester. There are two ways to overcome this problem. One approach was to activate the $\mathrm{RNH}^{\circ}$ anion and to render it more nucleophilic. The other approach was to activate the ester group by Lewis acid coordination to the carbonyl oxygen, hence increasing the electrophilicity of the carbonyl group. The RNHanion activation can be achieved by using HMPA or any other polar aprotic solvents which coordinate the sodium cation. Another alternative was to use Weinreb's ${ }^{55}$ aluminum amide to convert the ester to the corresponding amide. When three equivalents of HMPA were added, the amidation reaction proceeded very quickly and was finished within 2 h . Only two equivalents of NaH were needed to give a $53 \%$ yield, and this reaction was reproducible on a large scale.


There was an interesting observation regarding the DKP formation from the corresponding amino ester (for example 239 to 240 ). Several examples of this amide formation reaction are shown in Scheme 72.

Amino ester 239 (cis) has a diastereomer 168 (trans) that can be cyclized in MeOH at room temperature to provide $( \pm)$ DKP 171 in $>82 \%$ yield. In comparison, the cis-isomer 239 requires much stronger reaction conditions for cyclization. Compounds 241 and 149a exhibit the same behavior. We decided to spend some time investigating this phenomenon, and hoped to find an answer which will help us to understand more about this reaction and hopefully improve the yield of the cis-isomer cyclization.

Scheme 72
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## Figure 2



Cis 239



Trans 168


A and B are the two transition state models for cis-239 and trans-168 respectively (Figure 2). For the cis-compound, the transition state adopts a half chair-chair conformation (A). The large allylic group is in an axial position, and benzyl ether is also in an axial position. The carbonyl oxygen has a partial negative charge and the amino group has a partial positive charge. Due to the strong 1,3-axial-axial interaction between the benzyl ether group and hydrogen as well as the carbonyl group, the activation energy $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{A}}{ }^{*}$ for cyclization is higher than that of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{B}}{ }^{*}$. For trans-168, the transition state structure $\mathbf{B}$ has a lower activation energy $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{B}}{ }^{*}$ because the benzyl ether group is in the equatorial position. Therefore, the cyclization of the cis-isomer 239 is more difficult than that of trans-isomer 168. According to this model, if we change the protecting group at the $\beta$-position to a smaller one, the amide formation should be easier. Hydroxy bromide 246 was made from 220a in four steps (Scheme 73). 220a reacted with acetic anhydride catalyzed by DMAP to give acetate 243. Deprotection of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BOC}$ group with $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ followed by another deprotection of the acetate moiety with $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ provided hydroxy amine 245.

Treatment of 245 with one equivalent of bromoacetyl bromide under basic conditions afforded hydroxy bromide 246 in good yield. Aminolysis of 246 gave amine 247, which was cyclized in-situ in a solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ to afford DKP 248 in almost quantitative yield. Bromide 246 was also treated with a solution of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NH}_{2}$ in MeOH and DKP 249 was obtained in $>95 \%$ yield. In Scheme 72, the formation of DKP 242 (83\%), which has a smaller MOM ether protecting group at the $\beta$-position, was also much easier than that of compound 239. Therefore, the difficulty in cyclization of the cis-amino esters to the corresponding DKPs is in the order of $\mathrm{PhCH}_{2} \mathrm{O}>\mathrm{MOMO}>\mathrm{OH}$. These facts support the transition model drawn in Figure 2.

## Scheme 73



### 2.3 Two Connecting Methods between the Indole-dioxepin Subunit and

## Proline Derivatives

According to the synthetic strategy to access ( - --paraherquamide A, there were two methods envisioned for the connection of the indole-dioxepin subunit and the proline derivative. One approach was the dipeptide cyclization to the DKP (section 2.31), and the other was the Somei/Kametani coupling method. In this section, these two methods will be discussed in detail.

### 2.31 Dipeptide Cyclization to Diketopiperazine Method



Retrosynthetically, indole derivative 70 can be obtained from the cyclization of dipeptide 75. The coupling between compounds $\mathbf{6 0}$ and 76, and subsequent functional group transformations can provide intermediate 75. In fact, the coupling reaction between compounds 60 and 76 is the reaction which constructs the tryptophan derivative (right hand side amino acid of 75). The best available method is the one developed by Somei and Kametani et al. ${ }^{56,57}$ in 1981 (Scheme 74).

## Scheme 74
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Condition: $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$, reflux, 4 h
The malonates 250 and 251 and the nitro compound 252 were coupled with gramine 52 in the presence of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ in refluxing $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ to provide a variety of $\alpha$ substituted tryptophan derivatives or nitro indole 255. For the Somei/Kametani reaction, a relatively strong carbon acid ( $\mathrm{pKa}<12$ ) substrate (such as malonates $\mathbf{2 5 0}$ and 251, or nitro compound 252) is required. These substrates have two electron-withdrawing groups or an electron-withdrawing nitro group. Based on this method, ( $(-$-brevianamide B and (+)paraherquamide B were synthesized in the Williams group (Scheme75). In order to synthesize a suitable substrate for the Somei/Kametani type coupling reaction, two electronwithdrawing groups must be attached to the same carbon. Compound $\mathbf{6 1}$ was considered a reasonable substrate, and it was made from $\mathbf{2 5 6}$ by a two-step process. After the coupling
step, one of the electron-withdrawing groups must be removed to in order to make the tryptophan-type derivative. The whole process involves four steps.

## Scheme 75





2a, (+)-paraherquamide B
Can we find a substrate that has a relatively high pKa but will still couple with gramine derivatives to afford tryptophan-type compounds? Based my own experience with amino acids, imine protected glycine ester may be an appropriate substrate worth examining. In 1978, O'Donnell and coworkers ${ }^{58}$ developed a methodology for synthesizing racemic $\alpha$-amino acids from the stable Schiff base $\mathbf{2 5 9}{ }^{59}$ derived from glycine ethyl ester and benzophenone (Scheme 76).

## Scheme 76



Tryptophan and its analogs are $\alpha$-amino acids. The pKa of imine ester 259 is $18.8 .{ }^{59}$ Several related syntheses of tryptophan and derivatives was found through extensive literature search. Some researchers used lithium enolate to react with the gramine methiodide ${ }^{60.61}$. Others ${ }^{62,63}$ have used compound 259 in an alkylation reaction with gramine methiodide under phase transfer catalysis conditions.

The possible mechanism (I) of the Somei/Kametani reaction is shown in Scheme 77. Under refluxing $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$, gramine is in equilibrium with dimethylamine and 262 which can be attacked by the catalyst $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ to provide anion 263. Anion 263 can act as a base to abstract a proton from a relatively acidic carbon acid $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{CXY}$ to form the carbanion intermediate $\mathrm{HC} \times \mathrm{XY} . \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ reaction at the $\alpha$-carbon of 264 provides the coupling product 265 and returns the catalyst $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$. Another possible mechanism (II) in Scheme 77 shows some difference from the first one. In order to propagate this catalytic cycle, 263 must be a stronger base than anion HC XY or very close. The pKa value for the deprotonation of indole is $16.97 .{ }^{64}$ The pKa of $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ is 18.8 . These two pKa valves are very close. There is a good chance for imine $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ to undergo the Somei/Kametani reaction, because, in different solvent systems, the pKas of different substrates will respond differently. When imine 259 was treated with gramine under $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ catalysis in refluxing $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$, the desired coupling product (266) was obtained in $80 \%$ yield (Scheme 78).

Scheme 77

## Somei/Kametani Reaction
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Another method, the alkylation of the enolate formed from imine 259 and $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$ with gramine methiodide also provided $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ in $>80 \%$ yield (Scheme 78).

## Scheme 78



Based on the successful synthesis of 266, lactim ether 268, obtained from amide 240 in $77 \%$ yield (Scheme 79), was treated with gramine under Somei/Kamatani condition, but no reaction occurred. Lactim ether 270, a racemic diastereomer of 268, was treated with the base $\operatorname{LiN}(T M S)_{2}$ and gramine methiodide and produced no coupling product. Other bases such as $\mathrm{NaH}, \mathrm{LDA}$ and additives such as $15-\mathrm{C}-5$ were also used, but only the starting material lactim ether $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ or $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ were recovered. In a comparison of the pKa between 268 and $\mathbf{2 5 9}$, certainly the pKa of $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ is greater than that of $\mathbf{2 5 9}$. This pKa difference may reach the critical point such that the $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$-catalyzed reaction cycle can not occor. The reason for the lack of coupling between lactim ether $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ or $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ with gramine methiodide in the presence of strong base is still not clear.

## Scheme 79
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Initially, we reasoned that the anion was too stable and the lactim ether substrate was too hindered for reaction to occur. A much simple lactim ether 272 (Scheme 80), synthesized from proline, was treated with the same basic conditions. Although no starting material remained, no desired coupling product 273 was formed.

## Scheme 80
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Next, we decided to synthesize compound 70 by alkylation of compound 76 with gramine derivative 60 before ring closure to the DKP system. First, a model study was carried out (Scheme 81). Primary amine 239 was reacted with diphenyl imine ${ }^{65,66}$ to give the proline derivative 274. Compound 274 was treated with $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$ in THF/HMPA at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and then gramine methiodide was added at room temperature. After 2 h , the desired product 275 was obtained as a diastereomeric mixture in $42 \%$ yield. The anti-and syn-free amines 276 and 277 were obtained by deprotection of the diphenylimine with hydroxylamine. ${ }^{67,68}$ Compounds 276 and 277 were treated with NaH in toluene/HMPA repectively to give the anti-isomer 278 and the syn-isomer 279. The major anti-isomer 278 was converted into the lactim ether 280 followed by protection of the indole nitrogen as its t-BOC derivative, and TBAF-promoted t-butyldimethylsilyl ether deprotection to give lactim ether-alcohol 282. Compound 282 was a proposed intermediate for the stereocontrolled asymmetric synthesis of VM55599 ${ }^{13, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$, a structurally similar alkaloid to (-)-paraherquamide A . The approach shown here is a new method for the coupling reaction between a complex proline derivative and a tryptophan in order to form a diketopiperazine like 278 and 279. For the formation of $\mathbf{2 7 5}$, the Somei/Kametani reaction condition was also used on substrate 274, but the desired compound 275 was obtained in lower yield with a longer reaction time. The stereochemical assignment for amines 276/277 and diketopiperazines $278 / 279$ were based on similar intermediates made during the synthesis of breviamide $\mathrm{B},(+)$-paraherquamide B , and Kishi/Hutchison's work ${ }^{70}$. The syn-DKP 279 is more polar (lower Rf) and anti-DKP 278 is less polar (high Rf). The relative
polarity of the syn and anti diastereomers are the same as those of the corresponding proline-containing diketopiperazines (DKP). Westly and coworkers ${ }^{71}$ found that of various DKPs, the syn-isomer is the most polar, and the anti-isomer was the least polar on the TLC system. Additional evidence supporting these structural assignments will be discussed in the actual synthesis of $(-)$-paraherquamide A.

## Scheme 81







Scheme 82



Following the synthetic route of the model system, the synthetic approach to (-)paraherquamide A was devised as shown in Scheme 82. Gramine derivative 60 reacted with methyl iodide in THF to provide $\mathbf{2 8 3}$ in almost quantitative yield. Diphenyl imine derivative 274 was treated with $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a solvent system of THF/HMPA to provide the enolate intermediate, which was coupled with $\mathbf{2 8 3}$ to give a diphenyl imino dipeptide in $19 \%$ yield. Deprotection of the diphenyl imino group with hydroxylamine produced amine 284 in $55 \%$ yield. Compound 284 was then subjected to the standard cyclization conditions successfully used in the other diketopiperazine-forming reactions (HMPA/toluene/ NaH , at room temperature or reflux), but there was no reaction. Other conditions such as DMSO/NaH were also tried, and again there was no reaction. The only difference between amine 284, and amine 276 (anti-isomer), is that 284 has a tbutyldimethylsilyl (TBS) ether protected dioxepin ring fused to the indole ring. First, we believed that the TBS group was quite large, and this may force the molecule (284) to adopt a stable conformation that can not cyclize to the desired diketopiperazine. When the
intermediate without the TBS ether protecting group was treated with the same cyclization conditions, no reaction occurred. Due to the difficult cyclization reaction and the low yield ( $19 \%$ ) coupling reaction between compounds 274 and 283 , the cyclic dipeptide formation approach from the acyclic dipeptide was abandoned.

### 2.32 The Coupling between Benzyl Ether Substituted DKP and Gramine Derivative via Somei/Kametani Coupling Reaction

Benzyl ether substituted DKP 240 is the first candidate to undergo the Somei/Kametani coupling reaction. At the initial stage of planning for the synthesis of $(-)$-paraherquamide A, both benzyl ether and MOM ether protecting groups were carefully examined (including their stability towards all possible reaction conditions and the method of introducing and removing them). The benzyl ether group became our first choice due to its ease of introduction, stability to a variety of reaction conditions and its unique and neutral deprotection method. The only disadvantage of this protecting group is its steric bulkiness relative to the hydrogen atom found in ( + )-paraherquamide B, and we want the protecting group to be as small as possible in order to mimic the steric environment of the intermediates used in the synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B. The synthetic approach using benzyl ether DKP $\mathbf{2 4 0}$ is illustrated in Scheme 83.

The amide nitrogen of 240 was protected with a methoxycarbonyl group to provide 286 in $85-100 \%$ yield. When 286 was treated with $\operatorname{LiN}(T M S)_{2}(5 \mathrm{eq})$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and reacted with methyl chloroformate ( 7 eq ), a second methoxycarbonyl group was introduced at the $\alpha$-position of the glycine moiety in $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ to give 287 with the newly created chiral center as a single stereoisomer (as a mixture of $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ isomers) which was confirmed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR. Compound 287 was then reacted with gramine derivative 60 in the presence of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}$ (in refluxing $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ for $6 \mathrm{~h}, 52 \%$ ) to provide the syn-isomer 288 (a mixture of four diastereomers, $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ and $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{S}$ ) and the anti-isomer 289 (a mixture of four diastereomers) in a 3.3:1 ratio. The stereochemical assignment of $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ and $\mathbf{2 8 9}$ was based on their mobilities on TLC, the major less polar compound 288 possessing the syn-
configuration (but the allylic group is anti to the large indole ring, so $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ is less polar) and the minor more polar compound 289 being the anti-configuration.
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Although compound 288 was a mixture of four diastereomers and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR were complex, the high resolution mass spectrum (HRMS, $\mathrm{FAB}^{+}$) displayed the correct molecular mass. Both syn-and anti-isomers 288 and 289 smoothly underwent decarbomethoxylation [HMPA, $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.5 \mathrm{eq}), \mathrm{LiCl}(5 \mathrm{eq}), 100-105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 7-9 \mathrm{~h}\right]$ respectively to provide DKP 290 and $\mathbf{2 9 1}$ in a $1: 1.6$ ratio in $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ yield. The same result can be obtained for this reaction if a mixture of 288 and 289 were used. The stereochemical assignment of 290 and 291 were again based on their mobilities on TLC, the major more polar compound 291 possessing the syn-configuration, and the minor less polar compound 290 being the anti-configuration. The syn-isomer 291 was then treated with $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}(2.5 \mathrm{eq})\left[\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{eq})\right]$ to give a spot on TLC which had the exact same $R_{f}$ as the starting material 291 (Scheme 84). Several solvent systems were used (including EtOAc:hexane, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), but we did not achieve
any separation for the possible products and the starting material. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR indicated that the spot was a mixture of desired lactim ether 292, starting material 291 (292:291/~1:0.6) and some amide N -methylation product. Compound 291 was also treated with $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ ( 5.0 eq ) $\left[\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{eq})\right]$, under the condition used successfully in the synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B. However, the results were even worse. Considering the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ isomers, this spot is a mixture of twelve components. The subsequent protection of the indole nitrogen was accomplished by the reaction of 292 with ( BOC$)_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (DMAP, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ) in about $50 \%$ yield. Since the starting material was a mixture, the obtained 293 was also a mixture of the desired O-methylation and N -methylation compounds. Deprotection of both TBS ether groups with TBAF provided 294 as a mixture of many compounds. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS showed the product mixture contained the desired compound. Clearly, the lactim ether formation step was a major problem and can not be used in the total synthesis. Apparently, the $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ reagent is the best choice ${ }^{72}$ for this kind of transformation. Other reagents such as $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ are too harsh for the sensitive indole and lactim ether moiety and employing $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ may also produce amide N -methylation products ${ }^{73}$. Usually, the N - and O-methylation products are inseparable or very close in mobility on TLC. From our experience of working with the lactim ether formation reaction using $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$, the results strongly depend on the substrate. Usually you can obtain the desired product quickly in moderate to very good yield with trace amount of starting material remaining and no N-methylation. At other times, there is always a certain amount of starting material remaining no matter how many equiv. of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ are used and how long the reaction is run. If these substrates contain functional groups which are labile to $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$, too much $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ and longer reaction time will usually cause the starting material or product to decompose. Some typical reaction conditions are listed in Scheme 85.
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During the synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B, 296 was obtained from 295 in $81 \%$ yield under the conditions of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}(5 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ for 4-6 h. When the same conditions was applied to compound $\mathbf{2 4 0}$, the obtained products were the desilylated 240 (298) and desilylated lactim ether 297 in low yield, and if less $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ (1-2 eq) was used, there was starting material remaining even after 24 h . We finally found that $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ was a much better buffering reagent than $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$. Compound 240 smoothly underwent lactim ether formation with 1.5 equiv. of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$
(20 eq) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ within 4 h in $77 \%$ yield, with only a trace amount of starting material remaining. Compound $\mathbf{2 8 0}$ was obtained in $51 \%$ yield without starting material remaining (Scheme 81). There are several factors that may be responsible to the better performance (high yield, much less cleavage of TBS-ether functional group, less favoring the formation of N -methylation product) for $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3} . \mathrm{HBF}_{4}$, produced during the formation of lactim ether functional group, is the cause for the cleavage of TBS-ether group. $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ is a much stronger base than $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ and can quickly react with $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$. Therefore the cleavage of TBS-ether group is decreased dramatically. The proton at the amide group can be pulled away much easier by $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ and this may be responsible for the higher yield of the desired product. The $\mathrm{Cs}^{+}$ion has a larger radius than $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ion. The oxygen anion in the $\mathrm{O}^{-}-\mathrm{Cs}^{+}$ion pair is looser than that in $\mathrm{O}^{-}-\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ion pair. Therefore the oxygen anion in the former is harder and reacts fast with a harder reagent like $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$, favoring the formation of O-methylation product.

### 2.33 The Coupling between the MOM Ether Substituted DKP and Gramine

 Derivative via Somei/Kametani Coupling Reaction
## The Successful Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A

At this point, due to the failed lactim ether transformation of 291 to 292 , we decided to examine the MOM ether-protected substrates 305/306 (Scheme 87). Our reasoning was that the MOM ether group is more polar than the benzyl ether group, and the corresponding lactim ether product may have a different $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ from the starting material. Also the lactim ether formation reaction using $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ usually varies with different substrates, and changing to a different substrate may produce a better result.

The MOM ether protected diketopiperazine 91 was synthesized from 220a (Scheme 86). Treatment of alcohol 220a with MOMCl and $\mathrm{iPr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ provided the MOM ether ester 299 in $91 \%$ yield, which was then reacted with $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ to give amino ester $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ in $94 \%$ yield. Subsequent reaction of $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ with bromoacetyl bromide afforded bromide $\mathbf{3 0 1}$ in quantitative yield. Aminolysis of $\mathbf{3 0 1}$ with ammonia in MeOH
( 5.76 M ) provided the amino ester 241 in $94 \%$ yield. The resulting compound 241 was converted into the MOM ether DKP 242 in 84-93\% yield. Amide nitrogen protection was carried out by treatment of 242 with $n-\mathrm{BuLi}$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by addition of methyl chloroformate to give 302, and further introduction of a second methoxycarbonyl group (THF, $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2},-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{ClCO}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}, 1 \mathrm{~h}$ ) resulted in the desired MOM ether protected DKP 91 as a mixture of $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z}$ isomers, with the newly created chiral center as a single stereoisomer.
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At this point, we were ready for the coupling reaction (Scheme 87). The Somei/Kametani reaction between compounds $\mathbf{6 0}$ and 91 provided the syn-isomer 303 (high $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$, as a mixture of four diastereomers) and the anti-isomer 304 (lower $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$, as a mixture of four diastereomers) in a 3.1:1 ratio in 70\% yield. Decarbomethoxylation of

303 and 304 were carried out respectively to give, with the same results, four separable diastereomers $\mathbf{3 0 5 Z}, \mathbf{3 0 5 E}, 306 \mathrm{Z}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 6 E}$ in a combined $89 \%$ yield, and each of these is a mixture of two diastereomers (epimeric at the dioxepin $2^{\circ}$ alcohol carbon). This reaction was reproducibly run on a 1 g scale. If more than 1 g of $\mathbf{3 0 3}$ or $\mathbf{3 0 4}$ was used, or the external reaction temperature was greater than $104-105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, or the reaction lasted longer than 5 h , a by-product was formed in $20 \%$ yield. This by-product was deprotection of only the primary TBS ether moiety. One can convert the by-product into the desired product by standard TBS ether formation protocol. In order to ensure the right amount of water ( 1.5 eq ) was added, a stock solution of water in HMPA was always used. Next, we were ready to test the important key lactim ether-forming reaction. Compounds $306 \mathrm{E} / \mathbf{Z}$ underwent lactim ether formation smoothly to provide the desired compound $308 \mathrm{E} / \mathbf{Z}$ in $57-64 \%$ yield ( $86 \%$ yield based on recovered $\mathbf{3 0 6 E} / \mathbf{Z}$ ) under the conditions of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ (2.5 eq) and $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ for 8 h or overnight with about $30 \%$ starting material remaining. There was neither N-methylation, nor TBS ether cleavage observed. The desired product has a mobility higher than the starting material, and therefore the reaction process can be monitored by simple TLC. The advantage for this reaction is that the remaining starting material can be easily separated on a short flash column and can be recycled to give the desired lactim ether. This reaction has been run on a 1.5 g scale without problem. Literature precedent ${ }^{74}$ reveals that the stability of the MOM ether group is marginal to $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ and may be cleaved. Fortunately, all four substrates $305 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ and $306 \mathrm{E} / \mathbf{Z}$ are stable to $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ when used individually or as a mixture of $\mathbf{3 0 5 E} / \mathbf{Z}$ or 306E/Z.
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Herein we wish to discuss the stereochemical assignment of the lactim ether isomers $307 \mathrm{E} / \mathbf{Z}$ and $308 \mathrm{E} / \mathbf{Z}$. We previously assigned our proline-containing DKP compounds based on their mobility on TLC. The anti-isomer is less polar and the synisomer is more polar by TLC. For compounds $307 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ (formed from $305 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ ), we assign them as the anti-isomers. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMRs of these anti-isomers have a distinct difference with those of the syn-isomers $\mathbf{3 0 8 E} / \mathbf{Z}$. The methyl peaks of the MOM group are at 3.06 and 3.18 ppm for the two diastereomers of $\mathbf{3 0 7 E}$ and at 3.04 and 3.17 ppm for the two diastereomers of $\mathbf{3 0 7 Z}$. However, the methyl peaks of the MOM group are at 3.31 ppm $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$ for the syn-isomers $308 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$. The methyl peaks of anti-isomer $307 \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ appear at a higher field than that of syn-isomers $\mathbf{3 0 8 E} / \mathbf{Z}$. This observation can be explained by their structural difference. The methyl group of the MOM ether in the anti-isomers 307 $(307 E / Z)$ is on the same face and close to the dioxepin-indole ring, and is shielded by the dioxepin-indole ring. Therefore, they appear at higher field. For the syn-isomer $\mathbf{3 0 8 E} / \mathbf{Z}$, the dioxepin-indole ring is on the opposite face to the MOM ether group, and the methyl group of MOM ether is not shielded by the dioxepin-indole ring and appears at a lower field at 3.31 ppm . This phenomena appears for all the compounds (prior to $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ ) containing the lactim ether moiety. In summary, the stereochemical assignments for the DKP intermediates based on the their TLC mobility are correct and consistent with the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR evidence.

Protection of the indole nitrogen for 307 and 308 was straightforward and provided the corresponding products in $>95 \%$ yield (Scheme 87 ). Usually, 308E/Z were converted directly to diols 312 E and 312 Z by a two-step one pot process in $95 \sim 100 \%$ yield. Sometimes more than 5 equiv. of TBAF were needed to completely convert $\mathbf{3 1 0}$ to 312 when the reaction was conducted on a 1 g scale. In the decarbomethoxylation step, anti-isomers 305 Z and 305 E can be separated easily by flash column chromatography. However, the separation of the syn-isomers 306 E and 306 Z was much more difficult.

Instead, they were converted to the diols $\mathbf{3 1 2 E} / \mathbf{Z}$, and these two compounds can be separated by radial chromatography on a 1 g scale.
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The allylic chloride formation step, such as the formation of 317 or $\mathbf{3 1 6}$, is one of the most difficult transformations in both the synthesis of (+)-paraherquamide B and (-)paraherquamide A (Scheme 88). During the synthesis of (-)-brevianamide B, the Meyers
procedure ${ }^{75}$ (DMF, MsCl, LiCl, Collidine) was used successfully for the synthesis of $\mathbf{5 4}$ from 313 (Scheme 88). However, for (+)-paraherquamide B intermediate 314, the same procedure only led to the lactim ether-cleaved product 315. Cushing also tried several alternative routes to synthesize 316, but they all failed. Finally, this problem was solved by embracing the procedure of Corey ${ }^{76}$, essentially a modified Corey-Kim oxidization but without the base. Compound $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ was obtained in $81 \%$ yield (based on recovered starting material).
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Here is a quote about using the Corey-Kim procedure from Cushing's thesis " however, this reaction was somewhat problematic. It was extremely sluggish. On a large
scale it had to be stirred all day at $-23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then placed in the freezer $\left(\sim-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ and stirred for an additional period. If the reaction mixture was placed in the freezer one more night total decomposition would result ".

When the same Corey-Kim procedure was used for diol 312E (Scheme 89), there were two reactions which gave good results ( 14 mg and 45 mg scale). For all other cases, small or large scale, a complex mixture was produced including the starting material, the lactim ether moiety-cleaved starting material 318, the desired product 317 E and an unusual dichloro intermediate 319. A yellow-orange oily mixture was always obtained without exception. Compound 319 was presumably formed from the reaction of the highly electron-rich indole moiety with the intermediate $\mathbf{3 2 0}$. The structure of $\mathbf{3 1 9}$ was rigorously confirmed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR, IR and HRMS. We also purified the NCS by recrystallization from $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{AcOH}$ or benzene and redistilled DMS from sodium. However, compound 319 was always produced as a nearly inseparable spot on TLC from the desired compound 317E.

At this point, for this type of diol, the sensitive functionalities such as $t-B O C$ group, electron-rich indole and lactim ether, the allylic chloride formation proved to be a major obstacle. We decided to do a methodology investigation. According to a literature procedure ${ }^{77}$, diol 312E was treated with $\mathrm{TsCl}, \mathrm{DMAP}$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ for 3-4 days at room temperature, in hopes of producing the allylic chloride $\mathbf{3 1 7 E}$ (Scheme 90). Instead, the product obtained was the tosylate 321 and about half of the starting material was recovered. Phenyl sulfonate was expected to be more reactive and be displaced by chloride anion more easily to generate the allylic chloride. Diol 312E was reacted with $\mathrm{PhSO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(10 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF to provide the desired allylic chloride 317 E in $25-30 \%$ yield with a trace amount of $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ formed. Although this reaction went from spot to spot, for some unknown reason, the yield was low. At this time, we had depleted our supply of compound 312 E and had 240 mg of $\mathbf{3 1 2 Z}$, which was then used as the starting material for studying the allylic chloride-forming reaction. From our previous examples,
we knew that the allylic phenylsulfonate is not stable and can be displaced by the $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$in THF. The allylic mesylate is even less stable and may be used as an intermediate to synthesize the desired allylic chloride. The first example of this idea was conducted by treating 312 Z with $\mathrm{MsCl}(2 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ for 24 h at room temperature. Work-up gave two products, one is the allylic chloride-mesylate 323, the other is the desired allylic chloride $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z}$ in a 11:1 ratio. In order to decrease the formation of $\mathbf{3 2 3}$, less $\mathrm{MsCl}(1 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(2 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 h , then r.t. for 24 h ) were used, and gave a mixture of $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z} / \mathbf{3 1 2 Z}$ in a $29: 22$ ratio in $75 \%$ yield based on the recovered starting material 312Z.

Due to the by-product $\mathbf{3 2 3}$ formation, we did a literature search in order to solve this selective mesylation problem. In 1998, Burke et al. ${ }^{78}$ published a paper entitled " Selective Mesylation of Vicinal Diols: A Systematic Case Study." In this paper, they stated "It is known that the reaction of methanesulfonyl chloride with $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ results in a very reactive sulfene intermediate, which is unlikely to be kinetically selective. The increased selectivity observed with Hunig's base can be attributed to its lower basicity, thus generating less of the reactive sulfene intermediate." We modified their best conditions to test diol substrate 312E (Scheme 91). The base was changed from $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ to a large excess of a more hindered base collidine, the reaction was run at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and at low concentration $(0.05 \mathrm{M})$, in hopes of decreasing the formation of the by-product dimesylate.
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$$
\text { condition* } \quad \mathrm{MsCl}(2 \mathrm{eq}), \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(4 \mathrm{eq}) \quad \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \text {, r.t., } 24 \mathrm{~h}
$$

syn $312 Z$
$\xrightarrow[\substack{\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10 \mathrm{~h} \\ \text { r.t.,24 h} \\ 75 \%}]{\mathrm{MsCl} \text { (1 eq), } \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N} \text { (2 eq) }}$ syn 317Z $+\operatorname{syn} 312 \mathrm{Z}$ 29:22

To a solution of 312 E in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added collidine ( 10 eq ) and MsCl (1.1 eq), and the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and at $7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 17 h , the desired allylic mesylate-OH was obtained in $>90 \%$ yield, and the by-product bis mesylate in only $7 \%$ yield. Displacement of the mesylate by the Cl formed in-situ proceeded very slowly at 0.05 M concentration in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. This reaction should be faster if HMPA or DMF or an external $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$source such as $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{BnNCl}$ were added because this is an ionic reaction and can be accelerated by the addition of a polar solvent. When the mesylate solution in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was concentrated to half volume and $\mathrm{HMPA}(5.7 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{BnNCl}$ ( 4 eq ) were added, the desired allylic chloride was produced in $90 \%$ yield in 24 h without any cleavage of the lactim ether moiety which occurred with the Meyers procedure. This procedure always gave the product as a nice white foam. The above method is a simple, practical and reproducible way to synthesize the allylic chloride compounds which have labile founctionalities.
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The secondary alcohols of the desired allylic chlorides were carefully reprotected with t-butyldimethylsilyl triflate to furnish the key $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ cyclization substrate $\mathbf{3 2 5 E} / \mathbf{Z}$ (syn series) and 326E/Z. (anti series) (Scheme 92).

Scheme 92

$\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{2}$ substrate 325E ( 14 mg ) was treated with $\mathrm{NaH}(20 \mathrm{eq})$ in refluxing benzene for 32 h (Scheme 93). Three products were obtained and less than 1 mg 325E was recovered. Compound $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ is the desired product and macrocyclization compound $\mathbf{3 2 8}$ is the undesired product, which was formed from intramolecular alkylation of the indole nitrogen. The t-BOC group at the indole nitrogen is more labile than a t-BOC group of a normal alkyl amine under basic conditions and therefore was cleaved by extraneous hydroxide in the reaction. Compound 326 E is the diastereomer of 325 E , and this material was formed by epimerization of the stereogenic center adjacent to the lactim ether double bond. The above reaction was very sluggish and provided the desired product in very low yield ( $25-26 \%$ ). During the synthesis of paraherquamide B, chloride 65 was treated with $\mathrm{NaH}(20 \mathrm{eq})$ in refluxing benzene and the desired product 66 was obtained in $93 \%$ yield after 6-8 h with no macrocyclization by-product formed (Scheme 19). The only difference between compound 65 and 325 E is that 325 E has a MOM ether group at the C-3 position of the proline ring, which results in a large change in reactivity. Since the MOM ether group of $\mathbf{3 2 5 E}$ is on the $\alpha$-face and the indole moiety is on the $\beta$-face of the diketopiperazine ring, these two groups are on opposite sides of the DKP ring and block the NaH from pulling the proton from the reactive site; therefore the reaction is very sluggish.
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One possible explanation may be as follows: NaH in benzene may not exist as a monomer but as a cluster. This will make it difficult for the NaH to reach the reactive site. A possible solution is to use THF as the solvent to disassociate the cluster of NaH . When 325E was treated with NaH in refluxing THF for 6 h , the desired product was obtained in $65 \%$ yield with no starting material left and no macro-cyclization by-product (Scheme 94). When this reaction was run on a large scale, the desired product was obtained in $>87 \%$ yield. Occasionally, if the reaction takes longer than 9 h and is contaminated with moisture, compound $\mathbf{3 2 9}$ was obtained, which can then be converted back to $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ very easily. Bis-MOM ether compound $\mathbf{3 3 0}$ was also synthesized from 317E in $90 \%$ yield. Under $\mathrm{NaH} / \mathrm{PhH}$ conditions, there was no desired product 331 formed, and there was a tiny bit of decomposition of compound $\mathbf{3 3 0}$. Once the solvent was changed to

THF, the reaction underwent cyclization very quickly to give the desired product 331 and some 332.

Scheme 94


## Scheme 95



Interestingly, 325Z, the Z-isomer, and the Z-isomer of similar analogs have never been subjected to the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ cyclization previously. In this case, $\mathbf{3 2 5 Z}$ provided the desired cyclization product with exclusively syn-stereochemistry (syn refers to isopropenyl group and the proline nitrogen in compound 327) identical to the E-somers (Scheme 95). Fortunately, for both syn-series compounds $\mathbf{3 2 5}$ and anti-series compounds 326, the MOM ether group at the $\beta$-position of the proline ring did not affect the stereoselectivity of the newly created chiral center, and the result is the same as for paraherquamide B. The purity of the newly created stereogenic center was rigorously confirmed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR.

The high degree of facial selectivity observed in the cyclization from syn-325E to 327 is quite interesting and warrants some comments. It is generally accepted that $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$, reactions favor a syn orientation (i.e., the incoming nucleophile attacks the $\pi$-electrons from the same face as the departing leaving group, polarizing the $\pi$-system in the proper orientation for a backside displacement on the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Cl}$ bond). In the synthesis of (-)brevianamide B Williams et al. ${ }^{24}$ found that in a polar aprotic solvent (DMF or in the presence of 18-C-6), the major product was the exo-(anti) structure, while in a nonpolar solvent (benzene) the endo-(syn) product predominated. In the synthesis of (+)paraherquamide B , the $\operatorname{syn}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ product was formed exclusively in the presence of NaH under reflux in benzene. The stereochemistry outcome of the $S_{N} 2$ ' cyclization can be
explained by whether the transition state possesses a chelation-control closed structure or not. In the presence of DMF or 18-C-6, the chelation-control closed structure (transition state) (like 333) was forced to open to form a exo-open transition state structure, that would lead to the formation of anti-product, while in the presence of benzene or THF the chelation-control closed structure (transition state) can exist and would lead to the formation of the syn-product (Scheme 96)
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When the successful cyclization procedure used for the corresponding paraherquamide $B$ intermediate was applied to olefin 325 , the reaction gave a lot of spots on TLC (Scheme 97). There was no desired cyclized product 337 formed. Each of the spots were separated, and the ${ }^{1} H$ NMR indicated that they were most likely the deprotected products $\mathbf{3 3 4}, \mathbf{3 3 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 3 6}$ produced by the $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ formed in-situ. When the more eletrophilic Pd reagent $\left[\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)_{4}\right]\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$ was stirred with 325 in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ for two days at room temperature, no reaction occurred. Based on the information of the separated products from the $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}-\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ mediated reaction, obviously the products were produced by an acid formed in-situ (most likely $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ ). To prevent this from happening, a base should be added to neutralize the $\mathrm{HBF}_{4} . \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ is not a proper choice because it will reduce $\mathrm{Pd}^{2+}$ to $\mathrm{Pd}^{\circ}$ medal as indicated by Trost et al. ${ }^{29}$ 2,6-Lutidine, a hindered base in which the $\alpha$-carbon of the nitrogen has no hydrogen, was added to the reaction mixture, but only starting material was recovered. Finally, when 54 equiv. of propylene oxide were added, the desired cyclization product 337 was obtained in good yield (on a 50 mg scale, $66 \%$ yield; on a 201 mg scale, $85 \%$ yield) (Scheme 98).

## Scheme 98



The transformation of lactim ether $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ to lactam $\mathbf{3 3 8}$ in a practical manner turned out to be very difficult (Scheme 99). Two procedures ( $\mathrm{LiCl}, \mathrm{HMPA}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and $\left.\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{BnNCl}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)^{80}$ and $\left[\mathrm{NCS},\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{~S}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \text { to r.t., } \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]^{81}$ were able to provide the desired product 338, but these reactions gave complex mixtures and the yield was low, and were often not reproducible. Other conditions like 1 N HCl in THF (1:1), or 1 N HCl in THF (1:6), or PPTS in EtOH gave a complex mixture which contained some of the amino ester 339.

Scheme 99



At this point, I had to leave Colorado State University to work at Schering-Plough Corporation, New Jersey. At the same time, Dr. Hidekazu Tsujishima joined this project. He worked on the rest of this total synthesis work till the finish of the total synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A.

However, when THF: $0.1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl} / 12.5: 1$ was used for compound 337, the desired amino ester 339 were obtained in high yield. Reformation of the diketopiperazine 338 was accomplished by refluxing 339 in toluene catalyzed with 2 -hydroxypyridine to provide 338 in $83 \%$ yield (Scheme 100).

In the paraherquamide B synthesis, $\mathrm{AlH}_{3}-\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}^{85}$ complex and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{Al}$ were used to carry out the reduction in $64-71 \%$. However, making this alane complex reagent and subsequent titration were time-consuming and not convenient. In the total synthesis of $( \pm)$-gelsemine by Fukuyama et $\mathrm{al}^{82}$, they reported the selective reduction of a tertiary amide in the presence of a secondary amide using DIBAL-H in $82 \%$ yield. Regioselective reduction of the tertiary amide of $\mathbf{3 3 8}$ following the same procedure of Fukuyama proceeded cleanly with DIBAL-H in toluene to give tertiary amine $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ in $72 \%$ yield. N Methylation of the secondary amide in $340(\mathrm{NaH}, \mathrm{MeI}$ in DMF, $96 \%)$ afforded intermediate 341 (Scheme 100).

Scheme 100


Selective deblocking ${ }^{83}$ of the MOM ether protecting group in 341 (bromocatecholborane, 6 eq , in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, at ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) gave 342 in $91 \%$ yield (Scheme 101). This secondary alcohol was oxidized with Dess-Martin periodinane to afford compound $\mathbf{3 4 3}$ in $85 \%$ yield. In order to ensure that the oxidation of this hindered secondary alcohol would be successful, during the early stage of this project, a model study was conducted and the desired ketone 166 was obtained from 220a in $>85 \%$ yield (Scheme 101).
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Deblocking of both protecting groups of 343 ( 510 eq of TFA in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) gave keto-alcohol 344 in $97 \%$ yield (Scheme 102). The oxidative spirooxidation was accomplished by a two-step oxidation/rearrangement process (Scheme 103). Chloroindolenine 345 was obtained by treatment of 344 at $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a complex of pyridine and $\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{BuOCl}$. Hydration of the chloroindolenine $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ in a relatively less polar solvent system $\left(90 \% \mathrm{THF} / 10 \% \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ with 5 equiv. of TsOH affected rearrangement to oxindole 347 in $54 \%$ yield. It was found necessary to rigorously remove all of the pyridine solvent prior to the Pinacol-type rearrangement. It is assumed that the chlorination of 344 proceeds from the least hindered face of the indole giving the $\alpha$ chloroindolenine $\mathbf{3 4 5}$. The hydration of the imine functionality interestingly, must also occur from the same $\alpha$-face which is syn-to the relatively large chlorine atom furnishing the syn-chlorohydrin 346 which subsequently rearranges stereospecifically to the desired spiro-oxindole 347.

The final dehydration was affected with MTPI in DMPU ${ }^{84}$ to provide 14-keto-(-)paraherquamide A 43 in 55\% yield (Scheme 104). This material proved to be identical to the semi-synthetic intermediate prepared by Lee ${ }^{23}$ at Pharmacia-Upjohn by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{nmr}$,

HRMS and mobility on TLC. The final step, that involves methylmagnisum bromide addition to ketone $\mathbf{4 3}$ followed the same procedure that was successfully used by Lee $^{23}$ at Pharmacia-Upjohn to give (-)-paraherquamide A as the exclusive product (Scheme 104) (the C-14 epimer was not detected) in $42 \%$ yield that was identical in all respects ( ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ $\mathrm{nmr},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} n m r$, ir, exact mass, mobility on TLC). The synthetic sample recrystallized from ether has m.p. $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.) and $[\alpha]_{D}{ }^{25}=-22(\mathrm{c}=0.2 \mathrm{MeOH})$. A sample of natural paraherquamide A recrystallized from ether under the same conditions rendered a sample with m.p. $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.) and $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-21(\mathrm{c}=0.2 \mathrm{MeOH})$. The final synthetic paraherquamide A upon recrystallization from ether is $\sim$ optically pure.

Scheme 104



1, ( $)$-paraherquamide A

### 2.4 Summary of the Total Synthesis of (-)-Paraherquamide A

The first stereocontrolled total synthesis of (-)-paraherquamide A was completed in 48 chemical steps. This synthesis is a convergent one, starting from ethyl glycinate, ethyl acrylate and vanillin. The longest linear route is 35 steps.

Dioxepin-indole 60, one of the key intermediates, was synthesized in 13 steps from 4 kg of vanillin according to a known synthetic approach. Five different steps of this synthesis were optimized by way of increasing the yield of products, avoiding unnecessary chemical transformations and simplifying purification procedure. Key features of these optimizations include: the synthetic route was shortened from 14 to 13 steps by avoiding a basic hydrolysis step and the following recrystallization procedure; a simplified purification procedure for the prenynation reaction of compound 101 ; the yield of the epoxidation of $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ was increased to $85 \%$ from $64 \%$; the over-reduced indoline 106 was converted to the desired indole 105 in almost quantitative yield; and finally, the yield of a hindered alcohol t-butyldimethylsilylation reaction was increased to $95 \%$ from $82 \%$.

Both racemic and asymmetric synthetic methods were developed to synthesize $\alpha$ substituted $\beta$-hydroxy proline derivatives (219a-e). This compound was further transformed to DKP 91, the other key intermediate for the synthesis of paraherquamide A. The direct $\alpha$-alkylation of $\beta$-hydroxy proline ester 129 produced only one diastereomer, and this method demonstrated convenience and simplicity without the need for additional protection of 129. Other novel features are as follows: a complex DKP 91 and compound 60 were coupled together by using the Somei/Kametani reaction; a MOM ether protected substrate was converted to the lactim ether by using optimized conditions to overcome this often problematic transformation; a unique, convenient and mild allylic chloride formation procedure was found for the synthesis of compound 317 and its analogs ; a high yielding entirely stereoselective $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2^{\prime}$ reaction was carried out in THF not only for the E-isomeric allylic chloride, but also, for the first time, the Z isomer; a unique $\mathrm{Pd}($ II $)$-mediated cyclization reaction through addition of propylene oxide to neutralize the
in-situ formed acid; and a mild acidic condition for cleavage of the lactim ether without cleaving other acid-labile protecting groups.

Scheme 105 The Improved Synthesis of Dioxepin-indole Subunit 60


Scheme 106 Completion of the Paraherquamide A Synthesis
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1) $(\mathrm{PhO})_{3} \mathrm{PMel}, \mathrm{DMPU} 55 \%$
2) $\mathrm{MeMgBr}, \mathrm{THF} \quad 42 \%$


1 (-)-paraherquamide $A$

## CHAPTER THREE

## EXPERIMENTAL

## General information

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR were acquired using either a Bruker WP-270SY 270 MHz or a Braker AC300P or Varian JS-300 NMR spectrometer. The chemical shifts are given in parts per million ( ppm ) downfield from TMS at $\delta 0.0 \mathrm{ppm}$ or relative to residual $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ at $\delta 7.24 \mathrm{ppm}$. IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 1600 FT IR as thin films from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$. Both low and high resolution mass spectra were obtained from Colorado State University. Elemental analysis were from M-H-W Laboratories, Phoenix Arizona. Optical rotations were recorded on Perkin-Elmer 24 polarimeter at a wavelength of 589 nm using a 1.0 decimeter cell of 1.0 mL total volume.

## Chromatography

Flash column chromatography was performed with silica gel grade 60 (230-400 mesh). Radial chromatography was performed with a Harrison Research Chromatotron model 7924 using E.Merck silica gel 60 PF-254 containing gypsum and one, two or four millimeter plates were used as needed. Preparative thin layer chromatography (PTLC) was carried out with Merck Kieselgel $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ precoated glass plates ( $20 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). These plates were also used as a qualitative indicator for reaction completion, with ultraviolet light and heating with a solution of 5-7 \% phosphomolybdic acid in $95 \%$ ethanol. Additional visualization stains ( $\mathrm{I}_{2} /$ vanillin) were occasionally used.

## Reagents and solvents

Unless otherwise noted materials were obtained from commercially available sources and used without further purification. Tetrahydrofuran and diethyl ether were
distilled from sodium benzophenone ketyl under a nitrogen atmosphere. Methylene chloride, triethylamine, pyridine, acetonitrile, toluene, benzene, and diisopropylamine were distilled from calcium hydride under a nitrogen atmosphere. DMF and HMPA were dried over $3 \AA$ molecular sieves for 1 week prior to use. The molecular sieves were activated by heating to $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at 1 mm Hg for 4 h in a round bottom flask. NCS was recrystallized from benzene or acetic acid. LiCl and $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ are hydroscopic and were handled quickly. $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ was stored in a freezer and weighed in the air without problem. After each use, $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}$ was placed on the vacuum line and filled with nitrogen or argon. A stock solution of water in HMPA was used for the decarbomethoxylation reaction. A mesyl chloride stock solution in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was used for the allylic chloride formation reaction. Zinc chloride was dried by heating to $210^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h under vacuum in a flask.
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## $\beta$-Alanine, N -(2-ethoxy-2-oxoethyl)-, ethyl ester (150)

To a stirred solution of ethyl glycinate hydrochloride salt ( $100.5 \mathrm{~g}, 720 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ eq) in $95 \%$ ethanol $(1650 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature was added ethyl acrylate $(79.3 \mathrm{~g}, 793$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by triethyl amine ( $73.3 \mathrm{~g}, 720 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ). The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2-3 days. TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/4:2:1) was used to monitor the reaction. After the reaction was completed, the reaction mixture was concentrated, and water was added. The product was extracted with EtOAc, and the combined organic solution was washed with brine ( 3 times), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by vacuum distillation (104-108 $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 0.6-1 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ to afford $111 \mathrm{~g}(76 \%)$ of $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ as a colorless oil (lit., ${ }^{51}$ )
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.22-1.31(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.92(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s$), 2.50(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=$ $6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.90(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.41(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.07-4.25(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$

IR ( NaCl , film) $3338,2982,2937,2910,1732,1465,1371,1888 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$



## $\beta$-Alanine, $\quad \mathrm{N}$-[(1,1-dimethylethoxy)carbonyl]-N-(2-ethoxy-2-oxoethyl), ethyl ester (151)

To a stirred solution of $\mathbf{1 5 0}(17.6 \mathrm{~g}, 86.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(190 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}(25.9 \mathrm{~g}, 119 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.37 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by $5 \% \mathrm{NaOH}(190 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for about 1 h and at room temperature for 10 h . TLC (hexane:EtOAc/4:1) was used to monitor the reaction. The reaction mixture was extracted with $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to provide 50 g of a crude oil. Purification of the product by vacuum distillation (123-128 $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 0.15 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ afforded $23.5 \mathrm{~g}(90-95 \%)$ of 151 as a colorless oil (lit., ${ }^{50.51}$ )
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.21-1.33(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.40-1.53(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.59-2.70(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 3.49-3.60(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95-4.05(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.08-4.30(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.9,172.6,170.8,170.6,156.0,155.5,80.6,80.5$, $61.1,60.7,60.6,51.0,50.2,45.0,44.9,34.3,33.9,28.5,28.3,14.4,14.3$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2978,2938,1743,1702,1462,1367,1030 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$
FAB HRMS m/e $304.1760\left(\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{6}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 304.1760$)$
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1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3-oxo-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (131)

A suspension of $\mathrm{KO}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Bu}(24.48 \mathrm{~g}, 218.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene ( 580 mL ) was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by means of an external ice- NaCl bath $\left(-6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ to $\left.-8{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ and was stirred vigorously by a mechanic stirrer. A solution of $\mathbf{1 5 1}(44.8 \mathrm{~g}, 145.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene $(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via cannula over 12 min . After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 85 min , it was quenched with acetic acid ( 16 mL ) (in one portion) followed by a cold solution of $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(80 \mathrm{~g})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(800 \mathrm{~mL})$. The upper organic layer was separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(500 \mathrm{~mL}, 300 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with pH 7 phosphate buffer $(2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give 36 g of an oil. Toluene ( 800 mL ) was added to the above crude oil, and the resulting solution was washed with pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer $(5 \times$ $400 \mathrm{~mL})$, followed by water $(1 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. filtered and concentrated to afford 16 g of a reddish oil. The product was purified by Kugelrohr distillation ( $125-145{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 2-3 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ) to yield $14.0 \mathrm{~g}(37.4 \%)$ of 131 as a colorless oil (lit., ${ }^{50.51}$ ). TLC solvent system was hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/ 5:2:0.5.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.40-1.50(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.65-2.71(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.75-3.95 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.20-4.30(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.45-4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 205.3,204.8,166.9,166.7,154.7,81.7,66.4,66.0$, 62.7, 42.8, 42.2, 37.7, 37.0, 34.7, 34.3, 28.8, 14.8.

IR ( NaCl , film) 2978, 2930, 1771, 1738, 1704, 1391, $1160 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3(S)-hydroxy, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2(R)-ethyl ester (129)

To a 6-L Erlenmeyer flask, immersed in a water bath, was added in succession, $131(34.15 \mathrm{~g}, 0.132 \mathrm{~mol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$, sucrose $(513 \mathrm{~g})$ and distilled water ( 2731 mL ). The mixture was stirred until the sucrose dissolved, after which dry Baker's yeast ( 341 g , Red $S t a r^{R}$ ) was added. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $32{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $33^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , it was centrifuged. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted with ether ( 4 times). The combined extracts were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc $/ 4: 1$ then $2: 1$ ) gave 28.7 g $(84 \%)$ of 129 as a pure oil (lit., ${ }^{50.51}$ ). Both ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra of the derived Mosher's ester of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ indicated an enantiomeric excess of ca.90\% (Knight et al. ${ }^{51}$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(270 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.28-1.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.45-1.50(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.95-2.18(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 3.30(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s), 3.42-3.55 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.55-3.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.15-4.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 4.30-4.42 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.55-4.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.6,170.5,154.4,154.0,80.2,80.1,72.2,71.3$, $64.0,63.5,61.0,44.3,43.8,32.6,32.0,28.4,28.2,14.3,14.2$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3449,2982,2958,2899,1742,1702,1420,1358,1211,1194 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
$[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}+19.0$ (c 1.21, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ). lit., ${ }^{31}[\alpha]^{27} \mathrm{D}+18.2$ (c 1.45, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ).
Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{5}$ : C, 55.58 ; H, 8.16; N, 5.40. Found: C, $55.41 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.93$; N , 5.15 .



Silane, (1,1-dimethylethyl)[(E)-(4-iodo-2-methyl-2-butenyl)oxy]dimethyl (127)

To a stirred solution of $\mathbf{1 6 5}(4.70 \mathrm{~g}, 50.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$, at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(87.5$ mL ) was added $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}(3.0 \mathrm{~g}), t$-butyldimethylsilyl chloride ( $7.43 \mathrm{~g}, 49.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.98 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and tetrabutylammonium iodide ( $22.25 \mathrm{~g}, 60.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ). The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred for 27 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo, and hexane was added. The resulting suspension was filtered, and the solid pad was washed with hexane. The filtrate was concentrated and purified by Kugelrohr distillation $\left(80-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / 0.1 \mathrm{mmHg}\right)$ to give $9.33 \mathrm{~g}(58 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (127) and the Z isomer (a colorless liquid, as an E Z/6.4:1 mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(270 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.65-1.82(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05(2 \mathrm{H}$, s), 4.12-4.31 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 5.65-5.75 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 141.6,141.2,121.9,119.3,67.4,61.8,40.5$, 40.1, 26.0, 25.8, 21.3, 18.5, 13.4, -5.2.

IR (NaCl, film) 2956, 2930, 2886, 2857, 1472, 1463, 1389, 1362, 1254, 1147, 1115, $1078,1006,837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.




## 1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R)-[E-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethyl silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-hydroxy-,1-(1,1-dimethylethyl),2ethyl ester (220a)

To a stirred solution of disopropylamine ( $2.38 \mathrm{~g}, 25.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.25 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF $(7.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Li}(25.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, $25.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.25$ eq) over 8 min . The resulting brown solution was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min and then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of $129(2.02 \mathrm{~g}, 7.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF $(12.5 \mathrm{~mL}+2.5$ mL rinse) was added via cannula over 7 min . The reaction mixture was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for an additional 3 min and at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 50 min , then recooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of allylic iodide derivative ( $4.56 \mathrm{~g}, 14.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.8 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in HMPA ( $19.0 \mathrm{~g}, 106 \mathrm{mmol}, 13.7 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was introduced in one portion to the above vigorously stirred solution. The reaction was allowed to proceed at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for a further 2 h before being quenched with EtOAc and saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution. The mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 times), and the combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a liquid. TLC system (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) was used to monitor the reaction. Purification by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/4:1) provided $2.08 \mathrm{~g}(58 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 2 0 a})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 4.3$ :1 mixture). On a scale of $1.68 \mathrm{~g}, 2.04 \mathrm{~g}$ product was obtained ( $70 \%$ ).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01-0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.17-1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 1.32-1.41 $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.37-1.70(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.89-1.98(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.50(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s$), 2.74-$ $2.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.14-3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.60-3.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.02-4.22(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 5.25-5.29 (1H, m).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.3,153.8,138.6,138.2,118.1,117.7,80.4,79.6$, $76.8,76.5,71.7,71.2,68.4,68.1,61.3,45.4,44.9,31.4,31.1,30.4,30.2,28.5,28.4$, $26.0,22.0,18.5,14.4,14.3,14.1,14.0,-5.1$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3449, 2977, 2955, 2928, 2857, 1739, 1703, 1391, 1367, 1251, 837, 774 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$

Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{Si}$ : C, $60.36 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.47$; N, 3.06. Found: C, 60.17 ; H, 9.30; N, 3.05.



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3(S)-hydroxy-2(R)-methyl-, 1-(1,1dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (220d)

To a stirred solution of diisopropylamine ( $113 \mathrm{mg}, 1.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.2 $\mathrm{mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Li}(1.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, 1.32 mmol$)$ over 3 min . After the solution was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min and cooled to $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ $(104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 0.4 mL ) was added via cannula over 3 min . The temperature was raised to $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and held for 25 min , then at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min and lowered to $-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of methyl iodide ( $87 \mathrm{mg}, 0.60 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in HMPA ( 100 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq})$ was added by syringe in one portion. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1.5 h , at room temperature for 24 h and at $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic solution was washed with brine ( $4 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) to give $54 \mathrm{mg}(57 \%$, based on 15 mg of recovered $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ ) of $\mathbf{2 2 0 d}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.18-1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.36-1.41(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52-1.56(3 \mathrm{H}$, m), 1.89-1.96 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.00-2.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.83(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s), $3.33-3.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.65-3.71 (1H, m), 4.05-4.21 (3H, m).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75.47 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.3,154.1,81.1,80.4,80.0,79.8,69.1,61.5$, $31.4,30.8,28.6,28.5,22.6,21.6,14.4$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3443,2980,2936,1746,1731,1698,1391,1167,1094 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
$[\alpha]^{25}$ D -3.9 (c 0.54, EtOAc)
Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{NO}_{5}: \mathrm{C}, 57.13 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.48 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.12$. Found: C, $56.92 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.28 ; \mathrm{N}$, 5.05.


[^0]

1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3(S)-hydroxy-2(R)-(3-methyl-2-butenyl)-1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (220b)

To a stirred solution of diisopropylamine ( $113 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.2 $\mathrm{mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Li}(1.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, $1.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.24 \mathrm{eq})$ over 3 min . After the solution was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min and cooled to $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of 129 ( $104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.4 mL ) was added via cannula over 3 min . The reaction temperature was raised to $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and held for 25 min , then at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min and lowered to $-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of prenyl bromide $(91 \mathrm{mg}, 0.60 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1.5 eq ) in HMPA ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.38 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added by syringe in one portion. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2.5 h , and at room temperature for 2 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic solution was washed with brine ( $4 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) to provide $98.4 \mathrm{mg}(73.4 \%)$ of $\mathbf{2 2 0 b}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.22-1.29(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.34-1.37(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.53-1.65(6 \mathrm{H}$, m), 1.84-2.01 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.70-2.91 $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.57-3.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 4.03-4.19 (3H, m), 4.92-4.94 (1H, m).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.4,172.3,154.1,154.0,135.9,135.8,118.7$, $118.4,80.5,79.7,76.5,71.9,71.461 .4,45.6,45.0,31.8,31.3,30.9,30.6,28.6,28.5$, $26.4,26.3,18.5,18.3,14.5,14.4$. IR (NaCl, film) 3447, 2972, 2930, 2873, 1743, $1699,1668,1391,1170,1137 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \cdot[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}-48.2(\mathrm{c} 0.98, \mathrm{EtOAc})$.

Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{5}: \mathrm{C}, 62.36 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.93 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.28$. Found: C, $62.19 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.03 ; \mathrm{N}$, 4.27.



## 1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3(S)-hydroxy-2(R)-(phenylmethyl)-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (220c)

To a stirred solution of diisopropylamine ( $113 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.2 mL ) at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Li}(1.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{THF}, 1.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.3 \mathrm{eq})$ over 3 min . After the solution was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min and cooled to $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ ( $104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.4 mL ) was added via cannula over 3 min . The reaction temperature was raised to $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and held for 25 min , then at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 $\min$ and lowered to $-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of benzyl bromide ( $109 \mathrm{mg}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1.6 eq ) in HMPA ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added by syringe in one portion. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1.5 h , and at room temperature for 50 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic solution was washed with brine ( $4 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) to provide 64 mg ( $53 \%$, based on 15 mg of recovered $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ ) of $\mathbf{2 2 0 c}$ as a colorless oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 1.26-1.31(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.38-1.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.48(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 1.69-1.80 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.66(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s), 2.70-2.80 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.22-3.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.54-$ $3.81(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.11-4.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.23-4.31(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.11-7.27(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.1,169.5,154.2,153.9,136.8,136.5,130.9,130.8,128.5$, $128.3,126.9,126.7,80.8,79.9,75.9,72.5,72.2,61.6,60.6,45.3,45.0,37.8,36.8$, 30.9, 30.5, 28.6, 14.46, 14.41. IR (NaCl, film) 3446, 3085, 3062, 3030, 2979, 2881, 1732, 1693, 1681, 1392, 1367, $1167 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Anal. Caled. for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{5}: \mathrm{C}, 65.31 ; \mathrm{H}$, 7.79; N, 4.01. Found: C, 65.15; H, 7.69; N, 3.87, [ $\alpha]^{25}$ D -77.6 (c 0.59, EtOAc).



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R)-(4-bromobutyl)-3(S)-hydroxy-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (220e)

To a stirred solution of diisopropylamine ( $113 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 0.2 mL ) at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Li}(1.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{THF}, 1.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.3 \mathrm{eq})$ over 3 min . After the solution was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min and cooled to $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, a solution of $\mathbf{1 2 9}(104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 0.4 mL ) was added via cannula over 3 min . The reaction temperature was raised to $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and held for 25 min , then at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min and lowered to $-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of 1,4 -dibromobutane ( $130 \mathrm{mg}, 0.6$ mmol, 1.5 eq ) in HMPA ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added by syringe in one portion. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , and at room temperature for 19 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined extracts were washed with brine ( $4 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc/1:1) to provide $54 \mathrm{mg}(49 \%$, based 16 mg of recovered 129) of 220e as a colorless oil.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \quad 1.21-1.24(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.28-1.40(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.32-1.40$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.83-2.40(7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.62(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s), $3.22-3.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=$ $6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.65-3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 4.06-4.22 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 4.24-4.30 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(75.47$ $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.3,154.0,80.5,79.9,76.8,76.6,71.0,61.4,45.5,45.0,34.0$, 33.6, 32.9, 32.7, 32.4, 31.2, 30.6, 28.5, 22.1, 21.9, 14.4. IR ( NaCl, film) 3438, 2973, $2934,2875,1735,1696,1672,1383,1366,1246,1168,772 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} .[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{D}-22.8$ (c 0.54 , EtOAc). Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{BrNO}_{5}$ : C, 48.74; H, 7.16; N, 3.55. Found: C, 48.90; H, 7.31; N, 3.60.



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid,2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethyl silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-[(methylthio)thioxomethoxy]-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (228)

To a solution of 220a ( $92 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 3 mL ) at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}\left(17 \mathrm{mg}, 0.42 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.1 \mathrm{eq}\right.$ ) under Ar. After $15 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{CS}_{2}$ ( $126 \mathrm{mg}, 1.66 \mathrm{mmol}$, $8.3 \mathrm{eq})$ was added to the reaction mixture, producing a deep red solution. After 20 min , methyl iodide ( $454 \mathrm{mg}, 3.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 16 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added to the above solution in one portion. The resulting mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature slowly. After 8.5 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc (3 x 30 mL ). The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a yellow oil. Purification of the product by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/12:1) gave 86 mg (79\%) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 2 8})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/~3:1 mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.25-1.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.40-1.50$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.60-1.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.50(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.75-2.90(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), 3.30-3.42 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.68-3.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.05-5.35$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.85-5.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 2979, 2958, 2931, 2851, 1744, 1701, 1390, 836, $775 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid,2(S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethyl silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (229)

To a solution of AIBN ( $56.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.341 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.86 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in toluene ( 20 mL ) was added $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ ( $892 \mathrm{mg}, 3.06 \mathrm{mmol}, 8 \mathrm{eq}$ ) via syringe under Ar , and the reaction mixture was heated to reflux. A solution of 228 ( $209 \mathrm{mg}, 0.383 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in toluene ( 10 mL ) was added dropwise over 20 min . After 4.5 h , the solvent was removed in vacuo, and the residue was purified by radial chromatography (hexene:EtOAc/12:1) to yield 115 mg ( $69 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 2 9})$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

There were occasions of obtaining pure E isomer by radial chromatography purification method.

Data of the E isomer:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.00-0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.85-0.90(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.20-1.30(3 \mathrm{H}$, m), 1.35-1.45 $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.55-1.62(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.70-1.90(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.90-2.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 2.60-2.90 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.25-3.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.50-3.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.20(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 5.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2954,2928,2855,1738,1699,1388,1251,1169,836 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$



D-Proline, 2(S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-, ethyl ester (230)

To a suspension of zinc bromide ( $53 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1 mL ) at room temperature was added a solution of $229(22.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.051 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( $600 \mu \mathrm{~L}+1 \mathrm{~mL}$ rinse) via cannula over 2 min . After 7 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with pH sodium 10 carbonate buffer and extracted with EtOAc ( $2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The aqueous layer was filtered through a Celite pad, and the filtrate was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give $19.5 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 3 0})$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil that was used without further purification.

Data of the E isomer:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.86(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.20-1.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.22(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{t}, J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.57(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.60-1.80(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.5$, $14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.96(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.10$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, J=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2957,2855,1731,1253,1180,835 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.


230


D-Proline, 1-(bromoacetyl)-2(S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-, ethyl ester (231)

To a solution of $230(65 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ in water ( $572 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.286 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by bromoacetyl bromide ( $57.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.286 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 5 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give $74 \mathrm{mg}(83 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (231) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 3: 1$ mixture) that was used without further purification.

Data of the E isomer:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.87(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.58$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.02(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,15 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=6.6,15 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.50-3.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $3.97(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.15(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2951,2853,1738,1654,1439,1412,1209,1108,836 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione, 8a(S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxyl-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro <br> (232)

A solution of $231(35.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.076 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ in $2.59 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(2.4$ $\mathrm{mL}, 6.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 82 \mathrm{eq})$ was stirred at room temperature for 28 h . The solvent and excess ammonia were removed in vacuo and a solid residue. EtOAc was added, and the resulting suspension was filtered. The filtrate was concentrated to give 26 mg ( $97 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the E (232) and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of the E isomer:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.98-2.00(2 \mathrm{H}$, m), 2.13-2.18 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $2.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,16 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,16 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.45-3.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.73(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.70-3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $4.12(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.00(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s$)$. IR ( NaCl , film) 3241,2952 , 2927, 2857, 2892, 1667, 1445, $1254,1107 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. $[\alpha]^{\mathrm{D}} 25=+51.4$ (c 0.36, EtOAc).

For compound 235, the enantiomer of 232, $[\alpha]^{\mathrm{D}} 25=-62.5$ (c $\left.0.39, \mathrm{EtOAc}\right)$.


232



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione,8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1dimethylethyl)

dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro (235)
To a solution of $234(130 \mathrm{mg}, 0.546 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\operatorname{DMF}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $t$-butyldimethylsilyl chloride ( $124 \mathrm{mg}, 0.819 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(83.5$ $\mathrm{mg}, 0.819 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 3 h , saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution was added and the reaction mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give a crude oil 176 mg . The product was purified by preparative TLC (EtOAc:MeOH/7:1) to afford 39 mg (20\%) of 235 as a colorless oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.98-2.0(2 \mathrm{H}$, m), 2.13-2.18 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $2.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,16 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,16 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.45-3.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.73(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.70-3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $4.12(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.00(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad, s$)$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.3,163.5,140.3,116.1,67.8,46.7,45.2,35.9$, 34.8, 26.0, 20.4, 18.4, 13.7,5.2.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3241,2952,2857,1667,1445,1254,1107 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
$[\alpha]_{25}=-62.5$ (c 0.39, EtOAc).



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethy Isilyl]-oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenyImethyloxy)-, 1-(1,1-dimethyl ethyl) 2-ethyl ester (236)

To a suspension of $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(35.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.880 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 3 mL ) at room temperature was added a solution of $220 \mathrm{a}(91 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 8 mL ) via cannula. After $5 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{Bu}{ }_{4} \mathrm{NI}(91.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.234 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.4 \mathrm{eq})$ and benzyl bromide ( 154 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.88 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were added. The reaction mixture was stirred 2.5 h , quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The residue was purified by preparative TLC to give $80 \mathrm{mg}(73 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (236) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / \sim 2.3: 1$ mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(270 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.86(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.22(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.38-1.42$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.54-1.72(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.85(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.12-3.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.80-3.93$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.47-4.54(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.05-5.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.06-$ $7.31(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl, film) 3066, 3030, 2976, 2954, 2885, 2857, 1737, 1705, 1696, 1392, 1250, $1112,836,774 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (237)

To a suspension of zinc bromide ( $568 \mathrm{mg}, 2.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (11.4 mL ) at room temperature was added a solution of $236(550 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ via cannula over 2 min . After 20 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer and extracted with ether ( $90 \mathrm{~mL}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}, 2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined ether solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give 441 mg ( $99 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the E (237) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/2.3:1 mixture) that was used without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.16(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.56$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.89-1.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.01-2.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.52-2.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}, \mathrm{s}), 2.95-$ $2.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.04-4.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.08(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $4.41(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I} / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.34-5.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.21-$ $7.29(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3358,3064,2951,2857,1732,1457,1250,1112,1067,837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$



## D-Proline,1-(bromoacetyl)-2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (238)

To a solution of $237(441 \mathrm{mg}, 0.980 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution in water ( $3.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.65 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.68 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by bromoacetyl bromide ( $408 \mathrm{mg}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 6 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined extracts were washed with brine ( $3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/12:1 then $3: 1$ ) to gave $435 \mathrm{mg}(78 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 3 8})$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.86(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.18(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.00-$ $2.15(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.80-2.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.18-3.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35-3.45(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.65-3.70(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), 3.65-3.85 (1H, m), 3.80-3.85 (1H, m), $3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.00-4.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.10-4.20$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50-4.60(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.25(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.1,164.7,138.8,137.8,128.8,128.5,127.6,117.2$, 82.4. $72.5,72.1,68.1,61.3,46.9,29.8,29.4,27.4,26.0,18.4,14.3,14.0,-5.1$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 3089, 3064, 3032, 2955, 2930, 2855, 1738, 1659, 1651, 1435, 1413, $1249,1109,1069,1029,837,776,737 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



D-Proline, 1-(aminoacetyl)-2(R)-[E-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (239)

A solution of $238(435 \mathrm{mg}, 0.74 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}(15 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.59 \mathrm{M}$, $37 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was stirred at room temperature for 6 h . The solvent and excess ammonia were removed in vacuo and gave a solid residue. EtOAc was added, and the resulting suspension was filtered. The filtrate was concentrated to give $387 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 3 9})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 2.3: 1$ mixture) that was used without further purification.

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.86(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.10$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.85-2.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.30-3.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.70-4.00(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $4.00-4.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.10-4.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.52(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.50(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 7.40$ ( $5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ).

IR ( NaCl , film) $3200,3087,3062,2952,2852,1737,1667,1455,1360,1252,1108$, $1070,836 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione, 8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-8(S)-(phenylmethyloxy) (240)

To a solution of $239(197 \mathrm{mg}, 0.388 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene $(6 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature was added $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(64.0 \mathrm{mg}, 1.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by HMPA ( 200 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ ). After 3.5 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution, and extracted with EtOAc ( $4 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by preparative TLC (EtOAc: $\mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1$ ) to gave $93.5 \mathrm{mg}(53 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (240) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 8: 1$ mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.86(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.00-2.15(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 2.16-2.25 (1H, m), 2.68-2.78 (1H, m), 3.50(1H, m), 3.75-3.85 (1H, m), 3.96(2H, s), $3.90-4.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.00-4.20(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50-4.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{br})$ $7.40(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3229,3063,2955,2932,2858,1692,1682,1667,1455,1321,1252$, $1110,1068,837,775,755 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-2-carboxylic acid, 8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-1,4-dioxo-8(S)-(phenylmethyloxy),

## 2-methyl ester (286)

To a solution of $240(140 \mathrm{mg}, 0.306 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 3.82 mL ) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi}(1.6 \mathrm{M}$ in hexane) $(229 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq})$ over 2 min under Ar. After 0.5 h , methyl chloroformate ( $31.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.336 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added over 1 min . After the reaction mixture was stirred for 35 min , it was diluted with a mixture of EtOAc (5 $\mathrm{mL})$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic layer was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give $159.4 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (286) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 8: 1$ mixture) that was used without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.51-1.71(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.06(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $J=2.1,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.49$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=6.6,9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.85(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.90-4.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.26(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}$, $J=17.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.38(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=17.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.50(1 \mathrm{H}$, $1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.57(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.20-$ $7.30(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3065, 3031, 2955, 2853, 1784, 1733, 1668, 1435, 1377, 1285, 1258, $1230,1107,1070,835,777,742 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-2,3(1H)(S)-dicarboxylic acid, 8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-1,4-dioxo-8(S)-(phenyl methyloxy)-, 2,3-dimethyl ester (287)

To a solution of $286(137.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2663 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ and methyl chloroformate $(176 \mathrm{mg}, 1.86 \mathrm{mmol}, 7 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\operatorname{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}(1.33 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0$ M in THF, $1.33 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 2.5 h , the reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution, and extracted with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine ( $2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give $145 \mathrm{mg}(95 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(287)$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: Z / 8: 1$ mixture) that was used without further purification. Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.01-2.07(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.42-3.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.73(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.86(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}$, s), $4.00-4.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=2.1,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.49(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $4.54(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{l} / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.5(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.20-7.30(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $165.0,140.4,138.0,128.4,127.8,127.6,115.4,84.1$, $74.4,72.1,68.1,55.2,54.8,35.4,26.6,26.0,18.5,13.9,-5.1$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3034,2955,2858,1789,1756,1692,1434,1258,1200,1109,1072,836$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $573.2628\left(\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 573.2632)




## D-Proline, 3(S)-(acetyloxy)-, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3 methyl-2-butenyl], ethyl ester (244)

To a suspension of zinc bromide ( $552 \mathrm{mg}, 2.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(14 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature was added a solution of $243(450 \mathrm{mg}, 0.90 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{I} \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(14 \mathrm{~mL}+3 \mathrm{~mL}$ rinse) via cannula over 2 min . After the reaction mixture was stirred overnight, it was quenched with pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer $(140 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated to give $352 \mathrm{mg}(98 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (244) and the Z isomer as a colorless oil. The product was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.90(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.22-1.28(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.61$ and 1.74 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.00(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.20-2.32(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.60-2.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.00-3.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.20-3.30 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.99(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.08-4.18(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.20-5.40(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3361,2925,2853,1742,1364,1239,1073,835 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl] -3(S)-hydroxy, ethyl ester (244)

A solution of $244(541 \mathrm{mg}, 1.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}(63.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.76 \mathrm{M}$, $11 \mathrm{~mL}, 47 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was stirred at room temperature for 21 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated to give $473 \mathrm{mg}(98 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (245) and the Z isomer as a colorless oil that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.20-1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.60$ and $1.75($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.75-1.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.10-2.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.55-2.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.75(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), $3.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20-3.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.10-4.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.15-5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3360,2955,2858,1738,1732,1251,1072,837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



## D-Proline, 1-(bromoacetyl)-2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-hydroxy-, ethyl ester (246)

To a solution of $245(473 \mathrm{mg}, 1.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(26 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution in water ( $3.97 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.98 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by bromoacetyl bromide ( $294 \mathrm{mg}, 1.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 3 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give $490 \mathrm{mg}(77 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (246) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/16:1 mixture) that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.90(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.25-1.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.62$ and 1.78 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.10-2.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.30-2.50(1 \mathrm{H}$, br s $), 2.85-3.20(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.50(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), $3.70-3.90(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.20-4.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.10-5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3421,2956,2930,2858,1737,1640,1443,1252,1070,839 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.


246



Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione, $8 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{R})$-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl] oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-8(S)-hydroxy (248)

A solution of 246 ( $478 \mathrm{mg}, 1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}(25 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.76 \mathrm{M}, 144$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 144 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was stirred at room temperature for 10 h . The solvent was removed under reduced pressure. EtOAc was added to the residue, and the resulting suspension was filtered. The filtrate was concentrated to give $368.5 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2 4 8})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 16: 1$ mixture) that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.90(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.95-2.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 2.12-2.27 (1H, m), $2.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=7.2,7.8,13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.5(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=7.2,7.2,13.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 2.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), $3.47-3.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=17.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.88-3.95$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.03(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=17.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.35-4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,8.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 6.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3258,2953,2931,2859,1674,1650,1455,1322,1254,838 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]
-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(methoxymethoxy)-, 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl), 2-ethyldiester (299)

To a solution of $220 \mathrm{a}(9 \mathrm{~g}, 1.69 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added diisopropylethylamine ( $13.08 \mathrm{~g}, 98.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by methoxymethyl chloride ( $8.14 \mathrm{~g}, 98.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h and after 26 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(300 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. TLC solvent system (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:2: 0.5 ) was used to monitor the reaction. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/6:1) afforded $9 \mathrm{~g}(91.2 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(299)$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 3.3: 1$ mixture).

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.04-0.11(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.901,0.907$ and 0.913 (total $\left.9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.22-1.32 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 1.41, 1.44 and 1.45 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.63,1.67$ and 1.77 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.98-2.11 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.74-2.99 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.04-3.27 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.337 and 3.344 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.68-3.91 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.02(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.04-4.32(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.59(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.07(1 / 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.24-5.34(4 / 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.6,171.62,153.7,139.0,138.5,138.1,120.0$, $118.0,117.6,96.5,96.4,96.2,82.6,82.2,81.1,70.6,70.1,69.9,68.5,68.1,62.0,61.9$, $61.0,55.7,45.7,45.2,31.1,30.0,29.5,29.0,28.9,28.5,28.4,21.7,14.5,14.0,-5.1,-5.2$. IR ( NaCl, film) $2957,2852,1739,1701,1391 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $502.3217\left(\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{NO}_{7} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 502.3200)




## D-Proline,2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-

 3(S)-(methoxymethoxy)-, ethyl ester (300)To a suspension of zinc bromide ( $11.0 \mathrm{~g}, 48.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.7 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(205 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added a solution of $299(9.0 \mathrm{~g}, 17.95 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(180 \mathrm{~mL}+25$ mL rinse) via cannula under Ar . After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , it was checked by TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:2:0.5), and all the starting material had gone. The reaction mixture was poured into a flask containing pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer ( 2 L ) and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left(1300 \mathrm{~mL}, 800 \mathrm{~mL}, 700 \mathrm{~mL}\right.$ ). The combined $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give 6.8 $\mathrm{g}(94.4 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{3 0 0})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: Z / 3.5: 1$ mixture) that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.042,0.044$ and $0.07($ total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.87-0.94(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $1.27(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.63$ and 1.74 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), 1.91-2.11 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.12-2.25 ( 1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=14.4,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.74-3.14(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.24-3.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35(3 \mathrm{H}$, s), $4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.60(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}),), 4.63(1 \mathrm{H}$, $1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.21(2 / 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.39(5 / 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.9,138.4,138.0,120.3,118.9,100.1,95.6$, $83.5,74.4,68.7,62.1,61.29,61.25,55.7,44.6,44.5,35.3,35.0,31.8,26.1,21.5,18.5$, $14.3,14.0,-5.1,-5.2$.

IR ( NaCl, film $) 3360,2953,2891,1739,1250,1182,1040,836 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $402.2665\left(\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 402.2675$)$




## D-Proline,1-(bromoacetyl)-2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-me thyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(methoxymethoxy), ethyl ester (301)

To a stirred solution of $300(3.40 \mathrm{~g}, 8.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(155 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution in water ( $43 \mathrm{~mL}, 21.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by bromoacetyl bromide ( $34.8 \mathrm{~g}, 16.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 2.5 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 4.4 g ( $100 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{3 0 1})$ and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/3.5:1 mixture) that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.06$ and 0.08 (total 6 H, br s), $0.91(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.27$ and 1.28 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 1.64 and 1.77 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 2.14-2.25 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.78-2.91 ( 1 H , m), 3.12-3.53 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.357 and 3.363 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.74 and 3.75 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J$ $=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.83$ and $3.85($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), 4.07-4.27 (3 H, m), $4.64(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.05(1 / 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.26(2 / 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.1,164.8,164.7,139.7,138.9,119.5,117.0,96.5$, $96.4,81.0,80.7,71.7,71.6,68.2,61.9,61.4,55.8,30.1,29.9,29.6,27.3,26.1,21.8,18.5$, $14.2,14.0,-5.0$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $2955,2893,1747,1650,1416,1249,839,776 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $522.1727\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{BrNO}_{6} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 522.1709).





## D-Proline,1-(aminoacetyl)-2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(methoxymethoxy), ethyl ester (241)

To a stirred solution of $301(6.66 \mathrm{~g}, 12.77 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(296 \mathrm{~mL})$ at 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}(165 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.76 \mathrm{M}, 950 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \mathrm{eq})$ over 1 min . After 2 h , the solvent and excess ammonia were removed under reduced pressure. EtOAc ( 600 mL ) was added to the residue followed by saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(600 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(60$ $\mathrm{mL})$ solutions. The organic layer was separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(1 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine $(2 \times 200$ mL ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give $5.49 \mathrm{~g}(94 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (241) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 3.5: 1$ mixture) that was used in the next step without further purification.

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.00-0.10(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.87$ and 0.89 (total $\left.9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.15-1.33$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.51-1.80(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.99-2.28(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.60-2.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.95-3.86(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.90-4.06 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.06-4.45 (3 H, m), 4.50-4.76 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.90-5.50 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.2,169.8,168.6,163.3,162.5,140.7,139.2$, $138.9,138.5,117.2,116.8,114.9,96.3,96.33,96.1,80.8,80.5,79.9,72.8,72.5,71.9$, $68.1,67.6,61.9,61.3,61.1,56.0,55.8,48.2,46.2,45.1,43.2,34.6,30.3,30.0,27.1,26.0$, $25.8,18.4,14.3,14.0,13.7,-3.4,-5.1,-5.2$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3474,3316,3060,2951,2843,1745,1652,1454,1252,1045,838,774$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $459.2908\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 459.2890$)$



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione, 8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-8(S)-(methoxy methoxy) (242)

To a stirred solution of $241(2.74 \mathrm{~g}, 5.98 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene $(70 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(710 \mathrm{mg}, 17.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq})$ over 5 min followed by HMPA ( 5.5 $\mathrm{mL})$. After 75 min , the reaction mixture was added dropwise to a saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 300 mL ). The mixture was extracted with EtOAc (300, 200, 100 mL ). The combined organic solution was washed with brine $(3 \times 260 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography ( EtOAc ) provided $2.06 \mathrm{~g}(84 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (242) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/~3:1 mixture).

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.03$ and 0.04 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.88(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56$ and 1.74 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 2.02-2.32 $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.60-2.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.34$ and 3.35 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.51(1$ H, m), 3.72-3.85 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.89-4.07 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.96 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$ ), 4.26-4.33 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.58 and $4.59($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.70(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.19(1 / 3 \mathrm{H}$, m), $5.44(2 / 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.44-4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.9,163.5,141.8,140.8,117.5,115.0,96.2$, $80.9,72.9 .67 .7,61.6,56.1,46.3,43.4,34.7,34.6,27.2,26.1,21.8,18.5,13.9,-5.0,-5.1$. IR ( NaCl, film) $3237,2955,2855,1694,1638,1639,1053,1323,1252,1112,1064,835$, $775 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $413.2475\left(\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 413.2471$)$




## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-2,3(1H)-dicarboxylic acid, $8 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{R})$-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-1,4-dioxo-8(S)-(methoxy methoxy)-, 2,3-dimethyl ester (91)

To a stirred solution of $242(5.02 \mathrm{~g}, 12.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF $(192 \mathrm{~mL})$ at -78 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\operatorname{Ar}$ was added $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi}(1.1 \mathrm{M}$ in hexane) $(14.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 15.83 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.3 \mathrm{eq})$ over 6 min . When the addition of $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi}$ was almost over, the reaction mixture changed to brown, and then was stirred for an additional 10 min . Methyl chloroformate ( $1.49 \mathrm{~g}, 15.8$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1.3 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added over 3 min . After 40 min , the reaction was complete (TLC system EtOAc: $\mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1$ ) and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 10 min . At this time, methyl chloroformate $(4.60 \mathrm{~g}, 48.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq})$ was added by syringe to the above reaction mixture at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 2 min , followed by $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}(60.8 \mathrm{~mL}$, $60.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, 5 eq ) over 8 min . After the reaction mixture was stirred for 70 $\min$ (TLC system EtOAc ), it was quenched with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(800 \mathrm{~mL})$. The EtOAc layer was separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(2 \times 400 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution (red color) was washed with brine ( $3 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a red oil. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography (EtOAc) gave $6.0 \mathrm{~g}(93.4 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (91) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.06(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89$ and $0.90($ total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.53,1.58$ and 1.75 (total 3 H, br s), 1.84-2.35 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.44-2.80 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.345 and 3.348 (total 3 H , s), 3.35-3.69 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.86 (3 H, s), $3.90(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.91-4.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.35$ and 4.37
(total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$ ), 4.572 and 4.575 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.65(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.23(1 / 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.43(2 / 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 167.1,165.8,158.4,158.42,140.2,139.8,118.0$, $116.0,113.5,96.2,96.1,81.7,81.0,74.1,74.0,68.3,67.3,63.2,61.8,67.3,56.2,54.8$, $54.0,44.4,44.2,34.9,34.6,27.3,27.0,26.1,21.9,21.2,18.5,-5.0$. IR (NaCl, film) $2955,2857,1793,1749,1680,1434,1375,1222,1035,838,779 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. FAB HRMS m/e $529.2592\left(\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 529.2581$)$




1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 3-oxo-, 2(R/S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsily] $]$ oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl], 1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2 -ethyl ester (166)

To a suspension of $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(88 \mathrm{mg}, 2.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq})$ in DME ( 5 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added a solution of $\mathbf{1 3 1}(514 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in DME ( 1 mL ). After $10 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}$ butyldimethylsilylether substituted prenyl iodide ( $915 \mathrm{mg}, 3.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min and at $41^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 17 h , it was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/25:1) provided $637 \mathrm{mg}(70 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (166) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 10.3: 1$ mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01-0.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.83-0.87(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.16-1.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 1.35-1.43 ( $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 1.51-1.56 and 1.68 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.29-2.45 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.25-2.71 $(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), 2.85-2.97 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.53-3.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.78-3.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.90-3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05-$ $4.21(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.14-5.47$ (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ).

IR (NaCl, film) 2974, 2928, 2856, 1769, 1738, 1707, 1389, 1251, 1109, 835, $769 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R/S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethyl silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(R/S)-hydroxy-,1-(1,1-dimethylethyl) 2-ethyl ester (167)

To a stirred solution of $\mathbf{1 6 6}(303 \mathrm{mg}, 0.666 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(103 \mathrm{mg}, 2.66 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq})$ over 10 min . After 7 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with $0.25 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KHSO}_{4}$ solution $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure. Water was added to the residue followed by aqueous $\mathrm{KHSO}_{4}$ solution until the acidity of the mixture reached $\mathrm{pH} 2-3$. The product was extracted with $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(4 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a colorless oil. Preparative TLC purification of the product (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:2:0.5) provided 280 mg ( $92 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(167)$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.20-1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.35-1.45$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.50-1.65(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.65-1.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.05-2.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.30-2.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.70-2.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.30-3.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.25-4.50(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), $5.25-5.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 3426, 2976, 2892, 1731, 1738, 1698, 1673, 1391, 1366, 1252, 1174, 837.

( $\pm$
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1,2-Pyrrolidinedicarboxylic acid, 2(R/S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethy Isilyl]-oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(R/S)-(phenylmethoxy)-, 1-(1,1-dimethyl ethyl) 2-ethyl ester (169)

To a suspension of $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(36.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.90 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 4 mL ) at 23 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was added a solution of $167(280 \mathrm{mg}, 0.612 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 7 mL ) via cannula. After $5 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NI}(95.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.4 \mathrm{eq})$ and benzyl bromide ( 157 mg , $0.919 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were added. After the reaction mixture was stirred for 20 h , it was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product (hexane:EtOAc/14:1) by radial chromatography provided 276 mg ( $83 \%$ ) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{1 6 9 )}$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of the $E / Z$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.88(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.15-1.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.40(9 \mathrm{H}$, m), $1.54(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.82-2.12(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.72-3.17(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.21-3.50(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 4.00-4.29 $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.45-4.65(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.45-5.57(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.22-7.35(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) 3032, 2976, 2885, 1738, 1697, 1390, 1366, 1249, 1177, 1108, $836 \mathrm{~cm}-1$.



D-Proline, 2(R/S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-
butenyl]-3(R/S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (125)
To a suspension of zinc bromide ( $320 \mathrm{mg}, 1.42 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.8 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was added a solution of $169(279 \mathrm{mg}, 0.51 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ via cannula. After 15 h, the reaction mixture was quenched with pH 10 sodium carbonate buffer ( 40 mL ) and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (4 times). The combined ether solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to provide $200 \mathrm{mg}(88 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (125) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z} / 7.5$ :1 mixture) that was used in next step without further purification

Data of the E/Z mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.15-1.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.54$ and $1.70($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.86-1.96(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.50-2.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.90-3.15(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 4.05-4.18 (3H, m), 4.55-4.65 (2H, m), 5.30-5.40 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 7.20-7.35 (5H, m). IR ( NaCl , film) $3354,3087,3060,2953,2854,1732,1462,1251,1183,1111,1067,837$, $735 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



## D-Proline,1-(bromoacetyl)-2(R/S)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(R/S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (170)

To a solution of $\mathbf{1 2 5}(200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.447 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(9 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution in water ( $1.34 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by bromoacetyl bromide ( $136 \mathrm{mg}, 0.67 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 6 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product (hexane:EtOAc/12:1 then $3: 1$ ) by radial chromatography provided $184 \mathrm{mg}(73 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (170) and the Z isomer (a colorless oil, as an E:Z/8.2:1 mixture).

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.20-1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52$ and 1.72 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.10-2.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.75-2.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.50-3.65$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.05-4.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.45-4.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.60-4.65(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), $5.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.40-7.60(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3089, 3065, 3030, 2955, 2855, 1739, 1660, 1440, 1441, 1250, 1111, 1063, 838, 776.


( $\pm$ )-Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione,8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-8(R)-(phenylmethyloxy) (171)

A solution of $170(156.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.275 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.59 \mathrm{M}$, $10.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 38 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The solvent and excess ammonia were removed in vacuo and gave a solid residue. EtOAc was added, and the resulting suspension was filtered. The filtrate was concentrated to give 136.3 mg of a crude oil. Preparative TLC purification of the product (EtOAc: $\mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1$ ) provided 85.0 mg (67\%) of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{1 7 1 )}$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil and 20 $\mathrm{mg}(14.4 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the $\mathrm{E}(172)$ and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of 171 ( E isomer):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.88-2.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.15-2.26(1 H, \mathrm{~m}), 2.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.7,14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.35-$ $3.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.55-3.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=3.9,16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.10(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{d}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.7,8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.73(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.96(1 \mathrm{H}$, $1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.50-5.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.28-7.40(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 3233, 3088, 3029, 2954, 2854, 1681, 1661, 1434, 1256, 1111, 837, 776 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.




259
266

## DL-Tryptophan, N -(diphenylmethylene)-, ethyl ester (266)

To a flask charged with 259 ( $267 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and gramine ( $194 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol, 1.1 eq$)$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(21 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}(101 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5 \mathrm{eq})$. The reaction mixture was refluxed for 11.5 h . TLC (hexane:EtOAc/4:1) was used to monitor the reaction. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue was purified by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/10:1 then $5: 1$ ) to provide 280 mg ( $80 \%$, based on 16 mg of recoverd $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ ) of $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ as a white foam.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.7,14.7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=4.8,14.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.10-4.20(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=4.8,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.50-$ $7.60(15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 8.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}, \mathrm{s})$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3405,3053,2981,2926,1732,1618,1442,1289 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-1-[N-(diphenylmethylene)amino]acetyl 1-, 3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, ethyl ester (274)

To a solution of $239(50.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added diphenylimine ( $50.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.8 \mathrm{eq}$ ), producing a white cloudy mixture. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15.5 h , it was concentrated. Preparative TLC (EtOAc:hexane/1:1) purification of the product provided $44 \mathrm{mg}(>66 \%)$ of an isomeric mixture of the E (274) and the Z isomer as a colorless oil.

Data of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ mixture:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $2.00-2.20(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.80-2.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20-3.50(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.80-3.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}$, s), 4.00-4.25 $(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50-4.65(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.00-5.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.20-7.80(15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3061,3030,2954,2929,2853,1731,1650,1417 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



274


275

D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, 1-DL-[N-(diphenylmethylene)]tryptophyl, ethyl ester (275)

To a solution of $274(179 \mathrm{mg}, 0.268 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 4 mL ) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was added $\mathrm{LiN}(\mathrm{TMS})_{2}(348 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.348 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.3 \mathrm{eq})$. After 30 min , HMPA ( 192 mg , $1.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 10 min , and gramine methyl iodide salt ( $92.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.29 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added in one portion. After 4 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc . The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc/12:1) purification of the product gave 89 mg ( $42 \%$ ).of a diastereomeric mixture 275 as a colorless oil (pure E isomer).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01-0.10(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.86-0.92(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.15-1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $1.62(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.80-2.10(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.85-3.05(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20-3.70(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.80-4.00(3 \mathrm{H}$, m), 4.10-4.25 $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50-4.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.80-7.20(20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 8.2(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s).

IR ( NaCl , film) $3302,3058,2958,2926,2858,1739,1729,1651,1455,1252, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$



D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, 1-D-tryptophyl, ethyl ester (276)

D-Proline, 2(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3(S)-(phenylmethyloxy)-, 1-L-tryptophyl, ethyl ester (277)

To a solution of $275(40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 7.1 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by $\mathrm{NH}_{2} \mathrm{OH} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(26.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.38$ mmol, 7.6 eq ). After 9 h , the reaction mixture was filtered, and the filtrate was concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 15: 1\right)$ purification of the product provided $16 \mathrm{mg}(50 \%)$ of 276 (a white foam, as a single anti/E isomer) and 8.4 mg ( $26.4 \%$ ) of 277 (a white foam, as a single syn/E isomer) (total yield 77\%)

Data of anti/E isomer (276):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.85(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.15-1.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$,
$1.90-2.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.80-2.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.25(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35-3.65(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.97(2 \mathrm{H}$, s), 3.85-4.00 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.10-4.20(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.10-7.35(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $8.4(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 3355, 3284, 3069, 2985, 2854, 1738, 1650, 1455, 1361, 1248, 1105, $1056,858 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-1,4-dione, 8a(R)-[E-4-[I(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]3-methyl-2-butenyl]hexahydro-3(R)-(1H-indol-3-ylmethyl)-8(S)(phenylmethyloxy) (278)

To a stirred solution of $276(15.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.024 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene ( $600 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added $60 \% \mathrm{NaH}(7.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 8 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by HMPA ( $300 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). After 2 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC (EtOAc:hexane/4:1) purification of the product provided 6 $\mathrm{mg}(\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ ) of $\mathbf{2 7 8}$ (a colorless oil, as a single anti/E isomer)

Data of 278:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.02(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.10-$ $2.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=15,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.2,15 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.45-3.55$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=4.5,15 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.00-4.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.17(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $4.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=3.6,9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.57(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.64(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=$ $11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 6.90-7.54(10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.9(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3039,3360,3286,2954,2857,1682,1649,1434,1253,1108 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-4(3H)-one, 8a(R)-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl] oxy]-6,7,8,8a-tetrahydro-3(R)-[(indol-3-yl)methyl]-1-methoxy-8(S)(phenylmethyloxy) (280)

To a solution of $278(23.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.039 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(255 \mathrm{mg}, 0.78 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{eq})$ followed by $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}(14.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.095 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.35 eq) under Ar. After 24 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC (EtOAc:hexane/1:1) purification of the product provided $12 \mathrm{mg}(51 \%)$ of $\mathbf{2 8 0}$ as a colorless oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.88(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.05-2.16(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 2.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.42(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.66(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.90-4.00(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 4.23-4.38(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.00-7.40(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3295,3064,2931,1697,1651,1456,1436,1102,1069,839,739 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



3-[[8aR-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-
3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(phenylmethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-indole-1-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (281)

To a stirred solution of $\mathbf{2 8 0}(10.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0166 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(200 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added triethylamine ( $1.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ), DMAP ( $2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0166$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ and $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}(11.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.049 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.0 \mathrm{eq})$. After 2 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC (EtOAc:hexane/1:1) purification of the product provided 5 mg ( $43 \%$ ) of 281 as a colorless oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.02(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.84(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.51(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.62$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.96-2.11(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=9.3,14.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.07-3.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.30-3.45$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=4.2,14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.60(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.90(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.96-$ $4.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.19-4.37(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.03-7.06(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.18-7.27(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $7.53(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.65-7.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 8.00-8.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

IR (NaCl, film) 2930, 2857, 1732, 1694, 1650, 1372, 1254, 1159, 1090, $1069 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.



3-[[8aR-[ $(E)$-4-(hydroxy)-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(phenylmethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-indole-1-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (282)

A solution of $281\left(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 7.1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ and $\operatorname{TBAF}\left(11 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.1 \times 10^{-2}\right.$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, 1.5 eq ) in THF ( $150 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 282 as an oil (yield, unknown)
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.58(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.63(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.95-2.10(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.35-2.45$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35-3.45(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.50-3.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.60(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.78-$ $3.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.91(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.90-4.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.10-4.40(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.25-5.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.00$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.20-7.50(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.40-7.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.65-7.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.95-8.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. IR ( NaCl , film) $3387,2964,2935,1730,1710,1651,1371,1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. FAB HRMS m/e $588.3072\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 588.3073$)$


( $\pm$ )-1,3-Dihydro-7-[3,3-dimethyloxiranyl)methoxy]-6-hydroxy-2H-indol-2-one (103)
To a solution of m-CPBA ( $8 \mathrm{~g}, 46.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(250 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(4.87 \mathrm{~g}, 59 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.8 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}(10 \mathrm{~g})$. A solid of $102(7.6 \mathrm{~g}$, $32.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added to the reaction mixture in one portion. After $1 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ ( 5 $\mathrm{g}, 60 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.85 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{CPBA}(8 \mathrm{~g}, 46.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq})$ were added to the reaction mixture. After 1.5 h , the reaction mixture was filtered, and the solid pad was washed with $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$. The filtrate was washed twice with a mixture solution of $5 \% \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ with $10 \% \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 200$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine ( $1 \times 400 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give $7.1 \mathrm{~g}(87 \%)$ of $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ as a black foam. The crude product was used without further purification.

Epoxide 103 is a known compound. Analytical data: lit. ${ }^{33}$.


## ( $\pm$ )-3,4,8,10-Tetrahydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2H,9H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-

 9 -one (104)$\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}$ ( $3.94 \mathrm{~mL}, 33.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added dropwise to a flame-dried flask charged with anhydrous THF ( 400 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 min , a solution of $103(7.1 \mathrm{~g}$, $28.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 65 mL ) was added to the reaction mixture via cannula over 7 min to give a gray mixture. The ice-bath was removed and the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2.5 h . Approximately one-half of the solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the remaining solution poured into a separatory funnel containing saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, which was then exhaustively extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic solution was washed with brine ( $1 \times 600 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 7.0 g of $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ as a black solid. The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (EtOAc:Hexane $3: 1$ ) to yield $3.7 \mathrm{~g}(52 \%)$ of 104 as a reddish solid. Epoxide 104 is a known compound. Analytical data: lit. ${ }^{33}$.


## ( $\pm$ )-3-Hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-3,4,10-trihydro-2H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole (105)

To a solution of $106(2.9 \mathrm{~g}, 12.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 230 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added DDQ ( $3.48 \mathrm{~g}, 16.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.36 \mathrm{eq}$ ) over $2-3 \mathrm{~min}$. After 20 min , the reaction mixture was concentrated and EtOAc was added to the residue. The EtOAc solution was washed with $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}\left(1 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}\right.$ ), brine ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated. The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (EtOAc:Hexane/1:1) to yield $2.6 \mathrm{~g}(91 \%)$ of $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ as a white purplish solid.

Epoxide 105 is a known compound. Analytical data: lit. ${ }^{33}$.
Data for 106:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.22(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.58(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.04(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.61$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $6.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz})$.




## ( $\pm$ )-3-[[1,1-Dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-4,4-dimethyl-3,4,10-trihydro-2H-

## [1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole (107)

A solution of $105(2.68 \mathrm{~g}, 11.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$, imidazole $(5.13 \mathrm{~g}, 75.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 6.6$ eq) and TBSCl ( $4.88 \mathrm{~g}, 32.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.81 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in DMF ( 22.6 mL ) was heated at $44-45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( 200 mL ) and extracted with EtOAc ( $3 \times 70 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined EtOAc solution was washed with brine $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a white solid. The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (EtOAc:Hexane/1:6) to yield 3.9 g ( $98 \%$ ) of 107 as a white solid.

Epoxide $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ is a known compound. Analytical data: lit. ${ }^{33}$.


3-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2 $\mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}$ $[1,4]$ dioxepino $[2,3-g]$ indol-8-yl]methyl $]-8 a R-[(E / Z)-4-[[(1,1-d i m e t h y l e t h y l) d i m e t h y l ~$ silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-octahydro-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-1,4-dioxo-pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-3R-carboxylic acid, methyl ester (303)

3-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2 $\mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}$ [1,4]dioxepino $[2,3-g]$ indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(E/Z)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethyl silyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-octahydro-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-1,4-dioxo-pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine-3S-carboxylic acid, methyl ester (304)

To a flame-dried 1-L flask charged with $91(6.0 \mathrm{~g}, 11.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$, gramine derivative $60(5.04 \mathrm{~g}, 12.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq})$ and molecular sieves $(4 \AA, 6.5 \mathrm{~g})$ under Ar was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ( 340 mL , anhydrous). The reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{P}(1.59 \mathrm{~g}, 7.95 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.7 \mathrm{eq})$ was added in one portion. After the reaction mixture was refluxed for 4 h , the solvent was removed under reduced pressure to give 12 g of a foamy solid. Purification of the products by flash column chromatography (hexane: $\mathrm{EtOAc} / 2.5: 1,2: 1$ then EtOAc ) gave $5.0 \mathrm{~g}(53 \%)$ of $\mathbf{3 0 3}$ ( a white foam, as a high
$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ syn isomer) and 1.6 g ( $17 \%$ ) of 304 (a white foam, as a lower $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ anti isomer). The combined yield was $70 \%$.

Data of syn isomer (303) (mixture of four diasteromers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.03$ and 0.04 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.12-0.19 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.88 and 0.91 (total $18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.11-1.17 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 1.46 and 1.48 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.55 and 1.68 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.82-2.19(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.20-2.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.46-2.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.22-3.60(2 \mathrm{H}$, m ), $3.23,3.29,3.31$ and 3.75 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.71, 3.73, 3.74 and 3.32 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.79$4.28(7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.41-4.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.53-4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.11(3 / 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.34(2 / 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $6.11,6.13$ and $6.16($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 6.75$ and $6.76($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.97-7.02(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), $7.06(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 8.25 and 8.27 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.6,169.63,167.3,166.9,161.9,141.9,141.6$, $140.3,139.6,137.0,136.8,129.2,129.1,125.9,125.8,123.7,117.9,117.8,116.5,116.53$, $113.1,113.15,108.3,95.9,95.8,80.9,80.6,80.5,76.3,76.2,73.1,71.6,68.4,66.9,66.8$, $61.6,55.9,53.6,44.2,43.9,34.1,33.8,28.4,28.1,27.2,27.1,26.0,25.8,21.8,19.6,19.0$, $18.5,18.0,13.7,-4.0,-4.6,-5.1$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3310,2954,2857,1742,1676,1438,1251,1091,837,776 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $829.4377\left(\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 829.4365)
Anal. Calcd. For $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Si}_{2} \mathrm{C}, 60.76 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.13 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.06$. Found: C, $60.58 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.96 ; \mathrm{N}$, 5.13

Data of anti isomer (304) (mixture of four diasteromers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.11-0.20(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.78-0.95(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.09$ and 1.12 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.47(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.54-1.80(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.80-2.80(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.29(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.21-$ $3.58(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.65-4.75(11 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.52(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J$ $=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.07-5.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.32-6.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.70-6.81(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.90-7.03(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), $7.05-7.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 8.35,8.39$ and 8.46 (total 1 H , br s)
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ I $68.8,168.7,166.5,166.4,162.5,141.6,141.5$, $139.6,139.4,136.8,129.1,129.0,126.0,124.5,117.8,116.1,116.0,113.8,108.6,95.6$,
$80.6,80.2,76.3,73.1,73.0,72.9,72.94,71.6,68.0,61.7,55.9,55.8,53.5,43.8,35.2$, $35.0,33.8,33.6,29.8,28.4,28.3,27.4,26.0,25.8,19.3,19.1,18.5,18.0,13.9,13.8,-4.0$, $-4.6,-5.1,-5.3$.

IR (NaCl, film) $3285,2950,2855,1751,1678,1662,1442,1254,1091,1044,840,777$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $829.4360\left(\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 829.4365)





3R-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl$2 H, 10 H-[1,4]$ dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(Z)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-hexahydro-1,4-dioxo-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine (305Z)

3R-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl$2 \mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}-[1,4]$ dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-octahydro-1,4-dioxo-8S-(methoxymethoxy)pyrrolo [1,2-a]pyrazine (305E)

3S-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(Z)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-hexahydro-1,4-dioxo-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazine (306Z)

3S-[[3R/S-[I(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsily]]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(E)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl) dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-octahydro-1,4-dioxo-8S-(methoxymethoxy)pyrrolo $[1,2-a]$ pyrazine ( $\mathbf{3 0 6 E}$ )

To a $50-\mathrm{mL}$ flask charged with $303(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{LiCl}(260 \mathrm{mg}$, $6.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq})$ under Ar was added a solution of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(32.5 \mathrm{mg}, 1.81 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq})$ in HMPA $(9.32 \mathrm{~mL})$. After the reaction mixture was heated on an oil bath at $104-105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 h , it was cooled to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and poured into a $250-\mathrm{mL}$ Erlenmeyer flask containing EtOAc $(70 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined extracts were washed with brine $(6 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to give a white foam. Purification of the products by radial chromatography (EtOAc:hexane/2:1) provided $280 \mathrm{mg}(30 \%)$ of a diastereomeric mixture of the anti/Z ( $\mathbf{3 0 5 Z}$ ) and the anti/E $(305 \mathrm{E})$ isomer as a white foam and $545 \mathrm{mg}(59 \%)$ of a diastereomeric mixture of the $s y n / \mathrm{Z}(\mathbf{3 0 6 Z})$ and the $s y n / \mathrm{E}(\mathbf{3 0 6 E})$ isomer as a white foam. The combined yield was $89 \%$.

The analytical samples of anti/Z, anti/E, syn/Z and syn/E were obtained through careful separation of the products by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/2:1, 1:1 then $\mathrm{EtOAc})$

Data of anti/Z isomer (305Z) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.03-0.17(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.88(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.92(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.14$ and $1.16(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.70(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.06-2.30(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.58-2.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.82(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{dd}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.37(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.41-3.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.69-3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.86-$ $4.06(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.61(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.73(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.16(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 5.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.16$ (1H, br s).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.3,166.1,165.6,142.1,141.5,141.4,140.5$, $140.4,137.2,134.8,129.9,129.7,125.7,125.1,124.8,119.7,117.8,115.4,115.3,112.9$, $110.8,96.5,96.3,96.2,80.96,80.90,76.3,73.6,73.5,71.8,67.7,67.8,61.6,56.0,54.4$, $54.3,44.1,43.3,34.5,29.9,28.6,28.4,27.5,26.7,26.0,25.9,21.7,19.5,19.3,18.8,18.5$, 18.1, 13.8, -3.9, -4.6, -5.1.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3366,2955,2929,2893,2856,1681,1445,1251,1221,1090,1042,837$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $771.4286\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 771.4310)
Data of anti/E isomer (305E) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01,0.02,0.15$ and 0.16 (total $\left.12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.87(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.91$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.14(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.53$ and 1.54 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.90-2.31(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.67$ $(1 \mathrm{H}$, br dd, $J=14.7,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=14.7,11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.12-3.77(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.37$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.81-4.10(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.18-4.38(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.60(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.72(1$ $\mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{brt}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 6.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 7.02$ and 7.03 (total 1 H, br s), $7.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.17(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.2,165.5,142.0,141.9,140.5,137.1,129.8$, $129.7,125.0,125.03,123.1,117.8,117.7115 .4,115.2,112.96,112.90,110.87,110.82$, $96.1,80.85,80.80,76.3,73.5,71.7,67.88,67.81,56.0,54.5,54.4,43.3,34.5,29.8,28.8$, $28.7,28.39,28.35,26.0,25.8,19.4,19.3,18.4,18.0,13.7,-4.0,-4.6,-5.1,-5.2$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3366, 2955, 2929, 2894, 2857, 1681, 1445, 1251, 1107, 1043, 837, 776 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $771.4286\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 771.4310$)$
Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}: \mathrm{C}, 62.22 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.48 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.44$. Found: C, $62.40 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.48 ; \mathrm{N}$, 5.34

Data of syn/Z isomer (306Z) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.10(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.15$ and $0.17(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.91$ and $0.93(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $1.14(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.87(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.07-2.28(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.70-2.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.30(3 \mathrm{H}$,
s), 3.37-3.47 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.55-3.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.85-4.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.16(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.20-4.30(4 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 4.54(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.74$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}, \mathrm{s}), 6.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$, s).

IR ( NaCl , film) $3297,2955,2857,1681,1651,1445,1252,1221,1092,1049,837,776$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $777.4318\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 777.4310)
Data of syn/E isomer ( $\mathbf{3 0 6 E}$ ) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01-0.18(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.85-0.95(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.13$ and 1.14 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.48(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.63$ and 1.86 (total 3 H, br s), 2.00-2.26 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.61-2.99 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.35-3.63(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.82-4.01(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05-4.35(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.54$ and $4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.61$ and $4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.20-5.57$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.65-5.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.74-6.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.98-7.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.12-7.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $8.13-8.26$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ ) (mixture of four diastereomers) $\delta 166.5,165.7$, $141.8,140.0,139.9,137.0,129.6,124.9,123.3,118.7,117.7,117.6,116.0,113.1,110.9$, $110.8,95.4,80.6,80.7,76.2,73.0,71.6,68.0,61.7,57.3,57.2,55.8,43.2,33.5,32.4$, $28.3,27.0,26.0,25.8,21.9,19.2,18.5,18.0,-4.0,-4.7,-5.1,-5.2$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3297, 2955, 2857, 1681, 1651, 1445, 1252, 1221, 1092, 1049, 837, 776 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $771.4318\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 771.4310$)$


ppm



## Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-4(3H)-one, 3R-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-

 3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(Z)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-6,7,8,8a-tetrahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy) (307Z)

Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-4(3H)-one, 3R-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl- $2 \mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}$-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[ $(E)$-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-6,7,8,8a-tetrahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy) (307E)

To a flask charged with $\mathbf{3 0 5}(45.0 \mathrm{mg}, 58.3 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}), \mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(380 \mathrm{mg}, 1.16$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}(21.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.145 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq})$ under Ar was added $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(1.93 \mathrm{~mL})$. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a white foam. Preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:2:0.5) purification of the products gave $8.3 \mathrm{mg}(18 \%)$ of $\mathbf{3 0 7 Z}$ ( a white foam, as a high $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ anti/ Z isomer) and $21.3 \mathrm{mg}(46.5 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{3 0 7 E}$ (a white foam, as a lower $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{r}}$ anti/E isomer). The combined yield was $65 \%$.

Data of antilZ isomer (307Z) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.04$ and $0.13-0.15$ (total $12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $0.87-0.90$ (total $18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.06 and 1.39 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.44 and 1.48 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.72(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.82-2.10$ (total 3 H , m), 2.37-2.47 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.00 and 3.14 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.31-3.50 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.61 and
3.63 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.75-4.30 (total $10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 5.05 and 5.22 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 6.67 and 6.70 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 6.98 and 7.01 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $7.24-7.29$ (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 7.94-7.95 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz})$.

IR ( NaCl, film $) 3320,2958,2862,1707,1643,1466,1361,1249,1089,837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $786.4507\left(\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 786.4544).
Data of anti/E isomer ( $\mathbf{3 0 7 E}$ ) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.012,0.018,0.025$ and $0.030($ total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.14$ and 0.15 (total 6 H ), $0.88,0.89,0.90$ and 0.91 (total $18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.07 and 1.13 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.45 and 1.48 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.52(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.82-2.16(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.03$ and 3.16 (total 3 H, s), 3.26-3.52 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.62 and 3.64 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.71-4.32 ( $10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 5.19-5.29 (1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.99$ and $7.03($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.27$ and $7.29(1$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.93$ and $7.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.1,169.12,141.4,141.0,139.9,136.7,136.6$, $128.8,127.6,127.2,123.1,123.0,116.4,116.3,115.9,114.7,114.5,113.8,113.5,95.5$, $94.9,80.5,80.2,79.7,79.5,76.6,71.7,71.6,71.4,71.3,68.16,68.11,61.0,60.7,55.6$, $55.5,42.0,41.9,33.5,33.51,29.1,28.9,28.7,28.1,27.7,26.1,25.9,19.7,18.7,18.5$, 18.1, 13.7, $-3.8,-3.9,-4.5,-5.1$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3320,2958,2862,1707,1643,1446,1254,1217,1105,1041,839,775$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $785.4462\left(\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}\right.$ requires 785.4466)






Pyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-4(3H)-one, 3S-[[3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indol-8-yl]methyl]-8aR-[(E/Z)-4-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-6,7,8,8a-tetrahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy) (308)

To a flask charged with $306(1.50 \mathrm{~g}, 1.94 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}), \mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(9.50 \mathrm{~g}, 29.1$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 15 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{OBF}_{4}\left(863 \mathrm{mg}, 5.83 \mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{eq}\right.$ ) was added $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(65 \mathrm{~mL})$. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 11 h , it was quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(120 \mathrm{~mL})$, and extracted with EtOAc ( 3 times). The combined organic extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 1.60 g of a foamy solid. The product was purified by flash column chromatography (EtOAc:hexane/1:1) to give 877 mg of $\mathbf{3 0 8}$ $(57 \%, 86 \%$ based on the recovered 500 mg of a mixture of starting material and product) Data of 308 (mixture of four diasteromers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.00-0.18(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.87,0.88,0.90$ and 0.91 (total 18 H , s), 1.07 and $1.10($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.47$ and 1.48 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.51-2.03(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.04-3.16$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20-3.51(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.28(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.70(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 3.74-3.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.90-4.23$ $(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.37-4.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.53(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.15-5.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 7.06-7.11 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 7.20 and $7.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.8,158.5,141.5,141.4,139.6,139.3,138.5$, $138.3,136.8,128.9,129.0,126.4,122.6,119.3,116.8,114.2,114.1,113.9,113.6,94.9$,
$80.4,80.3,79.5,71.6,70.79,70.73,62.8,62.7,61.6,55.7,52.7,42.2,33.6,33.2,31.6$, $28.5,28.3,27.1,26.0,25.8,21.8,19.2,18.8,18.4,18.0,13.5,-3.9,-4.6,-5.2$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3327,2956,2855,1694,1644,1448,1252,1087,1042,836 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $786.4525\left(\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}_{2}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 786.4544)

308



8-[[8aR-[ $(E)-4$-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (309E)

To a solution of $\mathbf{3 0 7}(300 \mathrm{mg}, 0.382 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3.74 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added triethylamine ( $42.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.419 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ), DMAP ( $46.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.381 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}(250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.0 \mathrm{eq})$. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h , the solvent was removed, and the residue was purified by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/3:1) to provide 120 mg of $\mathbf{3 0 9}$ (a white foam, as a mixture of the anti/E and the anti/Z isomer) and 208 mg of $\mathbf{3 0 9 E}$ (a white foam, as an anti/E isomer). The combined yield was 97\%

Data of anti/E isomer (309E) (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.008,0.014,0.018$ and 0.024 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.14,0.15$ and 0.16 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $0.87,0.88,0.90$ and 0.91 (total $18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.06 and 1.10 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.48 and 1.49 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.52(3 \mathrm{H}$, br s), 1.595 and 1.598 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.76-1.95 (1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.97-2.13(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.35-2.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.02$ and $3.15($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.18-3.48$ (3 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.55$ and 3.61 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.70-4.06 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $3.93(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), 4.09-4.31 ( 4 H , $\mathrm{m}), 5.17-5.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}),(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.22-7.32(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta:-5.1,-4.6,-3.65,-3.58,13.7,18.2,18.6,18.7,19.1,26.0$, $26.1,27.7,28.4,28.6,28.9,33.5,42.0,52.7,55.4,55.6,60.3,60.7,68.0,68.1,71.1,71.2$, $76.2,79.0,79.2,80.3,82.39,82.44,94.6,114.9,115.8,116.7,116.9,119.1,126.9,127.0$, $127.7,131.1,131.4,139.9,140.2,140.3,145.76,145.85,149.1,158.0,168.8,169.2$. IR ( NaCl, film) $2953,2892,1749,1700,1649,1494,1435,1250,1257,1085 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. FAB HRMS m/e $886.5069\left(\mathrm{C}_{46} \mathrm{H}_{75} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Si}_{2}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 886.5069$)$


## 8-[[8aR-[ $(E)$-4-hydroxy-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (311E)

To a solution of 309 E ( $190 \mathrm{mg}, 0.214 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in THF ( 2.6 mL ) at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added TBAF ( $0.70 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, $0.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.3 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 11 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with water $(55 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 / 1)$ (three times). The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. The product was purified by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/1:2) to provide $132 \mathrm{mg}(94 \%)$ of 311 E as a white foam

Data of 311 E (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.19$ and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.55 and 1.57 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.591 and $1.594($ total $12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.77-1.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.98-2.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.01-3.12 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.04 and 3.15 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.20-3.44 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.49-3.67 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.52 and 3.61 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $3.75-4.38(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.22-7.30(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.9,158.0,148.8,146.0,140.5,131.3,131.1$, $127.9,127.8,127.0,126.8,118.7,116.4,115.3,115.2,94.6,94.4,82.5,82.4,79.9,79.8$, $79.1,78.7,75.6,71.1,70.8,70.7,67.9,60.5,60.1,55.4$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3406,2980,2883,1745,1696,1634,1439,1435,1367,1251,1155$, $1043,966,917 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $658.3328\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 658.3339)


 $\frac{h}{H}$




8-[[8aR-[(E)-4-hydroxy-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (312E)

8-[[8aR-[(Z)-4-hydroxy-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2 $\mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}$-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (312Z)

To a solution of $\mathbf{3 0 8}(877 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was added triethylamine ( $124 \mathrm{mg}, 1.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ), DMAP ( $136 \mathrm{mg}, 1.10 \mathrm{mmol}$, $1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ and $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}(730 \mathrm{mg}, 3.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.1 \mathrm{eq})$. After 4 h , the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure. THF ( 0.8 mL ) and TBAF ( $2.84 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, $2.84 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.47 \mathrm{eq})$ were added to the above residue at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 16 h , additional TBAF ( $1.70 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.48 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h , and then a third aliquot of TBAF $(1.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.87 \mathrm{eq})$ was added. The reaction was allowed to proceed for a further 10 h before being quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(400 \mathrm{~mL})$. TLC ( $\mathrm{EtOAc}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1$ ) was used to monitor the reaction. The mixture was extracted with EtOAc/ether (2/1) ( $3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a foamy solid. The products were purified by radial chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/1:2) to provide 550 mg of $\mathbf{3 1 2 E}$ (a white foam, as
a high $R_{f} s y n / E$ isomer) and 240 mg of 312 Z (a white foam, as a lower $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} \operatorname{syn} / \mathrm{Z}$ isomer), The combined yield was $100 \%$.

Data of 312E (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.20$ and $1.22($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.54-1.59(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.61(9 \mathrm{H}$, s), 1.74-2.19 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.93-3.23 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.25-3.41(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.29$ and 3.30 (total 3 H , s), $3.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s $), 3.70(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.80-3.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.00-4.17(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.23-4.35(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 4.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.54$ and $4.55($ total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.71$ and 5.03 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.91$ and 6.92 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.35$ and 7.39 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(\mathrm{APT})\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.6,169.3,159.2,158.4,148.8,146.6,146.5$, $141.0,139.0,138.8,130.5,130.4,128.5,126.9,126.8,119.5,119.4,118.2,117.9,117.1$, $116.8,115.1,95.0,94.8,83.0,80.2,80.1,75.8,71.0,70.9,68.4,68.3,62.2,61.8,52.8$, $52.7,42.8,42.3,34.2,33.8,30.9,28.2,27.1,26.4,26.0,23.6,23.3,14.3,13.9$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3416,1750,1693,1636,1493,1368,1157,757 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $657.3263\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10}\right.$ requires 657.3261$)$
Data of $\mathbf{3 1 2 Z}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.20$ and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.53 and 1.54 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1 . .60$ (total 9H, s), 1.77 (total 3H, s), 1.90-2.15 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.83-2.95 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.28 and 3.29 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.21-3.41 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $3.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.67 and 3.68 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.83 and 3.97 (total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.01-4.15 (total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.27-4.28 (total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.37-4.42 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.530$ and $4.539($ total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.18$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.37$ and 7.39 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ).

IR ( NaCl , film) $3420,2977,2945,1750,1699,1635,1368,1154,1037 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $657.3234\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10}\right.$ requires 657.3261)





8-[[8aR-[(E)-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (324E)

To a solution of $311 \mathrm{E}(55.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.084 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added collidine ( $101 \mathrm{mg}, 0.84 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by dropwise addition of MsCl ( $110 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.607 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{MsCl}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0.092 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ). The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3.5 h and at $7{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 14 h . TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 18: 1\right)$ showed that the starting material had reacted and that the desired allylic mesylate and by-product bis mesylate (minor) were formed. At this time, the reaction mixture was concentrated and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(675 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added followed by HMPA ( $84.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.453 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.4 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $24 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{Bn}(\mathrm{Bu})_{3} \mathrm{NCl}(104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq})$ was added, and the mixture was stirred at $23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for an additional 6 h . TLC (hexane:EtOAc/1:1) showed that the reaction was finished. The reaction mixture was concentrated and extracted with $\left(\mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)(2 / 1)$. The combined extracts were washed with $0.005 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}^{\text {in }}$ water ( $5 \times 35 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), washed with brine (once), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 60 mg of a while foam. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 25: 1\right)$ purification of the products gave $43 \mathrm{mg}(77 \%)$ of $\mathbf{3 2 4 E}$ as a white foam Data of 324 E (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.18$ and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.53 and 1.56 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.58 and $1.59($ total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.67(3 \mathrm{H}$, br s), $1.78-2.15(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.38-2.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.03-$ $3.65(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.04-3.14$ (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.51$ and 3.61 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.77-4.36 ( $7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $3.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.26-5.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.21-7.29(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.5,157.7,157.6,148.9,146.2,140.7,140.6$, $137.1,131.5,131.1,128.1,128.0,127.1,126.9,122.2,118.9,118.7,116.7,116.5,115.4$, $115.3,94.7,94.6,82.6,82.5,80.0,79.9,79.2,78.8,75.8,71.0,71.03,70.9,70.8,60.6$, $60.0,55.5,55.3,52.69,52.7,51.4,42.0,33.9,33.8,28.5,28.4,28.2,27.5,26.4,26.0$, 23.4, 23.2, 14.4.

IR ( NaCl , film) $3419,2978,2894,1745,1698,1645,1436,1158,1037,733 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $676.2992\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 676.2992)



8-[[8aR-[( $E$ )-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2 $\mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}$-[1,4]dioxepino [2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1 dimethylethyl ester (317E)

To a solution of $312 \mathrm{E}(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.152 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.7 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added collidine ( $183 \mathrm{mg}, 1.52 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by dropwise addition of MsCl ( $275 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.607 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0.167 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ). The reaction mixture was stirred at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and at $7{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 17 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.35$ mL ) was added followed by HMPA ( $155 \mathrm{mg}, 0.863 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.7 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $22 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{Bn}(\mathrm{Bu})_{3} \mathrm{NCl}(189 \mathrm{mg}, 0.61 \mathrm{mmol}, 4 \mathrm{eq})$ was added, and the mixture was stirred at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for an additional 5 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated and extracted with $\left(E t O A c / E t_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)(2 / 1)$. The combined extracts were washed with 0.005 N HCl in water ( $4 \times 70 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), washed with brine (once), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give 119 mg of a while foam. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 18: 1\right)$ purification of the products gave $90 \mathrm{mg}(90 \%$, based on recovered 2 mg of $\mathbf{3 1 2 E}$ ) of $\mathbf{3 1 7 E}$ as a white foam and $8 \mathrm{mg}(7 \%)$ of by-product chloride-mesylate 323 E as a white foam.

Data of $\mathbf{3 1 7 E}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 1.20$ and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.57 and 1.58 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.61(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.69(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 1.78-1.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.96-2.11(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.12-2.33(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$,
$2.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dt}, J=14.4,9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.02-3.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.21-3.43(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.295$ and 3.299 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.56-3.64 (1 H, m), 3.66 and $3.67(\operatorname{total} 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.93(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.10-4.25(2$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.25-4.33(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.55(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ABq}), 5.22$ and 5.29 (total 1 H , br t, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.19$ and $7.27($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.42$ and 7.43 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.5,158.1,157.8,148.8,146.6,141.1,136.1$, $136.0,130.3,128.47,128.40,126.8,122.97,122.90,119.4,117.0,116.8,114.9,94.8$, $82.9,80.1,80.0,79.6,79.5,75.7,70.9,70.7,61.8,55.8,52.8,51.5,42.3,33.9,33.8,31.5$, $31.4,28.2,27.1,27.0,26.4,23.4,23.3,14.4$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $3234,2982,2941,1751,1699,1643,1370,1036 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $675.2920\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Cl}\right.$ requires 675.2922)
Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Cl}: \mathrm{C}, 60.39 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.85 ; \mathrm{N}, 6.21$. Found: C, $60.52 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.74 ; \mathrm{N}$, 5.98.




8-[[8aR-[(Z)-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-3,4-dihydro-3-hydroxy-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (317Z)

To a solution of $312 \mathrm{Z}\left(60.0 \mathrm{mg}, 91.2 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ were added triethylamine ( $18.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.182 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) followed by dropwise addition of $\mathrm{MsCl}\left(150 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.607 \mathrm{M}\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 91.2 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}\right)$. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 11 h and at $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h , it was concentrated and extracted with $\left(\mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)(2 / 1)$. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 25: 1\right)$ purification of the product gave 29 mg ( $75 \%$ yield, based on 22.6 mg of recovered $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z}$ ) of $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z}$ as a white foam.

Data of $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.20-1.21$ (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.56-1.57 (total 3H, s), 1.61 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.84 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.90-2.20 (total 3H, m), 2.32-2.45 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.71-2.88 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.02-3.18 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.29-3.30 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.23-3.41 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.57-3.61 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.66-3.68$ (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.93-3.97 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.10-4.39 (total 5H, m), 4.54-4.55 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.20$ (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $6.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.43$ (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$.

IR (NaCl, film) 3407, 2979, 2929, 1747, 1698, 1643, 1493, 1369, $1046 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $676.2994\left(\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 676.2922$)$



## 8-[[8aR-[ $(E)$-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-

 (methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3R-yl]methyl]-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3$g$ ]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (326E)To a solution of $\mathbf{3 2 4 E}\left(40.0 \mathrm{mg}, 59.2 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ and 2,6 -lutidine ( 12.7 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.118 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.18 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was slowly added tbutyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate ( $23.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.183 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 3.5 h , additional 2,6 -lutidine ( $12.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.118 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and t-butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethane-sulfonate $(23.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.183 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq})$ were added, and the reaction was allowed to stir for 1 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a foamy solid. Preparative TLC (hexane:EtOAc/1:1) purification of the product gave $41.5 \mathrm{mg}(89 \%)$ of $\mathbf{3 2 6 E}$ as a white foam.

Data of 326 E (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 0.135,0.140$ and 0.148 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.89 and 0.90 (total 9 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.05$ and $1.10($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.47$ and $1.48($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.59(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.65-1.69(3$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.81-1.93(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.96-2.11(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.37-2.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.00$ and 3.13 (total 3 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.18-3.40(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.53$ and $3.60($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.73-4.26(7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 4.27-4.35 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $5.28-5.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.18-7.28(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(100.6 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.3,168.9,168.8,157.8,157.7,149.1,145.9$, $145.2,137.1,131.3,131.0,127.7,127.6,127.0,126.9,122.26,122.2,119.1,116.6,116.5$, $114.84,114.80,94.6,82.3,82.4,80.2,79.0,78.8,76.17,76.14,71.07,71.02,60.6,60.5$, $60.1,55.5,55.3,53.6,52.7,51.4,42.0,41.9,33.9,33.8,28.7,28.6,28.4,28.2,27.5,25.9$, $21.2,19.0,18.5,18.0,14.4,14.3,-3.71,-3.79,-4.7$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 2953, 2894, 1749, 1701, 1652, 1491, 1369, 1247, $1159 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $790.3854\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{60} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{SiCl}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 790.3865)




8-[[8aR- $[(E)$-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl $]$-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3$g$ ]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (325E)

To a solution of $\mathbf{3 1 7 E}$ ( $152 \mathrm{mg}, 0.225 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and 2,6-lutidine ( $48.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45$ mmol , 2 eq ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was slowly added t-butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate ( $88.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.450 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ eq). After 4 h , additional 2,6-lutidine ( $48.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and t-butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate ( 88.6 mg , $0.450 \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were added, and the reaction was allowed to proceed for a further 2 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc . The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give a foamy solid. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/1:1) gave $140 \mathrm{mg}(79 \%)$ of 325 E as a white foam. Data of 325E (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.14$ and $0.15($ total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.07$ and 1.09 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.48(3 \mathrm{H}$, br s), $1.60(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.66(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.77-1.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.93-2.26$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.78-2.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.282$ and 3.284 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.20-3.42(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.65$ and 3.66 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.71-3.84 (1 H, m), 3.91-3.98 (1 H, m), 3.92 (2 H, br s), 4.08-4.23 (3 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.35-4.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.50-4.57(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ABq}), 5.20$ and $5.29($ total 1 H , br t, $J=7.5$
$\mathrm{Hz}), 6.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.15$ and $7.16($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.40$ and 7.41 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(100.6 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.5,158.1,157.8,149.0,148.9,146.22,146.2$, $140.6,136.1,135.9,130.1,127.9,126.7,122.93,122.98,119.7,116.9,114.2,94.8,82.8$, $80.3,79.6,76.0,71.1,70.7,70.6,61.8,61.7,55.7,52.7,51.4,42.3,34.0,33.9,31.5,31.4$, $28.7,28.6,28.2,27.2,27.1,25.9,18.5,18.6,18.0,14.4,-3.9,-4.7$.

IR ( NaCl , film) $2955,2855,1749,1699,1644,1433,1368,1252,1157,1087,856,835$.
FAB HRMS m/e $790.3853\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{60} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{SiCl}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 790.3865)



8-[[8aR-[(Z)-4-chloro-3-methyl-2-butenyl]-3,4,6,7,8,8a-hexahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-4-oxopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethyl ethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3$g$ ]indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (325Z)

To a solution of $\mathbf{3 1 7 Z}\left(17.5 \mathrm{mg}, 25.9 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ and 2,6 -lutidine $(5.5 \mathrm{mg}$, $\left.51.8 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(500 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar was slowly added tbutyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate ( $10.2 \mathrm{mg}, 51.8 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 2 h, additional 2,6 -lutidine ( $5.5 \mathrm{mg}, 51.8 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and t-butyldimethylsilyl trifluoromethane-sulfonate $\left(10.2 \mathrm{mg}, 51.8 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 2 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ were added, and the reaction was allowed to proceed for a further 2 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Purification of the product by flash column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc/2:1) gave $15.4 \mathrm{mg}(75 \%)$ of $325 Z$ as a white foam.

Data of 325Z (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{\prime} H$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.14$ and $0.16($ total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.91(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.07$ and 1.09 (total 3H, s), 1.49-1.50 (total 3H, s), 1.62-1.67 (total 9H, s), 1.83 (total 3H, s), 1.90-2.10 (total 3H, m), 2..20-2.42 (total 1H, m), 2.71-2.92 (total 1H, m), 3.29-3.30 (total 3H, s), 3.35-3.41 (total 2H, m), 3.65-3.67 (total 3H, s), 3.76-3.83 (total 1H, m), 3.93-3.98 (total
$3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.14-4.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.34-4.39 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 4.54 and 4.55 (total $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 5.2 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.91-6.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.16-7.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.43($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$. IR ( NaCl , film) 2957, 2860, 1749, 1701, 1700, 1652, 1491, 1370, 1253, 1156, 1088, 1039 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $789.3782\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{60} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{SiCl}\right.$ requires 789.3782)



3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-8-[[3,4,7,8-tetrahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-10S-(1-methylethenyl)-4-oxo-6H-3,8aR-ethanopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g] indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (327)

To a suspension of anhydrous ether washed $\mathrm{NaH}(79.0 \mathrm{mg}, 3.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF 100 mL ) was added solid 325 E ( $128 \mathrm{mg}, 0.162 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) under Ar. After the reaction mixture was gently refluxed for 9.5 h , it was added dropwise to a flask containing $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and EtOAc $(35 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil which contained mostly the desired $\mathrm{SN}_{2}$ product 327 and some minor $\mathrm{SN}_{2}^{\prime}$ product (329) with the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{tBOC}$ group removed. The above mixture was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(4 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). Triethylamine ( $2.54 \mathrm{mg}, 0.025 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.16 \mathrm{eq}$ ), DMAP ( 2.8 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.023 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.14 \mathrm{eq})$ and $(\mathrm{BOC})_{2} \mathrm{O}(15 \mathrm{mg}, 0.069 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.42 \mathrm{eq})$ were added to the above mixture solution at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under Ar . After 3 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with water and extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. The crude product was purified by radial chromatography (EtOAc:hexane/1:2 then 1:1) to provide 107 mg of $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ (87\%) as a white foam.

Data of $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.15$ and 0.16 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.90(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.09$ and 1.10 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.39-1.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.61(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.64(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.98-2.06(1$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.08-2.24(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.44-2.54(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.02-3.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3 \cdot 33-3.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.42 and 3.43 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.52-3.72 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.69 and 3.61 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.75-3.87 ( 1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.93-4.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.15-4.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.29-4.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.62-4.91(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 6.856 and 6.861 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 7.32 and 7.39 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 7.47 and 7.56 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(100.6 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.5,171.2,170.2,149.1,145.79,143.8,143.5$, $140.2,140.1,131.5,127.9,127.6,119.1,116.26,116.2,115.8,96.7,82.4,80.2,79.0$, $76.1,71.6,71.10,69.3,69.0,66.53,66.5,66.0,56.0,54.6,54.56,48.9,48.6,41.5,36.9$, $31.4,28.7,28.2,26.9,26.8,25.9,19.7,18.8,18.7,18.0,-3.7,-4.7$.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2950,2892,1749,1677,1633,1474,1368,1248,1156,1089, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1 .}$
FAB HRMS m/e $754.4099\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 754.4094$)$



3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4-dihydro-4,4-dimethyl-8-[[3,4,7,8-tetrahydro-1-methoxy-8S-(methoxymethoxy)-10S-(1-methylethenyl)-4-oxo-6H-3,8aR-ethanopyrrolo[1,2-a]pyrazin-3S-yl]methyl]-2H,10H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g] indole-10-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (327)

To a suspension of anhydrous ether washed $\mathrm{NaH}(24.6 \mathrm{mg}, 1.03 \mathrm{mmol}, 24 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF ( 2.8 mL ) was added solid $325 \mathrm{Z}(33.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.043 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ under Ar. After the reaction mixture was gently refluxed for 11.5 h , it was added dropwise to a flask containing $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and EtOAc $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 18: 1\right)$ purification of the product gave 16 mg ( $50 \%$ ) of 327 as a white foam.

(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-17-methoxy-13S-(methoxymethoxy)-4,4,15,15-tetramethyl-9-oxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(nitrilomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h] carbazole-16carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (337)

To a flask charged with $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(40.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.205 \mathrm{mmol}, 3.1 \mathrm{eq})^{1}$ and $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}(55.0$ $\mathrm{mg}, 0.310 \mathrm{mmol}, 4.68 \mathrm{eq})$ was added $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(2.25 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature under Ar . After 6.5 h , propylene oxide ( $207 \mathrm{mg}, 3.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 53.6 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added and the mixture was stirred for $15 \mathrm{~min} .327(50.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.066 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ was added in one portion as a solid and produced a deep red color immediately. After the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for $40 \mathrm{~h}^{2}$ and then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, absolute ethanol ( 1.68 mL ) was added. $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.793 \mathrm{mmol}, 12 \mathrm{eq})$ was added portionwise over 45 min , yielding a black solid and a colorless clear solution. The mixture was stirred for an additional 40 min and filtered. The filtrate was concentrated, and EtOAc was added to the residue. The resulting solution was washed with 0.01 N HCl in water followed by brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC (hexane: $\mathrm{EtOAc}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 5: 3: 0.5$ ) purification of the crude product gave $32.8 \mathrm{mg}(66 \%)$ of 337 as a white foam ( 201 mg scale, $85 \%$ yield).

1. $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ is hydroscopic and should be handled quickly.
2. After 40 h reaction, TLC (hexane: $\mathrm{EtOAc}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 5: 3: 0.5$ ) showed there was no $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ left.

Data of $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.11$ and 0.14 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.90$ and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.10 and 1.20 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.23 and 1.26 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.33-1.35 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.47 and 1.49 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.58 \mathrm{ad} \mathrm{n} 1.60($ total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.9,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.94-2.07$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.11-2.32(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.00-3.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.34-3.76(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.47(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.83$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.83-3.96(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.04-4.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $4.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.80$ and 6.81 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.06-7.07(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ 8.1 Hz ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (APT) $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.7,170.7,153.6,143.4,143.3,139.5,139.3$, $138.6,138.1,129.3,129.2,125.7,125.6,118.7,118.1,113.1,113.0,110.8,96.8,84.4$, $84.2,80.7,80.2,79.1,76.3,72.1,71.4,67.0,65.3,56.0,54.6,49.1,49.0,41.6,40.5,37.0$, $32.0,31.6,28.8,28.6,28.0,27.5,27.3,26.9,20.5,20.4,19.5,19.1,18.0,-3.9,-4.0,-4.7,-$ 4.8.

IR ( NaCl, film) $2975,2956,2897,1745,1682,1633,1369,1047,837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $753.4034\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9}\right.$ Si requires 753.4020)



8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-13S-(methoxymethoxy)-4,4,15,15-tetramethyl-9,17-dioxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h]carbazole-16-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (338)

To a mixture of $337\left(4.0 \mathrm{mg}, 5.3 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{I} \mathrm{eq}\right), \mathrm{LiCl}(12.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.028 \mathrm{mmol}$, $53 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{BnBu}_{3} \mathrm{NCl}\left(2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 5.3 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{mmol}, 1.3 \mathrm{eq}\right)$ was added a solution of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.1$ $\mathrm{mg}, 0.058 \mathrm{mmol}, 11 \mathrm{eq})$ in HMPA ( $300 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at 60 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , it was quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and extracted with EtOAc. The combined extracts were washed with brine ( 5 times), dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give an oil. Preparative TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1\right)$ purification of the product provided 1 mg of 338 and 2 mg of recovered starting material.

Data of $\mathbf{3 3 8}$ (mixture of two diastereomers):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 0.11$ and 0.14 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.90 and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.10 and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.25 and 1.27 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.36 and 1.37 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.47 and 1.49 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.59 and 1.61 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.14-$ $2.29(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.52-2.65(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.48(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.58-$ $4.17(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05-4.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{1} / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.00(1$ $\mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.94(1 \mathrm{H}$, br s), 6.81 and 6.83 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 6.999 and 7.007 (total I H, d, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.2,168.2,153.3,153.2,143.6,143.4,139.5,139.3$, 138.7, 138.0, 129.3, 129.1, 125.1, 124.9, 119.0, 118.3, 112.7, 112.5, 108.5. 97.4, 84.8, $84.6,81.0,80.4,79.2,76.3,72.4,71.5,68.53,68.48,59.7,56.1,51.2,51.1,42.5,36.7$,
$31.5,31.2,28.9,28.7,27.6,27.0,26.7,26.0,25.9,25.1,20.2,20.0,19.7,19.1,18.13$, $18.09,-3.9,-4.0,-4.6,-4.8$.

IR ( NaCl , film) 3246, 2929, 2855, 1747, 1694, 1493, 1367, 1256, 1156, 1092, 1039, 839 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $739.3848\left(\mathrm{C}_{39} \mathrm{H}_{57} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9}\right.$ Si requires 739.3864)


8aS-amino-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8a,9,12,13,14aS,15-octahydro-13S-(methoxymethoxy)-4,4,15,15-tetramethyl-9-oxo-2H,8H$[1,4]$ dioxepino $[2,3-a]$ indolizino $[6,7-h]$ carbazole-13aR,16(11H,14H)-dicarboxylic acid, 16-(1,1-dimethylethyl), 13a-methyl ester (339)

To a solution of crude 337 (a product from $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2} / \mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ mediated cyclization reaction, 201 mg scale) in THF ( 25 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added 0.1 M HCl in water ( 2 mL ), and the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h . The reaction mixture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ in water, and extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by Preparative TLC on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 20: 1\right)$ to give 155.2 mg (two steps, $75.4 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{3 3 9}$ as a white foam.

Data for $\mathbf{3 3 9}$ (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.11,0.12$ and $0.13($ total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89$ and 0.91 (total 9 H , s), 1.08 and 1.17 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.47 and 1.48 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.54 and 1.55 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.62 and 1.64 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.77 and 1.78 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.88-2.15 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.24-2.41 (1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=16.8,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.16(1 \mathrm{H}$, br d,$J=$ $13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.63-3.96(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.83(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.64(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ABq})$, 6.78 and 6.79 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.0,171.2,153.4,143.4,139.0,138.9,138.6,138.1$, $129.1,129.0,125.7,125.6,118.8,118.3,112.4,107.21,107.17,96.3,84.9,84.7,83.5$, $80.8,80.4,76.3,76.2,72.0,71.5,69.7,69.6,57.8,56.0,52.9,50.24,50.17,43.8,36.0$,
$33.7,33.6,31.2,30.7,30.5,28.9,28.6,27.6,27.2,27.0,26.0,25.9,19.4,19.2,18.1,-3.9$, $-4.0,-4.7,-4.8$.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $2954,2930,2891,2861,1743,1644,1496,1438,1368,1251,1232$, $1155,1115,1091,1050,838,776 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

FAB HRMS m/e $772.4222\left(\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{62} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Si}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ requires 772.4204)



8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-13S-(methoxymethoxy)-4,4,15,15-tetramethyl-9,17-dioxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h]carbazole-16-carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (338)

To a solution of 339 ( $155.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.201 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in toluene $(6.7 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added 2-hydroxypyridine ( $20.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.219 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After the reaction mixture was heated at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h , it was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:10:1) to give 124.0 mg ( $83.4 \%$ ) of 338 as a white foam.

Data for 338 (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.11$ and 0.14 (total $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.90 and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.10 and 1.21 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.25 and 1.27 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.36 and 1.37 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.47 and 1.49 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.59 and 1.61 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.14-$ $2.29(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.52-2.65(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.48(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.58-$ $4.17(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05-4.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.78(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.00(1$ $\mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.94(1 \mathrm{H}$, br s), 6.81 and 6.83 (total $\mathrm{I} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 6.999 and 7.007 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.2,168.2,153.3,153.2,143.6,143.4,139.5,139.3$, 138.7, 138.0, 129.3, 129.1, 125.1, 124.9, 119.0. 118.3, 112.7, 112.5, 108.5, 97.4, 84.8, $84.6,81.0,80.4,79.2,76.3,72.4,71.5,68.53,68.48,59.7,56.1,51.2,51.1,42.5,36.7$, $31.5,31.2,28.9,28.7,27.6,27.0,26.7,26.0,25.9,25.1,20.2,20.0,19.7,19.1,18.13$, 18.09, -3.9, -4.0, -4.6, -4.8.

IR ( NaCl, film) 2954, 2930, 2891, 2861, 1743, 1644, 1496, 1438, $1368 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
FAB HRMS m/e $739.3848\left(\mathrm{C}_{39} \mathrm{H}_{57} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9}\right.$ Si requires 739.3864$)$


(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-13S-(methoxymethoxy)- $4,4,15,15$,-tetramethyl-17-oxo-9H, $11 \mathrm{H}-8 \mathrm{a}, 13 \mathrm{a}-$ (iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h]carbazole-16carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (340)

To a solution of $339(32.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.044 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added DIBAL-H ( $0.22 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in toluene, 5 eq ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and at room temperature for 1 h , additional DIBAL-H ( $0.14 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ in toluene, 3.2 eq ) was added. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , and at room temperature for 1 h , it was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ (aq.), and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (developed twice with hexane:EtOAc:MeOH /5:3:0.5) to give 23.3 mg ( $72.1 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ as a white foam.

Data for $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.115,0.119$ and 0.137 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.90$ and 0.91 (total 9 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.14$ and 1.18 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.40$ and $1.41(\operatorname{total} 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.48(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 1.62 and 1.64 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.10-2.52(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.73$ ( 1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I} / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.82(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=15.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{td}, J=8.7,5.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 3.44-3.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.45(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.74-3.97(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.16$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=11.7,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.79(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 6.81$ and $6.82($ total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.2,153.4,153.3,143.5,141.3,141.2,138.7,138.3$, $129.4,125.1,125.0,118.9,118.5,112.06,112.01,108.1,108.0,96.9,85.0,84.9,81.4$, $81.0,80.7,76.4,76.3,72.3,71.7,64.3,59.9,56.3,55.7,52.8,47.9,35.8,35.7,30.4,30.1$, $29.04,28.93,28.7,28.6,28.5,27.7,26.0,22.1,22.0,19.7,19.5,18.2,-3.8,-4.0,-4.6,-$ 4.7.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $2937,2932,2902,2855,1748,1693,1682,1496,1446,1369,1308$, $1253,1234,1155,1111,1092,1052,992,914,838,776,732 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{39} \mathrm{H}_{60} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 726.4150$, found 726.4168 .
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341
(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-13S-(methoxymethoxy)- 4,4,15,15,18-pentamethyl-17-oxo-9H,11H-

8a,13a-(iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h] carbazole-16carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (341)

To a solution of $340(37.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.052 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in DMF ( 1.7 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{NaH}(43.1 \mathrm{mg}, 1.08 \mathrm{mmol}, 60 \%$ oil dispersion, 20 eq ). After 15 min , MeI ( 159 mg , $1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 22 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was added. After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , and at room temperature for 1 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ (aq.), and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:10:1) to provide 36.9 mg ( $95.8 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{3 4 1}$ as an amorphous solid.

Data for $\mathbf{3 4 1}$ (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.12$ and 0.14 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.90$ and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.16 and 1.19 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.40 and 1.41 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.58$ and 1.60 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.62$ and 1.64 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.78-1.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.05-2.44(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.73-2.82(1$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.07(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.12-3.24(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.34-3.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.45(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.76-4.04(3$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.09-4.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.77(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.80(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 6.82$ and $6.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.1,153.3,143.5,141.0,140.8,138.7,138.3,129.7$, $129.5,125.3,125.1,118.8,118.4,111.9,108.4,108.2,96.8,84.9,84.8,81.7,81.0,80.7$,
$76.4,76.3,72.2,71.8,63.4,60.0,58.4,55.6,53.1,47.0,46.9,36.2,36.1,29.8,29.0,28.8$, $28.7,28.3,28.2,27.7,25.9,24.7,22.6,22.5,19.6,19.5,18.1,-3.8,-4.0,-4.66,-4.72$. IR ( NaCl , neat) $2955,2932,2896,2857,1747,1677,1496,1368,1252,1233,1154$, 1116, 1091, 1052, 838.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{62} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 740.4306$, found 740.4391 .


(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro-13S-hydroxy-4,4,15,15,18-pentamethyl-17-oxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h] carbazole-16carboxylic acid, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (342)

To a solution of $341(36.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.050 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added bromocatecholborane ( $1.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.2 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 6 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 0.5 h , it was quenched with $10 \%$ NaOH (aq.) ( 3 mL ), and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) to give $31.5 \mathrm{mg}(90.8 \%)$ of 342 as an amorphous solid.

Data for 342 (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.12$ and 0.14 (total $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 0.90$ and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.15 and 1.19 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.41 and 1.49 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $1.58(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.62$ and 1.64 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.82-2.06(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.13-2.45(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=15.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.09(3$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.10-3.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.73-3.97$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.04-4.23(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.405$ and 5.408 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.83$ and 6.84 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.8,153.4,153.3,143.6,140.8,140.7,138.7,138.4$, $129.7,129.6,125.2,125.1,118.9,118.5,111.9,108.0,107.8,85.1,85.0,81.1,80.8,77.3$, $76.4,76.3,72.3,71.8,62.0,60.2,58.7,53.3,47.32,47.27,36.3,36.2,32.5,29.7,29.0$,
$28.9,28.8,28.7,27.9,27.7,26.01,25.98,24.7,22.8,22.7,19.6,18.2,-3.8,-4.0,-4.6,-$ 4.7.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $3407,2954,2932,2858,1747,1644,1496,1445,1390,1369,1253$, $1233,1155,1108,1089,838,733 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{58} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 696.4044$, found 696.4032 .
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343
(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-[[(1,1-dimethylethyl)dimethylsilyl]oxy]-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro- 4,4,15,15,18-pentamethyl-13,17-dioxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(iminomethano)$2 \mathrm{H}, 16 \mathrm{H}$-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h] carbazole-16-carboxylic acid, 1,1dimethylethyl ester (343)

To a stirred solution of $342(13.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.9 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature was added Dess-Martin periodinane ( $40.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0960 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After 0.5 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with a solution of $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ in 1 M $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ (aq.) $(0.8 \mathrm{~mL})$, and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:3:0.5) to give $11.2 \mathrm{mg}(85.1 \%)$ of 343 as an amorphous solid.

Data for $\mathbf{3 4 3}$ (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.12$ and 0.14 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 0.90 and 0.91 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.16 and $1.20($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.395$ and 1.399 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.58(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 1.62 and 1.64 (total $9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.90-2.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.14-2.28(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=10.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 2.42-2.71(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.825$ and 2.833 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.08(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.75-3.98(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.11-4.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.836$ and 6.845 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \delta: 209.8,169.9,153.3,153.2,143.6,140.8,140.6,138.7$, $138.3,129.7,129.6,125.1,125.0,118.9,118.6,111.9,107.8,85.1,85.0,81.1,80.8,76.4$, $76.3,72.4,71.8,67.6,60.5,57.9,50.6,47.1,47.0,36.9,36.33,36.28,29.0,28.8,28.6$, $27.8,27.7,26.9,26.0,25.0,22.8,22.6,19.6,18.1,-3.8,-4.0,-4.6,-4.7$.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $2956,2930,2855,1760,1748,1670,1496,1252,1233,1157,1139$, 1112, 1092, $837 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 694.3888$, found 694.3870 .
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344
(8aS,13aS,14aS)-3R/S-hydroxy-3,4,8,12,13,14,14a,15-octahydro- 4,4,15,15,18-pentamethyl-13,17-dioxo-9H,11H-8a,13a-(iminomethano)-2H,16H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-a]indolizino[6,7-h]carbazole (344)

To a solution of $343(26.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.038 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added TFA ( $2.22 \mathrm{~g}, 19.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 513 \mathrm{eq}$ ). After the reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and at room temperature for 3 h , it was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ (aq.) and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:25:1) to give $17.5 \mathrm{mg}(96.7 \%)$ of $\mathbf{3 4 4}$ as an amorphous solid. Data for 344 (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.24$ and $1.26($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.33$ and 1.36 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.41 and 1.44 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.568 and 1.574 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.88-2.00 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.16-2.28 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.40-2.72(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.87$ and 2.88 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ 15.0 Hz ), $3.03-3.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.22$ and 3.24 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 3.29-3.39 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.55 and 3.58 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $3.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dt}, J=11.4,3.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 4.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.7,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.35(1 \mathrm{H} . \mathrm{dd}, J=11.7,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.79$ and 6.80 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 209.9,169.9$, $142.3,142.2,140.2,137.6,129.6,125.2,116.93,116.86,112.8,104.9,79.9,76.0,71.3$, $67.5,61.3,58.4,58.3,50.8,45.3,45.2,34.89,34.85,30.9,30.8,27.9,26.7,26.3,26.1$, $25.2,25.1,24.9,23.8,23.7$. IR ( NaCl , neat): $3374,2970,2932,1759,1654,1507,1474$, $1397,1364,1232,1136,1096,1065,1048,1025 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 480.2498$, found 480.2478 .
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347
$2,2^{\prime}, 3,3^{\prime}, 8^{\prime}$ 'aS, $9^{\prime}$ 'hexahydro-3R/S-hydroxy-4,4, $\mathbf{8}^{\prime}, 8^{\prime}, 11^{\prime}$ '-pentamethyl-spiro $[4 \mathrm{H}, 8 \mathrm{H}$ -[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-8, $7^{\prime} \mathrm{R}\left(8^{\prime} \mathrm{H}\right)-[5 \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}-5 \mathrm{aS}, 9 \mathrm{aR}]($ iminomethano $)[1 \mathrm{H}]$ -cyclopent[f]indolizine]-1',9,10'(10H)-trione (347)

To a solution of $344(9.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in pyridine $(0.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added ${ }^{\dagger} \mathrm{BuOCl}\left(0.31 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.031 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} .1 .5 \mathrm{eq}\right)$. After 2 h , the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo, and the trace amount of pyridine was removed azeotropically with benzene. To the above residue dissolved in THF ( 1.8 mL ) and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(18.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.102 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \mathrm{eq})$. After the mixture was refluxed for 0.5 h , it was cooled to room temperature, quenched with a mixture of EtOAc and $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ (aq.), and extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative $\mathrm{TLC}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 20: 1\right)$ on silica gel (developed three times) to give 5.5 mg (54.4\%) of 347 .

Data for 347 (mixture of two diastereomers)
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.84$ and 0.86 (total $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.08$ and 1.09 (total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 1.26 and $1.29($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.53$ and $1.55($ total $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.56-1.64(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.81$ and 1.90 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.37-2.76(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.98-3.46(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 3.09$ and $3.10(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.62-3.78(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.08-4.30(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.62$ and 6.66 (total 1 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 6.78 and 6.81 (total $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 7.72 and 7.94 (total 1 H , br s). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 208.4,182.5,182.3,168.7,148.4,148.1,136.4,136.2$, $133.7,133.6,125.6,121.1,117.3,116.8,81.1,80.9,77.4,75.6,71.5,71.3,70.3,66.3$,
$63.3,60.1,52.54,52.46,50.0,46.4,46.2,37.2,36.9,36.7,29.9,26.1,25.9,25.6,24.6$, 24.3, 23.9, 20.7.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $3421,2975,2936,1762,1705,1653,1498,1464,1418,1390,1330$, $1212,1194,1149,1112,1065 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 496.2448$, found 496.2447 .



$2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}, 8^{\prime}$ 'aS, $9^{\prime}$-tetrahydro-4,4,8', $8^{\prime}, 11^{\prime}$ 'pentamethyl-spiro[4H,8H-[1,4]dioxepino[2,3-g]indole-8,7'R( $\left.8^{\prime} \mathbf{H}\right)$-[ $\left.5 \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}-5 \mathrm{aS}, 9 \mathrm{aR}\right]$ (iminomethano) [1H]cyclopent[f]indolizine]$1^{\prime}, 9,10{ }^{\prime}(10 \mathrm{H})$-trione (43)

To a solution of $347(6.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0133 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in DMPU $(0.27 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature was added methyltriphosphonium iodide ( $30.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0669 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) After the reaction mixture was stirred for 21 h , it was quenched with 1 M KOH (aq.), stirred for 10 min , and then 1 M HCl (aq.) was added. The reaction mixture was extracted with EtOAc. The organic solution was washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH} / 10: 1\right)$ to give $3.6 \mathrm{mg}(54.8 \%)$ of 43 .

Data for $\mathbf{4 3}$
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.88(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.11(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.47(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $1.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=12.6,11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.42-2.76(5 \mathrm{H}$, m), $3.09(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $6.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $100.6 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 208.3,182.4,168.7$, 146.3, 139.1, 135.5, 132.5, 125.0, $120.5,117.6,115.2,80.0,70.3,66.3,63.2,60.0,52.5,49.9,46.3,37.0,36.7,30.1,30.0$, 29.9, 26.0, 24.6, 23.9, 20.7.

IR ( NaCl , neat) $3226,2927,2853,1762,1702,1654,1502,1466,1387,1328,1190$, $1112,1047 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 478.2342$, found 478.2336 .



(-)-Paraherquamide A (1)
To a solution of $43(5.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.011 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in THF at $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $\mathrm{MeMgBr}(35 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.105 \mathrm{mmol}, 9.5 \mathrm{eq}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ in ether). After 1 h , the reaction mixture was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution, extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3 times). The combined extracts were washed with brine, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by preparative TLC on silica gel (developed five times) (hexane:EtOAc:MeOH/5:25:1) to give 2.0 mg of (-)-paraherquamide $\mathbf{A}(1)$ as an amorphous solid ( $42 \%$, based on recovered 0.7 mg of starting material 43).

Data for (-)-paraherquamide A(1):
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.85(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.09(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.43(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.45(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $1.65(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.75-1.91(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.19-2.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.30-2.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J$ $=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.64(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.99-3.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.05(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $3.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $6.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{br})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(100.6 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 182.5,171.6,146.2,139.2,135.4,132.4,125.2,120.6$, $117.5,115.2,80.0,78.2,71.4,65.5,63.2,59.4,52.1,51.6,46.6,38.2,37.3,30.1,30.0$, 29.9, 26.1, 24.0, 22.3, 20.6, 19.2. IR ( NaCl , neat) $3409,3212,2972,2934,1703,1654$, 1328, 1193, $1047 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. HRMS (FAB) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} 494.2654$, found. 494.2653. The synthetic sample recrystallized from ether has m.p. $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.) and $[\alpha]_{D}{ }^{25}=-22(c=0.2 \mathrm{MeOH})$. A sample of natural paraherquamide A recrystallized from ether under the same conditions rendered a sample with m.p. $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.) and $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}$ $=-21(c=0.2 \mathrm{MeOH})$.
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## References and Footnotes

1 The Structure of Paraherquamide, A toxic Metabolite from Penicillium
Paraherquei.
Yamazaki, M.; Okuyama, E.; Kobayashi, M.; Inoue, C. Tetrahedron Lett. 1981, $22,135 \sim 136$.

2 Chemical Modification of Paraherquamide. 1. Unusual Reactions and Absolute Stereochemistry.

Blizzard, T. A.; Marino, G.; Mrozik, H.; Fisher, M. H.; Hoogsteen, K.; Springer, J J. P. J. Org. Chem. 1989, 54, 2657~2663.

Novel Antinematodal and Antiparasitic Agents from Penicilium Charlesii.
Ondeyka, J. D.; Goegelman, R. T.; Schaeffer, J. M.; Kelemen, L. J. of Antibiotics 1990, 43, 1375~1379.

New Paraherquamide Antibiotics with Anthelmintic Activity.
Blanchflower, S. E.; Banks, R. M.; Everett, J. R.; Manger, B. R.; Reading, C. J. of Antibiotics 1991, 44, 492~497.

Efficacy of Paraherquamide against Immature Trichostongylus Colubriformis in the Gerbil (Meriones unguiculatus).

Ostlind, D. A.; Mickle, W. G.; Ewanciw, D. V.; Andriuli, F. J.; Campbell, W. C.;
Hernandez, S.; Mochaeles, S.; Munguira, E. Research in Veterinary Science 1990, 48, 260~261.

Laboratory Selection of Benzimidazole-Resistant Isolate of Trichostrongylus Colubriformis for Ivermectin Resistance.

Shoop, W. L.; Egerton, J. R.; Eary, H. C.; Suhayda, D. J. Parasitol. 1990, 76(2), 186~189.

Van Wyk, J. A.; Malan, F. S. Vet. Rec. 1988, 123, 226.
Isolation and Structure (X-Ray Analysis) of Marcfortine A, A New Alkaloid from Pennicillium Roqueforti.

Polonsky, J.; Merrien, M. A.; Prange, T.; Pascard, J. Chem. Soc. Chem Comm. 1980, 13, 601~602.

Structure of Marcfortine B and C (X-Ray Analysis), Alkaloids from Pennicillium Roqueforti.

Prange, T.; Billion, M. A.; Vuilhorgne, M.; Pascard, C.; Polonsky, J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1981, 22, 1977~1980.

Brevianamides: A new Class of Funagl Alkaloid.
a) Birch, A. J.; Wright, J. J. J. Chem. Soc. Comm. 1969, 644~645.

Studies in Relation to Biosynthesis. Part XLVI. Incorporation of cyclo-L-Tryptophyl-l-Proline into Breviamide A..
b) Baldas, J.; Birch, A. J.; Russell, R. R. A. J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 1 1974, 50~52

1 Sclerotamide: A new Member of the Paraherquamide Class with Potent Antiinsectan Activity from the Sclerotia of Aspergillus Sclerotiorum. Whyte, A. C.; Gloer, J.B., J. Nat. Prod. 1996, 59, 1093~1095.

Asspergamides: Ph.D. thesis of Jens Fuchser: "Beeinflussung der Sekundarstoffbildung bei Aspergillus ochraceus durch Variation der Kulturbedingungen sovie Isolierung, Strukturaufklarung und Biosynthese der neuen Naturstoffe", University of Goettingen, 1995; K. Bielefeld Verlag, Friedland 1996 (Prof. A. Zeeck).
a) Further Novel Metabolites of the Paraherquamide Family, Blanchflower, S.E.; Banks, R.M.; Everett, J.R.; Reading, C. J. Antibiotics 1993, 46, 1355~1363. b) Novel Anthelmintic Metabolites from an Aspergillus Species; the Aspergillimides Banks, R.M.; Blanchflower, S.E.;. Everett, J.R.; Reading, C. J. Antibiotics 1997, 50, 840~846.
Asperparaline A, A new Paralytic Alkaloid from Aspergillus japonicus JV-23. Hayashi, H.; Nishimoto, Y.; Nozaki, H. Tetrahedron Lett. 1997, 38, 5655~5658.

Anthelmintic Activity of Paraherquamide in Dogs.
Shoop, W. L.; Eary, C. H.; Michael, B. F. Vet. Parasitol. 1990, 40, 339~341.
Acute Toxity of Paraherquamide as An Anthelmintic.
Shoop, W. L.; Haines, H. W.; Eary, C. H.; Michael, B. F.Am. J. Vet. Res.. 1992, 53, 2032~2034.
[3H]Paraherquamide Binding to Caenorhabditis Elegans.
Schaeffer, J. M.; Blizzard, T. A.; Ondeyka, J.; Goegelman, R.; Sinclair, P. J.;
Mrozik, H. Biochemical Pharmacology, 1992, 43, 679~684.
Blizzard, T. A.; Rosegay, A.; Mrozik, H.; Fisher, M. H. J. Labelled Cmpds. And Radiopharm. 1990, 28, 461

Chemical Modification of Paraherquamide. 1. Unusual Reactions and Absolute Stereochemistry.

Blizzard, T. A.; Marino, G.; Mrozik, H.; Fisher, M. H.; Hoogsteen, K.; Springer, J J. P. J. Org. Chem. 1989, 54, 2657~2663.

Chemical Modification of Paraherquamide. 2. Replacement of the C-14 Methyl Group.

Blizzard, T. A.; Mrozik, H.; Fisher, M. H.; Schaeffer, J. M. J. Org. Chem. 1990, 55, 2256~2259

Chemical Modification of Paraherquamide. 3. Vinyl Ether Modified Analogs. Blizzard, T. A.; Margiatto, G.; Mrozik, H.; Schaeffer, J. M; Fisher, M. H. Tetrahedron Lett. 1991 32, 2437~2440.

Chemical Modification of Paraherquamide. 4. 1-N-Substituted Analogs. Blizzard, T. A.; Margiatto, G.; Mrozik, H.; Schaeffer, J. M; Fisher, M. H. Tetrahedron Lett. 1991 32, 2441~2444.

Conversion of Marcfortine A to Paraherquamide A via Paraherquamide B. The First Formal Synthesis of Paraherquamide A
a) Lee, B. H.; Clothier, M. F. J. Org. Chem. 1997, 62, 1795~1798

Conversion of Marcfortine A to Paraherquamides via a Novel Platinum-Oxygen-Mediated Ring Contracting Reaction.
b) Lee, B. H.; Clothier, M. F.; Pickering, Dacia A. J. Org. Chem. 1997, 62, 7836~7840.

Asymmetric, Stereocontrolled Total Synthesis of (-)-Brevianamide B.
Williams, R. M.; Glinka, T.; Kwast, E.; Coffman, H.; Stille, J. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 808~821.

Promising Cyclization Reaction to Construct the Ring System of Brevianamides $A, B$.

Williams, R. M.; Glinka, T. Tetrahedron Lett. 1986, 27, 3581~5384..
Alkylation of Amino Acids without Loss of the Optical Activity: Preparation of $\alpha$ Substituted Proline Derivatives. A Case of Self-Reproduction of Chirality. Seebach, D.; Boes, M.; Naef, R.; Schweizer, W. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983, 105, 5390~5398.

Stereocontrolled Total Synthesis of ( + )-Paraherquamide B.
a) Cushing, T. D.; Sanz-Cervera, F. F.; Williams, R. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 9323~9324.

Stereocontrolled Total Synthesis of $(+)$-Paraherquamide B.
b) Cushing, T. D.; Sanz-Cervera, F. F.; Williams, R. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 557~579.

A Fast Synthesis of 2-Acylamino Acids.
Mukerjee, A. K.; Tripathy, P. K. Synthesis, 1984, 418~422..
Synthesis of 4-Arylidene-2-Phenyloxazol-5-ones Using 1:1 Mixture of $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{BO}_{3}$.

Das, P. J.; Kashyap, J. Synth. Commun. 1998, 28, 4187~4191.
Carey, F. A; Sundberg, R. J. Advanced Organic Chemistry, Part A: Structure and Mechanism. 3rd ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1990; Chapter 4, p 201.

Remers, W. A.; Brown, R. K. in Indoles part one; Houlihan, W. J; WileyInterscience: New York, 1972; pp 475~478.

Synthesis of 6,7-Dihydroxyoxindole (A Subunit of Paraherquamide A). Savall, B. M.; McWhorter, W. W. J. Org. Chem. 1996, 61, 8696~8697. Cushing, T. D. The Total Synthesis of (+)-Paraherqmde B. Ph.D. Thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Summer 1993.

PLE-catalyzed Resolution of $\alpha$-Substitutd $\beta$-Ketoesters. Application to the Synthesis of $(+)$-Nitramine and (-)-Isonitramine.

Westermann, B.; Scharmann, H. G.; Kortmann, I. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 1993, 4, 2119~2122

3-Pyrrolidinones by Intramolecular Condensation.
Black, J.; Willson, C. D.; Rapoport, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1964, 86, 5293~99.
Selective Removl of the tert-Butyloxycarbonyl Group from Secondary Amines: $\mathrm{ZnBr}_{2}$ the Deprotective Reagent.

Nigam, S. C.; Mann, A.;Taddei, M.; Wermuth, C-G. Synth. Commun. 1989, 19, 3139~3141.

Asymmetric Aldol Reaction Using Boron Enolate of Chiral Oxazinones, Synthesis of L-Allo-Threonine.

Reno, D. S.; Lotz, B. T.; Miller, M. J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1990, 31, 827~830.
Asymmetric Alkylation of $\alpha$-Alkyl $\beta$-Keto Esters .
a) Tomioka, K.; Ando, K.; Takemasa, Y.; Koga, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 2718~2719.

Factors Controling the Diastereoselectivity in the Complementary Asymmetric Alkylation of $\alpha$-Alkyl $\beta$-Keto Ester.
b) Tomioka, K.; Ando, K.; Takemasa, Y.; Koga, K Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, $25 .$, 5677~5680.

Enantioselective Alkylation of Ketones va Chiral, Nonracemic Lithioenamines. An Asymmetric Synthesis of $\alpha$-Alkyl and $\alpha, \alpha^{\prime}$-Dialkyl Cyclic Ketones.
a) Meyers, A. I.; Williams, D. R.; Erickson, G. W.; White, S.; Druelinger, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103,3081~3087. A Mild and Efficient Route to Schiff Base Derivatives of Amino Acids. b) O' Donnell, M. J.; Polt, R. L. J. Org. Chem. 1982, 47, 2663~2666.

Allylsilanes Derived from Aminoacids in the Synthesis of Piperidine and Pyrrolidine Derivatives

Franciott, M.; Mann, A.; Mordini, A.; Taddei, M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1993, 25., 1355~1358.

Further Synthetic Studies on Rifamysins.
Nagaoka, H.; Kish, Y. Tetrahedron, 1981, 37, 3873~3888.
Schreiber, S. L; Comprehensive Organic Synthesis,
Pergamon Press: New York, 1991; Vol. 1, P 762~763.
A highly Selective Synthesis of A Chiral gamma-Amino Trisubstituted Z-Vinyl Ester.

Hensel, M.; Fuchs, P. Synth. Commun. 1986, 16, 1285~1295.
Asymmetric Epoxidation of Allylic Alcohol by Modified Sharpless Reagent.
a) Wang, Z-M.; Zhou, W-S. Tetrahedron, 1987, 43 (13), 2935~2944.

Catalytic Asymmetric Epoxidation and Kinetic Resolution: Modified Procedures Including in situ Derivatization.
b) Gao, Y.; Hanson, R.; Sharpless, K. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 5765~80.

A New Entry to Chiral Building Blocks for the Synthesis of Biologically Active Nitrogen-Containing Compounds.

Takahata, H.; Banba, Y.; Momose, T. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 240~245. Asymmetric Synthesis of Spirocyclic Pyrrolidines and Tetrahydrofurans by Chiral Aldol Reactions and Phenylthio Migration.

Chibale, K.; Warren, S. Tetrahedron Lett. 1991, 32, 6645~6648.
47 The Stereoselectivity of the $\alpha$-Alkylation of (+)-(1R, 2S)-cis-Ethyl-2-HydroxyCyclohexancarboxylate.

Frater, G. Helv. Chim. Acta. 1980, 63, 1383~1390.
The Stereoselective $\alpha$-Alkylation of Chiral $\beta$-Hydroxy Esters and Some Applications Thereof.

Frater, G.; Gunther, W. Tetrahedron, 1984, 40, 1269~1277.
A Chemoenzymatic Synthesis of $(+)$-Castanospermine,
Bhide, R.; Mortezaei, R.; Sih, C. Tetrahedron Lett. 1990, 31, 4827~4830.
50 Amino Acids as Precursors to Indolizidine Alkaloids.
Sibi, M.; Christensen, J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1990, 31, 5689~5692.
Baker's Yeast Reduction of $\beta$-Oxopyrrolidinecarboxylates: Synthesis of $(+)$-cis-3Hydroxyproline and (-)-(IS,5S)-Geissman-Waiss Lactone, A Useful Precursor to Pyrrolizidine Alkaloids.

Cooper, J.; Gaallagher, P. T.; Knight, D. W. J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 1 1993, 1313~1317.

52 Carey, F. A; Sundberg, R. J. Advanced Organic Chemistry, Part B: Reaction and Synthesis; 3rd ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1990; Chapter 1, p 24~25. in Alkylation of Ambident Anion.

Kurts, A. L.; Reutov, O. A. Tetrahedron, 1971, 27, 4777~4785.
Structure and Reactivity of Lithium Enolates. From Pinacolone to Selective CAlkylation of Peptides. Difficulties and Opportunities Afforded by Complex Structures.

Seebach, D. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1988, 27, 1624~1654.
An Alternative Procedure for the Aluminum-Mediated Conversion of Esters to Amides.

Levin, J. I.; Turos, E.; Weinreb, S. M. Synth. Commun. 1982, 12, 989~993.

A Simple Synthesis of the Staurosporine Aglycon.
Sarstedt, B.; Winterfeldt, E. Hetereocycles 1983, 20, 469~476.
61 Patchett, A.; Greenlee, W. J. Process for Preparing Amino Acids and Esters. U. S. Patent 4,275,220, June 23, 1981.

Imamura, S.; Sato, H.; Kuramoto, H. Indole Derivatives and Process for Preparing the Same. European Patent Application. 0,037,271, March 27, 1981.
Selective Mono-Alkylation of Carbon Nucleophiles with Gramine.
Somei, M.; Karasawa, Y.; Kaneko, C. Hetereocycles 1981, 16, 941~949.
Asymmetric Total synthesis of Brevianamide E.
Kametani, T.; Kanaya, N.; Ihara, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 3974~3975.
The Synthesis of Amino Acids by Phase-Transfer Reactions.
O 'Donnell, M. J.; Boniece, J. M.; Earp, S. E. Tetrahedron Lett. 1978, 2641~2644.

9 Solid-Liquid Phase Transfer Catalitic Synthesis of $\alpha$-Amino Acid via Alkylation and Nucleophilic Addition of Benzaldehyde Imines.

Jiang, Y.; Zhou, C.; Wu, S.; Chen, D.; Ma, Y.; Liu, G. Tetrahedran, 1988, 44, 5343~5353.

60 Reactions with Indole Derivatives, XLVIII

A Facial Synthesis of Racemic $N^{\alpha}$-FMOC-2-Phenyltryptophan.
Majchrzak, M.; Zobel, J. Synth. Commun. 1997, 27, 3201~3211.
64 Remers, W. A.; Brown, R. K. in Indoles part one; Houlihan, W. J; WileyInterscience: New York, 1972; pp 13~14.

A Mild and Efficient Route to Schiff Base Derivatives of Amino Acids. O' Donnell, M. J.; Polt, R. L. J. Org. Chem. 1982, 47, 2663~2666.

Diphenyl Ketimine.

Pickard, P. L.; Tolbert, T. L. Organic Synthesis V, 520~522.

67 Synthesis of Enantiomerically Pure $\beta$-Amino- $\alpha$-Methylene- $\gamma$-Butyrolactones by Way of Ozonolysis of Aromatic $\alpha$-Amino Acids.

Hvidt, T.; Szarek, W. A.; Maclean, D. B. Can. J. Chem. 1988, 66, 779~782.
Aluminony Acetals from $\alpha$-Amino Esters Chirality Transfer via Sequential Addition of Hydride and C-Nulceophiles 2-Amino Alcohols and Sphingosines. Polt, R.; Peterson, M. A.; Deyoung, L. J. Org. Chem. 1952, 57, 5469~5480.

69 Future Novel Metabolites of the Paraherquamide Family.
Blanchflower, S. E.; Banks, R. M.; Everett, J. R. J. Antibiot. 1993, 46, 1355~1363.

70 Hutchison, A. Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, Department of Chemistry, 1979
71 A Simple Route to Sterically Pure Diketopiperazine.
Niitecki, D. E.; Halpern, B.; Westley, J. W. J. Org. Chem. 1968, 33, 864~866.
72 Synthesis of Verruculotoxin.

1) Williams, R. M.; Brunner, E. J.; Sabol, M. R. Synthesis 1988, 963~965. Asymmetric Synthesis via Heterocyclic Intermediate; VII. Enantioselective Synthesis of (R)- $\alpha$-Amino Acids Using (S)-O,O-Dimethyl- $\alpha$-Methyldopa as Chiral Auxiliary Reagent.
2) Schollkopf, U.; Hartwig, W.; Pospischil, K-H.; Kehne, H. Synthesis 1981, 966~969.

73 Chemical Reactions of Caprolactam.
Benson, R.; Cairns, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1948, 70, 2115~2118.
74 Greene, T.; Wuts, P. G. M. Protective Groups in Organic Synthesis; 3rd ed.; John Wiley \& Sons, Inc: New York, 1999; 10, p 711.

A facile and Specific Conversion of Allylic Alcohols to Allylic Chlorides without Rearrangement

Collington, E. W.; Meyers, A. I. J. Org. Chem. 1971, 36, 3044~3045..

A Method for Selective Conversion of Allylic and Benzylic Alcohols to Halides under Neutral Conditions.

Corey, E. J.; Takeda, M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1972, 4339~4342.
Reaction of Hydroxyl Groups with Tosylchloride-Dimethylaminopyridine System. Direct Synthesis of Chlorides from Hydroxycompounds. Hwang, C. K.; Li, W. S.; Nicolaou, K. C. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 2295~2296. Selective Mesylaton of Vicinal Diols: A Systematic Case Study. O'Donnell, C. J.; Burke, S. D. J. Org. Chem. 1998, 63, 8614~8616. Cyclizations Initiated by $\mathrm{Pd}^{2+}-\mathrm{Ag}^{+}$Mixed-Metal System. Trost, B. M.; Fortunak, M. D. Organometallics 1982, 1, 7~13. Based on the transformation of compound 290 to 292 and 293, an almost identical condition was used to cleave the lactim ether moiety.

During the synthesis of allylic chloride by using the conditions of NCS and $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, the lactim ether moiety-cleaved product was obtained.

Stereocontrolled Total Synthesis of $( \pm)$-Gelsemine.
Fukuyama, T.; Liu, G. Pure \& Appl. Chem. 1997, 69, 501~505.
Greene, T.; Wuts, P. G. M. Protective Groups in Organic Synthesis; 3rd ed.;John Wiley \& sons, Inc: New York, 1999; 2, p 30.

Selective Dehydration of Secondary Alcohols with Methyltriphenoxyphosphonium Iodide in Hexamethylphosphoramide. Hutchins, R. O.; Hutchins, M. G.; Milewski, C. A. J. Org. Chem. 1972, 37, 4190~4192.

Dimethylethylamine-Alane and N-Methylpyrrolidine-Alane. A Convenient Synthesis of Alane, a Useful Selective Reducing Agent in Organic Synthesis. Marlett, E. M.; Park, W. S. J. Org. Chem. 1990, 55, 2968~2969.


220e


Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for 1.

| Identification code | rw34 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Empirical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{BrNO}_{5}$ |
| Formula weight | 394.30 |
| Temperature | 173 (2) K |
| Wavelength | 0.71073 A |
| Crystal system | Orthorhombic |
| Space group | $\mathrm{P} 21^{2} 1^{2} 1$ |
| Unit cell dimensions | $a=9.4682(11) \dot{A} \quad$ alpha $=90^{\circ}$ |
|  | $b=10.3094(8) \hat{A}$ beta $-90^{\circ}$ |
|  | $c=19.254(2) \AA$ gamma $=90^{\circ}$ |
| Volume, 2 | $1879.4(3) \dot{A}^{3}, 4$ |
| Density (calculated) | $1.394 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| Absorption coefficient | $2.210 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| $F(000)$ | 824 |
| Crystal size | $0.20 \times 0.20 \times 0.22 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| $\theta$ range for data collection | 2.12 to $25.01{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Limiting indices | $-1 \leq h \leq 11,-1 \leq k \leq 12,-1 \leq 1 \leq 22$ |
| Reflections collected | 2540 |
| Independent reflections | 2357 ( $\left.\mathrm{R}_{\text {int }}=0.0507\right)$ |
| Absorption correction | None |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints / parameters | 2357/0/208 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 0.819 |
| Final R indices [ $1>20$ (I) ] | $R 1=0.0486, w R 2=0.1124$ |
| R indices (all data) | $R 1=0.0837, w R 2=0.1253$ |
| Absolute structure parameter | 0.00 (2) |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.630 and $-0.395 \mathrm{e}^{-3}$ |

Table 2. Atomic coordinates $\left[x 10^{4}\right]$ and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters $\left[\dot{A}^{2} \times 10^{3}\right]$ for 1 . $U(e q)$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized $U_{i j}$ tensor.

|  | x | y | z | $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N(1) | 1323(6) | 10697 (5) | 1391 (2) | $22(1)$ |
| $0(1)$ | 2055 (5) | $13496(4)$ | 351 (2) | 31 (1) |
| $0(2)$ | 1616 (5) | 8698 (4) | 997 (2) | 30 (1) |
| 0 (3) | 331 (5) | 9032 (4) | 1981 (2) | 33 (1) |
| $0(4)$ | 1830 (4) | 10900 (4) | -449(2) | 27 (1) |
| $0(5)$ | -184(5) | $11002(5)$ | $169(2)$ | 34 (1) |
| $\mathrm{Br}(1)$ | 6223(1) | 8116(1) | 2155(1) | 70 (1) |
| G(1) | 591 (7) | 11681 (7) | $1805(3)$ | $32(2)$ |
| C(2) | 714 (6) | 12915 (6) | 1373 (3) | 30 (2) |
| C(3) | $2049(7)$ | 12690 (6) | 951 (3) | 25(2) |
| C(4) | 2045 (7) | 11218(6) | 780 (3) | 20(2) |
| $C$ (5) | $1037(7)$ | 9429 (6) | 1493 (3) | $26(2)$ |
| C(6) | 1573(7) | 7257 (6) | 1021(3) | $31(2)$ |
| c(7) | $2259(7)$ | 6781 (7) | 1685 (4) | 42(2) |
| C(8) | 2454 (9) | 6893 (8) | 393 (3) | 53 (2) |
| C(9) | $57(7)$ | 6798 (8) | $959(4)$ | 49 (2) |
| C(10) | 3556(6) | 10729(6) | $660(3)$ | 23(2) |
| C(11) | 4406(6) | $10496(7)$ | 1316 (3) | 27 (2) |
| C(12) | 5941 (7) | $10139(7)$ | 1146 (4) | $38(2)$ |
| C(13) | 6806 (8) | 9742 (8) | 1766 (4) | $49(2)$ |
| C(14) | 1100 (8) | 11022 (6) | 141 (3) | 26 (2) |
| C(15) | 1034 (8) | 10748(8) | -1080(3) | 38(2) |
| C(16) | 2029 (9) | 10684 (11) | -1672(4) | 62 (3) |

Table 3. Bond lengths $[\AA]$ and angles $\left[{ }^{\circ}\right]$ for 1.

| $N(1)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.350 (8) | $N(1)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 1.464 (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N(1)-C(4)$ | 1.463 (8) | $0(1)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | $1.423(7)$ |
| $0(2)-\mathrm{C}(5)$ | 1.335 (8) | $0(2)-\mathrm{C}(6)$ | 1.488(7) |
| 0 (3).-C(5) | 1.223 (7) | 0 (4)-C(14) | $1.336(7)$ |
| 0 (4) - $\mathrm{C}(15)$ | $1.438(7)$ | $0(5)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1. 217 (8) |
| $\mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.917 (8) | $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 1.525 (9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 1.520(8) | C(3)-C(4) | 1.554(9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(14)$ | 1.534 (9) | $\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 1.535 (9) |
| C(6)-C(9) | 1.516 (10) | $\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 1.515 (9) |
| c(6)-C(7) | 1.515 (9) | $c(10)-c(11)$ | $1.517(8)$ |
| C(11)-C(12) | 1.535 (9) | $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)$ | 1.505 (9) |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)-\mathrm{C}(16)$ | 1.481(10) |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{N}(1)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | $119.8(5)$ | $C(5)-N(1)-C(4)$ | $124.5(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{N}(1)-\mathrm{C}(4)$ | 113.9 (5) | $C(5)-O(2)-C(6)$ | 122.0 (5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{O}(4)-\mathrm{C}(15)$ | $117.2(5)$ | $N(1)-C(1)-C(2)$ | 104.1 (5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{C}(1)$ | 103.2 (5) | $0(1)-\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{C}(2)$ | 110.4 (5) |
| $0(1)-C(3)-C(4)$ | 113.4 (5) | $C(2)-C(3)-C(4)$ | 105.1 (5) |
| $N(1)-C(4)-C(14)$ | 108.9 (5) | $N(1)-C(4)-C(10)$ | 115.9 (5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(10)$ | 112.3 (5) | $\mathrm{N}(1)-\mathrm{C}(4)-\mathrm{C}(3)$ | 100.9 (5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)-c(4)-C(3)$ | 107.5 (5) | C(10)-C(4)-C(3) | $110.5(5)$ |
| $0(3)-\mathrm{C}(5)-0(2)$ | 125.8 (6) | $0(3)-C(5)-N(1)$ | 123.1(6) |
| $0(2)-\mathrm{C}(5)-\mathrm{N}(1)$ | 111.1(5) | $0(2)-C(6)-C(9)$ | 109.6 (6) |
| $0(2)-C(6)-C(8)$ | $102.0(6)$ | $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(8)$ | 112.4 (6) |
| $0(2)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 109.7 (6) | $\mathrm{C}(9)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 111.8 (6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(8)-\mathrm{C}(6)-\mathrm{C}(7)$ | 110.9 (6) | C(11)-C(10)-C(4) | 114.9 (5) |
| $\mathrm{C}(10)-\mathrm{C}(11)-\mathrm{C}(12)$ | 111.2 (5) | $\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(11)$ | 114.2 (6) |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)-\mathrm{C}(13)-\mathrm{Br}(1)$ | 113.1 (5) | $0(5)-\mathrm{C}(14)-0(4)$ | $123.5(6)$ |
| $0(5)-C(14)-C(4)$ | 123.3(6) | $0(4)-C(14)-C(4)$ | 113.1(6) |
| $0(4)-C(15)-C(16)$ | 108.8(6) |  |  |

Symmetry transformations used to generate equivalent atoms:

Table 4. Anisotropic displacement parameters $\left[\dot{A}^{2} \times 10^{3}\right]$ for 1.
The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2 \pi^{2}\left[\left(h a^{*}\right)^{2} U_{11}+\ldots+2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U_{12}\right]$

|  | U11 | U22 | U33 | U23 | U13 | U12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N(1)$ | 19(3) | $25(3)$ | 23(3) | -1(2) | $4(3)$ | -2(3) |
| O(1) | 29(2) | 28 (3) | $36(3)$ | 6 (2) | $4(2)$ | $2(2)$ |
| $\bigcirc(2)$ | 39 (3) | 22 (2) | 29 (3) | 1 (2) | $5(2)$ | -5(2) |
| O(3) | 31 (3) | $35(3)$ | 33 (3) | 6 (2) | $8(2)$ | -2(2) |
| $0(4)$ | 21 (2) | 37 (3) | 24 (2) | -2(2) | -5 (2) | 3 (2) |
| 0 (5) | $21(3)$ | 43 (3) | $39(3)$ | $4(2)$ | -5 (2) | 1(2) |
| $\mathrm{Br}(1)$ | $40(1)$ | 79 (1) | 91(1) | $50(1)$ | -6(1) | $9(1)$ |
| C(1) | 28(3) | $40(4)$ | 28(3) | -5 (3) | $4(3)$ | 5 (4) |
| C(2) | 20(3) | 29 (4) | 41(4) | -6(4) | -1(3) | 0 (3) |
| C(3) | $19(3)$ | 25 (4) | 32(4) | 3(3) | 0 (3) | -1(3) |
| C(4) | $19(4)$ | 23 (4) | 19(3) | 2 (3) | 3 (3) | 1(3) |
| C(5) | 23 (4) | 37 (4) | 19(3) | 7 (3) | 2 (4) | $3(4)$ |
| C(6) | 42(4) | 19 (4) | 30 (4) | 3 (3) | 0 (4) | -11(3) |
| C(7) | 43 (4) | 27 (4) | 56(5) | $8(4)$ | -5(4) | -2(4) |
| C (8) | 89 (6) | $29(4)$ | 41(4) | -8(4) | $20(4)$ | $-2(5)$ |
| C(9) | $48(4)$ | $38(5)$ | 62 (5) | 8(4) | -27(4) | $-13(5)$ |
| C(10) | 19(3) | $21(3)$ | $30(4)$ | 0 (3) | $2(3)$ | -1(3) |
| C(11) | 20 (3) | 27 (4) | 34 (4) | $4(3)$ | -3(3) | $5(3)$ |
| C(12) | 26 (4) | $49(5)$ | 39 (4) | 17 (4) | $3(4)$ | $2(4)$ |
| C(13) | 27 (4) | 58(5) | 63 (5) | $9(5)$ | -6(4) | -7(4) |
| C(14) | $30(4)$ | 13 (3) | 34 (4) | $5(3)$ | -3(4) | $-1(4)$ |
| C(15) | 33 (4) | 56(5) | 25 (4) | -5 (4) | -8(4) | 3 (4) |
| C(16) | $52(5)$ | 101(8) | 34 (4) | -7(5) | -9(4) | 19 (6) |

Table 5. Hydrogen coordinates $\left(x 10^{4}\right)$ and isotropic displacement parameters ( $\dot{A}^{2} \times 10^{3}$ ) for 1 .

|  | x | $y$ | $z$ | U (eq) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H(1C) | 2796(5) | 13362(4) | 122(2) | 47 |
| $\mathrm{H}(1 \mathrm{~A})$ | 1048 (7) | $11791(7)$ | 2264 (3) | 38 |
| $\mathrm{H}(1 \mathrm{~B})$ | -412(7) | 11441(7) | 1876(3) | 38 |
| $\mathrm{H}(2 \mathrm{~A})$ | -117(6) | 13025(6) | 1066 (3) | 36 |
| $\mathrm{H}(2 \mathrm{~B})$ | 808(6) | 13689 (6) | 1673(3) | 36 |
| $\mathrm{H}(3 \mathrm{~A})$ | 2892(7) | 12897 (6) | 1244 (3) | 31 |
| $\mathrm{H}(7 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3235 (7) | 7097(7) | 1707 (4) | 63 |
| H(7B) | 2257(7) | 5831(7) | 1691 (4) | 63 |
| H (7C) | 1730(7) | $7109(7)$ | 2085(4) | 63 |
| $\mathrm{H}(8 \mathrm{~A})$ | 3422(9) | 7208(8) | 457 (3) | 79 |
| $\mathrm{H}(8 \mathrm{~B})$ | 2046(9) | 7287(8) | -24(3) | 79 |
| $\mathrm{H}(8 \mathrm{C})$ | 2465(9) | 5947 (8) | 341 (3) | 79 |
| $\mathrm{H}(9 \mathrm{~A})$ | -470(7) | 7055(8) | 1375 (4) | 74 |
| $\mathrm{H}(9 \mathrm{~B})$ | $39(7)$ | 5851 (8) | 914 (4) | 74 |
| H (9C) | -379(7) | 7191(8) | 548 (4) | 74 |
| H(10A) | 3511 (6) | 9907 (6) | 394 (3) | 28 |
| $\mathrm{H}(10 \mathrm{~B})$ | 4064 (6) | 11370(6) | 370 (3) | 28 |
| H(11A) | 3967 (6) | 9786(7) | 1586 (3) | 33 |
| H(11B) | 4392 (6) | 11289 (7) | 1606 (3) | 33 |
| $\mathrm{H}(12 \mathrm{~A})$ | 5939 (7) | 9418 (7) | 806 (4) | 46 |
| H (12B) | 6400(7) | 10894(7) | 922 (4) | 46 |
| H(13A) | 6731(8) | 10422(8) | 2127(4) | 59 |
| H(13B) | 7810 (8) | 9679 (8) | 1627 (4) | 59 |
| H(15A) | 382 (8) | 11490 (8) | -1140(3) | 46 |
| H(15B) | 466 (8) | 9942(8) | -1058(3) | 46 |
| H(16A) | 1497 (9) | 10583(11) | -2106(4) | 94 |
| H(16B) | 2664 (9) | 9942(11) | -1612(4) | 94 |
| $\mathrm{H}(16 \mathrm{C})$ | 2584(9) | 11486(11) | -1692(4) | 94 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| क सै |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\vec{\infty} \vec{\square} ज \vec{\circ}$ <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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# Studies on the Total Synthesis of Paraherquamide A. Stereocontrolled, Asymmetric Synthesis of $\alpha$-Alkyl- $\beta$ Hydroxyproline Derivatives 

Robert M. Williams* and Jianhua Cao<br>Department of Chemistry, Colorado State Unwersity<br>Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

Summary: The dianion formed from $3(\mathrm{~S}), 2(\mathrm{R})$-3-hydroxyproline ethyl ester (5) with LDA, can be alkylated with a variety of alkyl halides with net retention of configuration to give the corresponding $\alpha$-alkylated- $\beta$ hydroxyproline esters (6) in good yield. Copyright © 1996 Elsevier Science Lid

Substituted proline derivatives are widely found as constituents of natural products. ${ }^{1}$ For example, the microbial products paraherquamide $\mathrm{A}(1)^{2}$ and lactacystin (2) ${ }^{3}$ contain densely functionalized $\alpha$-substituted3 -hydroxyproline moieties. As part of a general program ${ }^{4}$ aimed at developing new methods to access $\alpha$ substituted amino acids in high optical purity, we have examined the enolate alkylation of $3(\mathrm{~S}), 2(\mathrm{R})-3$ hydroxyproline ethyl ester (5) which is readily available from racemic 3 -ketoproline by Baker's yeast reduction is described by Cooper, Gallagher and Knight. ${ }^{5}$ More specifically, ongoing work in these laboratories on the total synthesis of paraherquamide $A,{ }^{6 a}$ mandated access to a $\beta$-functionalized $\alpha$-prenylated proline derivative zorresponding to 1 .


There are no general synthetic methods available for the synthesis of optically active $\alpha$-substituted- $\beta$ nydroxyproline derivatives. Seebach ${ }^{7}$ has developed a useful method to $\alpha$-alkylate proline via formation of the zorresponding bicyclic pivaldehyde aminal, followed by enolate alkylation which, proceeds with net retention of configuration; subsequent vigorous hydrolysis of the hindered, $\alpha$-alkylated bicyclic aminal, provides the zorresponding $\alpha$-substituted proline derivatives in high enantiomeric excess.

N -Boc-3(S), 2(R)-3-Hydroxyproline ethyl ester (5), 5 made by Baker's yeast reduction of N -Boc-3ketoproline ethyl ester (4) in $>90 \%$ ee, was treated with 3 equivalents of LDA at $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in THF to form the corresponding alkoxy enolate dianion. The subsequent alkylation was performed by cooling the mixture to $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a mixture of alkyl halide ( 1.5 eq ) and HMPA ( 1.4 eq ) was added. The reaction was allowed to warm to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 hours up to $1-2$ days depending on the specific alkyl halide. Following
standard work-up and extraction of the organic-soluble product, the $\alpha$-alkylated products 6a-e (Scheme 1) were purified by silica gel chromatography and were obtained in moderate-good yields. In each case, only one diastereomer was formed, and little or no O-mono-alkylated or O., C-dialkylated by-products were produced.
Scheme 1


| Entry | RX | \% YIELD of 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a <br> b <br> $c$ <br> d <br> e |  | 70\% |
|  |  | 73\% |
|  |  | 53\% |
|  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 57\% |
|  |  | 49\% (X-RAY) |



For $6 \mathrm{c}, 6 \mathrm{~d}$, and 6 e , only the desired C-alkylation product was obtained, and there was no evidence for the production of O -alkylation products. For $6 \mathbf{a}$ and 6 b , there was less than $1-2 \%$ of the corresponding O alkylation products which, were easily removed by chromatography.

These highly stereoselective alkylation reactions all proceeded with net retention of configuration giving single diastereoisomers as evidenced by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{nmu}$. The relative stereochemistry of alkylation was rigorously secured through a single crystal X-ray analysis for $6 e$ (Figure 1). The absolute and relative stereochemistry of 6 a was secured by chemical correlation. 6 The relative and thus, absolute stereochemistry for all alkylation products 6 a-e was assigned based on similarities in nmr spectroscopic characteristics and optical rotation.

The dianion derived from 5 (see structure $A^{8}$ ) is expected to have a concave shape due to the Li coordinated bicyclo[4.3.0] ring system geometry; alkylation from the convex face opposite the alkoxy substituent is the expected (and observed) diastereofacial bias.


Figure 1. X-ray Structure for 5 e . Spheres are of fixed, arbitrary radius.

General experimental procedure: A solution of $5(104 \mathrm{mg}, 0.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 0.4 mL ) was cannulated over a period of 2 min to a magnetically stirred solution of LDA ( $1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.8 \mathrm{M}$ solution in THF) at $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 25 min ., and then at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min . followed by the dropwise addition of a solution of alkylating reagent $(0.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ in HMPA $(0.56 \mathrm{mmol})$ at $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over a period of 2 min . The mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for about 1 h ; the ice bath was then removed and the mixture was allowed to continue stirring at room temperature for 4 h ( 6 a and 6 b ) or $48 \mathrm{~h}(6 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{e}$ ). The reaction mixture was quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, extracted with EtOAC $(3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, washed with brine $(5 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over anhydrous $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (eluted with hexane:EtOAc:MeOH, 5:3:0.5) to afford 6a-e. ${ }^{9-13}$

It is noteworthy that, neither $\beta$-elimination nor significant $O$-alkylation attended these transformations. Further, the convenience and simplicity of performing the alkylations directly on substrate 5 without the need for additional protection 6,7 or manipulation should render this approach a highly attractive and general method for synthesizing functionalized pyrrolidine derivatives. The application of this methodology to the total synthesis of paraherquamide A (via 6 a), lactacystin and related substituted proline derivatives and pyrrolizidine alkaloids is under active investigation in these laboratories.
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3. (a) Omura, S.; Fujimoto, T.; Otoguro, K.; Matsuzaki, K.; Moriguchi, R., Tanaka, H.; Sasaki, Y., J. Antibiot, 1991, 44, 113; (b) Omura, S.; Matsuzaki, K.; Fujimoto, T; Kosuge, K.; Furuva, T; Fujita, S; Nakagawa, A., J. Antibiot. 1991, 44, 117; (c) Corey, E.J.; Reichard, G. A., J. Am. Chem.Soc. 1992, 114, 10677; (d) Corey, E.J.; Choi, S., Tetrahedron Lett. 1993, 34, 6969; (e) Corey, E.I; Reichard, G. A. Tefraheiron Lett 1993, 34, 6973; (f) Corey, E. I.; Reichard, G.A.; Kania, R., Tetrahedron Lett. 1993, 34, 6977; (g) Sunazuka, I.; Nagamitsu, T: Matsuzaki, K., Tanaka, H.; Omura, S.; Smith, A. B., J.Am.Chem.Soc. 1993, 115, 5302.
4. (a) Williams, R.M., Aldrichimica Acta 1992, 25, 11; (b) Williams, RM, Im, M-N., |.Am.Chem:Soc. 1991, 113, 9276; (c) Williams, R.M., Fegley, G.J., J.Am. Chem. Soc 1991, 113, 8796; (d) Williams, R.M., Advances m Asymmetric Synthesis, Hassner, A., Ed., JAI Press, 1995, Vol. 1, pp 45-94.
5. (a) Cooper, I; Gallagher, P.T, Knight, D.W., / Chem Soc.Chem Comm, 1988, 509; (b) Cooper, J;; Gallagher, P I.; Knight, D.W., I Chem.Soc. Perkin Trans I, 1993, 1313; (c) Knight, D.W., Lewis, N., Share, A.; Haigh, D., Tetrahedron Asymm. 1993, 4, 625; see also, (d) Sibi. M.P., Christensen. J. W., Tetrahedron Lett. 1990, 31, 5689. Compound 5 was prepared as described in ref. 5 b .
6. (a) Cushing, T.D.; Sanz-Cervera, JF.; Williams, R.M., J.Am.Chem.Soc. 1996, 118, 557; The absolute stereochemistry of the overall process was further corroborated by the conversion of 6 a into the bicyclic substance 8 which (as the enantiomer) was previously converted into ( + )-paraherquamide B, a substance whose absolute stereochemistry has been confirmed (see ref. 6a); see also: (b) Williams, R.M.; Glinka, T.; Kwast, E.; Coffman, H.; Stille, J.K., I.Am.Chem.Soc. 1990, 112, 808:

7. (a) Seebach, D; Naef, R., Helv. Chim. Acta 1981, 64, 2704; (b) Seebach, D; Boes, M.; Naef, R.; Schweizer, B., J.Am.Chem.Soc. 1983, 105, 5390; see also: (c) Dikshit, D.K.; Maheshwari, A.; Panday, S.K., Tetrahedron Lett. 1995, 36, 6131.
8. Structure A was minimized and rendered on CSC Chem 3D Plus ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$.
9. Data for 6 a , colorless oil, yield ( $70 \%$ ), [ $\alpha]_{D}^{25}-32.2$ (C, 0.74, EtOAc). IR(neat): 3449, 2977, 2955, 2928 , $2857,1739,1703,1391,1367,1251,837,774,{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.01-0.02(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.83-0.84(9 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 1.17-1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.32-1.41(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.37-1.70(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.898-1.98(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.74-2.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.14-$ $3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{r}), 3.60-3.77(111, \mathrm{~m}), 3.94(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.02-4.22(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.25-5.29\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{i}}\right),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.1,14.0,14.1,14.3,14.4,18.5,22.0,26.0,28.4,28.5,30.2,30.4,31.1,31.4,44.9,45.4,61.3,68.1_{2}$ $68.4,71.2,71.7,76.5,76.8,79.6,80.4,117.7,118.1,138.2,138.6,153.8,172.3$. Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 60.36 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.47 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.06$. Found: C, $60.17 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.30 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.05$. (reaction scale: 1.67 g of 5 ).
10. Data for $6 \mathbf{b}$, colorless oil, yield ( $73 \%$ ), $[\alpha]_{D^{25}}-48.2$ (C, 0.98, EtOAc). IR(neat): 3447, 2972, 2930, 2873, $1743,1699,1668,1391,1170,1137.1_{\mathrm{H}} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}_{,} \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.22-1.29(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.34-1.37(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.53$. $1.65(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.84-2.01(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.70-2.91(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.10-3.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.57-3.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.03-4.19(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.92-$ $4.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 18.3,18.5,26.3,26.4,28.5,28.6,30.6,30.9,31.3,31.8,45.0$. $45.6,61.4,71.4,71.9,76.5,79.7,80.5,118.4,118.7,135.8,135.9,154.0,154.1,172.3,172.4$. Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{5}: \mathrm{C}, 62.36 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.93 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.28$. Found: C, $62.19 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.03 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.27$. (reaction scale: 312 mg of 5 ).
11. Data for 6 c , colorless oil, yield ( $53 \%$ ), $[\alpha]_{D^{25}}-77.6$ (C, 0.59 , EtOAc). IR(neat): $3446,3085,3062,3030$, $2979,2881,1732,1693,1681,1392,1367,1167 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.26-1.31(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.38$. $1.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.48(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.66(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad $), 2.70-2.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.22-3.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.54-3.81(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.11-$ $4.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.23-4.31(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.11-7.27(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 14.41,14.46,28.6,30.5$ $30.9,36.8,37.8,45.0,45.3,60.6,61.6,72.2,72.5,75.9,79.9,80.8,126.7,126.9,128.3,128.5,130.8,130.9$, $136.5,136.8,153.9,154.2,169.5,172.1$. Anal Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{5}$ : C, $65.31 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.79 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.01$. Found: C. $65.15 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.69 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.87$. (reaction scale: 104 mg of 5 ),
12. Data for 6d, colorless oil, yield ( $57 \%$ ), $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}-3.9$ (C, 0.54, EtOAc). IR(neat): 3443, 2980, 2936, 1746 $1731,1698,1391,1167,1094 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.18-1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.36-1.41(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52$. $1.56(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.89-1.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.00-2.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.83(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad $), 3.33-3.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.65-3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.05$ $4.21(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 14.4,21.6,22.6,28.5,28.6,30.8,31.4,61.5,69.1,79.8,80.0$ 80.4, 81.1, 154.1, 172.3. Anal. Caled for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{NO}_{5}$ : C. 57.13 ; H, 8.48 ; N, 5.12 . Found: C. $56.92 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.28$ $\mathrm{N}, 5.05$. (reaction scale: 104 mg of 5 ).
13. Data for 6e, white powder, yield ( $49 \%$ ), $\left.|\alpha|\right|_{0} ^{25}-22.8$ (C, 0.54, EtOAC). IR(neat): 3438, 2973, 2934, 2875 $1735,1696,1672,1383,1366,1246,1168,772 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.21-1.24(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.28$ $1.40(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.32-1.40(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.83-2.18(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.62(1 \mathrm{H}$, broad $), 3.22-3.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.36-3.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}$ $\mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.65-3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.06-4.22\left(2 \mathrm{H} .{ }^{+} \mathrm{m}\right), 4.24-4.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75.47 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 14.4,21.9$ $22.1,28.5,30.6,31.2,32.4,32.7,32.9,33.6,34.0,45.0,45.5,61.4,71.0,76.6,76.8,79.9,80.5,154.0,172.3$ Anal. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{BrNO}$ : C, 48.74 ; $\mathrm{H}, 7.16$; N, 3.55 Found: $\mathrm{C}, 48.90 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.31 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.60$. (reaction scale 104 mg of 5).
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#### Abstract

The asymmetric synthesis of (2S,6R)-2,6-diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl) pimelic acid (17) and (2S,6S)-2,6-diamino6 -(hydroxymethyl)pimelic acid (4) has been accomplished. Sequential enolate alkylation of (5S,6R)-4-(benzyloxy-carbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-2,3,5,6-tetrahydro-1,4-oxazin-2-one (9) with 1-iodo-3-butene and bromomethyl methyl ether gave the a, e-disubstituted lactone in $\sim 100 \%$ de; subsequent ozonolysis gave the quaternary aldehyde 19. Aldol condensation with the enol borane of ( $5 S, 6 R$ )-4-(benzyloxycarbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-2,3,5,6-tetrahydro-1,4-oxazin-2-one (9) gave the dilactone 20. Barton deoxygenation, reductive cleavage of the oxazinones, and demethylation gave ( $2 S, 6 S$ )-2,6-diamino- 6 -(hydroxymethyl) pimelic acid (4). Synthesis of the $2 S, 6 R$ isomer followed the same protocol, only starting with ( $5 R, 6 S$ ) -4 -(benzyl-oxycarbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-2,3,5,6-tetrahydro-1,4-oxazin-2-one (5). Comparison of these two amino acids reveals that the $2 S, 6 S$ isomer 4 is the constituent of natural $N$ - 2,6 -diamino- 6 -(hydroxymethyl) pimel-1-yl]-L-alanine (3), a natural antibiotic produced by Micromonospora chalcea.


## Introduction

2.6-Diaminopimelic acid (1, DAP) is an important, naturally occurring amino acid biosynthesizod in bacteria and higher plants. ${ }^{1}$ L.1- and meso-DAP serve as the penultimate biosynthetic precursors of the essential amino acid L -lysine. meso-DAP functions as a cross-linking constituent of virtually all Gram-negative and some Gram-positive bacterial peptidoglycans, and also serves to anchor various membrane-associated macromolecules, such as lipoprotein, to the cell wall. Recognition of the pivotal roles DAP plays in microbial metabolism ${ }^{2}$ and cell wall structure has resulted in an increased level of interest in possible means to selectively disrupt the DAP biosynthetic pathway. A flurry of recent papers3 on the synthesis of DAP and, more significantly, structural analogues of DAP that can function as substrate-based inhibitors of key biosynthetic transformations attests to the potential importance of the DAP/lysine pathway as a viable target for antibiotic design. Recent studies in several laboratories demonstrate that a number of compounds that inhibit the formation or metabolism of 2,6-diaminopimelic acid in bacteria possess antibiotic activity ${ }^{4}$ Since mammals lack the diaminopimelate pathway and require L-lysine in their diet,' specific inhibitors of the enzymes along this route are potential antimicrobial agents that should display low mammalian host toxicity.

Despite the apparent simplicity of this amino acid, there exist no stereochemically unambiguous syntheses of meso-DAP nor asymmetric synthesis of L,L-DAP. Two very recent exceptions
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4
are the synthesis of $\beta$-fluoro DAP by Vederas and Gelb ${ }^{6 a}$ and $\beta$-hydroxy DAP by Bold and associates. ${ }^{6 \mathrm{~b}}$ The potential importance of inhibiting the DAP pathway through the design and synthesis of functionalized DAP analogues renders this class of amino acids an attractive and worthy synthetic problem. A recent example is the (stereorandom) preparation of the aziridino DAP 2 that was shown ${ }^{7}$ to be a potent inhibitor of L,L-DAP epimerase and exhibits antimicrobial activity. In this paper, we report a stereochemically unambiguous asymmetric synthesis of two stereoisomers of the only known natural DAP homologue, 2,6-di-amino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic acid (4). ${ }^{8}$
$N$ - [2,6-Diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimel-1-yl]-L-alanine (3) was isolated from the culture extracts of a microorganism identified as Micromonospora chalcea by the Shionogi Co. in Japan. ${ }^{1}$ The dipeptide 3 exhibits timited antimicrobial activity against Escherichia coli on a synthetic medium, and this activity is synergistically enhanced by several cell wall synthesis inhibitors such as penicillin G. phosphonomycin, cycloserine, chloro-D-alanine, macarbomycin, and cephaloridine.

The structure of 3 was determined by spectroscopic methods and chemical degradation. "The natural substance was assumed to be a dipeptide composed of an unknown amino acid and alanine. This was established by hydrolysis and subsequent analysis of the hydrolysate by an automatic amino acid analyzer. Specific optical rotation and ORD spectra proved that the alanine isolated from the hydrolysate has the $L$ configuration. Elemental analysis indicated that the molecular formula of the unknown amino acid is $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$. Furthermore, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectroscopic data
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suggested that the unknown amino acid should be 2,6-diamino6 -(hydroxymethyl)pimelic acid (4). This was further corroborated by chemical degradation. Amino acid 4 was acetylated with acetic anhydride in a dilute sodium bicarbonate solution, and then treated sequentially with $\mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ in a dilute alkaline solution followed by oxidation with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$; subsequent hydrolysis furnished t - $\alpha$ aminoadipic acid. Thus, the new amino acid proved to be 2,6 -diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl) pimelic acid with the L configuration at the C-2 stereogenic center. Employment of the Scheinblatt method' established the connectivity shown in 3 . However, the relative and absolute stereochemistry at C-6 remained unknown.

In spite of the weak biological activity exhibited by 3 , we decided to synthesize this natural product in a stereochemically unambiguous manner. In this way, we hoped to be able to assign the stereochemistry at C-6 and develop methodology that would be generally applicable to the 2,6 -diaminopimelic acid (DAP) family of amino acids. In addition, 4 and stereoisomeric derivatives would appear to be ideal precursors for unambiguously preparing all individual stereoisomers of the biologically active aziridine 2

[^3]
## Results and Discussion

We have previously reported ${ }^{10}$ on the utility of the diphenyloxazinones 5 as versatile templates from which both electrophilic ${ }^{1 t}$ and nucleophilic ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond-forming strategies can be employed to access a variety of nonproteinogenic $\alpha$-amino acids. In selecting a strategy to accomplish the key coupling of two optically pure glycinates to a three-carbon tether, we examined a variety of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$
(10) Williams, R. M. Symihesis of Optically Active a-Amino Acids. Pergamon Press: Oxford, 1989.
(11) (a) Sinclair, P. J; Zhai, D.; Reibenspies, J.; Williams, R. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1986, 108, 1103. (b) Williams, R. M.: Sinclair, P. J.; Zhai, D. Chen, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 1547, (c) Sinclair, P. J. Ph. D. Thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, 1987. (d) Williams, R. M.: Zhai, D; Sinclair, P. J. J. Org. Chem. 1986, 51, 5021. (e) Williams, R. M.; Sinclair. P. J.: Zhai, W. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 482. (f) Williams, R. M.: Zhai, W. Tetrahedron 1988, 44, 5425. (g) Zhai, D.; Zhai, W:; Williams, R. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 2501. (h) Williams, R. M.; Hendris. J. A. J. Org. Chem. 1990, 55, 3723.
(12) (a) Williams, R. M.: Im, M.-N. Tetrahedron L... 1989, 29, 6075. (b) Details of dialkylations of 5 and 9 and the X-ray erystal structure of a dialkylation product (from 9, alkylating sequentially with methyl iodide and benzyl bromide) will be published elsewhere; Williams, R. M.: Im, M.-N. f. Am. Chem. Soc., in press.

Scheme II

bond-forming reactions between two oxazinones, one carrying the activated three-carbon tether and the other, unsubstituted. Attempted enolate couplings to various $3^{\prime}$-halo derivatives all met with complete failure. Similarly, attempted electrophilic couplings between metallo-alkynylated ${ }^{\text {II }}$ substrates also failed to give the desired homologations. Finally, we found that employment of the enol borane aldol couplings reported by Miller ${ }^{13}$ on these oxazinone systems proved to be effective. Initially, we attempted to synthesize the $2 S, 6 R$ isomer: As shown in Scheme 1, the commercially available ${ }^{14}$ lactone 5 was treated with homoallyl iodide in the presence of lithium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide to give the homoallyloxazinone 6 in $47 \%$ yield. After extensive experimentation, it was found that enolate alkylation of 6 could be carried out in high yield by the following procedure. To a solution of 6 in THF at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added potassium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide: after 5 min , bromomethyl methyl ether was added. The (methoxymethyl) homoallyloxazinone 7 was obtained in $97 \%$ yieid ( $\sim 100 \%$ de) afier chromatography. We could not detect any of the epimeric alkylation product in the crude reaction mixture by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis. Approach of the electrophile to the least hindered

[^4]face of the enolate has been corroborated ${ }^{12 \mathrm{~b}}$ through single-crystal $X$-ray analysis of a related dialkylation on 5. The homologated oxazinone 7 was ozonized and then quenched with dimethyl sulfide to afford the aldehyde 8 in $94 \%$ yield.

Preparation of the boron enolate of 9 according to Miller ${ }^{13}$ followed by aldol condensation with the aldehyde 8 gave the $\beta$-hydroxy dilactone 11 ( $61 \%$ ) as the major product and 12 ( $4 \%$ ) as the minor product. It is assumed that the relative stereochemistry of the minor diastereomer 12 at the $a$-position is syn to the two phenyl rings ( $R$ ) because of the characteristic ${ }^{\text {lc }}$ relative difference in chemical shifts of methine protons at the benzylic positions of the oxazinone ring. For the anti diastereomer 11, the difference in chemical shift $(\Delta \delta)$ for the benzylic methines in the monosubstituted lactone ring is 1.26 ppm while $\Delta \delta$ for the syn diastereomer 12 is 0.47 ppm . This assignment is based on the additional assumption that both the syn and anti diastereomers have similar chemical shift differences for the methines in the quaternary lactone system. These relative chemical shift differences are in accord with empirical observations first discussed by Sinclair. ${ }^{\text {He }}$ Although ultimately unimportant for the synthesis of 4 , the diastercoselectivity of the aldol condensation appears to be excelient. Out of a total of four possible diastereoisomers, only two were observable in the crude reaction mixture. The small vicinal coupling constants ( $\sim 1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ) for the C-2/C-3 (DAP numbering) methines for each diastereomer (11 and 12) are in
accord with the anti selectivity observed by Miller ${ }^{13}$ in related aldolizations.

Next, we examined reductive functional transformation of the $\beta$-hydroxy group to obtain the requisite deoxygenation product. This proved to be very difficult since this alcohol moiety is very hindered and is prone to $\alpha, \beta$-elimination. Many attempts at activating the hydroxyl for hydride displacement resulted in either no reaction or $\alpha, \beta$-dehydrogenation. is

After examining a multitude of reductive activation possibilities. we established conditions to prepare a Barton reaction ${ }^{16}$ precursor. As shown in Scheme I, treatment of the alcohol II with phenyl chlorothionoformate in the presence of sodium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide furnished the thionoformate 13 in $62 \%$ yield. Standard procedures" ${ }^{17}$ to prepare phenyl thionoformates afforded either the $\alpha \beta$-unsaturated lactone or unreacted starting material, depending on the reaction conditions. Several attempts to prepare other Barton reaction precursors failed, leading to no reaction. Among several bases examined (nBuLi, $\mathrm{LiN}\left(\mathrm{SiMc}_{3}\right)_{2}, \mathrm{NaN}\left(\mathrm{SiMe}_{3}\right)_{3}$, $\left.\mathrm{KN}\left(\mathrm{SiMc}_{3}\right)_{2}\right)$, sodium bis(trimethytsily) amide gave the best result for the conversion of 11 to 13.

The reduction of 13 with tributyltin hydride in the presence of AIBN in refluxing toluene provided the deoxygenated product 14 in $60 \%$ yieid along with an epimer 15 in $15 \%$ yield (major:minor $\sim 5: 1$ ). Formation of the unexpected minor isomer 15 can be explained mechanistically as follows: the initially formed secondary $\beta$-radical from tin hydride removal of the thionoformate is quenched with tributyltin hydride to afford the major diastereomer 14. However, a more stable tertiary radical at the $\alpha$ position of the monosubstituted lactone can be formed by two pathways: (1) 1,2-hydrogen migration of the $\beta$-radical, or (2) abstraction of the $\alpha$-hydrogen in the initially formed dilactone 14 by the secondary $\beta$-radical or from a stannane radical. Hy-drogen-atom transfer from tributyltin hydride to the putative tertiary radical is expected to proceed from the least hindered face (anti to the phenyl rings), leading to the minor product 5 . It is unlikely that 1,2 hydrogen atom migration occurs because this process is not allowed by orbital symmetry theory. The latter explanation is therefore the most plausible.

Finally, 14 was smoothly converted into ( $2 S, 6 R$ )-2,6-di-amino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic acid (17). Dilactone 14 was hydrogenated to give the amino acid 16, which was directly converted into 17 in $95 \%$ yield by demethylation in refluxing $48 \%$ HBr and subsequent scavenging of HBr with propylene oxide in refluxing ethanol.

Measurement of the specific optical rotation of 17 indicates that the $6 R$ stereochemistry is not that of the natural amino acid $\left[[\alpha]^{2 S_{D}}+22.5^{\circ}(c 0.6,5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}),-\operatorname{lit}{ }^{8}[\alpha]^{25}+8.1 \pm 1.0^{\circ}(c 0.506\right.$, $5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl})]$. Since the stereochemistry at C-2 of the natural
(15) The reaction of $i$ with mesyl chloride in the presence of triethylamine and subseguent treatment with excess triethylamine furnished the alkene ii. Unfortunately, sequential hydrogenation, hydrolytic deprotection of the methyl ether, and scavenging of acid with propylene oxide produced the amino acids iii and iv as a $1: 1$ mixture of diastereomers.


(16) (a) Berton, D. H. R., McCombic, S. W. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans t1975, 1574. (b) Barton, D. H. R.; Subramanian, R. J. Chem. Sox. Perkin 11975,1574, (b) Bar
Trans. $1977,1718$.
(17) (a) Robins. M. J.; Wilson, J. S. J. Am. Chem. Sor. 1981, 103, 932 (b) Robins, M. J. Wilson, J. S.: Hansske. F. 1983, 105, 4059
product had been assigned by the oxidative degradation to $L-\alpha$ aminoadipic acid, preparation of the $2 S, 6 S$ isomer starting with the antipodal lactone 18 (Scheme II) was carried out.

Following the identical protocol used to prepare 7, the antipodal quaternary lactone aldehyde 19 was prepared. As shown in Scheme 11 , aldol condensation of 10 with 19 provided the hydroxy dilactone $\mathbf{2 0}$ as the major diastereomer ( $51 \%$ ) plus 21 as the minor isomer ( $2 \%$ ). Again, as in the case above for 11 and 12, excellent diastercoselectivity in the aldol reaction was observed. The vicinal coupling constants for the C-2/C-3 system were 0 and 2.4 Hz for 20 and 21 , respectively. We could not detect the corresponding anti (aldol) diastereomers in the crude reaction mixture by NMR analysis. Both sets of aldolizations support a Zimmerman-Traxler chair-type transition state predominantly from the face of the oxazinone anti to the two phenyl rings with the aldehyde methine oriented toward the inside of the oxazinone ring. The major isomer 20 was converted into the thionoformate 22 by the method described above for 13 . The reduction of 22 with tributyltin hydride gave the dilactone $23(60 \%)$, and the minor syn isomer 24 was obtained in $10 \%$ yield. Employment of triphenyltin hydride instead of tri-n-butyltin hydride enhanced the yield of reduction, giving the major isomer 23 in $81 \%$ yield and the minor isomer 24 in $5 \%$. Catalytic hydrogenolysis and demethylation produced (2S.6S)-2,6-diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic acid (4) in $91 \%$ overall yield from 23. Measurement of the specific rotation of synthetic 4 demonstrates that the natural product possesses the $2 S, 6 S$ relative and absolute steroochemistry $\left[[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}+7.1^{\circ}(c 0.55\right.$, $\left.5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}) \operatorname{lit}^{8}[\alpha]_{D}^{25}+8.1 \pm 1.0^{\circ}(c 0.506,5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl})\right]$. The synthetic amino acid 4 proved to be identical ('H NMR. TLC) with an authentic sample of 4 obtained from hydrolytic cleavage ${ }^{18}$ of the natural product 3 obtained from Shionogi \& Co. Since the diastereochemical purity of 19 is ca. $100 \%$ de, the enantiomeric purity of the synthetic amino acid 4 is similarly $\mathrm{ca} .100 \% \mathrm{ec}$.
Thus the complete stereostructure for the natural dipeptide 3 is ( $2 S, 6 S$ )-N-(2,6-diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimel-1-yl)-1-alanine:


We have examined the biological activity of both amino acids 4 and 17 against nine microorganisms (Bacillus subtilis, Staphylococcus aureus, Micrococcus luteus, Candida albicans, Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Pseudomonas aeruginasa, Saccharomyces cerevisiae, and Seratia marcescens) and find that neither compound displays significant antimicrobial activity up to $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$.
In summary, we have developed an asymmetric and stereochemically defined construction of an $\alpha$-functionalized diaminopimelic acid system and have assigned, through total synthesis, the stereochemistry at the quaternary center of the natural product 3. The availability ${ }^{14}$ of both optical antipodes of the oxazinone systems renders this chemistry adaptable to preparing all possible diastereoisomers of substances based on the DAP skeleton in optically pure form. Efforts to extend this methodology to construct other functionalized DAP systems, particularly those with potential antimicrobial activity, are being pursued in these laboratories and will be reported on in due course.

## Experimental Section

General Information. 'H NMR spectra were obtained on the following instruments: Brucker WP-200SY $200-\mathrm{MHz}$ spectrometer, Brucker WP-270S $270-\mathrm{MHz}$ spectrometer, or Brucker $\mathrm{AC} 300 \cdot \mathrm{MHz}$ spectrometer. ${ }^{\text {IF }}$ NMR spectra were recorded on the Brucker WP- 200 SY 200 MHz spectrometer. Chemical shifts are reported in parts per million downfield from the internal standard. Infrared specira were recorded on
(18) Natural 3 was hydrolyzed and separated according to the procedure detailed in reference 8 to provide an authentic comparison sample of 4 .

Perkin-Elmer 1600 Series FTIR and are reported as $\lambda_{\text {max }}$ in $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$. Melting points were determined in open-ended capillary tubes on a Mel-Temp apparatus and are uncorrected. Optical rotations were obtained on a Rudoiph Research Autopol III automatic polarimeter at wavelength 589 nm (sodium D line) using a 1.0 -decimeter cell with a total volume of 1 mL . Specific rotations, $[\alpha]_{0}$, are reported in degrees per decimeter at the specified temperature and the concentration (c) given in grams per 100 mL in the specified solvent. Elemental analyses were performed by M-H-W Laboratories, Phoenix, AZ, and are accurate to within the caiculated values by $\pm 0.4 \%$. High-resolution mass spectra were carried out by Midwest Center for Mass Spectrometry, Department of Chemistry, University of Nebraska-Lincoin, Lincoln, NE. Thinlayer chromatography (TLC) was performed on $0.25-\mathrm{mm}$ E. Merck precoated silica gel glass plates. Visualization on TL.C was achievod with ultraviolet light, an $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ developing chamber, and/or heating of TLC plates submerged in a $5 \%$ solution of phosphomolybdic acid in 95\% ethanol. Preparative chromatography was performed by the following methods. Column chromatography was performed with Merck silica gel grade 60 . 230-400 mesh, 60 A. Radial chromatography was done on $1-2-2$, and $4-\mathrm{mm}$ silica gel plates using E. Merck silica gel 60 PF- 254 containing gyprum on a Harrison Research Chromatotron Model 7924. Reagents and solvents were commercial grades and were used as supplied with the following exceptions. Tetrahydrofuran was freshly distilled from sodium benzophenone ketyl. Dry methylene chloride and carbon tetrachloride were obtained by distillation over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$. DMF and HMPA were dried over activated 4-A molecular sieves. All moisture-sensitive reactions were carried out in glassware that was flame-dried under high vacuum $(0.5-2.0 \mathrm{mmHg})$ and then purged with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$. The term "concentrated refers to solvent removal using a Buchi Rotavapor. The amino acids furnished crude from the hydrogenation were always obtained in greater than the theoretical amount due to a certain fraction of HCl salt resulting from the $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}$ catalyst. To ascertain the exact amount of amino acid by weight in the residue, the mixture was dissolved in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ with a known amount of tericucine (purity titrated against ultrapure acetamide), and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}$ NMR integration of a well-resolved resonance of the amino acid against the nine-proton singlet of terieucine was carried out, averaged, and calculated to give the adjusted chemical yields.
( $3 S, 5 R, 6 S$ )-4-(Benzyloxycarbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-3-(3'-butenyl). $2,3,5,6$-tetrahydro-4H-1,4-oxazin-2-one (6). To a stirred solution of 5 ( 3 g .7 .744 mmol , I equiv) and 4 -iodobutene ( $4.2 \mathrm{~mL} .39 .35 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.1$ equiv) in warm THF ( 90 mL ) and HMPA ( 9 mL ) was added lithium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide ( $13.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 13.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.8$ equiv, I M solution in THF) dropwise via syringe at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 min the dry ice bath was removed. After an additional I h. the reaction mixture was poured into ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with water and brine. dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate, filtered, concentrated, and separated by column chromatography on silica gel to afford 1.59 g ( $46.5 \%$ ) of 6 as a white solid. The antipode was obtained from 9 in $48.5 \%$ yield. Data for 6: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}, 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $82.18-2.31(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.81-5.16(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.93 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $5.77-5.95(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.02 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.54-6.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $7.02-7.24$ ( $13 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ): IR ( $\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) $1747,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp}$ 146-147 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:[a]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+44.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c} 0.49, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ antipode (from 9) $-45.2^{\circ}(c 0.42$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ). Anal. (recrystallized from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} /$ hexanes) Calod for $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{4}: \mathrm{C} .76 .17: \mathrm{H} .6 .17: \mathrm{N} .3 .17$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 76.07: \mathrm{H}, 6.36 ; \mathrm{N}$. 3.20.
(3R,5R,6S)-4-(Benzyloxy carbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-3-(3'-butenyl)-3-(methoxymethyl)-2,3,5,6-tetrahydro-4H-1,4-oxazin-2-one (7). To a stirred solution of 6 ( $1.1 \mathrm{~g}, 2.49 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) in THF ( 15 mL ) was added potassium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide $(8.9 \mathrm{~mL}, 12.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 5$ equiv, 1.4 M solution in THF) dropwise via syringe at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 5 min bromomethyl methyl ether ( $2 \mathrm{~mL}, 24.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, 10 equiv) was added to the reaction mixture at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After an additional 50 min , the reaction mixture was poured into ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with water and brine, dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate. filtered. concentrated, and separated by column chromatography on silica gel to afford $1.17 \mathrm{~g}(96.7 \%)$ of 7 as a colorless oil. The antipode was obtained in $88.5 \%$ yield. Data for 7: 'H NMR ( 200 MHz . DMSO-d. $3.393 \mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{vs}$ TMS) \& 1.29-1.43 (1 H, m), 1. $51-1.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.09-2.38(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. $3.32(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.64\left(1 \mathrm{H},{ }^{1} / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=9.76 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.37(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{Abq}$. $J=9.79 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.65-4.79(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) .5 .15(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=12.31 \mathrm{~Hz})$. $5.24(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q},. \mathrm{~J}=12.07 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.41-5.64(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$. $J=3.32 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.28 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.07-7.31(15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}): I \mathrm{R}$ $\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 1746.1702 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;\{a\}^{25} \mathrm{p}-49.4^{\circ}\left(c 0.35, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, antipode $+48.7^{\circ}\left(c 0.39 . \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ : exact mass (FAB) calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}$. O, Li 492.236228, found 492:2381
( $3 R, 5 R, 6 S$ )-4-(Benzyloxycarbonyl)-5,6-diphenyl-3-(2'-carbony) ethyl)-3-(methoxymethyl)-2,3.5.6-tetrahydro-4H-1,4-oxazin-2-one (8). Ozone was bubbled through a solution of $7(316 \mathrm{mg}, 0.651 \mathrm{mmol}, ~ 1$ equiv) in $\mathrm{MeOH}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL}, ~ 1: 1)$ antil the solution turned blue (ca

5 min ). Nitrogen gas was then passed through the reaction mixture to remove excess ozone until the solution became colorless. The resulting solution was quenched with excess dimethyl sulfide. After is h the reaction mixture was concentrated and separated by radial chromatog. raphy on silica gel to afford $319 \mathrm{mg}(96 \%)$ of 8 as a colorless oil. The antipode 19 was obtained in $94 \%$ yield. Data for 8: H NMR (200 MHz , DMSO- $d_{6} .393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS $) ~ \$ 1.69-1.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.95-2.10(1$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.28-2.60(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.32(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.68(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=9.79$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 4.38\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{1}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=9.81 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.14\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{1} / / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=12.35\right.$. $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.24(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=.12.35 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, f=3,40 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.44 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.14-7.32(15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 9.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;$ IR $\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 1745,1722$ (shoulder), $1701 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;[a]^{23} \mathrm{D}-79.9^{\circ}$ (cl.2, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ), antipode $19+80.4^{\circ}\left(c 0.7, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; exact mass ( FAB ) calco for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{6} 488.207314\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$, found 488.2070.

Aldol Adducts 11 and 12 . To a stirred solution of 9 ( $445 \mathrm{mg}, 1.15$ mmol. 1 equiv) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was added dibutylboron triflate ( 2.3 $\mathrm{mL}, 2.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ equiv, 1 M solution in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) followed by the addition of triethylamine ( $320 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ equiv) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 min the reaction mixture was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(11 \mathrm{~mL})$ solution of aldehyde 8 ( $1.12 \mathrm{~g}, 2.297 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ equiv) was added to it. After 30 min the reaction mixture was quenched with phosphate buffer solution $(0.025 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{pH} 6.9)$ and poured into water. The aqueous layer was extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic solution was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate, filtered, concentrated, and separated by column chromatography on sitica gel to afford 613 mg ( $6 \ddagger \%$ ) of 11 as a white solid and $41 \mathrm{mg}(4 \%)$ of 12 as a white solid.

11: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz , DMSO- $d_{6} .393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) \$ $1.32-1.55$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.36-2.47(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.34(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.65(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=$ $9.86 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.89-3.99(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.38(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ q. $J=9.74 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.52$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=1.89 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.89(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.66 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.98(1 \mathrm{H}$ $1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.52 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.11(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q, J=12.47 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.18(1$ $\left.H_{,}, d, J=3.21 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.23(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q, J=12.39 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$ $\mathrm{E}_{2} O$ exch, $\left.J=5.23 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.63(1 \mathrm{H}, d, J=3.59 \mathrm{~Hz}), \delta .36\{1 \mathrm{H}, J, J=$ $3.50 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.14 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.52(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.76 \mathrm{~Hz})$. 6.93-7.34 ( $28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ); IR ( $\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) $3474,1749,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp}$ $123-125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:[\alpha]^{25} \mathrm{~b}-7.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}, 0.92, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right.$ ), Anal. (recrystallized from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ /hexanes) Calod for $\mathrm{C}_{50} \mathrm{H}_{60} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{10} \div \mathrm{C}, 72.76 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.76 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.20$. Found: C, 72.94; H, 6.02; N, 3.02.

12: ${ }^{4} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6,} 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $\delta 1.41-1.59$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.96-2.11(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.39-2.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.54$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}, \mathrm{g}, J=9.78 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.63-3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.91\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exch, $J=4.79 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.33(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}, J=9.82 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$ $J=1.96 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.11\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{4}{ }^{1} / 2 \mathrm{AB}\right.$ q. $\left.J=12.31 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.13\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{3}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}\right.$ q. $J=12.43 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.20(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \wedge B \mathrm{q}, J=12.39 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.22(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2$ AB q, $J=12.33 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.61(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.23 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.29$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 6.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.31 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.07-7.39(30 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ; I \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{NaCl}$ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 3483,1746,1702 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ; \mathrm{mp} 101-103^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;[\alpha]^{28}+11.1^{\circ}(c 0.56$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) : exact mass caled for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{51} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{40}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right) 875.35453$, found 875.3521 .

Phenyl Thionoformate 13. To a solution of 11 ( $237 \mathrm{mg}, 0.271 \mathrm{mmol}$, I equiv) in THF ( 4 mL ) was added phenyl chlorothionoformate ( 187 mL , $1.352 \mathrm{mmol}, 5$ equiv) followed by addition of sodium bis(trimethyisilyl)amide ( $298 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.298 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv, 1 M solution in THF) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 min the dry ise bath was removed. After further reaction for 3 h , the reaction mixture was poured into ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with water and brine, dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate, filsered, concentrated, and separated by column chromatography on silica gei to afford 170 mg ( $62 \%$ ) of 13 as a labile white solid. This compound was used directly after purification for the subsequent tin hydride reaction. Data for 13: 'H NMR ( 200 MHz . DMSO- $d_{6 .} 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS $)$ § $1.50-1.76$ ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.22-2.65 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $3.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.66(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q},. \mathrm{~J}=9.56 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.38(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}$. $J=9.83 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=1.66 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.94(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12.46$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.03\left(1 \mathrm{H}^{1} / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=.12.79 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.17(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12.31$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.30(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{Ab} q, J=12.27 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.15 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $5.75(1 \mathrm{H}, d, J=3.32 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.77-5.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.21$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 6.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.34 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.56(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.84 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.97-7.46$ $(33 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}): I \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 1754,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

Reduction Products 14 and 15. To a solution of 13 ( $170 \mathrm{mg}, 0.168$ mmol, I equiv) in toluene ( 5 mL ) was added AIBN ( $5.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.033 \mathrm{mmol}$ 0.2 equiv) followed by addition of tributyltin hydride ( $90 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.335 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2 equiv). The resulting solotion was brought to reflux. After 3 h the toluene was evaporated off and the residue was separated by column chromatography on silica gel to afford 71 mg (49\%) of 14 as a white solid and 16 mg ( 11 \%) of 15 as a white solid.
14. 'H NMR ( 220 MHz . DMSO-d $\mathrm{d}_{6} 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $81.01-1.18$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.22-1.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.79-2.03(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.11-2.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.35-2.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.33(3 \mathrm{H}, 5), 3.64(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=9.78 \mathrm{~Hz})$ $4.37\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{1}, / 2 \wedge \mathrm{Aq}, J=9.78 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=9.69 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=4.62$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 4.90\left(1 \mathrm{H}_{3} 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=.12.71 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.99(1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq} . J=12.75$

Hz ), $5.13(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12.33 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $5.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.32 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.22(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ q. $J=12.25 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.48 \mathrm{~Hz}) .6 .08$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.03 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.45 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.50-6.54(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $7.01-7,34(28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}):$ IR $\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 1748,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ : mp $99-101$ $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;[a]^{2 S_{0}}-16^{\circ}(c) 0.5, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ : exact mass (FAB) caled for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{50}-$ $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, Li 865.367637 , found 865.3675 .

15: ${ }^{1}$ H NMR ( 200 MHz , DMSO-d $6,393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $\delta 0.64-1.02$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.31-1.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.70-1.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.06-2.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $3.29(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.52(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=9.77 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=9.66$ $\left.\mathrm{Hz}_{\mathrm{I}} J=4.33 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=9.83 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.02(2 \mathrm{H}, 5), 5.07$ ( $1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 7 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.74 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ). $5.18(1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q},. J=12.34 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 5.62 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.54 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.76 \mathrm{~Hz}) .5 .88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $2.76 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.48 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.03-7.43(30 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}): 1 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{NaCl}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) $1748,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp} 114-116^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{D}}-20.6^{\circ}$ (c 0.6 , $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ); exact mass ( FAB ) caled for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Li} 865.367637$, found 865.3662.
(2S,6R)-2,6-Diamino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic Acid (17). To a solution of 14 ( $66 \mathrm{mg}, 0.077 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) in THF and EtOH ( $3 \mathrm{~mL}, 1: 1$ ) was added palladium chloride ( $41 \mathrm{mg}, 0.231 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv). The reaction mixture was hydrogenated at 50 psi for 48 h . The mixture was then purged with nitrogen and filtered through Celite to remove the catalyst. The filtrate was concentrated and dried in vacuo. The crude product 16 was dissolved in $48 \% \mathrm{HBr}$ and refluxed for 3 h . The solvent was evaporated off and the residue was treated with excess propylene oxide for 20 min in refluxing EtOH . The white precipitate was filtered to give 16 mg ( $95 \%$ ) of 17 as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, vs DSS) $\delta 1.26-1.45(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.65-1.90(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.66(1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ $\mathrm{q} . J=11.90 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.80(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=11.80 \mathrm{~Hz})$ : ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(69.73 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta($ DSS $) 21.3,34.3,56.8,66.8,68.7,176.4$, 176.6; IR $\left(\mathrm{ZnS}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) 3435,3119.1618 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp} 220-230^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec, $[\alpha]^{23} \mathrm{p}+22.5^{\circ}$ ( $\left.\mathbf{c} 0.6,5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}\right)$ : exact mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (M $+\mathrm{H}^{+}$) 221.11375 , found 221.1137 .
Aldol Adducts 20 and 21. To a solution of $9(407 \mathrm{mg}, 1.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dibutylboron triflate ( $2.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.1$ mmol, 2 equiv, 1 M solution in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) followed by addition of triethylamine ( $293 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ equiv) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 min the reaction mixture was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ solution of 19 ( $1.024 \mathrm{~g}, 2.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 2$ equiv) was added to it. After 30 min the reaction mixture was quenched with a phosphate buffer solution ( pH 6.9 ) and poured into water. The aqueous layer was extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic solution was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate, filtered, concentrated, and separated by column chromatography on silica gel to afford 465 mg ( $50.6 \%$ ) of 20 as a white solid and $17 \mathrm{mg}(2 \%)$ of $\mathbf{2 1}$ as a white solid.
20. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz , DMSO- $d_{6}, 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) ) $1.34-1.69$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.19-2.64(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.34(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.64-3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$. $3.91-4.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.40(1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=.9.87 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $4.98(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) .5 .11(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.38 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.16$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.22(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.58 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.40\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exch, $J=$ $5.22 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.64(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.64 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.43 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.42$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.04 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.55-6.58(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.91-7.37(28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ; \mathrm{IR}$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 3477,1749,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp} 92-94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}: \mid \alpha\right)^{23}{ }_{0}+3.6^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}$ $0.94, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{3}$ ); exact mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{53} \mathrm{H}_{51} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{10}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right) 875.35453$. found 875.3508.
21: 'H NMR ( 200 MHz , DMSO- $d_{6}$. 393 K , ys TMS) \& 1.27-1.45 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 1.58-1.76 (1 H, m), 2.05-2.41 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.31 ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.56 $(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ q. $J=9.70 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.52-3.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.99\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exch, $J=6.70 \mathrm{~Hz}) .4 .33(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=9.75 \mathrm{~Hz}) .4 .47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=2.39 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.06(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=12.64 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.17(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.18$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q, J=12.22 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.57(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.49 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.60(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{d}, J=3.60 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.45 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.47 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $7.02-7.33(30 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;$ IR $\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 3488.1747,1704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp}$ $105-107^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:[a]^{2 S_{\mathrm{D}}}+56.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c} 0.36, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$.
Phenyl Thionoformate 22 . To a solution of 20 ( $400 \mathrm{mg}, 0.457 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv) in THF ( 4 mL ) was added phenyl chlorothionoformate ( $316 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. 2.284 mmol. 5 equiv) followed by addition of sodium bis(trimethylsilyl) amide ( $503 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.503 \mathrm{mmol}$, I. I equiv, I M solution in THF at -78 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 h , the reaction mixture was poured into ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with water and brine, dried over anhydrous
magnesium sulfate, filtered, concentrated, and separated by colun chromatography on silica gel to afford 174 mg ( $38 \%$ ) of 22 as a wh solid and 135 mg (34\%) of unreacted 22: 'H NMR ( 200 Mt DMSO- $d_{6 .} 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) \& $1.41-1.59$ (1 H. m), 1.76-1.95 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{n}$ $2.36-2.61(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.66(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J=.9.77 \mathrm{H}$ $4.39(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ q. $J=9.70 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.08(1 \mathrm{H} .1 / 2 \mathrm{AB}$ $J=12.32 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=1.70 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.24(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q} J$. $12.44 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.15 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.71(1 \mathrm{H}, d, J=3.54 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5$. $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.09 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.40 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6$. $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.74 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.98-7.44(33 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ; \mathrm{JR}\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 174$ $1705 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

Reduction Products 23 and 24. To a solution of 22 ( $155 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1$ : mmol, I equiv) in toluene ( 5 mL ) was added AIBN ( 8 mg .0 .049 mm 0.3 equiv) followed by addition of triphenyltin hydride ( $269 \mathrm{mg}, 0.7 \mathrm{t}$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 5$ equiv). The resulting solution was brought to reflux. After 2 h the toluene was removed under reduced pressure and the residue w: separated by column chromatography on silica gel to afford 107 m ( $81 \%$ ) of 23 as a white solid and $7 \mathrm{mg}(5 \%)$ of 24 as a white soli

23: 'H NMR ( 200 MHz, DMSO $-d_{6}, 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $\delta 1.09-1.2$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, J=7.67 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.30(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=8.07 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.5$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $3.65(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=9.87 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.37(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J$ $9.78 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.43 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.98(2 \mathrm{H}, 5), 5.10(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{~A}$ q. $J=12.31 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.99 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.20(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}$. $=12.42 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.63(\mathrm{I} \mathrm{H}, ~ d, J=3.36 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \delta, J=3.02 \mathrm{~Hz}$ $6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3.40 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.51-6.55(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.98-7.29(28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ IR $\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right.$ ) $1750,1705 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp} 98-100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ : $[a]^{25}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-8.8^{\circ}$ ( $\mathrm{c} 0 .:$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ). Anal. (recrystallized from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} /$ hexanes) Calcd fo $\mathrm{C}_{53} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9}: \mathrm{C}, 74.11 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.87: \mathrm{N}, 3.26$. Found. C. $74.18 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.04 ; \mathrm{N}$ 3.08. Exact mass (FAB) caled for $\mathrm{C}_{53} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O} 9 \mathrm{Li} 865.367637$, foun 865.3670.

24: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz, DMSO-d $\boldsymbol{d}_{6}, 393 \mathrm{~K}$, vs TMS) $\delta$ 0.66-0.8: $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.0 \mathrm{t}-1.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.28-1.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.96(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.21$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 3.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.53(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=9.75 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}$, . $=4.61 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}, J=9.72 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.02(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{ABq}$ $J=12.87 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.08(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} \mathrm{q}, J=12.51 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.11(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AI}$ q. $J=12.86 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.19(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q, J=12.58 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$. $=3.56 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.29 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.32 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.2 \mathrm{~S}$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.49 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.01-7.39(30 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$; $1 \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) 1749$ $1705 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \mathrm{mp} 88-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:[a]^{25} \mathrm{D}+12.9^{\circ}\left(c 0.22, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$.
( $2 S, 6 S$ ) -2,6-Dismino-6-(hydroxymethyl)pimelic Acid (4). To a solution of 23 ( $73 \mathrm{mg}, 0.085 \mathrm{mmol}$, I equiv) in THF and EtOH ( $3 \mathrm{~mL}, 1: 1$ ) was added palladium chloride ( $90 \mathrm{mg}, 0.508 \mathrm{mmol}, 6$ equiv). The reaction mixture was hydrogenated at 50 psi for 48 h . The mixture was then purged with nitrogen and filtered through Celite to remove the catalyst. The filtrate was concentrated and dried in vacuo. The crude product was dissolved in $48 \% \mathrm{HBr}$ and refluxed for 3 h . The solvent was evaporated off and the residue was treated with excess propylene oxide for 20 min in refluxing EtOH. The white precipitate was filtered to give 17 mg (91\%) of 4 as a white solid. This material proved to be indistinguishable by 'H NMR and TLC from the authentic amino acid obtained by hydrolysis of natural 3 provided by Shionogi \& Co. Data for 4: 'H NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, vs DSS) $81.29-1.39$ (1 H. m), 1.43-1.57 (1 H m), $1.62-1.90(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.64(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q, J=11.69 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.65(1$ H. m), $3.89\left(1 \mathrm{H}, 1 / 2 \mathrm{AB} q . J=11.83 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$ ) ${ }^{10} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(67.93 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ 8 DSS 21.7, 33.2, 34.6, 57.4, 66.7. 68.6, 176.4, 176.9; IR (ZnS, $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) 3395,3109,1614 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}: \mathrm{mp} 235-245{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec, lit. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{mp} 240-250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ $\mathrm{dec} ;[\alpha]^{23}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+7.1^{\circ}(c \quad 0.55,5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}), \mathrm{lit}^{3}+8.1 \pm 1.0^{\circ}(c \quad 0.506,5 \mathrm{~N}$ HCl ).

Acknowledgment. We are indebted to the National Science Foundation (CHE 8717017), the National Institutes of Health (GM 40988), and Hoffman-La Roche, Inc. for providing financial support. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained at the Midwest Center for Mass Spectrometry, Lincoln, NE (as NSFfunded Regional Instrumentation Facility). We are grateful to Dr. Tadashi Yoshida, Dr. S. Matsutani, Dr. Masayuki Narisada, and Urara Katsuyama of the Shionogi \& Co., Ltd., Japan, for sending us an authentic sample of compound 3.


[^0]:    

[^1]:    (1) Patte, J.-C, In Amino Acids: Biosymhesis and Genetic Regulation; Hermann, K. M., Somerville. R. L., Eds.: Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA. 1983: pp 213-218.
    (2) Certain bacteria bypass the Li form of DAP by means of mesa-DAP D-dehydrogenase: (a) Barileth, A. T. M : White, P. J. J. Gen. Microbiol, 1985, 131.2145 . (b) Misono, H: Ogasawara, M: Nagasaki, S Agric. Biol. Chem 1986, 30, 2729 .
    (3) (a) Berges, D. A.; Dewolf, W. E, Jr.; Dunn, G. L., Grappel, S. F; Newman, D. J. Taggart, J. J.; Gilvarg. C. J. Med. Chem 1986, 29.89 . (b) Berges. D. A. DeWolf, w. E. Jr; Dunn, G. L. Newman, D. J. Schmidt, S. J. Taggari, J. J. Gilvarg, C. J. Biol Chem. 1986, 261.6160. (c) Kelland, J. G: Arnold, L. D. Palcic, M. M.; Pickard, M. A.; Vedaras, C. J. Biol Chem. 1986. 261. 13216 (d) Girodeau, J.M.: Agouridas, C.; Masson, M Pineau, R.; LeGoffic, F. J. Med Chem. 1986, 29, 1023. (e) Lam, L. K. P.; Arnold, L. D:: Kalantar, T. H: Kelland, J G.: Lane-Bell, P. M.: Palcic, M M.: Pickard, M: A. Vederas. J. C. J. Biol. Chem. 1988, 263, 11814, (f) Baumann, R. J.: Bohme, E. H.: Wiseman, J. S., Vaal, M., Nichols, J. S Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 1988. 32, 1119. (g) Bohme. E. H.; Gerhart, $\mathrm{F}_{\text {: }}$. Higgins, W. US. Patent 4,7300.006. 1988.
    (4) See also references in: Lin, Y,: Myhrman, R.: Schrag, M. L., Gelb, M H. J. Biol. Chem. 1988, 263, 1622,
    (5) Jouanneau, 3: Stragier, P: Bouvier, J; Patte, J.C.; Yaniv, M. Eur. J. Biochem. 1985, 146. 173 and references therein.

[^2]:    (6) (a) Gelb, M. H.; Lin, Y; Pickard, M. A.; Song. Y.; Vederas, J. C. . Am. Chem. Sor. 1990, 112, 4932. (b) Bold, G.; Duthaler, R. O.: Riediker, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1989, 28, 497.
    (7) Gerhart, F: Higgins, W; Tardif, C.; Ducep. J.-B. J. Med. Chem. 1990. 33. 2157.
    33. 2157.
    (8) Sho

    M: Yasuda, Y: Hinco, H: Kato, T: Nakauchi, K: Matsuura, S: Mayama, M: Yasuda, Y.: Kawamura, Y. J. Antibior. 1981, 34, 374.

[^3]:    (9) Sheinblatt, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1966.88, 2845.

[^4]:    (13) Reno, D. S.: Lotz, B. T.; Milier, M. J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1990, 31, 827.
    (14) Lastones 5 and 9 are commercialily avsilable from Aldrich Chemical C.. 5: catalog \#33, 185.6:9. catalog: \#33, 187-2.

