UC Irvine UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions

Permalink <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5fc2p3ps>

Author Johnson, Aaron George

Publication Date 2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Chemistry

by

Aaron George Johnson

 Dissertation Committee: Professor Elizabeth R. Jarvo, Chair Professor Christopher D. Vanderwal Professor James S. Nowick

Portion of Chapter 1 © 2013 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Portion of Chapter 3 © 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All other materials © 2015 Aaron George Johnson

DEDICATION

For my parents

who taught me to never stop learning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions of Grignard

Reagents with Benzylic Ethers

Chapter 2: Studies of Pathways Leading to Side-Products of Kumada Type Cross-Coupling Reactions

Chapter 3: Selective Synthesis of Either Enantiomer of an Anti-Breast Cancer Agent From

a Common Enantioenriched Intermediate

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF SCHEMES

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank John Wiley and Sons for permission to include Chapter 1, portions of which were originally published in *Angewante Chemie International Addition*. I also thank Elsevier for permission to include Chapter 3, portions of which were originally published in *Tetrahedron Letters*.

I need to thank Stanley Behrens and the University of California, Irvine Graduate Division for awarding me a Stanley Behrens Public Impact Fellowship. The funding and support that came from this fellowship was invaluable to me as I worked to push my research forward and has helped me keep in the forefront of my mind the impact that I, as a chemist, can make on society. I also wish to thank the Graduate Division for awarding me a LaVerne Noyes Fellowship. I wish to honor my great grandfather, Aaron Clayton Parker, whose service to our country in World War I both guaranteed our freedom and qualified me for this award. His sacrifices were great and have not been forgotten. I also wish to thank Jennifer Bentson-Gebel for her continued support of the Gebel award. The recognition and funding that came with this award came at a crucial time for me and was invaluable in pushing me through the third and fourth years of my Ph.D.

I wish to thank the American Chemical Society Green Chemistry Institute and the National Science Foundation for selecting me as a Green Chemistry Scholar, allowing me to attend and present my research at the 17th annual Green Chemistry and Engineering Conference in Bethesda, Maryland. This experience permanently changed the way I think about chemistry and gave me a solid commitment to minimize the environmental impact of my work.

I would like to thank my Ph.D. advisor, Professor Elizabeth Jarvo, for her mentorship and support. I could not be the scientist I have become without her expert hand. I also wish to thank my undergraduate research advisor, Professor Steven Castle, who welcomed me into his lab and ignited my passion for chemistry.

I wish to thank Professors James Nowick, Chris Vanderwal and Dave Van Vranken for insightful discussions on chemistry and life that both enriched my education and, on more than one occasion, pushed me past road blocks in my research.

I want to thank my lab mates in both the Jarvo and the Castle Labs. They have been fantastic mentors and have become great friends. I especially wish to thank Dr. Iva Yonova, Michael Harris, Charlotte Osborne and Lucas Erickson with whom I have shared projects. They have all been great teammates, and I feel privileged to have had the chance to work with them.

I want to thank my parents, Tom and Stephanie Johnson, for their love and support. I thank my father for teaching me how to work hard while maintaining balance. I thank my mother for instilling a deep love of learning within me. I could never have developed the intellect necessary to obtain a Ph.D. without both of them.

I want to thank my brothers, Thomas, Abe, and John for their frequent visits and fantastic adventures.

Finally, I would like to thank my beautiful wife, Annique, whose endless support and unfailing love has pushed me forward more than anything else. In order for me to earn my Ph.D., she has had to make tremendous sacrifices. To my wife, thank you for never letting me even entertain the thought of leaving UCI without finishing my Ph.D. Thank you for being willing to cross state borders to help me achieve my dreams. Thank you for the great memories we have made in California. Thank you for being my best friend and the love of my life.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Aaron George Johnson

EDUCATION:

2010-2015 Ph.D. in Chemistry, University of California, Irvine 2006-2009 B.S., Cum Laude, Biochemistry, Brigham Young University Minors: Business Management and Asian Studies

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

2010-2015 **Doctoral Research** University of California, Irvine; Irvine, CA Advisor: Professor Elizabeth Jarvo

- Stereospecific nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions of alkyl ethers with alkyl and aryl Grignard reagents
- Mechanistic studies of Kumada-type cross-coupling and major side reactions
- Synthesis of either enantiomer of a bioactive triarylmethane

2008-2009 **Undergraduate Research** Brigham Young University; Provo, UT Advisor: Professor Steven Castle

- Investigation of the scope of an enantioselective ketone allylation
- Work towards the total synthesis of the natural product hasubanonine

INDUSTRY EXPERIENCE:

- 2007 Intern: K2 Energy Solutions (battery plant); Shanghai, China
	- Translation · interpretation · quality control · global logistics · English instruction

LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE: Mandarin Chinese

SAFETY EXPERIENCE:

2011-2015 Jarvo Laboratory Safety On Site Representative

 Identify and correct safety hazards · develop and implement standard operating procedures · train new personnel in best practices · develop safety culture · ensure compliance

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

- 2011-2014 Lecture and Laboratory Teaching Assistant: General Chemistry (UCI-4 quarters)
- 2009-2012 Lecture and Laboratory Teaching Assistant: Organic Chemistry (UCI-8 quarters)
- 2009-2010 Conversational English (Tianjin Normal University)
- 2007 English for Battery Manufacturing (K2 Energy Solutions; Shanghai, China)

SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS:

ADVOCACY:

- 2014 UC Graduate Advocacy Day Delegate; Sacramento, CA
	- Selected as a delegate to explain to state legislatures the public impact of academic research

AWARDS AND HONORS:

PUBLICATIONS:

- **Johnson, A. G.**; Erickson, L. W.; Greene, M. A.; Yonova, I. M.; Taylor, B. L. H.; Jarvo, E. R. "Mechanistic Study of Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions." Manuscript in preparation.
- **Johnson, A. G.**; Tranquilli, M. M.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. "Selective Synthesis of Either Enantiomer of an Anti-Breast Cancer Agent Via a Common Enantioenriched Intermediate." *Tetrahedron Lett*. **2015**, *56*, 3486.
- **Johnson, A. G.**[‡]; Yonova, I. M.[‡]; Osborne, C. A.; Moore, C. E.; Morrissette, N. S.; Jarvo, E. R. "Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reaction of Alkyl Grignard Reagents and Identification of Selective Anti-Breast-Cancer Agents." *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2014, *53*, 2422–2427.
- **Johnson, A. G.**; Loertscher, B. M.; Moeck, A. R.; Matthews S. S.; Ess, D. H.; Castle, S. L. "Experimental and Theoretical Investigation of the Scope of Enantioselective Ketone Allylations Employing Nakamura's Allylzinc-bisoxazoline Reagent." *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 2011, *21*, 2706–2710.

PRESENTATIONS:

- **Johnson, A. G.**; Yonova, I. M.; Erickson, L. W.; Greene, M. A.; Osborne, C. A.; Jarvo E. R. Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling of Benzylic Ethers and Grignard Reagents. Presented at the 249th National Meeting of the American Chemical Society. Denver, CO, March 25, 2015 (oral presentation).
- **Johnson, A. G.** The Impact of Molecular Handedness on Drug Discovery and Development. Presented at the 2014 UCI Public Impact Fellows Reception. Irvine, CA, February 3, 2014 (oral presentation).
- **Johnson, A. G.**; Yonova, I. M.; Jarvo, E. R. Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling of Benzylic Ethers with Grignard Reagents. Presented at the 17th Annual ACS Green Chemistry and Engineering Conference. North Bethesda, MD, June, 19, 2013 (poster presentation).
- **Johnson, A. G.**; Yonova, I. M.; Jarvo, E. R. Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling of Benzylic Ethers with Grignard Reagents. Presented at the University of California, Irvine, Graduate and Postdoctoral Research Symposium. Irvine, CA, February 22, 2013 (oral presentation).
- **Johnson, A. G.**; Moech, A. R.; Castle, S. L. Asymmetric Allylation of Assorted Ketones Using Nakamura's Reagent. Presented at the Pacific Northwest Undergraduate Research Symposium on Organic Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Corvallis, OR, August 3-4, 2009 (oral presentation).

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions

by

Aaron George Johnson Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry University of California, Irvine, 2015 Professor Elizabeth R. Jarvo, Chair

Transition metal catalyzed cross-coupling reactions have become a staple of organic synthesis and are frequently the most practical strategy for the preparation of medicinal agents and fine chemicals. Catalysts based on the precious metal palladium are commonly used in cross-coupling reactions. Replacing palladium catalysts with nickel catalysts is an active area of research as such advances present significant benefits including increasing the sustainability of transformations and new mechanisms for control of stereochemistry in the construction of C_{sp} ^{3–} $C_{\rm sp}$ ³ bonds.

In Chapter 1, a stereospecific nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reaction of secondary benzylic ethers with a variety of aliphatic and aryl Grignard reagents is presented. The method is highly stereospecific and proceeds with inversion at the benzylic carbon. Products prepared by this method were subject to biological testing, and a thiophene-containing product was shown to selectively inhibit the growth of MCF-7 breast cancer cells.

In Chapter 2, mechanistic studies that provide insight into the mechanism of oxidative addition as well as the mechanisms of major side reactions, hydrogenolysis and β-hydride elimination, are presented. Experiments presented provide evidence that the mechanisms of

xiv

cross-coupling, hydrogenolysis, and β-hydride elimination reactions all include a step of oxidative addition with inversion at the benzylic center. Hydrogenolysis was also shown to be stereospecific, proceeding with overall inversion at the stereogenic center.

In Chapter 3, the application of nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions to the synthesis of either enantiomer of a bioactive triaryl methane from a single enantiomer of a precursor alcohol is presented. In the key cross-coupling step a Kumada protocol allows for crosscoupling with inversion at the benzylic carbon, while a Suzuki reaction allows for cross-coupling with retention.

Chapter 1

Stereospecific Nickel-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling Reactions of Grignard Reagents with Benzylic Ethers

1.1 Introduction

Palladium and nickel catalyzed cross-coupling reactions have revolutionized organic chemistry.¹ For $C_{sp}^2 - C_{sp}^2$ bond formation, transition-metal catalyzed cross-coupling reactions are likely the first disconnection a chemist will propose. Nonetheless, these reactions remain underdeveloped in forming $C_{sp}^3 - C_{sp}^3$ bonds. Two reasons are commonly cited to explain the difficulty of transition metal mediated alkyl-alkyl cross-coupling reactions: oxidative addition to an alkyl electrophile is slower than oxidative addition to an aryl or vinyl electrophile, and βhydride elimination often outcompetes reductive elimination.^{1b} The latter challenge is especially pertinent when both coupling partners contain β-hydrogens. Despite these challenges, recent advances have brought the field closer to realizing the potential of transition metal-catalyzed alkyl-alkyl bond formation. Major milestones in nickel-catalyzed alkyl-alkyl cross-coupling research have included reactions between two primary alkyl groups, reactions between primary and secondary alkyl groups, and stereoconvergent reactions.

The Knochel group demonstrated that alkyl-alkyl bonds between two primary coupling partners could be formed in a nickel-catalyzed reaction when they reported the reaction shown in Scheme 1.1.² Reductive elimination to form $C_{sp}^3 - C_{sp}^3$ bonds is difficult owing to the electron rich nature of $sp³$ carbons. In Knochel's transformation, a pendant olefin promotes reductive elimination by decreasing electron density at the metal center through a backbonding interaction

¹ (a) Jana, R.; Pathak, T. P.; Sigman, M. S. *Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *111*, 1417. (b) Netherton, M. R.; Fu. G. C. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2004**, *346*, 1525. (c) Rudolph, A.; Lautens, M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 2656. (d) Johnson, C. R.; De Jong, R. L. *J. Org. Chem.* **1992**, *57*, 594.

² (a) Giovannini, R.; Stüdemann, T.; Devasagayaraj, A.; Dussin, G.; Knochel, P. *J. Org. Chem.* **1999***, 64*, 3544. (b) For a more recent example see: Nielsen, D. K.; Huang, C.-Y.; Doyle, A. G. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 13605.

(**1.2**). Other π-accepting functional groups such as ketones, cyanides, or esters also increase reactivity.³ Knochel's work showcased the potential of using nickel catalysts in alkyl-alkyl cross-coupling reactions.

Kambe has shown that nickel complexes can catalyze Kumada-type cross-coupling reactions between primary halides and primary and secondary Grignard reagents.⁴ In the reaction shown in Scheme 1.2, two butadiene molecules dimerize around the metal center to form a bis-πallyl Ni^{II} complex (1.7) that enters a proposed $Ni^{II}–Ni^{IV}$ catalytic cycle. While initially developed to cross-couple primary alkyl groups, this reaction provides good yields with a secondary Grignard reagent, *i*-PrMgCl (**1.4**).⁵

In recent years, research in the Fu group has shown the power of nickel complexes to catalyze stereocontrolled alkyl-alkyl cross-coupling reactions. The Fu group has developed several methods to prepare enantioenriched tertiary products (Scheme 1.3, structure **1.10**) utilizing secondary alkyl halogens (1.8).⁶ Many of these strategies are stereoselective. These

l

³ (a) Giovannini, R.; Stüdemann, T.; Dussin, G.; Knochel, P. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 2387. (b) For an

example utilizing exogenous dimethyl fumerate see: Huang, C.-Y.; Doyle, A. G. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 9541. 4 Terao, J.; Watanabe, H.; Ikumi, A.; Kuniyasu, H.; Kambe, N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 4222.

⁵ For a realted transformation in which secondary Grignard reagents are coupled to vinyl halides, see: (a) Hayashi,

T.; Konishi, M.; Fukushima, M.; Mise, T.; Kagotani, M.; Tajika, M.; Kumada, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1982**, *104*, 180. (b) Schwink, L.; Knochel, P. *Chem. Eur. J.* **1998**, *4*, 950.

⁶ (a) Lu, Z.; Wilsily, A.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 8154. (b) Zhou, J.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 14726. (c) Lou, S.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 1264. (d) Lundin, P. M.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am.*

reactions are proposed to go through a radical mechanism and rely on a chiral catalyst to set stereochemistry in a stereoconvergent manner.

Stereoconvergent reactions, such as Fu's, represent a strategy that finds high utility when a stereocenter is to be set in a cross-coupling reaction (Scheme 1.4a). However, this strategy is not ideal when stereochemical information is already present at the reactive center of a substrate. In these cases a stereospecific approach, in which stereochemical information is transferred from substrate to product, is desired (Scheme 1.4b). As shown by Fu and others, alkyl halides are expected to go through a radical mechanism of oxidative addition and are not suitable substrates for stereospecific cross-coupling reactions because radical processes scramble stereochemical information.⁷

Ethers are suitable electrophiles for stereospecific nickel catalyzed C_{sp} ³– C_{sp} ³ bond formation.⁸ The literature of nickel-catalyzed substitution reactions of allylic ethers shows that

l

Scopelliti, R.; Hu, X. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 3889.; (c) Becker, Y.; Stille, J. K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1978**, *100*, 838. (d) Hall, T. L.; Lappert, M. F.; Lednor, P. W. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans* **1980**, 1448*.*

Chem. Soc. **2010**, *132*, 11027. (e) Owston, N. A.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2010**, *132*, 11908. (f) Saito, B.; Fu. G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 6694.

⁷ (a) Choi, J.; Martín-Gago, P.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 12161. (b) Vechorkin, O.; Csok, Z.;

⁸ For a stereospecific palladium catalyzed reaction, see: He, A.; Falck, J. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 2524.

the oxidative addition of nickel complexes into C–O bonds may proceed through heterolytic bond cleavage.⁹ Alcohol derivatives are also an attractive electrophile class owing to the variety of robust methods with which enantioenriched alcohols can be prepared (Scheme 1.5).¹⁰ For these reasons, the cross-coupling of ethers with organometallic nucleophiles is a valuable contribution to the cross-coupling literature.

In 2011, the Jarvo lab demonstrated the utility of using ethers in Kumada-type couplings to install a methyl group.^{11,12} An example is shown in Scheme 1.6. First enantioenriched alcohol **1.12** is prepared via a titanium mediated enantioselective addition of diethylzinc to

 $\overline{}$

¹⁰ (a) For CBS reduction, see: (i) Corey, E. J. (Nobel Lecture) *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1991**, *30*, 455. (ii) Corey, E. J.; Helal, C. J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 1986. (iii) "Reductions": Li, J. J.; Limberakis, C.; Pflum, D. A. in *Modern Organic Synthesis in the Laboratory: A Collection of Standard Experimental Proceedures*, Oxford University Press, New York, **2007**, 96–97. (b) for keto reductacses, see: Bohren, K. M.; Bullock, B; Wermuth, B.;

Gabbay, K. H. *J. Biol. Chem.* **1989**, *264*, 9547. For Noyori hydrogenation, see: (i) Noyori, R. (Nobel Lecture) *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 2008. (ii) Noyori, R.; Takaya, H. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1990**, *23*, 345. (d) for

⁹ (a) Consiglio, G.; Morandini, F.; Piccolo, O. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1981**, *103*, 1846. (b) Kobayashi, Y; Ikeda, E. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.***1994**, 1789. (c) Didiuk, M. T.; Morken, J. P.; Hoveyda, A. H. *Tetrahedron* **1996**, *54*, 1117.

assymetric additions to ketones, see: (i) Zhang, F.-Y.; Yip, C.-W.; Cao, R.; Chan, A. S. C. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **1997**, *8*, 585. (ii) Braga, A. L.; Paixão, M. W.; Westermann, B.; Schneider, P. H.; Wessjohann, L. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 2879.

¹¹ (a) Taylor, B. L. H.; Swift, E. C.; Waetzig, J. D.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 389. (b) For a variant that does not require an extended π-aromatic system see: Greene, M. A.; Yonova, I. M.; Williams, F. J.; Jarvo, E. R. *Org. Lett.* **2012**, *14*, 4293.

 12 A similar racemic cross-coupling reaction was reported by Shi, see: Guan, B.-T.; Xiang, S.-K.; Wang, B.-O.; Sun, Z.-P.; Wang, Y.; Zhao, K.-Q.; Shi, Z.-J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 3268.

aldehyde **1.11** (Scheme 1.6a). ¹³ Methylation of alcohol **1.12** provides methyl ether **1.13** which is capable of undergoing oxidative addition.¹⁴ Under the influence of an achiral catalyst, ether 1.13 will couple with methyl Grignard reagents with overall inversion at the stereogenic center to form enantioenriched target compound **1.14** (Scheme 1.6b).

The Jarvo lab's initial report established that this nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling method is feasible to install a methyl group to a variety of substrates. Herein are reported my efforts aimed to extend the scope of this methodology to include more complex alkyl and aryl Grignard reagents.¹⁵

1.2 Results and Discussion:

l

1.2.1 Optimization of Cross-Coupling Reaction

Initial attempts to perform the cross-coupling reaction with a propyl Grignard reagent showed that nickel could catalyze cross-coupling reactions between methyl ether **1.13** and *n*propylmagnesium iodide to form cross-coupled product **1.15**. Unfortunately, the reaction gave variable yields (14–65%) that seemed to erode proportional to catalyst age (Table 1.1, entry 1).¹⁶

 $¹³$ The competing enantiomer conversion method can be used to assign the absolute configuration of secondary</sup> alcohols; see: Wagner, A. J.; Rychnovsky, S. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, *78*, 4594.

¹⁴ Herrmann, J. M.; König, B. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, 7017.

¹⁵ This chapter will focus on content of the following publication: Yonova, I. M.; Johnson, A. G.; Osborne, C. A.; Moore, C. E.; Morrissette, N. S.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 2422.

¹⁶ Taylor, B. L. H.; Swift, E. C.; Waetzig, J. D.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 389.

A time-correlated drop in yield could be explained if a co-catalyst was precipitating out of the Grignard reagent solution as the solution aged. We proposed that such a co-catalyst was present in trace amounts in the magnesium source. This hypothesis was tested through a study on Grignard reagent age. Grignard reagents were prepared from magnesium from two sources: standard purity magnesium from Acros, and ultra-pure magnesium from Alfa Aesar (99.98+% Puratronic grade). Reactions run with aged Grignard reagent were expected to show lower yields than reactions run with fresh reagent. In experiments run with pure magnesium, low yields were expected regardless of Grignard reagent age. Surprisingly, in all experiments, both Grignard reagents afforded between 50% and 60% yield (Table 1.1). It was therefore concluded that a co-catalyst was not responsible for the variable yields. Fortuitously, this study also showed that the reaction was reproducible.

^aMultiple experiments run by Buck Taylor ^bAll Grignard reagents were titrated with iodine less than two hours before use. ^cYield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy by comparison to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene). dNot determined.

Although the reproducible yields in these experiments were encouraging, these results showed that the products of β-hydride elimination (**1.16**) and hydrogenolysis (**1.17**) were still problematic. ¹⁷ Interestingly, hydrogenolysis product **1.17** was not produced when methyl

 $\overline{}$

¹⁷ See Chapter 2 for in-depth studies on the mechanism of byproduct formation.

Grignard reagent was used. This result suggests that the reduction pathway arises from β-hydride elimination from the nucleophile prior to oxidative addition (Scheme 1.7).

We next sought to identify conditions that would promote the cross-coupling reaction while suppressing formation of the undesired elimination and hydrogenolysis byproducts. The nickel source was briefly studied. First, a nickel-free positive control showed that the crosscoupling reaction was mediated by the metal catalyst (Table 1.2, entry 1). As has already been shown (vide supra), $Ni(cod)_{2}$ allows for cross-coupling with an average 56% yield (entry 2). When $Ni (acac)_2$ is used, the cross-coupling reaction proceeded in a comparable 59% yield (entry 3). Because Ni(acac)₂ is more stable and less expensive than Ni(cod)₂, subsequent studies where performed using Ni(acac)2. Regardless of the nickel source, greater than 36% of starting material underwent undesired hydrogenolysis or β-hydride elimination.

^a Yield determined by ¹H NMR by comparison to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene). b 98% starting material recovered. c Average of eight experiments.

We postulated that by screening a variety of ligands with varying electronic properties and steric effects, we would be able to improve conversion to desired product **1.15.** To this end we screened a variety of diphosphine ligands (Table 1.3). DPEphos, Xantphos, and racBINAP, all of which give optimal conversion with methyl Grignard reagents, give suboptimal results in reactions with a longer chain Grignard reagent (entries 1–3). Bis-diphenylphosphino ligands

with long carbon-chain linkers (dppoctane and dpppentane) promoted the formation of elimination and hydrogenolysis byproducts (entries 4–5). Use of a ligand with a shorter linker (dppp) resulted in a 62% yield of the desired product with most of the mass balance accounted for by elimination and deoxygenation pathways (entry 6). A ligand with a slightly shorter tether, 1,2-bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane (dppe), proved to be an optimal ligand, providing 80% yield of cross-coupling product with minimal byproduct formation (entry 7). The fact that ligands that contain a short tether (dppe and dppp) best promote the reaction suggests that a strongly coordinating bidentate ligand interaction promotes cross-coupling reactivity.

 α Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy by comparison to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene).

Having established that cross-coupling reactions with a long chain Grignard reagent can proceed in high yield, we turned our attention to the enantiospecificity of the reaction. Despite many attempts, enantiomers of product **1.15** were inseparable by SFC and GC analysis. Therefore an alternative substrate **1.18** was investigated (Scheme 1.8). Methyl ether **1.18** is electronically similar to methyl ether **1.13**, but more sterically congested, a property that we expected to improve separation on a chiral SFC column. The cross-coupling reaction with methyl ether **1.18** afforded desired product **1.19** in 94% yield. Enantiomers of product **1.19**

readily separated by chiral column SFC revealing that the reaction proceeds with 98% enantiospecificity.¹⁸

Unfortunately, subsequent experiments showed that the cross-coupling protocol shown in Scheme 1.8 is unreliable. In multiple experiments under "identical" conditions, compound **1.18** was either fully consumed, resulting in nearly quantitative conversion to desired product **1.19**, or no reaction was observed, resulting in quantitative recovery of starting material (Table 1.4).

^aDetermined by 1H NMR agianst an internal standard: 1,4-dimethoxybenzene.

This observed *on-off* effect may be due to subtle differences in the stoichiometry of dppe relative to nickel. Such subtle differences could be caused by random error when weighing small quantities on an analytical scale.¹⁹ It is not uncommon for optimal conditions of nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions to be reported with a 2:1 ligand to nickel ratio.²⁰ However, the smaller bite angle of dppe, versus DPEphos, BINAP, or other ligands may allow for two dppe ligands to simultaneously coordinate the nickel center if there is an excess of dppe. Indeed, the bis-dppe-

 $\overline{}$

¹⁸ Enantiospecificity (es) = ee_{product}/ee_{starting material}, see, Denmark, S. E.; Vogler, T. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, 15, 11737.

¹⁹ Wernerova, M.; Hudlicky, T. *Synlett*, **2010**, 2701.

²⁰ For representative examples, see reference 11 and: (a) Shields, J. D.; Ahneman, D. T.; Graham, T. J. A.; Doyle, A. G. *Org. Lett.* **2014**, *16*, 142. (b) Leowanawat, P.; Zhang, N.; Percec, V. *J. Org. Chem.*, **2012**, *77*, 1018.

nickel complex has been characterized.²¹ We hypothesized that the active catalyst is comprised of one nickel atom ligated to one dppe ligand (**1.20**). Complex **1.20** presumably forms after Grignard reagent reduces nickel (II) to nickel (0) (Scheme 1.9). In the presence of excess dppe, a second ligand will bind the nickel atom resulting in complex **1.21**, which we hypothesized is unreactive in the cross-coupling reaction. 22

To test these hypotheses, we carried out the experiments shown in Table 1.5. Crosscoupling reactions were executed with 5 mol % $Ni (acac)_2$ and varying amounts of dppe. When dppe is used as ligand, conversion to products is efficient if the dppe:nickel ratio is less than 2:1 (entries 1–6). If the dppe:nickel ratio exceeds 2:1, the catalyst presumably coordinates a second dppe ligand rendering an inactive catalyst (entries 9–10). At a 2:1 dppe:nickel ratio, the reaction is unreliable, presumably because the actual ligand to nickel ratio is very slightly above or very slightly below 2:1 (entries 7–8). These results are consistent with the hypotheses that the active catalyst has one and only one dppe ligand bound to the metal atom.

 $\overline{}$

²¹ (a) Fisher, K. J.; Alyea, E. C. *Polyhedron* **1998**, *8*, 13. (b) Yamashita, K.-I; Takeda, H.; Kashiwabara, T.; Hua, R.; Shimada, S.; Tanaka, M. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2007**, *48*, 6655.

²² Yonova, I. M. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Irvine, 2013.

"Yield determined by ${}^{1}H$ NMR spectroscopy by comparison to an internal standard (1,4-dimethoxybenzene).

 Because the active catalyst has a 1:1 ligand:nickel ratio, a precatalyst that also exhibits this ratio would be advantageous as it would eliminate the possibility of weighing error. Ni(dppe)Cl2 displays an inherent 1:1 dppe:nickel ratio. Furthermore, it is stable at room temperature and is not air-sensitive, obviating the need for a glovebox. Initial experiments using Ni(dppe)Cl₂ as precatalyst showed the reagent to be as effective as and easier to work with than $Ni (acac)_2$ (Scheme 1.10). $Ni (dppe)Cl_2$ was therefore used in all future experiments. With optimized conditions in hand, we turned our attention to reaction scope.

1.2.2. Reactions with Alkyl Grignard Reagents to Form Csp³–Csp3 bonds.

With regards to scope, we began by studying the scope of alkyl Grignard reagents (Table 1.6). Ni(dppe)Cl2 catalyzes the coupling of benzylic ethers to a variety of long-chain aliphatic Grignard reagents (entries 1–4). These include functionalized Grignard reagents featuring aromatic rings and olefins (entries 2–3). A pharmaceutically relevant trifluoromethyl moiety was also tolerated (entry 4). Yields are generally high, but somewhat lower with a sterically encumbered nucleophile (entry 5). In all cases, enantiospecificity is greater than 90%.

Table 1.6. Alkyl Grignard Reagent Scope

^aCalculated after silica chromatography. ^bDetermined by chiral SFC chromatography. c 100 x ee_{product}/ee_{starting material} d [Ni(dppe)Cl₂] (5 mol %). e [Ni(dppe)Cl₂] (10 mol %).

Some nucleophiles require mild tuning of reaction conditions to achieve optimal reactivity. In most cases, altering only catalyst loading or temperature is sufficient to realize efficient conversion and high stereospecificity. The cross-coupling reaction with 4,4,4 trifluorobutylmagnesium bromide to form compound **1.25** provides a good example (Table 1.6, entry 4). Most reactions give optimal ee when catalyst loading is 2 mol %; however, inductively electron poor 4,4,4-trifluorobutylmagnesium bromide undergoes poor conversion even at 5 mol % catalyst loading (Table 1.7, entry 1). Heating the reaction boosts yield, but at the expense of ee (entry 2). For the fluorinated nucleophile, optimal results are achieved by doubling catalyst loading to 10 mol % to boost yield while running the reaction at room temperature to maintain high stereochemical fidelity (entry 3). These conditions resulted in an acceptable yield of 68% and an excellent 97% ee. Some Grignard reagents required similar reagent-specific optimization,

but in almost all cases, efficient conversion to cross-coupled product was achieved after slight adjustments of temperature or catalyst loading.²³

OMe $Ni(dppe)Cl₂$ (5-10 mol %) F_3C MgBr (2 equiv) 1.25 1.18 99 % ee PhMe, 24-48 h Temp 1.18 recovery $(\%)^a$ 1.25 yield $(\%)^b$ Entry $Ni(dppe)Cl₂$ ee/es 5 mol % 25 °C $\overline{1}$ 48 37 95/95 $\overline{2}$ 5 mol % 50 °C $\mathbf 0$ 68 65/65 3 10 mol % 25 °C $\overline{4}$ 68 97/97

Table 1.7. Optimization of Reaction with CF₃ Containing Nucleophile

^aDetermined by 1H NMR against an internal standard, PhTMS. ^bIsolated yield after silica gel flash column chromotography.

 Olefin-containing Grignard reagents are exceptionally challenging, and achieving crosscoupling reactivity with them proved more difficult than simply altering concentration or temperature (vide supra, Table 1.6, entry 3). Olefin-containing products are highly attractive as they represent a functional group that can be exploited for further synthetic elaboration. Unfortunately, initial coupling with allyl and terminal olefin-containing Grignard reagents failed to give any cross-coupling product (Table 1.8, entries 1–2). This is not surprising as olefins are known to be ligands for nickel complexes.²⁴ For example, styrenes have been shown by our lab to have a detrimental effect on nickel-catalyzed Kumada reactions.²⁵ Steric bulk around the alkene was expected to prevent coordination and preserve reactivity. Unfortunately, a Grignard reagent containing a bulkier *Z*-substituted olefin failed to promote the reaction (entry 3). Fortunately, a trisubstituted olefin underwent cross-coupling to form compound **1.24** in 81% yield and with 97% ee (entry 4). These results suggest that a high degree of olefin substitution is required to prevent coordination of nickel to double bonds.

 $\overline{}$

²³ See experimental section.

²⁴ See reference 2. See also: Yamamoto, T.; Yamamoto, A.; Ikeda, S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **1971**, *93*, 3350.

²⁵ Taylor, B. L. H.; Swift, E. C.; Waetzig, J. D.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *133*, 389.

Table 1.8. Effect of Olefin Substitution

^aYield determined by ¹H NMR against an internal standard, 1,4-dimethoxybenzene. bee determined by chiral cholum SFC. ^cIsolated yield determined after purification by silica gel flash column chromotography.

1.2.3 Reactions with Aryl Grignard Reagents to Form Csp³–Csp2 bonds

 $\overline{}$

The primary focus of the project described in this chapter was to develop a facile method for the stereospecific formation of $C_{sp}^3 - C_{sp}^3$ bonds. Once optimal conditions for that transformation were identified, we investigated whether or not the same protocol is a general method that could also be applied to the formation of $C_{sp}3-C_{sp}2$ bonds. Such a strategy could be used to prepare diarylalkanes, $26,27$ a class of molecule that has been shown to have significant biological relevance.^{28,29} We therefore investigated if the conditions optimized for C_{sp} ³– C_{sp} ³

²⁸ Representative Examples: (a) as ligands for nuclear receptors, see: Kainuma, M.; Kasuga, J.-I.; Hosoda, S.; Wakabayashi, K.-I.; Tanatani, A.; Nagasawa, K.; Miyachi, H.; Makishima, M.; Hashimoto, Y. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **2006**, *16*, 3213. (b) as combretastatin analogues for colon cancer, see: Messaoudi, S.; Hamze, A.; Provot, O.; Tréguier, B.; Rodrigo De Losada, J.; Bignon, J.; Liu, J.-M.; Wdzieczak-Bakala, J.; Thoret, S.; Dubois, J.; Brion, J.- D.; Alami, M. *ChemMedChem* **2011**, *6*, 488. (c) prostate cancer: Hu, Q.; Yin, L.; Jagusch, C.; Hille, U. E.; Hartmann, R. W. *J. Med. Chem.* **2010**, *53*, 5049. (d) diabetes: Chang, J.; Kim, R. M.; Lins, A. R.; Parmee, E. R.;

Tan, Q.; Yang, C. International Patent WO 2007111864 A2, October 4, 2007.

²⁶ For similar disconnections see: (a) Lόpez-Pérez, A.; Adrio, J; Carretero, J. C.; *Org. Lett.* **2009**, *11*, 5514. (b) Imao, D.; Glasspoole, B. W.; Laberge, V. S.; Crudden, C. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 5024. (c) Li, J.; Burke, M. D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 13774. (d) Maity, P; Shacklady-McAtee, D. M.; Yap, G. P. A.; Sirianni, E. R.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 280. (e) Do, H.-Q.; Chandrashekar, E. R. R.; Fu, G. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 16288.

²⁷ For representative alternative strategies for enantioselective synthesis of 1,1-diarylalkanes, see: (a) Wang, Z.; Ai, F.; Wang, Z.; Zhao, W.; Zhu, G.; Lin, Z.; Sun, J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 383. (b) Saini, V.; Liao, L.; Wang, Q.; Jana, R.; Sigman, M. S. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*, 5008. (c) Wang, X.; Guram, A.; Caille, S.; Hu, J.; Preston, J. P.; Ronk, M.; Walker, S. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 1881. (d) Fessard, T. C.; Andrews, S. P.; Motoyoshi, H.; Carreira, E. M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 9331.

²⁹ For breast cancer, See: (a) Pathak, T. P.; Gligorich, K. M.; Welm, B. E.; Sigman, M. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **2010**, *132*, 7870. (b) Pathak, T. P.; Osiak, J. G.; Vaden, R. M.; Welm, B. E.; Sigman, M. S. *Tetrahedron* **2012**, *68*, 5203.

bond formation may represent a general method that is also applicable to stereospecific C_{sp} ³ $-C_{sp}$ ² bond formation.

Experiments run using aryl Grignard reagents showed that the reaction is amenable to alkyl-aryl cross-coupling. Results of experiments run with aryl Grignard reagents are shown in Table 1.9. The reaction works well with electron donating groups (entries 2, 5–6). The reaction does not work well with a strongly electron withdrawn para-trifluoromethylphenylmagnesium bromide (not shown) but does work with a para-fluorinated aryl Grignard reagent (entry 3). A heteroaryl Grignard reagent was also amenable to the reaction (entry 4). Analogous to olefin containing nucleophiles, the reactions with aryl Grignard reagents tolerate trisubstituted olefins in the electrophile (entry 6). These results show that the reaction is a general method amenable to the formation of C_{sp} ³– C_{sp} ³ bonds as well as C_{sp} ³– C_{sp} ² bonds.

^alsolated yield after silica gel chromatography. ^bDetermined by chiral SFC chromatography. c 100 x ee_{product}/ee_{starting material.} d 10 mol % Ni(dppe)Cl₂

1.2.4 Demonstration of Stereochemical Outcome

We wanted to be confident that we knew the absolute stereochemistry of products synthesized by this method. Analogous to previously reported nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions involving methyl Grignard reagents, 30 we expected that the Ni(dppe)Cl₂ catalyzed cross-coupling reaction also proceeds with inversion at the benzylic center. Alcohol (*R*)-**1.36** was prepared by CBS reduction of ketone **1.35** (Scheme 1.11). The absolute stereochemistry was assigned as *R* based on the accepted model for CBS reductions 31 and confirmed by competing enantioselective conversion (CEC).³²

The absolute stereochemistry of the cross-coupled product was confirmed by X-ray crystallography.³³ A crystal of cross-coupled product **1.23** was grown from a methanol/pentane solution by slow evaporation. The x-ray structure was obtained on a Bruker Kappa APEX CCD diffractometer equipped with Cu K_{α} radiation ($\lambda = 1.5478$). The absolute stereochemistry of the crystal structure confirmed that cross-couplings reactions using $Ni(dppe)Cl₂$ proceed with inversion at the benzylic center.

³⁰ See Scheme 1.6.

l

³¹ Corey, E. J.; Helal, C. J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 1986.

 32 (a) Experiment performed by Alexander J. Wagner using the method described in Wagner, A. J.; David, J. G.; Rychnovsky, S. D. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 4470. (b) Wagner, A. J.; Rychnovsky, S. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, *78*, 4594. ³³ X-ray structure solved by Curtis Moore; see, Yonova, I. M.; Johnson, A. G.; Osborne, C. A.; Moore, C. E.; Morrissette, N. S.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014***, 53*, 2422.

1.2.5 Biological Studies

As diarylmethanes are a common motif in pharmaceutically relevant molecules, we were interested in seeing if these compounds show biological activity against various cancer cell lines. Several of the compounds exhibited selective inhibition of MCF-7 breast-cancer cell proliferation. The most potent compound tested, $(+)$ -1.32, exhibited an EC₅₀ of 5.3 µmol (Figure 1.1).³⁴ Fortuitously, this compound had no observed effect on non-cancerous MCF-10A cells.

Figure 1.1. Bioactivity of Compound 1.32

1.3 Conclusion

 $\overline{}$

In summary, a stereospecific cross-coupling reaction of benzylic ethers with a variety of alkyl and aryl Grignard reagents was developed. It was determined that a 1:1 dppe:nickel ratio was necessary for optimal reactivity; therefore, reaction conditions were optimized using Ni(dppe)Cl₂ as the precatalyst. The reaction was shown to be amenable to a broad scope of nucleophiles. An X-ray crystal structure confirmed that the reaction proceeds with inversion at the benzylic center. A diarylmethane synthesized by this method was shown to be active against an MCF-7 breast-cancer cell line.

³⁴ Biological assays performed by Charlotte Osborne; see, Yonova, I. M.; Johnson, A. G.; Osborne, C. A.; Moore, C. E.; Morrissette, N. S.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014***, 53*, 2422.

1.4 Experimental Section

1.4.1 General Procedures

All reactions were carried out under an atmosphere of N_2 using glassware that was either ovenor flame-dried prior to use. Hexanes, tetrahydrofuran (THF), diethyl ether ($Et₂O$), and toluene (PhMe), were degassed with argon and then passed through two 4 x 36 inch columns of anhydrous neutral A-2 alumina (8 x 14 mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated under a flow of argon at 350 °C for 12 h) to remove H_2O . All other solvents utilized were purchased "anhydrous" commercially or purified as described (vide infra). ${}^{1}H$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker GN-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C), CRYO-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C) or DRX-400 (400 MHz ¹H, 100 MHz ¹³C) spectrometers. Proton chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to internal tetramethylsilane (TMS, δ 0.00). Data are reported as follows: chemical shift (multiplicity [singlet (s), broad singlet (br s), doublet (d), doublet of doublets (dd), triplet (t), doublet of triplets (dt), doublet of doublet of triplets (ddt), triplet of triplets (tt), quartet (q), quintet (quint), multiplet (m), apparent singlet (ap s), apparent doublet (ap d), apparent quartet (ap q), broad doublet (br d) and broad multiplet (br m)], coupling constants [Hz], integration). Carbon chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to TMS with the respective solvent resonance as the internal standard (CDCl₃, δ 77.16 ppm). Unless otherwise indicated, NMR data were collected at 25 °C. Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed using Silica Gel 60 F_{254} pre-coated plates (0.25 mm thickness). Visualization was accomplished by irradiation with a UV lamp and/or staining with $KMnO₄$ solution. Flash chromatography was performed using Silica Gel 60Å (170-400 mesh) from Fisher Scientific. Melting points (m.p.) were obtained using a Mel-Temp melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Infrared spectra were obtained on a Mattson Instruments *Galaxy 5000* (thin film) and Perkin-Elmer Spectrum

1000 FT-IR Systems and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption (cm^{-1}) . High resolution mass spectrometry was performed by the University of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Center. Optical rotations were measured with a Rudolph Research Analytical Autopol IV Automatic Polarimeter or a Jasco P-1010 digital polarimeter. SFC determinations of enantiopurity were performed on a Berger Analytical instrument using a Daicel™ Chiralpak® column (OD-H, OJ-H, or AD-H; 100 bar, 50 °C, 215 nm).

Ni(cod)₂ was purchased from Strem, stored in a glovebox freezer (-20 °C) under an atmosphere of N₂, and used as received. Ni(acac)₂ was purchased from Strem, stored in a glovebox under an atmosphere of N_2 , and used as received. 1,2-Bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane (dppe) was purchased from Alfa Aesar, stored in a glovebox under an atmosphere of N_2 , and used as received. 1,2-Bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane nickel (II) chloride (Ni(dppe) $Cl₂$) was purchased from Strem and used as received.

Organomagnesium reagents for substrate synthesis were freshly prepared from the halide precursor in THF, and molarities were determined by titration with I_2 .³⁵ All other chemicals were purchased commercially and used as received.

1.4.2 Synthesis of Alkyl and Aryl Halides and Organomagnesium Reagents for Cross-Coupling Reactions

(5-methylhex-4-enyl)magnesium bromide was prepared from **5-methylhex-4-enylbromide (1.37)** which was prepared via the following route:

 $\overline{}$

³⁵ Krasovskiy, A.; Knochel, P. *Synthesis* **2006**, 890.

5-methylhex-4-enal (**1.40**) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Saucy and co-workers.³⁶ A sealed tube was charged with ethoxyethene (**1.38**) (11.6 mL, 121 mmol), 2 methylbut-3-en-2-ol (**1.39**) (6.40 mL, 60 mmol), and 85% phosphoric acid (59 μL, 0.60 mmol). The tube was sealed, heated to 150 \degree C, and allowed to stir for 2.5 h. The reaction mixture was cooled to room temp, opened, and neutralized with triethylamine. Purification by fractional distillation (120 °C, 50 torr) afforded the title compound as a clear, colorless oil (2.41 g, 21.5 mmol, 36%). Analytical data is consistent with literature values.³⁷

5-methylhex-4-ene-1-ol (**1.41**) was prepared according to the procedure reported by Heathcock and co-workers.³⁸ A flame dried round bottom flask was charged with LiAlH₄ (1.49 g, 39.4) mmol), put under a nitrogen atmosphere, and cooled to 0 $^{\circ}$ C. Et₂O (22 mL) was added then aldehyde **1.40** (4.41g, 39.4 mmol) was added as a solution in Et₂O (86 mL). The reaction mixture was allowed to slowly return to room temperature over 3 hours and stirred for an additional 10 hours at which time the reaction mixture was cooled back down to 0° C. Water (2) mL), 15% NaOH (2 mL), and another aliquot of water (6 mL) were added sequentially. The

 \overline{a}

³⁶ (a) Marbet, R.; Saucy, G. *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1967**, *50*, 2095. (b) Liu, C.; Kudo, K; Hashimoto, Y.; Saigo, K. *J. Org. Chem.* **1996**, *61*, 494.

³⁷ Wei, X.; Lorenz, J. C.; Kapadia, S.; Saha, A.; Haddad, N.; Busacca, C. A.; Senanayake, C. H. *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, *72*, 4250.

³⁸ Wallace, G. A.; Heathcock, C. H. *J. Org. Chem.* **2001**, *66*, 450.

quenched mixture was allowed to return to room temperature. The solid material was filtered and purified by silica gel flash column chromatography to yield the target compound as a clear, colorless oil (3.04g, 26.1 mmol, 68% yield). Analytical data is consistent with literature values.³⁹

6-Bromo-2-methylhex-2-ene (1.37) was prepared according to a procedure reported by Boyer.⁴⁰ A flame dried round bottom flask was charged with alcohol **1.41** (1.26 g, 11.0 mmol) and DMAP (15.2 mg, 0.125 mmol). Pyridine (11 mL) was added, and the reaction mixture was cooled to 0 ^oC. Tosyl chloride (232 mg, 12.2 mmol) was added in portions, and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 2.5 h at 0° C. The reaction mixture was poured into ice cold water, and the crude mixture was extracted with Et₂O (3 x 10 mL), washed with 10% HCl, washed with a saturated NaHCO₃ (aq) solution, and washed with brine. The combined organics were dried with MgSO4 and concentrated in vacuo. With no further purification, the crude tosylate (2.35 g, 9.84 mmol) was loaded into a round bottom flask. LiBr (2.96g, 34.1 mmol) and acetone (23 mL) were added, and the reaction mixture was heated to and stirred at reflux for 1 hour. The reaction mixture was then cooled to room temperature and diluted with a 3:1 mixture of pentane and water. The organic layer was separated and dried with MgSO₄. After filtration and concentration, the crude material was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to yield bromide **1.37** as a clear, colorless oil (0.703g, 3.97 mmol, 36% yield from the alcohol). Analytical data was consistent with literature values.⁴⁰

³⁹ Corey, E. J.; Cheng, H.; Baker, C. H.; Matsuda, S. P. T.; Li, D.; Song, X. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 1277.

⁴⁰ Boyer, F.-D.; Hanna, I. *Org. Lett.* **2007**, *9*, 2293*.*

(Z)-6-bromohex-2-ene (1.43) was prepared according to the same procedure as **1.37** but starting from the commercially available alcohol **1.42**. Analytical data were consistent with literature values.⁴¹

All other alkyl and aryl halides were purchased commercially and used as received.

1.4.3 Preparation of Grignard Reagents

*p***-(***N***,***N***-Dimethylamino)phenylmagnesium bromide** (**1.45**) was prepared according to a procedure reported by Jarvo and co-workers.⁴² Magnesium turnings $(0.18 \text{ g}, 7.5 \text{ mmol})$ were ground in a mortar and pestle, and then added to a round bottom flask along with one crystal of iodine. The round bottom flask was equipped with a water condenser and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. THF (2.0 mL) was then added. The heterogeneous mixture was heated to reflux, and *p*-(*N,N*-dimethylamino)phenyl bromide (**1.44**) (1.0g in 0.5 mL THF) was added drop wise. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 1 h and cooled to room temperature. The Grignard solution was then carefully transferred by syringe to a Schlenk flask in such a way as to leave left-over magnesium solid behind. The Grignard reagent was then concentrated in vacuo on a Schlenk line. Et₂O (1 mL) was added, and the solution was again concentrated in vacuo by

⁴¹ Burns, N. Z.; Witten, M. R.; Jacobsen, E. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 14578.

⁴² Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

Schlenk technique. This process was repeated five times. The solid Grignard reagent was then transferred to a glove box. Grignard reagent **1.45** was stored and dispensed in the same glove box.

All other Grignard reagents were prepared according to the following general procedure. For satisfactory yields and enantiospecificities in the cross-coupling reactions, the Grignard reagent must be prepared from the alkyl bromide in diethyl ether. In cases were initiation is sluggish, gentle heating by heat gun or oil bath, or the addition of 0.05 mL of 1,2-dibromoethane proved helpful.

General Procedure for Grignard Reagent Preparation: Magnesium turnings (1.08 g, 45.0 mmol) were added to a vacuum flame-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar and oven-dried condenser. The reaction apparatus was put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Et₂O (5.0) mL) was added to the reaction apparatus, followed by a single crystal of I_2 (ca. 2 mg). The organohalide⁴³ (15.0 mmol) was added portion-wise over 30 min. The reaction was stirred at ambient temperature for an additional two hours. The resulting Grignard reagents was typically between 2.0 and 3.0 M as titrated using Knochel's method,⁴⁴ and could be stored (sealed, under nitrogen) for at least 4 weeks without detrimental effects.

⁴³ All alkyl and arylhalides were commercially available and used as received without any purification unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁴ Krasovskiy, A.; Knochel, P. *Synthesis* **2006**, 890.

1.4.4 Synthesis and Characterization of Substrates

(*R***)-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)propan-1-ol ((***R***)-1.12)** was prepared according to the procedure reported by Jarvo and co-workers.⁴⁵ Analytical data is consistent with literature values:⁴⁵ ¹H **NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) 7.80 (m, 3H), 7.73 (s, 1H), 7.45 (m, 3H), 4.72 (t, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1 H), 2.17 (s, 1H), 1.79–1.90 (m, 2H), 0.91 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 3H); ¹³**C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 142.0, 133.3, 133.1, 128.3, 128.0, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 124.8, 124.2, 76.2, 31.8, 10.3; $\left[\alpha\right]^{24}$ \rm{D} +39.5 (*c*) 1.01, CHCl₃), lit. [α]²³_D +41.9 (*c* 1.02, CHCl₃, 96% ee);⁴⁵ **SFC** analysis (OD-H, 10% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 95% ee: t_R (minor) = 9.1 minutes, t_R (major) = 9.9 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(1-methoxypropyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.13)** was Prepared according to the procedure reported by Jarvo and co-workers.⁴⁵ Analytical data is consistent with literature values:⁴⁵ ¹H **NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) 7.83 (m, 3H), 7.70 (s, 1H), 7.45 (m, 3H), 4.17 (t, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 1 H), 3.24 (s, 3H), 1.92 (m, 1H), 1.75 (m, 1H), 0.89 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) 139.8, 133.3, 133.2, 128.4, 128.0, 127.8, 126.17, 126.16, 125.8, 124.7, 85.8, 56.9, 30.9, 10.4; $[\alpha]^{24}$ D +110.5 (*c* 1.07, CHCl₃), lit. $[\alpha]^{23}$ D +92.2 (*c* 1.82, CHCl₃);⁴⁵ **SFC** analysis (OD-H, 1% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 95% ee: t_R (minor) = 5.8 minutes, t_R (major) = 6.2 minutes.

⁴⁵ Taylor, B. L. H.; Swift, E. C.; Waetzig, J. D.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 389.

2-cyclohexyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethanone (1.35) was prepared according to the procedure reported by Jarvo and co-workers.⁴⁶ Analytical data is consistent with literature values:⁴⁶ ¹H **NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 8.45 (s, 1H), 8.03 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 7.97 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.88 (t, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 7.46–7.61 (m, 2H), 2.95 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 2H), 2.10–1.97 (m, 1H), 1.85–1.75 (m, 2H), 1.70–1.65 (m, 3H), 1.31–1.26 (m, 2H), 1.22–1.17 (m, 1H), 1.15–1.02 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 200.4, 135.7, 135.0, 132.7, 129.9, 129.7, 128.52, 128.47, 127.9, 126.8, 124.2, 46.4, 34.9, 33.7, 26.4, 26.3.

(*R***)-2-cyclohexyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethanol ((***R***)-1.36)** was prepared according to the procedure reported by Jarvo and co-workers.⁴⁶ Analytical data is consistent with literature values:⁴⁶ **¹H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.84–7.83 (m, 3H), 7.78 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.45 (m, 3H), 4.97–4.95 (m, 1H), 1.85–1.77 (m, 4H), 1.71–1.60 (m, 4H), 1.51–1.40 (m, 1H), 1.29–1.13 (m, 3H), 1.04–0.92 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.8, 133.5, 133.1, 128.4, 128.1, 127.8, 126.3, 125.9, 124.6, 124.3, 72.4, 47.1, 34.4, 34.1, 33.1, 26.7, 26.4, 26.3; **[α]25D** +33.3 (*c* 0.17, CHCl₃), lit. $[\alpha]^{28}$ _D +23.8 (*c* 1.0, CHCl₃, 87% ee);⁴⁶ **SFC analysis** (AS-H, 3% IPA, 3 mL/min) indicated 96% ee: t_R (minor) = 12.2 minutes, t_R (major) = 12.8 minutes. Absolute configuration

⁴⁶ Wisniewska, H. M.; Swift, E. C.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 9083.

was assigned as *R* based on the accepted model for selectivity in CBS reduction⁴⁷ and confirmed by competing enantioselective conversion (CEC).⁴⁸

(*R***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-methoxyethyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.18)**: To a solution of NaH (0.514 g, 21.4 mmol) in THF (100 mL) was added (*R*)-**1.36** (2.72 g, 10.7 mmol), and the mixture was stirred at 40 °C for 30 min. MeI (2.00 mL, 32.1 mL) was added, and stirring was continued for 8 h. The reaction was quenched with MeOH, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was taken up in CH_2Cl_2 (100 mL), washed with sat. NaCO₃, brine, dried over NaSO₄, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (5% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as a white solid (2.85 g, 10.6 mmol, 99%): **m.p.** 43–47 ^oC; **TLC R_f** = 0.4 (5% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.83–7.82 (m, 3H), 7.70 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.43 (m, 3H), 4.36 (dd, *J* = 8.6, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 3.21 (s, 3H), 1.84–1.76 (m, 3H), 1.69–1.62 (m, 3H), 1.54–1.49 (m, 1H), 1.42–1.37 (m, 1H), 1.25–1.10 (m, 3H), 0.99–0.90 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 140.5, 133.4, 133.2, 128.4, 127.9, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 125.8, 124.6, 81.9, 56.8, 46.2, 34.3, 34.0, 33.3, 26.7, 26.4, 26.3; **[α]25D** +63.2 (*c* 1.06, CHCl3); **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₉H₂₄O [M]⁺ 268.1827 found 268.1821; **SFC analysis** (OJ-H, 3% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (minor) = 7.1 minutes, t_R (major) = 8.8 minutes.

⁴⁷ Corey, E. J.; Helal, C. J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 1986.

⁴⁸ (a) Experiment performed by Alexander J. Wagner using the method described in Wagner, A. J.; David, J. G.; Rychnovsky, S. D. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 4470. (b) Wagner, A. J.; Rychnovsky, S. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, *78*, 4594.

(*S***)-2-cyclohexyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethanol ((***S***)-1.36)** was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Presnell and co-workers.⁴⁹ To a cooled (brine ice bath) solution of (*R*)-**1.36** (0.15 g, 0.59 mmol), benzoic acid (0.29 g, 2.4 mmol), and PPh3 (0.62 g, 2.4 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was added DIAD (0.46 mL, 2.4 mmol) drop-wise over 30 min. After the addition was complete the reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature and stir for 12 hours, then heated up to 40 °C and stirred for an additional 3 h. The reaction mixture was diluted with Et_2O (10 mL) , washed with sat. NaHCO₃, dried over NaSO₄, and concentrated in vacuo. Trituration with hexanes removed the PPh₃ by-products and purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (10% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as a white solid (0.112 g, 0.43 mmol, 73%). The product was recrystallized from hexanes to improve enantiopurity. Analytical data is consistent with literature values:⁵⁰ ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.84–7.83 (m, 3H), 7.78 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.45 (m, 3H), 4.97–4.95 (m, 1H), 1.85–1.79 (m, 4H), 1.71–1.60 (m, 4H), 1.51–1.40 (m, 1H), 1.29–1.13 (m, 3H), 1.04–0.92 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.8, 133.5, 133.1, 128.4, 128.1, 127.8, 126.3, 125.9, 124.6, 124.3, 72.4, 47.1, 34.4, 34.1, 33.1, 26.7, 26.4, 26.3; **[α]26D** –27.4 (*c* 1.02, CHCl3); **SFC analysis** (AS-H, 3% IPA, 3 mL/min) indicated 94% ee: t_R (major) = 11.8 minutes, t_R (minor) = 12.7 minutes.

(*S***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-methoxyethyl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.18)** was prepared according to the procedure reported above for (*R*)-**1.18**: **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.83–7.82 (m, 3H), 7.70

⁴⁹ Dodge, J. A.; Nissen, J. S.; Presnell, M. *Org. Synth.* **1996**, *73*, 110.

⁵⁰ Wisniewska, H. M.; Swift, E. C.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 9083–9090.

(s, 1H), 7.49–7.43 (m, 3H), 4.36 (dd, *J* = 8.6, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 3.21 (s, 3H), 1.84–1.76 (m, 3H), 1.69– 1.62 (m, 3H), 1.54–1.49 (m, 1H), 1.42–1.37 (m, 1H), 1.25–1.10 (m, 3H), 0.99–0.90 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 140.5, 133.4, 133.2, 128.4, 127.9, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 125.8, 124.6, 81.9, 56.8, 46.2, 34.3, 34.0, 33.3, 26.7, 26.4, 26.3; **[α]25D** –58.1 (*c* 1.30, CHCl3); **SFC analysis** (OJ-H, 3% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 92% ee: t_R (major) = 7.0 minutes, t_R (minor) = 8.9 minutes.

5-methyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)hex-4-en-1-one (1.47) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Hultzsch and co-workers.⁵¹ To a cooled (brine/ice bath) solution of CuI (0.059 g, 0.31 mmol) and 2-naphthoyl chloride (**1.46**) (1.19 g, 6.25 mmol) in THF (7 mL) was slowly added (4-methylpent-3-enyl)magnesium bromide (10.9 mL, 6.25 mmol, 0.574 M in THF), and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. The reaction was quenched by the addition of MeOH, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The crude reaction mixture was taken up in EtOAc (30 mL), washed with 1 N HCl (10 mL), sat. NaHCO₃ (10 mL), and brine (10 mL), dried with NaSO₄, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (4% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as a colorless oil (1.01 g, 4.22 mmol, 68% yield). This compound has been previously reported. ⁵² Spectral data is not fully consistent with the reported literature values, therefore full characterization data is provided to support structural assignment shown above: **TLC R** $f = 0.4$ (10% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.46 (s, 1H), 8.03 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.94 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.86 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.57– 7.49 (m, 2H), 5.22 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 3.12 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 2.48 (q, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.70 (s,

l

⁵¹ Gribkov, D. V.; Hultzsch, K. C.; Hampel, F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 3748.

⁵² Narender, T.; Sarkar, S.; Rajendar, K.; Tiwari, S. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 6140.

3H), 1.65 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 200.0, 135.6, 134.4, 132.8, 132.6, 129.7, 129.6, 128.43, 128.39, 127.8, 126.8, 124.0, 123.1, 38.9, 25.8, 23.2, 17.8; **IR** (neat) 3058, 2967, 2913, 1678, 1277, 1180, 1123 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for C17H19O [M + H]⁺ 239.1436, found 239.1429.

 (R) -5-methyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)hex-4-en-1-ol $((R)$ -1.48) was prepared according to a modified procedure by Okamura and co-workers.⁵³ A flame dried round bottom flask was charged with (*S*)-2-methyl-CBS-oxazaborolidine (0.12 g, 0.42 mmol), ketone **1.47** (1.01 g, 4.22 mmol), and toluene (20 mL). The mixture was cooled to -78 °C, and catecholborane (0.90 mL, 8.4 mmol) was added dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 20 h, then quenched by slow addition of MeOH (2 mL) followed by sat. NH4Cl (10 mL). After warming to room temperature, the quenched mixture was extracted with Et₂O (3×20 mL). The combined organics were washed with sat. $Na₂CO₃$, then brine and dried over NaSO₄. Solvent was removed in vacuo. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (10–20% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as a white solid (0.703 g, 2.91 mmol, 69%). The product was recrystallized from hexanes to improve enantiopurity: **m.p.** 53–55 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.5 (20% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹H **NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.82 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 7.76 (s, 1H), 7.47–7.43 (m, 3H), 5.16 (t, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 4.83 (t, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 1H), 2.12–2.04 (m, 3H), 1.94–1.82 (m, 2H), 1.69 (s, 3H), 1.58 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (150 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.3, 133.4, 133.1, 132.5, 128.4, 128.1, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 124.7, 124.3, 123.9, 74.5, 39.0, 25.9, 24.6, 17.9; **IR** (neat) 3263, 2924, 2856, 1059, 1016 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₇H₂₀ONH₄ [M + NH₄]⁺ 258.1858, found 258.1847;

⁵³ Lee, A. S.; Norman, A. W.; Okamura, W. H. *J. Org. Chem.* **1992**, *57*, 3846.

 α ²⁶ α +4.9 (*c* 1.16, CHCl₃); **SFC analysis** (OD-H, 15% IPA, 3 mL/min) indicated 93% ee: t_R (minor) = 4.9 minutes, t_R (major) = 5.3 minutes. Absolute configuration was assigned as *R* based on the accepted model for selectivity in CBS reductions.⁵⁴

(*R***)-2-(1-methoxy-5-methylhex-4-enyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.49):** To a suspension of NaH (0.032 g, 1.3 mmol) in THF (3 mL) was added a solution of (*R*)-**1.48** (0.160 g, 0.67 mmol) in THF (3 mL), and the mixture was stirred at 40 °C for 30 min. MeI (0.124 mL, 2.00 mmol) was added and stirring was continued for 5 h. The reaction was quenched with MeOH, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The crude mixture was taken up in CH_2Cl_2 (10 mL), filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (5% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as a colorless oil (0.164 g, 0.645 mmol, 96%): **TLC R^f** = 0.5 (10% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.84 (app d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 7.70 (s, 1H), 7.47–7.43 (m, 3H), 5.12 (t, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 4.24 (t, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 1H), 3.23 (s, 3H), 2.07– 2.02 (m, 2H), 1.96–1.91 (m, 1H), 1.74–1.69 (m, 4H), 1.56 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 140.0, 133.4, 133.2, 132.2, 128.4, 128.0, 127.9, 126.2, 126.1, 125.8, 124.6, 124.0, 83.6, 56.8, 38.1, 25.9, 24.5, 17.9; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2966, 2926, 1445, 1099, 745 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for C₁₈H₂₂O [M]⁺ 254.1671, found 254.1652; [α]²⁷D +30.2 (*c* 1.11, CHCl₃); **SFC analysis** (OD-H, 5% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 94% ee: t_R (minor) = 4.2 minutes, t_R (major) = 4.6 minutes.

⁵⁴ Corey, E. J.; Helal, C. J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 1986.

1.4.5 Representative Procedure for Cross-Coupling Reactions

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexylpentan-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.19)**: A vial was charged with (*R*)-**1.18** $(0.134 \text{ g}, 0.500 \text{ mmol})$ and Ni $(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol)$. The vial was capped, and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Toluene (3.0 mL) was added, followed by *n*-propylmagnesium bromide (0.44 mL, 1.0 mmol, 2.3 M in Et₂O). The reaction was allowed to stir at room temperature for 24 h, at which point the reaction was quenched by the addition of MeOH (1 mL) and run through a silica plug. The solvents were removed in vacuo, and the crude was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% hexanes). The resulting colorless oil (0.137 g) was a mixture of the title compound (93% calculated yield) and the product of elimination (5% calculated yield). Further purification (100% heptanes) afforded a pure sample of (*S*)-**1.19**: **TLC Rf** = 0.7 (100% hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.80–7.76 (m, 3H), 7.55 (s, 1H), 7.45– 7.39 (dquint, *J* = 5.5, 1.2 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (dd, *J* = 8.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 2.84–2.79 (dq *J* = 9.3, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 1.84 (d, *J* = 12.8 Hz, 1H), 1.85–1.47 (m, 8H), 1.26–1.05 (m, 6H), 0.91–0.86 (m, 5H); **¹³C NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 144.1, 133.7, 132.3, 128.0, 127.73, 127.65, 126.4, 126.2, 125.8, 125.1, 44.9, 42.7, 39.9, 35.0, 34.4, 33.0, 26.8, 26.4, 26.3, 20.9, 14.3; **IR** (thin film) 3052, 2661, 1915, 1633, 1600 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₂₁H₂₈ [M]⁺ 280.2191, found 280.2187; $[\alpha]^{29}D +17.8$ (*c* 1.11, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 2% hexanes, 2.0 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (major) = 11.4 minutes, t_R (minor) = 12.3 minutes.

1.4.6 Characterization Data for Cross-Coupling Products

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexylheptan-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.22)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** (0.134 g, 0.500 mmol), Ni(dppe)Cl2 (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), *n*-pentylmagnesium bromide (0.50 mL, 1.0 mmol, 2.0 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL) . Purification by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) afforded a colorless oil (0.147 g) as a mixture of the title compound (91% calculated yield) and the product of elimination (6% calculated yield). Further purification (100% heptanes) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: $\mathbf{R_f} = 0.3$ (100%) hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.80–7.75 (m, 3H), 7.55 (s, 1H), 7.44–7.37 (m, 2H), 7.31 (dd, *J* = 8.4, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 2.83–2.75 (m, 1H), 1.84 (d, *J* = 12.8 Hz, 1H), 1.63–1.44 (m, 8H), 1.21–1.04 (m, 10H), 0.89–0.81 (m, 5H); **¹³C NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 144.2, 133.7, 132.3, 128.0, 127.74, 127.67, 126.4, 126.1, 125.8, 125.1, 45.0, 43.0, 37.6, 35.0, 34.4, 33.0, 32.2, 27.5, 26.8, 26.4, 26.3, 22.7, 14.3; **IR** (neat) 3020, 2920, 2850, 815, 744, 697 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m* / *z* calcd for C₂₃H₃₂ [M]⁺ 308.2504, found 308.2507; $[\alpha]^{27}$ _D +9.4 (*c* 1.20, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 2% hexanes, 2.0 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (minor) = 11.4 minutes, t_R (major) $= 12.3$ minutes.

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexyl-5-phenylpentan-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.23)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18**

 $(0.401 \text{ g}, 1.50 \text{ mmol})$, Ni $(dppe)Cl₂$ (16 mg, 0.030 mmol), (3-phenylpropyl)magnesium bromide $(1.59 \text{ mL}, 1.89 \text{ mmol}, 1.19 \text{ M} \text{ in } Et_2O)$, and toluene (22 mL) . Purification by flash column chromatography ($0-5\%$ EtOAc in hexanes) afforded a colorless oil (0.522 g) as a mixture of the title compound (88% calculated yield) and the product of Wurtz coupling of the organomagnesium reagent (1,6-diphenylhexane). Further purification by flash chromatography (100% pentane) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **m.p.** 81–81 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.3 (100% hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.81 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.54 (s, 1H), 7.46–7.39 (m, 2H), 7.29 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.24–7.20 (m, 2H), 7.13 (t, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.08 (d, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 2.82 (p, *J* = 5.0 Hz, 1H), 2.60–2.48 (m, 2H), 1.82 (d, *J* = 12.5 Hz, 1H), 1.69–1.43 (br m, 10H), 1.11–1.00 (m, 4H), 0.88–0.82 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 143.7, 142.7, 133.7, 132.3, 128.5, 128.3, 128.0, 127.73, 127.68, 126.4, 126.1, 125.9, 125.7, 125.1, 44.9, 42.9, 37.2, 36.1, 34.9, 34.4, 32.9, 29.6, 26.8, 26.4, 26.3; **IR** (neat) 2918, 2850, 1442, 822, 745, 696 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₂₇H₃₂ [M]⁺ 356.2504, found 356.2509; $\left[\alpha\right]^{20}D + 1.0$ (*c* 1.03, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 20% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (minor) = 4.2 minutes, t_R (major) = 5.2 minutes. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction (vide infra) were grown by slow evaporation of solvent from a solution of the title compound in a mixture of methanol and pentane.

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexyl-7-methyloct-6-en-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.24)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** $(53.7 \text{ mg}, 0.200 \text{ mmol})$ and Ni $(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 \text{ mg}, 0.010 \text{ mmol})$, $(5$ -methylhex-4-enyl)magnesium

bromide (0.48 mL, 0.40 mmol, 0.83 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 48 h. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% pentane) afforded a colorless oil (0.054 g) composed of a mixture of the title compound (81% calculated yield) and the product of elimination (12% calculated yield). Further purification by flash chromatography on silver-impregnated silica $(0-3\%$ Et₂O in pentane) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (100% pentane); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.81–7.76 (m, 3H), 7.55 (s, 1H), 7.46–7.39 (dp, *J* = 8.4, 1.2 Hz, 2H), 7.31 (dd, *J* = 8.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 5.01 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 2.80 (dq, *J* = 14.8, 5.3 Hz, 1H), 1.96–1.82 (m, 3H), 1.68–1.47 (m, 14H), 1.36–1.18 (m, 2H), 1.16–1.01 (m, 4H), 0.94–0.80 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 144.0, 133.7, 132.3, 131.3, 128.0, 127.7, 127.6, 126.4, 126.1, 125.8, 125.1, 124.9, 44.9, 42.9, 37.2, 35.0, 34.4, 32.9, 28.2, 28.0, 26.8, 26.4, 26.3, 25.8, 17.8; **IR** (neat) 2919, 2850, 1447, 853, 815, 743 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS EI+) m / z calcd for C₂₅H₃₄ [M]⁺ 334.2661, found 334.2660; $\left[\alpha\right]^{24}D +11.8$ (*c* 5.33, CHCl₃) ; **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 3% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (minor) = 6.5 minutes, t_R (major) = 6.9 minutes.

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexyl-6,6,6-trifluorohexan-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.25)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** $(53.7 \text{ mg}, 0.200 \text{ mmol})$, Ni $(dppe)Cl₂ (10.6 \text{ mg}, 0.0200 \text{ mmol})$, $(4,4,4$ -trifluorobutyl)magnesium bromide (0.20 mL, 0.40 mmol, 2.0 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 48 h. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% pentane) afforded a colorless oil (54 mg) as a mixture of the title compound (67% calculated yield) and the product of elimination (15% calculated yield). Further purification by silica gel

flash column chromatography on silver-impregnated silica (100% pentane) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (100% pentane); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.82– 7.78 (m, 3H), 7.55 (s, 1H), 7.44 (dp, *J* = 6.9, 1.3 Hz, 2H), 7.29 (dd, *J* = 8.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 2.81 (dq, *J* = 14.8, 4.9 Hz, 1H), 2.11–1.90 (m, 2H), 1.83 (d, *J* = 12.9 Hz, 1H), 1.75–1.25 (m, 10H), 1.15– 1.01 (m, 4H), 0.93–0.81 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.9, 133.7, 132.4, 128.3, 127.8, 127.7, 126.4, 126.0, 125.7, 125.3, 44.8, 42.8, 36.5, 34.9, 34.3, 33.9 (q, *J* = 28.3 Hz, 1C), 32.9, 26.7, 26.7, 26.3, 26.2, 20.3 (q, *J* = 2.8 Hz, 1C); **IR** (neat) 2920, 2850, 1448, 1253, 1131, 816, 744 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS EI+) m / z calcd for C₂₂H₂₇F₃ [M]⁺ 348.2065, found 348.2065; α ²⁶D +19.7 (*c* 1.2, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 10% hexanes, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (major) = 4.7 minutes, t_R (minor) = 5.3 minutes.

(*S***)-2-(1-cyclohexyl-4-methylpentan-2-yl)naphthalene ((***S***)-1.26)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** (0.134 g, 0.500 mmol), Ni(dppe)Cl² (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), *i*-butylmagnesium bromide (0.40 mL, 1.0 mmol, 2.5 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL). Purification by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) afforded a colorless oil (0.067 g) as a mixture of the title compound (40% calculated yield), the product of hydrogenolysis (8% calculated yield), and the product of elimination (7% calculated yield). Further purification (100% heptanes) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.7 (100% hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.79 (q, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 3H), 7.56 (s, 1H), 7.46–7.41 (m, 2H), 7.32 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 2.92 (hept, *J* = 5.0 Hz, 1H), 1.85 (d, *J* = 12.5 Hz, 1H), 1.66–1.54 (m, 6H), 1.49–1.39 (m, 2H), 1.35–1.33 (m, 1H),

1.14–1.03 (m, 4H), 0.92–0.84 (m, 5H), 0.80 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) 144.2, 133.7, 132.3, 128.0, 127.7, 127.6, 126.3, 126.1, 125.8, 125.1, 46.9, 45.4, 40.5, 34.9, 34.3, 33.0, 26.8, 26.4, 26.3, 25.5, 23.7, 22.0; **IR** (neat) 2919, 2849, 1447, 853, 813, 743 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS EI+) m / z calcd for C₂₂H₃₀ [M]⁺ 294.2347, found 294.2350; [a]²⁷_D +14.9 (*c* 0.80, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 2% hexanes, 2.0 mL/min) indicated 90% ee: t_R (major) = 7.0 minutes, t_R (minor) = 8.4 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(octan-3-yl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.27)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.13** (0.100 g, 0.500 mmol), Ni(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), *n*-pentylmagnesium bromide (0.60 mL, 1.0 mmol, 1.7 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL). Purification by flash column chromatography (100%) hexanes) afforded a colorless oil (0.118 g) as a mixture of the title compound (96% calculated yield), the product of hydrogenolysis (2% calculated yield), and the product of elimination (1% calculated yield). Further purification (100% heptanes) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.6 (100% hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.80–7.76 (m, 3H), 7.56 (s, 1H), 7.46–7.38 (m, 2H), 7.30 (dd, *J* = 8.4, 0.8 Hz, 1H), 2.60–2.52 (m, 1H), 1.78–1.60 (m, 4H), 1.26–1.10 (m, 6H), 0.83–0.76 (m, 6H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) 143.7, 133.7, 132.2, 127.9, 127.7, 127.6, 126.5, 126.2, 125.8, 125.1, 48.2, 36.6, 32.2, 29.8, 27.5, 22.7, 14.2, 12.4; **IR** (neat) 3056, 2981, 2918, 2850, 1107, 1067 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₈H₂₄ [M]⁺ 240.1878, found 240.1871; **[α]27D** –1.6 (*c* 1.83, CHCl3); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 2% hexanes, 2 mL/min) indicated 96% ee: t_R (minor) = 10.0 minutes, t_R (major) = 10.6 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(6-phenylhexan-3-yl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.28)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.13** (40 mg, 0.20 mmol), Ni(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), (3-phenylpropyl)magnesium bromide (0.24 mL, 0.40 mmol, 1.7 M in Et₂O), and toluene $(3.0$ mL). Purification by flash column chromatography (100% heptanes) afforded a colorless oil (0.054 g) as a mixture of the title compound (93% calculated yield) and the product of Wurtz coupling of the organomagnesium reagent (1,6-diphenylhexane). Further purification (flash column chromatography in 100% pentanes) afforded a sample of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.6 (100% hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) 7.79 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.54 (s, 1H), 7.42 (dt, J = 17.4, 6.7 Hz, 2H), 7.28 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.23–7.20 (m, 2H), 7.14–7.11 (m, 1H), 7.08 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 2.61–2.49 (m, 3H), 1.79–1.59 (m, 4H), 1.57–1.41 (m, 2H), 0.77 (t, *J* = 7.3Hz, 3H); ¹³**C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 143.3, 142.7, 133.7, 132.4, 128.5, 128.3, 128.3, 128.0, 127.72, 127.65, 126.6, 126.1, 125.9, 125.7, 125.2, 48.1, 36.23, 36.15, 29.8, 29.6, 12.4; **IR** (neat) 3024, 2928, 2856, 815, 743 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₂₂H₂₄ [M]⁺ 288.1878, found 288.1880; $[\alpha]^{24}$ D –15.1 (*c* 1.08, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 15% IPA, 2.0 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (minor) = 6.3 minutes, t_R (major) = 7.8 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-phenylethyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.29)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** $(0.134 \text{ g}, 0.500 \text{ mmol})$, Ni $(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 \text{ mg}, 0.010 \text{ mmol})$, phenylmagnesium bromide (0.37 mL) , 1.0 mmol, 2.7 M in Et₂O), and toluene (7.5 mL). The reaction was stirred for a period of 24 h. Purification by flash column chromatography (100% pentane) afforded the title compound as a colorless oil (0.105 g, 0.33 mmol, 67%): **TLC R^f** = 0.2 (100% pentane); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.77 (t, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.72 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.69 (s, 1H), 7.41 (quintd, *J* = 6.9, 1.3 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (dd, *J* = 8.5, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.29–7.24 (m, 4H), 7.17–7.14 (m, 1H), 4.23 (t, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 2.08–1.95 (m, 2H), 1.80 (t, *J* = 11.7 Hz, 2H), 1.66–1.58 (m, 3H), 1.26–1.05 (m, 4H), 1.01–0.93 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) 145.5, 143.0, 133.7, 132.3, 128.5, 128.1, 127.9, 127.7, 127.0, 126.2, 126.0, 125.4, 48.2, 43.5, 35.0, 33.7, 33.5, 26.8, 26.3; **IR** (neat) 2919, 2849, 1448, 3055, 1490, 743, 698 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS EI+) *m / z* calcd for C₂₄H₂₆ [M]⁺ 314.2035, found 314.2030; **[α]25D** –10.8 (*c* 1.99, CHCl3); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 15% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 92% ee: t_R (major) = 6.1 minutes, t_R (minor) = 6.9 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-(4-methoxyphenyl)ethyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.30)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of

reagents: (R) -1.18 $(0.134 \text{ g}, 0.500 \text{ mmol})$ and Ni(dppe) Cl_2 $(5.3 \text{ mg}, 0.010 \text{ mmol})$, 4methoxyphenylmagnesium bromide (0.53 mL, 1.0 mmol, 1.9 M in Et₂O), and toluene (7.5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 24 h. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography $(5\%$ Et₂O in pentane) afforded a mixture of the title compound $(86\%$ calculated yield) and the starting material (15% calculated yield) as a colorless oil (0.157 g total mass). Further purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (1–15% benzene in hexanes) afforded a pure sample of the title compound: **TLC R^f** = 0.7 (5% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** $(500 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDC1}_3)$ δ 7.77 (t, *J* = 9.3 Hz, 2H), 7.72 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.66 (s, 1H), 7.45–7.35 (m, 2H), 7.32 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.18 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.83 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 4.18 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 3.74 (s, 3H), 2.02–1.94 (m, 2H), 1.80–1.78 (m, 2H), 1.70–1.55 (m, 3H), 1.23–1.04 (m, 4H), 1.02–0.91 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) 157.9, 143.4, 137.6, 133.7, 132.2, 129.0, 128.5, 128.1, 127.8, 127.7, 127.0, 126.0, 125.8, 125.4, 113.9, 55.3, 47.2, 43.7, 35.0, 33.62, 33.57, 26.8, 26.3; **IR** (neat) 2919, 2848, 1509, 1447, 1245, 1177, 1037 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m* / *z* calcd for C₂₅H₂₈O [M]⁺ 344.2140, found 344.2131; $[\alpha]^{24}$ _D –6.3 (*c* 1.17, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 15% IPA, 3.0 mL/min) indicated 97% ee: t_R (major) = 9.0 minutes, t_R (minor) = 9.6 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-(4-fluorophenyl)ethyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.31)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** $(0.134 \text{ g}, 0.500 \text{ mmol})$, Ni $(dppe)Cl₂$ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), 4-flourophenylmagnesium bromide

 $(0.46 \text{ mL}, 1.0 \text{ mmol}, 2.2 \text{ M} \text{ in Et}_2\text{O})$, and toluene (7.5 mL) . The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 48 h. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) afforded a mixture of the title compound (82% calculated yield) and the product of Wurtz coupling of the organomagnesium reagent as a colorless oil (0.147 g total mass). Further purification by column chromatography (100% pentane) afforded a pure sample of (*R*)-**1.31**: **TLC Rf** = 0.8 (5% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.78 (t, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.74 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.66 (s, 1H), 7.46–7.40 (m, 2H), 7.31 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.22 (dd, *J* = 8.5, 6.0 Hz, 2H), 6.95 (app t, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 4.21 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 2.02 (quint, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 1.94 (quint, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 1.79 (t, *J* = 12.3 Hz, 2H), 1.70–1.56 (m, 3H), 1.22–1.04 (m, 4H), 1.01–0.96 (m, 2H); ¹³**C NMR** (150 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 161.4 (d, *J* = 242.5 Hz, 1C), 142.8, 141.1 (d, *J* = 3.3 Hz, 1C), 133.7, 132.2, 129.5 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 2C), 128.2, 127.8, 127.7, 126.8, 126.1, 125.9, 125.5, 115.3 (d, *J* = 84.0 Hz, 2C), 47.3, 43.6, 35.0, 33.6, 33.5, 26.7, 26.2; **IR** (neat) 3053, 2920, 2850, 1506, 1222, 793 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for C24H25F [M]⁺ 332.1940, found 332.1930; [α]²⁰_D –11.1 (*c* 0.91, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OJ-H, 15% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 87% ee: t_R (major) = 4.3 minutes, t_R (minor) = 5.6 minutes.

(*S***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethyl)thiophene ((***S***)-1.32)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*R*)-**1.18** $(54 \text{ mg}, 0.20 \text{ mmol})$, Ni $(d$ ppe)Cl₂ (10.6 mg, 0.0200 mmol), 2-thienylmagnesium bromide (0.15 mL, 0.40 mmol, 2.6 M in Et₂O), and toluene (3.0 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 48 h. Purification by flash column chromatography $(2\% Et_2O)$ in pentane) afforded the

title compound as a yellow oil (49 mg, 0.15 mmol, 76%): **TLC Rf** = 0.5 (100% hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.78 (t, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 3H), 7.70 (s, 1H), 7.47–7.38 (m, 3H), 7.12 (d, *J* = 4.4 Hz, 1H), 6.91 (dd, *J* = 5.2, 3.2 Hz, 1H), 6.83 (d, *J* = 3.2 Hz, 1H), 4.45 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 2.05 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.85 (d, *J* = 12.4 Hz, 1H), 1.73 (d, *J* = 12.4 Hz, 1H), 1.64–1.50 (m, 3H), 1.30–0.96 (m, 6H); ¹³**C NMR** (150 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 150.2, 142.5, 133.7, 132.5, 128.4, 127.9, 127.8, 126.7, 126.3, 126.2, 126.1, 125.6, 123.9, 123.6, 45.1, 43.9, 35.1, 33.8, 33.1, 26.7, 26.3, 26.2; **IR** (neat) 3026, 2922, 2853, 1453, 743, 697 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for $C_{22}H_{24}SH [M + H]^+$ 321.1677, found 321.1672; $[\alpha]^{24}D +42.4$ (*c* 1.20, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (OD-H, 20% hexanes, 3.0 mL/min) indicated 93% ee: t_R (minor) = 14.9 minutes, t_R (major) = 17.5 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(2-cyclohexyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethyl)thiophene ((***R***)-1.32)** was prepared according to the representative procedure outlined above using the following amounts of reagents: (*S*)-**1.18** (39 mg, 0.15 mmol), Ni(dppe)Cl₂ (7.7 mg, 0.015 mmol), 2-thienylmagnesium bromide (0.17 mL, 0.29 mmol, 2.0 M in Et₂O), and toluene (2.2 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 48 h. Purification by flash column chromatography $(2\%$ Et₂O in pentane) afforded the title compound as a yellow oil (33 mg, 0.10 mmol, 70%): ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.78 (t, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 3H), 7.70 (s, 1H), 7.42 (m, 3H), 7.13 (d, *J* = 5.2 Hz, 1H), 6.91 (dd, *J* = 5.2, 3.6 Hz, 1H), 6.84 (d, *J* = 3.6 Hz, 1H), 4.45 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 2.05 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.86 (d, *J* = 12.8 Hz, 1H), 1.73 (d, *J* = 12.4 Hz, 1H), 1.64–1.54 (m, 3H), 1.26–0.96 (m, 6H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) 150.2, 142.5, 133.7, 132.5, 128.4, 127.9, 127.8, 126.7, 126.3, 126.14, 126.09, 125.6,

123.9, 123.6, 45.1, 43.8, 35.1, 33.8, 33.1, 26.7, 26.25, 26.21; **[α]24D** –42.9 (*c* 0.98, CHCl3); **SFC** analysis (OD-H, 20% hexanes, 3.0 mL/min) indicated 92% ee: t_R (major) = 14.3 minutes, t_R $(minor) = 17.5$ minutes.

(*R***)-***N***,***N***-dimethyl-4-(1-(naphthalen-2-yl)propyl)aniline ((***R***)-1.33)**: A 7 mL vial was equipped with a stir bar, flame dried, and pumped into a glove box while still warm. (*R*)-**1.13** (0.040 g, 0.20 mmol), $\text{Ni(dppe)}\text{Cl}_2$ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol), and 4- $(N,N$ -dimethylamino) phenylmagnesium bromide (**1.45**) (0.133 g, 0.400 mmol) were added. The vial was capped, removed from the glove box and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Toluene (3 mL) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for 24 h at which point the reaction was quenched with an excess of methanol. The crude mixture was eluted through a silica plug $(100\% Et₂O)$ and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash column chromatography $(1\% \text{ Et}_3\text{N}, 5\% \text{ Et}_2\text{O})$ in pentane) afforded the title compound as a yellow oil $(0.047 \text{ g}, 0.16 \text{ mmol}, 80\% \text{ yield})$. Trace amounts $(<5\%)$ of Wurtz coupling product of the organomagnesium reagent could not be separated from the product. **TLC Rf** = 0.2 (1% Et₃N, 5% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.77 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.71 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (s, 1H), 7.40 (quint, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.33 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.14 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.75 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 3.87 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.89 (s, 6H), 2.17–2.08 (quint, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 2H), 0.93 (t, $J = 7.4$ Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 149.2, 143.6, 133.7, 133.3, 132.2, 128.7, 128.0, 127.8, 127.7, 127.1, 125.9, 125.8, 125.2, 112.9, 52.4, 40.9, 28.6, 13.0; **[α]²⁶D** –3.4 (*c* 1.17, CHCl₃); **IR** (neat) 2958, 2928, 2871, 2797, 1613, 1564,

1818, 1345, 811, 780, 747; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES+) *m / z* calcd for C21H23NH [M + H]⁺ 290.1909, found 290.1903; $[\alpha]^{25}$ _D –3.4 (*c* 1.16, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 20% IPA, 2.5 mL/min) indicated 85% ee: t_R (major) = 6.1 minutes, t_R (minor) = 7.4 minutes.

(*R***)-2-(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-5-methylhex-4-enyl)naphthalene ((***R***)-1.34)**: A flame dried 20 mL dram vial was charged with (R) -1.49 (127 mg, 0.50mmol) and Ni(dppe)Cl₂ (5.3 mg, 0.010 mmol). The vial was capped and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Toluene (7.5 mL) was added followed by (4-methoxy)phenylmagnesium bromide $(0.57 \text{ mL}, 1.0 \text{ mmol}, 1.8 \text{ M} \text{ in } Et_2O)$. The reaction mixture was stirred for a period of 24 h at which point the reaction vessel was briefly opened to air and another 5.3 mg (0.010 mmol) of Ni(dppe)Cl₂ were added. The reaction mixture was then allowed to stir for a second 24 hour period then run through a silica plug (100% Et₂O). Purification of the crude material by silica gel flash column chromatography (2% Et₂O in pentane) yielded a mixture of the title compound (92% calculated yield) and the product of Wurtz coupling of the organomagnesium reagent as an oil (151 mg total mass). Further purification by silica gel flash column chromatography $(1\%$ Et₂O in pentane) afforded a pure sample of (*R*)-1.34: **TLC Rf** = 0.7 (2% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.78 (t, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 7.72 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (s, 1H), 7.45–7.38 (m, 2H), 7.31 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.19 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 6.81 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 5.17 (t, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 4.02 (t, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 3.75 (s, 3H), 2.17–2.11 (m, 2H), 1.97 (app q, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 1.69 (s, 3H), 1.48 (s, 3H); ¹³**C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 158.0, 143.1, 137.3, 133.7, 132.22, 132.16, 129.1, 128.1, 127.8,

127.7, 126.9, 126.0, 125.9, 125.4, 124.3, 113.9, 55.3, 49.9, 35.8, 26.5, 25.9, 17.9; **IR** (neat) 2925, 1608, 1509, 1440, 1245 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₂₄H₂₆O [M]⁺ 330.1984, found 330.1986; $[\alpha]^{20}$ $D -2.7$ (*c* 1.06, CHCl₃); **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 10% IPA, 3.0 mL/min) indicated 88% ee: t_R (major) = 8.2 minutes, t_R (minor) = 8.9 minutes.

1.4.7 Crystallographic Data⁵⁵

 $\overline{}$

 The single crystal X-ray diffraction studies were carried out on a Bruker Kappa APEX CCD diffractometer equipped with Cu K_a radiation ($\lambda = 1.5478$). Crystals of the subject compound were grown by slow evaporation of a 1:1 methanol:pentane solution. A 0.217 x 0.095 x 0.053 mm colorless needle was mounted on a Cryoloop with Paratone oil. Data were collected in a nitrogen gas stream at 90(2) K using ϕ and ϖ scans. Data was collected at two crystal-todetector distances, 45mm or 60mm, using variable exposure time (2s-10s) depending on θ with a scan width of 1.0°. Data collection was 98.7% complete to 68.00° in *θ*. A total of 57312 reflections were collected covering the indices, $-7 \le -h \le -7$, $-16 \le -k \le -16$, $-17 \le -17$. 7355 reflections were found to be symmetry independent, with a R_{int} of 0.0524. Indexing and unit cell refinement indicated a primitive, triclinic lattice. The space group was found to be *P*1. The data were integrated using the Bruker SAINT software program and scaled using the SADABS software program. Solution by direct methods (SHELXT) produced a complete phasing model consistent with the proposed structure.

All nonhydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically by full-matrix least-squares (SHELXL-2013). All hydrogen atoms were placed using a riding model. Their positions were

⁵⁵ Crystal Structure solved and X-Ray data compiled by Curtis E. Moore at the University of California, San Diego.

constrained relative to their parent atom using the appropriate HFIX command in SHELXL-2013. Crystallographic data are summarized in Table 1.10.

Table 1.10. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for Jarvo02.

	X	$\mathbf y$	z	U(eq)
C(1)	8627(3)	2712(2)	9759(1)	20(1)
C(2)	8982(4)	1839(2)	10204(2)	23(1)
C(3)	9335(3)	883(2)	9445(1)	21(1)
C(4)	10054(4)	108(2)	9944(2)	27(1)
C(5)	10507(3)	$-808(2)$	9186(1)	21(1)
C(6)	8896(3)	$-1776(2)$	8845(2)	23(1)
C(7)	9312(4)	$-2603(2)$	8126(2)	27(1)
C(8)	11349(4)	$-2473(2)$	7748(2)	29(1)
C(9)	12964(4)	$-1513(2)$	8083(2)	28(1)
C(10)	12546(4)	$-689(2)$	8797(2)	26(1)
C(11)	8776(3)	3692(2)	10609(1)	18(1)
C(12)	10775(3)	4502(2)	10932(1)	18(1)
C(13)	11023(3)	5399(2)	11773(1)	18(1)
C(14)	9133(3)	5458(2)	12292(1)	19(1)
C(15)	7078(3)	4622(2)	11945(1)	21(1)
C(16)	6901(3)	3768(2)	11136(1)	20(1)
C(17)	13086(3)	6234(2)	12111(1)	20(1)
C(18)	13267(3)	7090(2)	12923(2)	23(1)
C(19)	11385(4)	7148(2)	13438(2)	24(1)
C(20)	9373(4)	6355(2)	13131(2)	22(1)
C(21)	6322(3)	2349(2)	8940(2)	21(1)
C(22)	5748(3)	3152(2)	8446(1)	19(1)
C(23)	7800(3)	3596(2)	8012(2)	22(1)
C(24)	7172(4)	4332(2)	7439(2)	24(1)
C(25)	4963(4)	3801(2)	6602(2)	27(1)
C(26)	2893(3)	3389(2)	7036(2)	25(1)
C(27)	3503(3)	2646(2)	7602(2)	22(1)
C(1)	9460(3)	671(2)	3372(1)	21(1)
C(2)	10172(4)	1568(2)	2946(2)	24(1)
C(3)	11922(4)	2533(2)	3706(2)	23(1)
C(4)	12998(4)	3309(2)	3205(2)	28(1)

Table 1.11. Atomic coordinates (χ 10⁴) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ($\AA^2 \chi$ 10³) for Jarvo02. U(eq) is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized U^{ij} tensor.

$C(1)$ -H(1)	1.0000	$C(16) - H(16)$	0.9500
$C(1)-C(2)$	1.546(3)	$C(17) - H(17)$	0.9500
$C(1)-C(11)$	1.514(3)	$C(17)-C(18)$	1.370(3)
$C(1)-C(21)$	1.542(3)	$C(18) - H(18)$	0.9500
$C(2)-H(2A)$	0.9900	$C(18)-C(19)$	1.415(3)
$C(2)-H(2B)$	0.9900	$C(19) - H(19)$	0.9500
$C(2)-C(3)$	1.523(3)	$C(19)-C(20)$	1.366(3)
$C(3)-H(3A)$	0.9900	$C(20)$ -H (20)	0.9500
$C(3)-H(3B)$	0.9900	$C(21) - H(21A)$	0.9900
$C(3)-C(4)$	1.533(3)	$C(21) - H(21B)$	0.9900
$C(4)-H(4A)$	0.9900	$C(21)-C(22)$	1.536(3)
$C(4)-H(4B)$	0.9900	$C(22) - H(22)$	1.0000
$C(4)-C(5)$	1.510(3)	$C(22) - C(23)$	1.533(3)
$C(5)-C(6)$	1.388(3)	$C(22)-C(27)$	1.538(3)
$C(5)-C(10)$	1.392(3)	$C(23) - H(23A)$	0.9900
$C(6)-H(6)$	0.9500	$C(23) - H(23B)$	0.9900
$C(6)-C(7)$	1.389(3)	$C(23)-C(24)$	1.534(3)
$C(7)-H(7)$	0.9500	$C(24)$ -H $(24A)$	0.9900
$C(7)-C(8)$	1.384(3)	$C(24)$ -H $(24B)$	0.9900
$C(8)-H(8)$	0.9500	$C(24)-C(25)$	1.522(3)
$C(8)-C(9)$	1.382(3)	$C(25)$ -H $(25A)$	0.9900
$C(9)-H(9)$	0.9500	$C(25)$ -H $(25B)$	0.9900
$C(9) - C(10)$	1.384(3)	$C(25) - C(26)$	1.526(3)
$C(10) - H(10)$	0.9500	$C(26) - H(26A)$	0.9900
$C(11)-C(12)$	1.373(3)	$C(26) - H(26B)$	0.9900
$C(11)-C(16)$	1.424(3)	$C(26) - C(27)$	1.533(3)
$C(12) - H(12)$	0.9500	$C(27) - H(27A)$	0.9900
$C(12)-C(13)$	1.421(3)	$C(27) - H(27B)$	0.9900
$C(13)-C(14)$	1.423(3)	$C(1')-H(1')$	1.0000
$C(13)-C(17)$	1.416(3)	$C(1')-C(2')$	1.539(3)
$C(14)-C(15)$	1.415(3)	$C(1')-C(11')$	1.519(3)
$C(14)-C(20)$	1.420(3)	$C(1')-C(21')$	1.538(3)
$C(15) - H(15)$	0.9500	$C(2')-H(2'A)$	0.9900
$C(15)-C(16)$	1.366(3)	$C(2')-H(2'B)$	0.9900

Table 1.12. Bond lengths [Å] and angles [°] for Jarvo02.

	U^{11}	U^{22}	U^{33}	U^{23}	U^{13}	U^{12}
C(1)	23(1)	19(1)	18(1)	7(1)	3(1)	6(1)
C(2)	30(1)	20(1)	18(1)	7(1)	2(1)	7(1)
C(3)	24(1)	20(1)	19(1)	7(1)	3(1)	7(1)
C(4)	38(1)	24(1)	21(1)	9(1)	6(1)	13(1)
C(5)	26(1)	20(1)	17(1)	9(1)	1(1)	9(1)
C(6)	22(1)	27(1)	22(1)	13(1)	2(1)	8(1)
C(7)	34(1)	22(1)	20(1)	6(1)	$-4(1)$	5(1)
C(8)	41(1)	31(1)	18(1)	5(1)	2(1)	20(1)
C(9)	27(1)	39(1)	24(1)	14(1)	7(1)	16(1)
C(10)	24(1)	28(1)	26(1)	12(1)	1(1)	4(1)
C(11)	21(1)	21(1)	16(1)	9(1)	1(1)	8(1)
C(12)	20(1)	21(1)	16(1)	8(1)	3(1)	9(1)
C(13)	22(1)	21(1)	16(1)	10(1)	2(1)	9(1)
C(14)	24(1)	22(1)	15(1)	10(1)	3(1)	11(1)
C(15)	21(1)	26(1)	20(1)	11(1)	6(1)	9(1)
C(16)	20(1)	21(1)	19(1)	8(1)	1(1)	4(1)
C(17)	21(1)	23(1)	18(1)	10(1)	2(1)	8(1)
C(18)	24(1)	21(1)	21(1)	7(1)	$-3(1)$	5(1)
C(19)	32(1)	21(1)	16(1)	4(1)	$-1(1)$	12(1)
C(20)	28(1)	28(1)	16(1)	10(1)	6(1)	15(1)
C(21)	25(1)	18(1)	19(1)	6(1)	1(1)	5(1)
C(22)	22(1)	18(1)	16(1)	6(1)	3(1)	7(1)
C(23)	22(1)	25(1)	21(1)	9(1)	4(1)	7(1)
C(24)	28(1)	26(1)	24(1)	13(1)	7(1)	9(1)
C(25)	30(1)	36(1)	19(1)	13(1)	5(1)	12(1)
C(26)	23(1)	31(1)	21(1)	10(1)	1(1)	9(1)
C(27)	22(1)	25(1)	19(1)	7(1)	2(1)	5(1)
C(1)	24(1)	21(1)	18(1)	8(1)	4(1)	5(1)
C(2)	30(1)	22(1)	18(1)	7(1)	3(1)	4(1)
C(3)	28(1)	22(1)	20(1)	8(1)	4(1)	3(1)

Table 1.13. Anisotropic displacement parameters $(\AA^2 x 10^3)$ for Jarvo02. The anisotropic displacement factor exponent takes the form: $-2\pi^2$ [h² a^{*2}U¹¹ + ... + 2 h k a^{*} b^{*} U¹²]

Table 1.14. Hydrogen coordinates (χ 10⁴) and isotropic displacement parameters (\AA ² χ 10³) for Jarvo02.

Chapter 2

Studies of Pathways Leading to Side-Products of Kumada-Type Cross-Coupling Reactions

2.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 described a cross-coupling reaction in which $Ni(acac)_2$ in the presence of dppe catalyzes the cross-coupling of benzylic ethers with aryl and alkyl Grignard reagents. Additionally, $Ni (acac)_2$ in the presence of a longer-chain ligand, dppo, was shown to promote major side-reactions: hydrogenolysis and elimination.¹ While attempting to identify conditions that were amenable to the cross-coupling of benzhydryl substrates, we saw a similar but more pronounced trend. Ni(acac)2 in the presence of dppo and *n*-propylmagnesium iodide catalyzes the nearly quantitative hydrogenolysis of substrate **2.1** to form hydrocarbon **2.2** (Scheme 2.1a). The catalytic system also effectively performs hydrogenolysis on substrate **2.3** to form hydrocarbon **2.4** (Scheme 2.1b). If rendered a general method this reaction would be an interesting and useful reaction in its own right. We therefore studied the application of this protocol as a general method for the hydrogenolysis of benzylic ethers.

 One of the most prolific hydrogenolysis protocols is the Barton-McCombie deoxygenation.² This reaction has found ample application in late stage synthesis.³ For example, as shown in Scheme 2.2, Barton-McCombie deoxygenation is the last step in the total synthesis

l

¹ See Table 1.3, entry 4.

² (a) Barton, D. H. R.; McCombie, S. W. *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1* **1975**, 1574. (b) Hartwig, W. *Tetrahedron* **1983**, *39*, 2609. (c)Hong, F.-T.; Paquette, L. A. *Chemtracts* **1998**, *11*, 67.

³ For representative examples, see (a) Singh, V.; Prathap, S.; Porinchu, M. *J. Org. Chem.*, **1998**, *63*, 4011. (b) Luzzio, F. A.; Fitch, R. W.; *J. Org. Chem.* **1999**, *64*, 5485. (c) Schlessinger, R. H.; Gillman, K. W. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1996**, *37*, 1331.

of tricycloillicinone (**2.7**).⁴ Barton-McCombie deoxygenations are carried out through a twostep process: first an alcohol is converted to a thiocarbonyl derivative, and second, the intermediate is reduced by a tin hydride reagent in a radical hydrogenolysis reaction. The reaction lends itself to late stage deoxygenation due to its superb functional group tolerance.⁵ The reaction proceeds with primary and tertiary substrates, but works particularly well with secondary alcohols. Unfortunately, the tin reagents are toxic making tin-free alternatives attractive.⁶

 Among alternatives to the Barton-McCombie deoxygenation, few nickel-catalyzed reactions have been reported. Recent nickel-catalyzed advances that have been reported primarily allow for the deoxygenation of phenols and the hydrogenolysis of aryl ethers (Scheme 2.3a).⁷ Rhodium-based catalysts have been more successful in the hydrogenolysis of alkyl $C-O$ bonds.⁸ For instance rhodium based Wilkinson's catalyst will promote hydrogenolysis of a benzylic ester (Scheme 2.3b).⁹ Unfortunately, with a commodity price of greater than \$1000 per

 \overline{a}

⁴ Pettus, T. R. R.; Inoue, M.; Chen, X.-T.; Danishefsky, S. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 6160.

⁵ (a) Zard, S. Z. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1997**, *36*, 672. (b) Chatgilialoglu, C.; Ferreri, C.; *Res. Chem. Intermed.* **1993**, *19*, 755. (b) Barton, D. H. R.; Jang, D. O.; Jaszberenyi, J. C. *J. Org. Chem.* **1993**, *58*, 6838. (c) Barton, D. H. R.; Jang, D. O.; Jaszberenyi, J. C.; Joseph, C. *Synlett* **1991**, 435. (d) Barton, D. H. R.; Motherwell, W. B.; Stange, A.

Synthesis **1981**, 743.

⁶ Kimbrough, R. D. *Environ. Health. Perspect.* **1976**, *14*, 51.

⁷ (a) Sasaki, K; Sakai, M; Sakakibara, Y.; Takagi, K. *Chem. Lett.* **1991**, *20*, 2017. (b) Sasaki, K. Kubo, T.; Sakai, M.; Kuroda, Y. *Chem. Lett.*, **1997**, *26*, 617. (c) Sergeev, A. G.; Hartwig, J. F. *Science* **2011**, *332*, 439. (d) Sergeev, A. G.; Webb, J. D.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 20226. (e) Tobisu, M.; Yamakawa, K.; Shimasaki, T.; Chatani, N. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 2946. (f) Lipshutz, B. H.; Frieman, B. A.; Butler, T.; Kogan, V. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 800.

⁸ (a) Maruyama, Y.; Sezaki, T.; Tekawa, M.; Sakamoto, T.; Shimizu, I.; Yamamoto, A. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1994**, *473*, 257. (b) Kang, S.-K.; Kim, D.-Y.; Rho, H.-S.; Yoon, S.-H.; Ho, P.-S. *Synth. Commun.* **1996**, *26*, 1485. 9 Liu, H.-J.; Zhu, B.-Y. *Synth. Commun.* **1990**, *20*, 557.

ounce, rhodium is expensive.¹⁰ In contrast, nickel carries a commodity price of less than \$10 per pound.¹¹ A method of hydrogenolysis catalyzed by an earth-abundant nickel catalyst would be an attractive alternative to rhodium based methods.

We envisioned that a catalytic system comprised of $Ni(acac)_2$ and dppo may be a general catalyst for the hydrogenolysis of benzylic ethers. Analogous to the cross-coupling chemistry discussed in Chapter 1, we envisioned that this reaction would go through a two-electron mechanism. If so, in addition to providing an alternative to the Barton-McCombie reaction, the dppo ligated nickel catalyst may allow for the stereospecific installation of deuterium for labeling studies. In this chapter, I present my efforts to develop a general hydrogenolysis protocol as well as to identify the stereochemical outcome of hydrogenolysis reactions. Although we found that the Ni(acac)₂, dppo catalytic system is not a general method, these studies provided insight into the mechanism of both hydrogenolysis and elimination pathways, and insight into the mechanism of polar cross-coupling reactions in general.

¹⁰ Kitco. http://www.kitco.com/charts/historicalrhodium.html (accessed 21 April, 2015).

¹¹ InvestmentMine. Nickel Prices and Nickel Price Charts. http://www.infomine.com/investment/metalprices/nickel/ (accessed 21 April, 2015).

2.2 Optimization of Hydrogenolysis Protocol

We set out to investigate if the hydrogenolysis reaction we discovered with benzhydryl ether **2.1** might represent a general method for the hydrogenolysis of alkyl ethers. In particular, we wanted to extend the methodology to benzylic ethers similar to the substrates discussed in Chapter 1. Unfortunately, subjecting benzylic substrates **2.12** and **2.14** to conditions that are identical to those that worked with benzhydryl substrates resulted in less than 50% yield of hydrogenolysis product (Scheme 2.4).

Scheme 2.4. Initial Hydrogenolysis Conditions Applied Simple Benzylic Substrates

Because we had proposed that the Grignard reagent was the hydride source, 12 we hypothesized that certain Grignard reagents may allow for more facile formation of a nickel hydride complex. We therefore studied the effect of various Grignard reagents on hydrogenolysis. Isopropylmagnesium bromide and 2-phenylethylmagnesium bromide were chosen because they were expected to undergo faster β-hydride elimination than *n*-alkyl Grignard reagents. Isopropylmagnesium bromide has six rather than two β-hydrogens, and βhydride elimination from 2-phenylethylmagnesium bromide would give a stable styrene. As shown in Table 2.1, none of the organomagnesium bromide reagents were effective at performing hydrogenolysis on simple benzylic ethers (entries 1–7) although several were effective at performing hydrogenolysis on benzhydryl ethers (entries $8-11$).¹³

¹² See Chapter 1, Scheme 1.7

¹³ With Lucas Erickson

	- ,	OMe R	Grignard Ni(acac) ₂ (5 mol %) dppo (10 mol %) PhMe		R
	2.14 $R = i Pr$ 2.16 R = Ph			2.15 R = i Pr $2.17 R = Ph$	
Entry	R	Grignard	Temperature	SM $(%)^a$	Hydrogenolysis (%) ^a
1	i -Pr	i-PrMgBr	r t.	95	0
2	i -Pr	Ph(CH ₂) ₂ Mg Br	r t.	95	0
4	$i-Pr$	Ph(CH ₂) ₃ MgBr	60° C	89	0
5	$i-Pr$	cyclopentylMgBr	60° C	73	9
6	i-Pr	n-OctylMgBr	r t.	76	0
$\overline{7}$	i-Pr	EtMgBr	r t.	96	0
8	Ph.	Ph(CH2)2MgBr	r t.	97	Ω
9	Ph	Ph(CH ₂) ₃ MgBr	r t.	7	80
10	Ph	cyclopentylMgBr	r t.	0	75
11	Ph	n-OctylMqBr	r t.	0	79

Table 2.1. Efficacy of Grignard Reagents in Hydrogenolysis Reaction

^aDetermined by ¹H NMR against an internal standard, phenyltrimethylsilane (PhTMS)

We wanted to see if the identity of the halogen on the Grignard reagent had any effect on reactivity. Interestingly, *i-*PrMgI was far better at promoting hydrogenolysis from ether **2.14** than *i*-PrMgBr (Scheme 2.5). Therefore, *i*-PrMgI was used in subsequent studies. Unfortunately, with substrate 2.14, high yield was only accomplished at elevated temperatures.¹⁴

In an attempt to achieve high yields at room temperature, we performed a ligand screen. Bidentate ligands do not efficiently promote hydrogenolysis (Table 2.2, entries 1–6). Bisphosphine ligands with long carbon-chain linkers better promote the hydrogenolysis reaction (entries 7–9). Due to the high degree of freedom of these long linkers, these ligands likely acts as monodentate ligands. Monophosphine ligands were therefore studied and shown to give higher yields of hydrogenolysis product (entries 10–12). Among monodentate ligands, PPh₃ gives the highest yield $(33\%$, entry 12). PPh₃ was therefore used in subsequent studies.

¹⁴ Reactions studying halogen effect run by Lucas Erickson

^aDetermined by ¹H NMR against an internal standard, PhTMS.

We were interested in seeing what solvent effects might be at play in this reaction. A study of solvent effects is shown in Table 2.3. The reaction does not proceed in the presence of THF and DCM (entries 1–3). Hydrocarbon solvents, toluene and *n*-hexane, both provide hydrogenolysis product in 33% yield (entries 4–5). The use of diethyl ether improved yield to 42% (entry 6). The best result, 51% yield, was achieved with triethylamine (TEA) (entry 7). A small ligand screen run in TEA showed that regardless of solvent, hydrogenolysis is most efficient when PPh₃ is used as ligand (entries $7-10$).

^aDetermined by ¹H NMR against an internal standard, PhTMS.

 We wanted to see if we were converging on a general hydrogenolysis method that could be applied to compounds other than ether **2.12**. To test for generality, we ran the optimized reaction against benzylic substrate **2.14** and benzhydryl substrate **2.16** (Scheme 2.6). Unfortunately, the optimized conditions for hydrogenolysis of **2.12** proved to be suboptimal for the other two ethers. Because we did not appear to be converging on a general method, we shifted our focus to mechanistic studies.

2.3 Mechanistic Studies

From the inception of this project we sought to develop a stereospecific method for deuterium incorporation. To test for stereospecificity, we needed to design molecules that would allow for the differentiation of deuterated diastereomers. Ethers **2.18** and **2.19** were selected because diastereomers of the products of hydrogenolysis were expected to give discernable differences in *J*-coupling as defined by the Karplus equation.¹⁵ Additionally, experiments run with these compounds provided evidence for a mechanism of oxidative addition with inversion at the benzylic center.

¹⁵ Karplus, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1959**, *30*, 11

2.3.1 Stereochemical and Mechanistic Studies with Compound 2.18

Figure 2.2. Diastereomers of Compound 2.18 MeC M۴ MeC $2.18a$ 2.18b

 Studies on diastereomeric compounds **2.18a** and **2.18b** (Figure 2.2) provided insight into both the mechanism of oxidative addition and the stereochemical course of hydrogenolysis. These compounds were prepared as shown in Schemes 2.7–2.9. Synthesis of both **2.18a** and **2.18b** went through common alkynyl intermediate **2.22** which was prepared by a Corey-Fuchs protocol (Scheme 2.7).¹⁶ Trapping the acetylide with MeI allowed for the facile synthesis of the methylated alkyne.

 Ether **2.18a** was prepared from acetylene **2.22** as shown in Scheme 2.8. *Syn*-deuteration was achieved by treatment with Lindlar catalyst under a D_2 atmosphere. *m*-CPBA epoxidation to form epoxide **2.24** followed by ring-opening with LAH afforded alcohol **2.25**. ¹⁷ Finally, *o*methylation of **2.25** in the presence of NaH and MeI yielded the desired mechanistic probe **2.18a**.

¹⁶ Corey, E. J.; Fuchs, P. L. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1972**, *13*, 3769.

¹⁷ Zhou, Q.; Srinivas, H. D.; Dasgupta, S.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3307.

 Compound **2.18b** was prepared by a similar procedure, differing primarily in the deuteration of the alkyne (Scheme 2.9). Treatment of **2.22** with lithium aluminum deuteride afforded the desired trans olefin in 76% yield with a greater than 20:1 E/Z ratio.¹⁸ To achieve high deuterium incorporation at the benzylic position, it was important that this step was quenched with D₂O from a freshly opened ampule. The remainder of the synthesis of 2.18b is analogous to the procedures used for **2.18a**. Oddly, epoxide opening with LAH is far less effective on *trans*-epoxide **2.27** than with c*is*-epoxide **2.24**. Ring opening of epoxide **2.27** suffers from attack at the benzylic position resulting in formation of the homobenzylic alcohol as the major product.

 With deuterated compounds **2.18a** and **2.18b** in hand, we were ready to perform studies on the stereochemical outcome of the hydrogenolysis reaction. The outcome of experiments run with **2.18a** and **2.18b** in the presence of $Ni(acac)_2$ and dppo are shown in Scheme 2.10. A discussion of the mechanistic implications of these results follows. In the presence of $Ni(acac)_2$ and dppo, diastereomers of **2.18** undergo both hydrogenolysis and elimination processes. The mechanistic implications of these processes will each be discussed in turn.

¹⁸ Magoon, E. F.; Slaugh, L. H. *Tetrahedron*, **1967**, *23*, 4509.

Mechanistic insights gained from hydrogenolysis will be discussed first. An explanation of the results of hydrogenolysis using both diastereomers of ether **2.18** is provided in Scheme 2.11. Oxidative addition with inversion into diastereomer **2.18a** followed by reductive elimination from **2.31a**-*H* was expected to result in deuterated hydrocarbon **2.29a** (Scheme 2.11a). In its most stable s-trans conformation, **2.29a** bears hydrogen atoms, H^a and H^b , which are anti to each other and should therefore exhibit a large $J_{H²-H^b}$ coupling (see Newman projection). If diastereomer **2.18b** were subject to the same reaction, product **2.29b** would exhibit hydrogens that, in the s-trans conformation, exhibit H^a and H^b in a gauche orientation (Scheme 2.11b). Diastereomer 2.29b would therefore be expected to exhibit a smaller $J_{\text{H}^{\text{a}}\text{-H}^{\text{b}}}$ coupling value than **2.29a**. A *J*-coupling of 8 Hz or greater is indicative of protons on adjacent carbons that are predominantly in a trans orientation relative to one another, and a *J*-coupling value of 7 Hz or less is typical of a gauche orientation.¹⁹ As expected **2.29a** gave a *J*-coupling value greater than 8 Hz and **2.29b** gave a J-coupling value of 7 Hz. These results show that the hydrogenolysis process delivers a hydride stereospecifically with inversion at the benzylic center.

l

¹⁹ (a) Silverstein, R. M.; Webster, F. X.; Kiemle, D. J. *Spectrometric Identification of Organic Compounds*, 7th ed; John Wiley and Sons: Hoboken, NJ, 2005; 171–172. (b) Bock, P. L.; Boschetto, D. J.; Rasmussen, J. R.; Demers, J. P.; Whitesides, G. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1974**, *96*, 2814. (c) Whitesides, G. M.; Sevenair, J. P.; Goetz, R. W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1967, 89, 1135. For similar experiments, see: (d) Ridgway, B. H.; Woerpel, K. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **1998**, *63*, 458. (e) Matos, K.; Soderquist, J. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **1998**, *63*, 461. (f) Taylor, B. L. H.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Org. Chem.* **2011**, *76*, 7573.

Under the conditions used in this experiment, the product of β -hydride elimination was also a major product (vide supra, Scheme 2.10). Interestingly, both diastereomers underwent elimination to give very different yields. This difference in yield can be explained by a kinetic isotope effect that is consistent with a mechanism of oxidative addition with inversion followed by β-hydride elimination. When diastereomer **2.18a** undergoes oxidative addition with inversion, intermediate **2.31a** forms (Scheme 2.12a). To avoid a steric interaction between the methyl and naphthyl groups, reductive elimination will proceed from rotamer **2.31c**. Because β-deuteride elimination proceeds from this rotamer, a slow rate is expected and observed. In contrast, when diastereomer **2.18b** is subject to eliminating conditions, oxidative addition leads to intermediate **2.31b** (Scheme 2.12b). Sterics are minimized in rotamer **2.31d** from which β-hydride elimination can occur. The kinetic isotope effect is seen as β-deuteride elimination from **2.31c** proceeds slower than β-hydride elimination from **2.31d**. These results provide evidence that elimination and hydrogenolysis mechanisms begin with a polar S_N2 -like mechanism of oxidative addition which proceeds with inversion at the reactive center.

Scheme 2.12. Mechanism of Elimination

2.3.2 Stereochemical and Mechanistic Studies with Compound 2.19

Diastereomers of compound **2.19** (Figure 2.3) were also designed to probe the stereochemical outcome of hydrogenolysis and the mechanism of β-hydride elimination. Both diastereomers of compound **2.19** were obtained via the synthesis outlined in Scheme 2.13. Addition of deprotonated sulfone **2.33** into ketone **2.32** resulted in dioxolane **2.34**. Oxidizing conditions revealed carboxylic acid **2.35**. A Friedel-Crafts type cyclization gave tetralone **2.36**. 20 Reaction of the enolate of **2.36** with methyl iodide resulted in methylated ketone **2.37** which could be reduced to alcohol **2.38**. Finally, *o*-methylation of alcohol **2.38** completed the synthesis of the desired mechanistic probe **2.19** as a mixture of diastereomers which were readily separated by silica gel flash column chromatography.

²⁰ Orita, A.; Yaruva, J.; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1999**, *38*, 2267.

Scheme 2.13. Synthesis of Compound 2.19

Compound **2.19** was chosen to study the hydrogenolysis stereochemical course because hydrogenolysis of the diastereomers of **2.19** were expected to yield diastereomeric products **2.39a** or **2.39b**, which should exhibit distinct differences in the magnitude $J_{\text{H}^{\text{a}}-\text{H}^{\text{b}}}$ -couplings (Scheme 2.14). Starting from **2.19a**, oxidative addition with inversion would give intermediate **2.40a**-*d1*, which could undergo reductive elimination to give hydrogenolysis product **2.39a** (Scheme 2.14a). In its most stable conformation, compound **2.39a** would present hydrogen H^a anti to hydrogen H^b , and would be expected to give a large value for the $J_{H^a-H^b}$ coupling. Hydrogenolysis of 2.19b should give product 2.39b in which H^a is gauche to H^b (Scheme 2.14b). This confirmation would be expected to exhibit a small value for the J_H ^a– H^b coupling. Unexpectedly, no hydrogenolysis product was observed with either of these substrates. Rather, the major observed product was that of β-hydride elimination (Scheme 2.15).

 Although the stereochemical course of hydrogenolysis could not be determined in the above studies, experiments using the diastereomers of **2.19** provided valuable insight into the mechanisms of oxidative addition and subsequent elimination processes. The conformational rigidity of **2.19** would be expected to define β-hydride elimination reactivity. Oxidative addition with inversion into diastereomer **2.19a** would result in a nickel complex (**2.40a**) in which nickel is in a syn orientation to the only adjacent hydride (Scheme 2.16a). In this orientation, complex **2.40a** should readily undergo β-hydride elimination to form elimination product **2.41**. Indeed, elimination is observed at 62% yield. In contrast, if diastereomer **2.19b** is used, oxidative addition with inversion would result in complex **2.40b** in which nickel is anti to the only adjacent hydride (Scheme 2.16b). β-hydride elimination should not be possible from complex **2.40b**. When we ran experiments with **2.19b** we were surprised to observe 37% yield of the elimination product. This result can be explained, however, if after oxidative addition with inversion to form complex **2.40b**, a second nickel complex attacks **2.40b**, again with inversion, resulting in complex **2.40a**. Complex **2.40a** can then undergo β-hydride elimination. In support of this

bimetallic mechanism, we have shown that there is an inverse correlation between nickel catalyst concentration and cross-coupled product ee.²¹ These results are consistent with an overall oxidative addition with inversion, followed by β-hydride elimination. Taken together, the results of all mechanistic studies discussed in this report provide evidence that cross-coupling, hydrogenolysis, and elimination mechanisms all include a fundamental mechanistic step of SN_2 like oxidative addition with inversion at the benzylic carbon.

2.4 Conclusion

 $\overline{}$

In conclusion, we sought to identify a general method for the hydrogenolysis of benzylic and benzhydryl ethers. With dppo as ligand, the reaction works well with benzhydryl ethers, but provides marginal conversion with simple benzylic ethers. Attempts to optimize the hydrogenolysis reaction with ether 2.12 showed that in the presence of PPh₃ and with triethylamine as solvent, compound **2.12** undergoes hydrogenolysis at 51% yield. Unfortunately, these optimized conditions are not applicable to a broad range of substrates.

Studies were conducted to better understand the polar mechanism of these reactions. Deuterium labeling studies showed that the nickel-catalyzed hydrogenolysis reaction delivers a hydride in a stereospecific manner with inversion at the benzylic center. Additionally, results of

²¹ Yonova, I. M.; Johnson, A. G.; Osborne, C. A.; Moore, C. E.; Morrissette, N. S.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 2422.

elimination reactions are consistent with a mechanism of oxidative addition with inversion followed by β-hydride elimination.

2.5 Experimental Section

2.5.1 General Procedures

All reactions were carried out under an atmosphere of N_2 using glassware that was either ovenor flame-dried prior to use. Methanol (MeOH) was purchased commercially and used without further purification. *N*,*N*-Dimethylformamide (DMF), tetrahydrofuran (THF), and toluene (PhMe) were degassed with argon and then passed through two 4 x 36 inch columns of anhydrous neutral A-2 alumina (8 x 14 mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated under a flow of argon at 350 °C for 12 h) to remove H_2O . All other solvents utilized were purchased "anhydrous" commercially, or purified as described (vide infra). ¹H NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker GN-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C), CRYO-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C) or DRX-400 (400 MHz ¹H, 100 MHz ¹³C) spectrometers. Proton chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to internal tetramethylsilane (TMS, δ 0.00). Data are reported as follows: chemical shift (multiplicity [singlet (s), broad singlet (br s), doublet (d), triplet (t), quartet (q), quintet (quin), sextet, septet (sep), multiplet (m), doublet of doublets (dd), doublet of triplets (dt), apparent doublet (ap d), apparent triplet (ap t), apparent septet (ap sep), apparent quintet (ap q), apparent doublet of doublets (ap dd), apparent quintet of doublets, (ap quin)], coupling constants [Hz], integration). Carbon chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to TMS with the respective solvent resonance as the internal standard (CDCl₃, δ 77.16 ppm). Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed using Silica Gel 60 F₂₅₄ pre-coated plates (0.25 mm thickness). Visualization was accomplished by irradiation with a UV lamp. Flash chromatography was performed using Silica Gel 60Å (170-400 mesh) from Fisher Scientific. Melting points (m.p.) were obtained using a Mel-Temp melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Infrared spectra were obtained on a Nicolet[™] iS™5 FT-IR spectrometer system

and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption $(cm⁻¹)$. High resolution mass spectrometry was performed by the University of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Center. Optical rotations were measured with a Rudolph Research Analytical Autopol IV Automatic Polarimeter or a Jasco P-1010 digital polarimeter. SFC determinations of enantiopurity were performed on a Berger Analytical instrument using a Daicel™ Chiralpak® column (AD-H; 100 bar, 50 °C, 254 nm).

2.5.2 Preparation of Hydrogenolysis Substrates

2-((2-Methoxyethoxy)(phenyl)methyl)naphthalene (2.1) was prepared as described by Jarvo.²²

 $\begin{array}{c}\n 0 \\
 \text{CI} \\
 \text{Cul, THE} \\
-10^{\circ}\text{C - r.t.}\n\end{array}$

 $((2-Methoxyethoxy)methylene) dibenzene (2.3) was prepared as described by Jarvo.²³$

2-Methyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)propan-1-one (2.43): In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with CuI (0.141 g, 0.711 mmol, 0.551 equiv.), then removed and 2-naphthoyl chloride **2.42** (2.46 g, 12.9 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was added as a solution in THF (25 mL). The reaction mixture was cooled to -10 °C and isopropylmagnesium bromide (1.52 M in THF, 8.50)

²² Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

²³ Greene, M. A.; Yonova, I. M.; Williams, F. J.; Jarvo, E. R. *Org. Lett.* **2012**, *14*, 4293.

mL, 12.9 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was added dropwise. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1 h. The crude mixture was concentrated in vacuo then quenched with HCl (20 mL, 1M) and extracted with $Et₂O$ (3 x 20 mL). The crude mixture was then washed with brine (20 mL) and dried over MgSO4. Purification by flash column chromatography (5% EtOAc in hexanes) yielded **2.43** as a yellow oil (2.23 g, 11.2 mmol, 87% yield). Spectral data are consistent with literature values.²⁴

2-Methyl-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)propan-1-ol (2.44): A round bottom flask was charged with sodium borohydride (0.303 g, 8.0 mmol) and cooled to -10 °C. **2.43** (0.793 g, 4.0 mmol) and methanol (80 mL) were added to the reaction flask, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. The reaction was quenched with NaHCO₃ (20 mL), extracted with EtOAc (3 x 30 mL), washed with brine (40 mL), and dried over $Na₂SO₄$. The crude mixture was then concentrated in vacuo and purified by flash column chromatography $(20\%$ Et₂O in hexanes) to afford the title compound as a yellow oil (0.375 g, 1.87 mmol, 47% yield). Analytical data are consistent with literature values:²⁵ **TLC Rf** = 0.3 (20% Et₂O in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.82 (m, 3H), 7.74 (s, 1H), 7.46 (m, 3H), 4.52 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (sx, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 1H), 1.96 (s, 1H), 1.03 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.83 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 141.4, 133.5, 133.3, 128.3, 128.2, 128.0, 126.4, 126.1, 125.7, 125.0, 80.5, 35.5, 19.5, 18.6.

²⁴ Lee, S. W.; Lee, K.; Seomoon, D.; Kim, S.; Kim, H.; Kim, H.; Shim, E.; Lee, M.; Lee, S.; Kim, M.; Lee, P. H. *J. Org. Chem.* **2004**, *69*, 4852.

²⁵ Kulasegaram, S.; Kulawiec, R. J. *J. Org. Chem.* **1997**, *62*, 6547.

2-(1-Methoxypropyl)naphthalene (2.12) was prepared as described by Jarvo.²⁶

2-(1-Methoxy-2-methylpropyl)naphthalene (2.14): A round bottom flask was charged with NaH (348 mg, 14.5 mmol, 1.8 equiv.). Alcohol **2.44** (1.61 g, 8.05 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was then added as a solution in THF (25 mL), and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 1 h. MeI (0.85 mL, 14 mmol, 1.7 equiv.) was added and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir overnight. The reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous NH4Cl, extracted with EtOAc (3 x 20 mL), washed with brine, and dried over MgSO4. The crude mixture was then concentrated in vacuo. Purification of the crude mixture by silica gel flash column chromatography $(2\%$ Et₂O in pentanes) yielded **2.14** as a clear, colorless oil (1.51 g, 7.06 mmol, 88% yield): **TLC R^f** = 0.6 (2% Et₂O in pentanes); ¹**H** NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.82 (d, *J* = 6.4 Hz, 3H), 7.67 (s, 1H), 7.48– 7.40 (m, 2H), 7.41 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 3.89 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 3.22 (s, 3H), 2.02 (sextet, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 1.05 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.75 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** δ (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 138.8, 133.21, 133.18, 128.04 127.96, 127.8, 126.9, 126.1, 125.8, 125.3, 90.1, 57.2,. 34.8, 19.23, 19.20; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2957, 2927, 2919, 1468, 1383, 1135, 1089, 815, 773 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₅H₁₈ONH₄ [M + NH₄]⁺ 232.1701, found 232.1704.

2-(Methoxy(phenyl)methyl)naphthalene (2.16) was prepared as described by Jarvo.²²

²⁶ Taylor, B. L. H.; Swift, E. C.; Waetzig, J. D.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 389.

2.5.3 Hydrogenolysis Reactions

Hydrogenolysis Representative Procedure A

2-Benzylnaphthalene (2.2): In a glove box, a flame-dried 7 mL vial was charged with 1,8 bis(diphenylphosphino)octane (dppo) $(4.8 \text{ mg}, 0.010 \text{ mmol}, 0.10 \text{ equiv.})$. Ni $(acac)₂ (1.3 mg,$ 0.0050 mmol, 0.050 equiv.) was added as a stock solution in toluene $(1 \text{ mL}, 5.06 \text{ x } 10^{-3} \text{ M})$. The vial was capped and removed from the box but kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. Ether **2.1** (28 mg, 0.10 mmol, 1.0 equiv.) was also added from a stock solution in toluene (0.5 mL, 0.191 M). *n*-Propylmagnesium bromide (0.090 mL, 0.20 mmol, 2.2 M, 2.2 equiv.) was added, and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 24 h. The reaction was quenched with MeOH and run through a silica plug (100% Et₂O as eluent). Analysis by ¹H NMR with an internal standard (1,2-dimethoxybenzne) revealed that the reaction proceeded to give 19 mg of hydrogenolysis product (0.087 mmol, 87% yield). Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (20% DCM in hexanes) yielded a pure sample. Analytical data is consistent with literature values: 27 **TLC R_f** = 0.7 (20% DCM in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.77 (m, 3H), 7.64 (s, 1H), 7.44 (quint, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.30 (quint, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 3H), 7.23 (m, 3H), 4.15 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 141.3, 138.9, 133.9, 132.4, 129.4, 128.8, 128.4, 127.97, 127.95, 127.8, 127.4, 126.5, 126.3, 125.7, 42.4.

²⁷ Cho, C.-H.; Sun, M.; Seo, Y.-S.; Kim, C.-B.; Park, K. *J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *70*, 1482.

Diphenylmethane (2.4) was prepared according to Representative Procedure A described above using the following amounts of reagents: 2.3 ($23 \mu L$, 0.010mmol, 1 equiv.), Ni(acac)₂ (1.3 mg, 0.0049 mmol, 0.050 equiv.), dppo (4.7 mg, 0.010 mmol, 0.10 equiv.), *n*-PrMgI (0.079 mL, 0.20 mmol, 2.0 equiv.), and toluene (1.5 ml). Analysis by ¹H NMR with an internal standard (PhTMS) revealed 71% conversion to the product of hydrogenolysis. Analytical data are consistent with literature values.²⁸

2-Propylnaphthalene (2.13) was prepared according to Representative Procedure A using the following amounts of reagents: ether 2.12 (40 mg, 0.20 mmol, 1.0 equiv.), Ni(acac)₂ (2.6 mg, 0.010 mmol, 0.050 equiv.), PPh³ (5.3 mg, 0.020 mmol, 0.10 equiv.), *i*-PrMgI (0.26 mL, 0.40 mmol, 1.5 M, 2.0 equiv.), and TEA (1.5 mL). Analysis by ¹H NMR with an internal standard (PhTMS) revealed 51% conversion to the product of hydrogenolysis. Analytical data was consistent with literature values.²⁹

²⁸ Peña-Lόpez, M.; Ayán-Varela, M.; Sarandeses, L. A.; Sestelo, J. P. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 9905.

²⁹ Guan, B.-T.; Xiang, S.-K.; Wang, B.-Q.; Sun, Z.-P.; Wang, Y.; Zhao, K.-Q.; Shi, Z.-J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 3268.

2-Isobutylnaphthalene (2.15) was prepared according to Representative Procedure A outlined above with the follow reagents: 2.14 (43 mg, 0.20 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), Ni(acac)₂ (2.6 mg, 0.010 mmol, 0.050 equiv.), dppo (9.7 mg, 0.020 mmol, 0.10 equiv.), *i*-PrMgI (1.43 M in ether, 0.28 mL, 0.40 mmol, 2.0 equiv.) and toluene (1.5 mL). The crude mixture was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (20% DCM in hexanes) to give **2.15** as a clear colorless oil (27 mg, 0.15 mmol, 71% yield). Spectral data are consistent with literature values:³⁰ TLC $R_f = 0.9$ (20%) DCM in hexanes);**¹H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.82 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 7.79 (t, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 7.59 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.38 (m, 2H), 7.32 (dd, *J* = 8.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 2.65 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 2.00 (septet, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 0.97 (d, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 6H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 139.6, 133.9, 132.3, 128.3, 127.93, 127.90, 127.8, 127.5, 126.1, 125.3, 46.0, 30.5, 22.8.

2.5.4 Preparation of Mechanistic Probes

 $\overline{}$

2-(2,2-Dibromovinyl)naphthalene (2.21) was prepared according to a modified procedure as described by Rao.³¹ A flame dried round bottom flask was charged with triphenylphosphine (13.4 g, 51.2 mmol, 4.00 equiv.) and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Dichloromethane (DCM, 46 mL) was added, and the reaction mixture was cooled to 0 °C. Tetrabromomethane (8.5g, 26 mmol, 2.0 equiv.) was then added as a solution in DCM (12 mL). The reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 3 min, and 2-naphthaldehyde (**2.20**) (2.00 g, 12.8 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was

³⁰ Limmert, M. E.; Roy, A. H.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *70*, 9364

³¹ Rao, M. L. N.; Jadhav, D. N.; Dasgupta, P. *Org. Lett.* **2010**, *12*, 2048.

added as a solution in DCM (11 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 additional min then run through a silica plug. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (5–50% EtOAc in hexanes) yielded the title compound as a white solid (3.47g, 11.1 mmol, 94% yield). Spectral data are consistent with literature values:³² **m.p.** = 103–105 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.8 (10%) EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.99 (s, 1H), 7.84–7.79 (m, 3H), 7.64–7.62 (m, 2H), 7.52–7.46 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 137.1, 133.12, 133.11, 132.9, 128.4, 128.3, 128.1, 127.8, 126.9, 126.6, 125.8, 90.0; **IR** (neat) 3011, 1595, 1506, 1272, 834 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₂H₈Br₂ [M]⁺309.8993, found 309.8995.

2-(Prop-1-yn-1-yl)naphthalene (2.22) was prepared by Corey-Fuchs protocol.³³ A flame dried round bottom flask was charged with dibromide **2.21** (2.90 g, 9.15 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. THF was added, and the reaction vessel was cooled to -78 °C. *n*-BuLi (12.3 mL, 18.3 mmol, 1.49 M in Et₂O, 2.00 equiv.) was added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 hour at -78 °C. The reaction mixture was heated to room temperature, and the reaction was allowed to stir for an additional 1 h. Methyl iodide (1.25 mL, 20.1 mmol, 2.20 equiv.) was added dropwise followed by an excess of MeOH, also added dropwise. An excess of H2O was added, and the aqueous layer was separated from the organic layer. The aqueous layer was extracted with Et₂O (3 x 30 mL). The combined organics layers were dried with MgSO₄, filtered, and purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to yield the title compound as a reluctant solid (1.39 g, 8.57 mmol, 94% yield): **m.p.** = $28-29$ °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (100% hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.89 (s, 1H), 7.80–7.73 (m, 3H); 7.46–7.43 (m,

³² Rao, M. L. N.; Jadhav, D. N.; Dasgupta, P. *Org. Lett.* **2010**, *12*, 2048.

³³ Corey, E. J.; Fuchs, P. L. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1972**, *13*, 3769.

3H), 2.10 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 133.2, 132.6, 131.1, 128.8, 128.0, 127.8, 127.7, 126.5, 126.4, 121.5, 86.4, 80.2, 4.6; **IR** (neat) 3056, 2914, 2235, 1596, 1500 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for C13H¹⁰ [M]⁺184.1126, found 184.1122.

 d_2 **-(** Z **)-2-(Prop-1-en-1-yl)naphthalene (2.23):** In a glove box, a flame-dried 7 mL vial was loaded with acetylene **2.22** (50 mg, 0.30 mmol, 1.0 equiv.) and Lindlar catalyst (5% pd, 3.0 mg, 0.0010 mmol Pd, 0.0050 equiv.). The vial was capped and connected to a Schlenk line. The reaction vessel was evacuated and back filled with D_2 gas (x 5). The reaction mixture was stirred under a deuterium atmosphere for 7 h at which point the reaction vessel was again evacuated and back filled with nitrogen (x 6). The reaction mixture was filtered through Celite to yield the title compound as a clear colorless oil (163 mg, 0.959 mmol, 53% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.6 (100%) hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.81–7.78 (m, 3H), 7.73 (s, 1H), 7.47–7.41 (m, 3H), 1.97 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 135.2, 133.5, 132.2, 129.6 (t, *J* = 23.6 Hz, 1C), 128.0, 127.71, 127.69, 127.59, 127.4, 126.9 (t, *J* = 23.6 Hz, 1C), 126.1, 125.8, 14.8; **IR** (neat) 3053, 2938, 2243, 1503, 1372 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for C13H10D2 [M]⁺ 170.1064, found 170.1069.

(*E***)-2-(1,2-Dideuteroprop-1-enyl)naphthalene (2.26)** was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Magoon.³⁴ In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with lithium aluminum deuteride (141 mg, 3.35 mmol, 1.70 equiv.). The reaction vessel was $\overline{}$

³⁴ Magoon, E. F.; Slaugh, L. H. *Tetrahedron* **1967**, *23*, 4509.

fitted with a water condenser, capped, removed from the glove box, and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. Alkyne **2.22** (327 mg, 1.97 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was added as a solution in dry THF (6 mL). The reaction mixture was heated to a gentle reflux and allowed to stir for 24 h. The reaction was quenched with D2O (1.40 mL, 19.4 mmol, 9.85 equiv.) from a sealed ampule. The reaction mixture was run down a silica plug with 100% Et₂O as eluent. The crude material was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to yield the title compound as a white solid (255 mg, 1.50 mmol, 76% yield, 97% D incorporation, > 20:1 *E*/*Z*): **m.p.** 43–44 ^oC; **TLC R_f** = 0.6 (100% hexanes); ¹**H** NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.78–7.74 (m, 3H), 7.65 (s, 1H), 7.56 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.41 (ap quin, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 1.93 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 135.5, 133.9, 132.7, 130.9 (t, *J* = 23.1 Hz, 1C), 128.2, 128.0, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9 (t, *J* = 22.7 Hz, 1C), 125.5, 125.3, 123.6, 18.6; **IR** (neat) 3051, 2906, 2846, 2226, 1508, 1445 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₃H₁₀D₂NH₄ [M + NH₄]⁺ 188.1408 found 188.1409.

(*cis***)-2-Methyl-1,2-dideutero-3-(naphthalen-2-yl)oxirane (2.24)** was prepared according to a modified procedure as reported by Watson.³⁵ A round bottom flask was charged with a stir bar and *m*-CPBA (898 mg, 4.01 mmol, 1.20 equiv.) then put under a nitrogen atmosphere. DCM (25 mL) was added followed by olefin **2.23** (562 mg, 3.34 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) as a solution in DCM (13 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 35 min then quenched with saturated Na₂SO₄. The crude mixture was diluted with brine and the organic layer was separated from the aqueous layer. The organic layer was dried with Na₂SO₄, filtered, and purified by flash column chromatography (5% Et₂O in hexanes) to give the product as a clear colorless oil (568 mg, 3.08)

³⁵ Zhou, Q.; Srinivas, H. D.; Dasgupta, S.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3307.

mmol, 92% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.2 (2% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.85– 7.82 (m, 3H), 7.76 (s, 1H), 7.51–7.41 (m, 3H), 1.11 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 133.11, 133.10, 133.0, 128.0, 127.9, 127.8, 126.4, 126.0, 125.6, 124.6, 57.4 (t, *J* = 26.4 Hz, 1C), 55.1 (t, *J* = 26.4 Hz, 1C), 12.5; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2963, 2927, 2207, 1602, 1389 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for $C_{13}H_{10}D_2ONH_4 [M + NH_4]^+$ 204.1357, found 204.1366.

(*trans***)-2-Methyl-1,2-dideutero-3-(naphthalen-2-yl)oxirane (2.27)** was prepared according to the same epoxidation procedure as compound **2.24** (vide supra) using the following amounts of reagents: *m*-CPBA (363 mg, 1.62 mmol, 1.40 equiv.), **2.26** (197 mg, 1.16 mmol, 1.00 equiv. in 5 mL DCM), and 10 additional mL of DCM. Purification by flash column chromatography (5% Et₂O in hexanes) yielded the title compound as a white solid $(165 \text{ mg}, 0.886 \text{ mmol}, 76\% \text{ yield})$: **m.p.** $51-53$ °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.2 (2% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.81 (ap d, *J* = 8.15 Hz, 3H), 7.76 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.44 (m, 2H), 7.32 (dd, *J* = 7.0, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 1.49 (s. 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 135.3, 133.4, 133.3, 128.4, 127.9, 126.4, 126.1, 125.1, 123.1, 59.4 (t, *J* = 26.8 Hz, 1C), 58.8 (t, *J* = 26.4 Hz, 1C), 17.9; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2974, 2926, 2226, 1600, 1505 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₃H₁₀D₂ONH₄ [M + NH₄]⁺ 204.1357, found 204.1345.

*threo***-1-(Naphthalen-2-yl)-1,2-dideuteropropan-1-ol (2.25)** was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Watson.³⁶ A flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with

³⁶ Zhou, Qi; Srinivas, H. D.; Dasgupta, S.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3307.

LiAlH4 (524 mg, 13.7 mmol, 4.50 equiv.) and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. Dry THF (20 mL) was added and the vessel was cooled to 0 $^{\circ}$ C. Epoxide **2.24** (568 mg, 3.05 mmol, 1.00 equiv) was then added dropwise as a solution in THF (5 mL). The reaction mixture was allowed to return to room temperature and stirred for an additional 2 h. The reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous NH₄Cl and washed with brine. The organic layer was dried with MgSO₄ and purified by silica gel flash column chromatography $(17\%$ Et₂O in hexanes) to yield the title compound as a white solid (376 mg, 2.00 mmol, 66% yield): **m.p.** 31–32 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.6 (20%) EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.84–7.82 (m, 3H), 7.78 (s, 1H), 7.45–7.44 (m, 3H), 1.92–1.85 (m, 2H), 0.93 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.0, 133.3, 133.1, 128.3, 128.0, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 124.8, 124.2, 75.7 (t, *J* = 21.7, 1C), 31.3 (t, *J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 10.12; **IR** (neat) 3254, 3052, 2967, 1600, 1452 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) *m / z* calcd for $C_{13}H_{12}D_2O$ [M]⁺ 188.1170, found 188.1174.

*erythro***-1-(Naphthalen-2-yl)-1,2-dideuteropropan-1-ol (2.28)** was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Watson.³⁷ In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with lithium aluminum hydride (117 mg, 3.09 mmol, 4.50 equiv.) and dry THF (1 mL). The reaction vessel was capped, removed from the glove box, and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. Epoxide **2.27** (128 mg, 0.687 mmol, 1.00 equiv) was added as a solution in THF (4 mL). The reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 4 h at room temperature and then quenched with H₂O and run through a silica plug. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (10% EtOAc in hexanes) yielded the title compound as an oil (13 mg, 0.069 mmol, 10% yield):

³⁷ Zhou, Qi; Srinivas, H. D.; Dasgupta, S.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3307.

TLC R_f = 0.6 (20% EtOAc in Hexanes); **¹H NMR** (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.84–7.82 (m, 3H), 7.77 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.44 (m, 3H), 1.90–1.80 (m, 2H), 0.93 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 142.0, 133.4, 133.1, 128.4, 128.1, 127.8, 126.2, 125.9, 124.9, 124.3, 75.8 (t, *J* = 21.7 Hz, 1C), 31.4 (t, *J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 10.1; **IR** (neat) 3352, 3054, 2963, 2937, 1127, 1018 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₃H₁₂D₂O [M]⁺ 188.1170, found 188.1306.

*threo***-2-(1-Methoxy-1,2-dideuteropropyl)naphthalene (2.18a)**: In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with NaH (82 mg, 3.4 mmol, 1.8 equiv.). The reaction vessel was capped, removed from the glove box, and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. THF (5 mL) was added, followed by alcohol **2.25** (360 mg, 1.91 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) as a solution in THF (4 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h, at which point MeI (0.202 mL, 3.25 mmol, 1.78 equiv.) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred overnight then the reaction was quenched with an excess of saturated aqueous NH4Cl. The aqueous phase was extracted with EtOAc (4 x 10 mL), and the combined organics were dried with MgSO4, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography to yield the title compound as a clear, colorless oil (380 mg, 1.88 mmol, 98% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.7 (10% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H** NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.85–7.83 (m, 3H), 7.71 (ap d, $J = 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.49–7.43 (m, 3H), 3.25 (s, 3H), 1.89 (q, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 0.89 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 139.7, 133.3, 133.2, 128.4, 128.0, 127.9, 126.18, 126.16, 125.8, 124.7, 85.3 (t, *J* = 21.7 Hz, 1C), 56.8, 30.4 (t, *J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 10.3; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2971, 2929, 2816, 1460 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₄H₁₄D₂O [M]⁺ 202.1327, found 202.1325.

*erythro***-2-(1-Methoxy-1,2-dideuteropropyl)naphthalene (2.18b)** was prepared by the same procedure as **2.18a** with the following amounts of reagents: NaH (7.2 mg, 0.30 mmol, 4.0 equiv.), alcohol **2.28** (14 mg, 0.07 mmol, 1.0 equiv.), MeI (0.050 mL, 0.82 mmol, 11 equiv.). Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (10% EtOAc in hexanes) afforded the title compound as an oil (11 mg, 0.050 mmol, 73% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.7 (10% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.85–7.82 (m, 3H), 7.71 (s, 1H), 7.49–7.43 (m, 3H), 3.25 (s, 3H), 1.73 (q, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 0.88 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 139.7, 133.3, 133.2, 128.4, 128.0, 127.9, 126.2 (2C), 125.8, 124.7, 85.3 (t, *J* = 21.7 Hz, 1C), 56.8, 30.4 (t, *J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 10.2; **IR** (neat) 3055, 2969, 2929, 2817, 1454, 1086 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₄H₁₄D₂O [M]⁺ 202.1327, found 202.1323.

2-(3-(Phenylsulfonyl)propyl)-1,3-dioxolane (2.33) was prepared according to the procedure reported by LeBel.³⁸

2-(3-(Naphthalen-1-yl)propyl)-1,3-dioxolane (2.34) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Otera.³⁹ A flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with sulfone **2.33** (1.95g, 7.61 mmol, 1.40 equiv.) and put under a nitrogen atmosphere. THF (31 mL) was added,

³⁸ LeBel, N. A.; Balasubramanian, N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, *111*, 3363.

³⁹ Orita, A.; Yaruva, J.; Otera, J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1999**, *38*, 2267.

and the vessel was cooled to -78 °C. *n*-BuLi (4.2 mL, 6.5 mmol, 1.6 M in hexanes, 1.2 equiv.) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min. α-Tetralone (**2.32**) (795 mg, 5.44 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) and benzoyl chloride (0.95 mL, 8.2 mmol, 1.5 equiv.) were then added. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred for 3 h. Potassium *tert*butoxide (3.05 g, 27.2 mmol, 5.00 equiv.) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred at reflux for another 3 h. The reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous NH4Cl. The organic layer was separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with Et_2O (3 x 20 mL). The combined organic layers were dried with Na2SO4, filtered through a fritted funnel, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by flash chromatography $(5\% Et_2O)$ in Hexanes) to yield **2.34** as a yellow oil (608 mg, 2.51 mmol, 46% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.1 (3% EtOAc in Hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.99 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 7.63 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (t, *J* = 7.25 Hz, 1H), 7.38 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 7.31 (t, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.25 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 4.81 (t, *J* = 4.4 Hz, 1H), 3.84–3.77 (m, 2H), 3.71–3.64 (m, 2H), 3.05 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 1.85 (quin, *J* = 7.6 Hz*,* 2H), 1.77–1.73 (m, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 138.4, 134.0, 132.0, 128.9, 126.7, 126.1, 125.9, 125.6, 125.5, 124.0, 104.6, 65.0 (2C), 33.9, 32.9, 25.1; **IR** (neat) 2924, 1733, 1394, 1133, 1029 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₆H₁₈O₂ [M]⁺ 242.1307, found 242.1302.

4-(Naphthalen-1-yl)butanoic acid (2.35) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Otera.⁴⁰ A flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with dioxolane **2.34** (54 mg, 0.22 mmol, 1.0 equiv.) and THF (0.67 mL). In a second flame-dried round bottom flask was $\overline{}$ ⁴⁰ Orita, A.; Yaruva, J.; Otera, J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1999**, *38*, 2267.

prepared a solution of potassium peroxymonosulfate (OXONE®) (205 mg, 0.67 mmol, 3 equiv.) in H2O (0.7 mL). The OXONE® solution was added to the solution of dioxolane **2.34**, and the resulting mixture was stirred for 12 h. The reaction was quenched by a mixture of H_2O and EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, and the aqueous layer was washed three times with EtOAc. The combined organic layers were dried with $Na₂SO₄$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was purified by flash column chromatography (30% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield the title compound as a white solid (705 mg, 3.29 mmol; 78% yield): **m.p.** 109–110 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.2 (30% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 11.33 (br s, 1H), 8.05 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.85 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.72 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.52 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 7.47 (t, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 7.40 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.32 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 3.14 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 2.47 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 2.11 (quin, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 179.6, 137.4, 134.0, 131.9, 128.9, 127.1, 126.4, 126.1, 125.7, 125.6, 123.8, 33.7, 32.3, 25.6; **IR** (neat) 2951, 1705, 1428, 1408 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES-) m / z calcd for C₁₄H₁₃O₂ [M–H]⁻ 213.0916, found 213.0909.

3,4-Dihydrophenanthren-1(2H)-one (2.36) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Otera and coworkers.⁴¹ A flamed dried round bottom flask was charged with carboxylic acid 2.35 (705mg, 3.29 mmol, 1.00 equiv) and cooled to 0 \degree C. Trifluoromethanesulfonic acid (3.29 mL, 37.2 mmol, 11.3 equiv.) was then added. The reaction mixture was slowly allowed to warm to room temperature over 2 h while stirring. Ice-cold H_2O

⁴¹ Orita, A.; Yaruva, J.; Otera, J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1999**, *38*, 2267.

was added and the aqueous phase was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 10 mL). The combined organics were washed with brine, dried over $Na₂SO₄$, and purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (10% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield the title compound as a white solid (577 mg, 2.94 mmol, 89% yield): **m.p.** 89–90 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (10% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 8.16–8.11 (m, 2H), 7.88–7.86 (m, 1H), 7.76 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 7.64–7.57 (m, 2H), 3.40 (t, *J* = 6.2 Hz, 2H), 2.75 (ap t, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 2H), 2.31 (quin, *J* = 6.4 Hz, 2H); **¹³C NMR** (125 Hz, CDCl3) δ 198.7, 143.1, 135.9, 131.6, 130.2, 128.9, 128.4, 127.1, 126.8, 125.0, 122.9, 38.5, 25.8, 22.9; **I.R.** (neat) 2947, 1668, 1618, 1460, 1105 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES+) *m / z* calcd for $C_{14}H_{12}ONa$ $[M + Na]$ ⁺ 219.0786, found 219.0781.

3,4-Dihydrophenanthren-1(2H)-one (2.37): A flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with distilled diisopropyl amine (0.33 mL, 2.4 mmol, 1.0 equiv.) and dry THF (4.7 mL). The reaction was cooled to -78 °C, and a solution of *n*-BuLi (1.6 mL, 2.4 mmol, 1.5 M in hexanes, 1.0 equiv.) was added. The reaction mixture was warmed to 0 \degree C and stirred for 1 h. The reaction mixture was again cooled to -78 °C and ketone 2.36 (462 mg, 2.35 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was added as a solution in THF. The reaction mixture was warmed to 0° C and stirred for 3 h, at which point methyl iodide (0.29 mL, 4.7 mmol, 2.0 equiv.) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 2 h at 0° C, and the reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous NaHCO₃. The aqueous layer was extracted with Et₂O (3 x 10 mL) and the combined organics were washed with brine, dried over Na2SO4, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (2% EtOAc in hexanes) to yield the title compound as a white solid (495 mg, 2.35 mmol, 46% yield): **m.p.** 67–68 °C; **TLC R** f =
0.2 (2% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.11–8.08 (m, 2H), 7.83 (ap dd, *J* = 6.4, 2.2 Hz, 1H), 7.72 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 7.59–7.53 (m, 2H), 3.50 (dt, *J* = 17.4, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 3.27–3.19 (m, 1H), 2.66 (ap sep, *J* = 5.9 Hz, 1H), 2.38–2.32 (m, 1H), 2.02–1.95 (m, 1H), 1.31 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 201.1, 142.4, 135.6, 131.5, 129.8, 128.8, 128.2, 127.0, 126.7, 124.8, 123.2, 41.7, 30.8, 25.1, 15.4; **IR** (neat) 3060, 2930, 2862, 1674 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES+) m / z calcd for C₁₅H₁₄ONa [M + Na]⁺ 233.0942, found 233.0951.

2-Methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydrophenanthren-1-ol (2.38): In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with ketone **2.37** (219 mg, 1.04 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) and NaBH4 (79 mg, 2.1 mmol, 2.0 equiv.). The flask was removed from the glove box and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. The reaction vessel was cooled to -10 °C and methanol (21 mL) was added. The reaction was stirred for 25 min at -10 °C. The reaction was quenched with a mixture of saturated aqueous NaHCO3. Dichloromethane was added, and the aqueous and organic layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \text{ mL})$ and the combined organic layers were dried with MgSO4 then filtered through a fritted funnel. The crude mixture was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography to yield **2.38** as a white solid. The product was an inseparable mixture of diastereomers (215 mg, 1.01 mmol, 97% yield): **m.p.** 84– 92 ^oC.; **TLC Rf** = 0.3 (10% EtOAc in hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ7.96 (t, *J* = 9.3 Hz, 2H), 7.79 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 7.68 (ap t, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 7.62 (ap d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 7.52– 7.42 (m, 5H), 4.64 (d, *J* = 3.1 Hz, 1H), 4.43 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 3.29 (dt, *J* = 17.4, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 3.17–2.91 (m, 3H), 2.13–2.06 (m, 1H), 1.98–1.80 (m, 5H), 1.70–1.60 (m, 2H), 1.17 (d, *J* = 6.8

Hz, 3H), 1.14 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 135.8, 135.6, 133.3, 132.9, 132.5, 132.2, 132.1, 132.0, 128.6, 128.5, 128.1, 126.8, 126.7, 126.21 (2C), 126.17, 125.9, 125.7, 123.7, 123.6, 75.5, 72.1, 37.0, 33.9, 27.7, 25.8, 24.7, 24.6, 18.1, 17.1; **IR** (neat) 3312, 2955, 2926, 2872 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₅H₁₆O [M]⁺ 212.1201, found 212.1199.

1-Methoxy-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydrophenanthrene (2.19): In a glove box, a flame-dried round bottom flask was charged with alcohol **2.38** as a mixture of diastereomers (270 mg, 1.27 mmol, 1.00 equiv.). NaH (55 mg, 2.3 mmol, 1.8 equiv) was added, and the reaction vessel was capped, removed from the glove box, and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. Dry THF (3.8 mL) was added, and the reaction was stirred for 1 h. Methyl iodide (0.13 mL, 2.2 mmol, 1.7 equiv.) was then added, and the reaction mixture was stirred overnight. The reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous NH₄Cl, extracted with ethyl acetate $(3 \times 5 \text{ mL})$, and washed with brine. The crude mixture was dried over MgSO4, filtered through a fritted funnel and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography $(2-5\%$ Et₂O in pentane) yielded each diastereomer pure, both as clear, colorless oils (85% combined yield).

2.19a (100 mg, 0.442 mmol, 35% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.5 (5% Et₂O in pentane); ¹**H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.98 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.79 (d, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.67 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.50– 7.42 (m, 3H), 4.23 (d, *J* = 3.3 Hz, 1H), 3.51 (s, 3H), 3.27 (dt, *J* = 17.6, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 3.03 (dt, *J* = 17.6, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.16–2.13 (m, 1H), 2.09–2.00 (m, 1H), 1.89–1.81 (m, 1H), 1.11 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 133.9, 133.2, 132.4, 132.2, 128.5, 127.6, 126.0, 125.9,

125.6, 123.7, 81.4, 57.9, 32.2, 25.5, 24.6, 15.8; **IR** (neat) 3049, 2927, 2817, 1457, 1088, 818 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES+) m / z calcd for $C_{16}H_{18}ONa$ [M + Na]⁺ 249.1255, found 249.1249.

2.19b (145 mg, 0.642 mmol, 50% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (5% Et₂O in pentane); ¹**H NMR** (400MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.96 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.79 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.50–7.44 (m, 3H), 4.21 (d, *J* = 6.3 Hz, 1H), 3.36 (s, 3H), 3.10 (t, *J* = 6.4 Hz, 2H), 2.24–2.15 (m, 2H), 1.70–1.67 (m, 1H), 1.06 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ 133.2, 133.01, 132.98, 132.2, 128.5, 127.1, 126.3, 126.0, 125.6, 123.5, 83.2, 55.2, 30.9, 26.7, 23.7, 17.3; **IR** (neat) 3052, 2926, 1508, 1456, 1083, 815 cm-1; **HRMS (TOF MS ES***+*) *m / z* calcd for $C_{16}H_{18}$ ONa [M + Na]⁺ 249.1255, found 249.1248.

2.5.5 Representative Mechanistic Experiments

2-(1,2-Dideuteropropyl)naphthalene (2.29a) and **(***E***)-2-(prop-1-en-1-yl-1-d)naphthalene** $(2.30a)$: In a glove box, a flame-dried 7mL vial was charged with Ni(acac)₂ (2.5 mg, 0.010 mmol, 0.050 equiv.), dppo (9.8 mg, 0.020 mmol, 0.10 equiv.), and ether **2.18a** (41.0 mg, 0.200 mmol, 1.00 equiv.). Toluene (1.5 mL) was then added. The reaction vessel was removed from the glove box and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min, then isopropylmagnesium iodide (0.25 mL, 1.7M, 0.41 mmol, 2.0 equiv.) was added. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 24 hours, quenched with methanol, then run down a silica plug (100% Et₂O as eluent). Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (100%) pentanes) yielded **2.29a** as an oil and **2.30a** as a white solid.

2.29a (18 mg, 0.095 mmol, 51% yield): **TLC Rf** = 0.6 (100% pentane); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.81–7.75 (m, 3H), 7.61 (s, 1H), 7.42 (ap quin, *J* = 7.5, 1.3 Hz, 2H), 7.33 (dd, *J* = 8.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 1 H), 1.71 (quin, $J = 7.4$ Hz, 1H), 0.96 (d, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 3H); ¹³C **NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 140.3, 133.8, 132.1, 127.8, 127.7, 127.6, 127.5, 126.5, 125.9, 125.1, 37.9 (t, *J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 24.1 (*J* = 19.4 Hz, 1C), 13.9; **IR** (neat) 3050, 2957, 2910, 2871, 1507 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₃H₁₂D₂ [M]⁺ 172.1221, found 172.1216.

2.30a (8.9 mg, 0.052 mmol, 26% yield): **m.p.** 40–42 °C; **TLC Rf** = 0.5 (100% pentane); ¹**H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.78–7.74 (m, 3H), 7.65 (s, 1H), 7.56 (dd, *J* = 8.6, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.45–7.38 (m, 2H), 6.36 (qt, *J* = 6.6, 2.2 Hz, 1H), 1.93 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 135.5, 133.9, 132.8, 131.0 (t, *J* = 23.1 Hz, 1C), 128.2, 128.0, 127.8, 126.24, 126.23, 125.5, 125.3, 123.6, 18.7; **IR** (thin film) 3052, 2906, 2847, 2225, 1596, 1507, 1445 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₁H₁₁D [M]⁺ 169.1002, found 169.1004.

2-Methyl-3,4-dihydrophenanthrene (2.41): In a glove box, a flame-dried 7 mL vial was charged with Ni(acac)₂ (2.6 mg, 0.010 mmol, 0.050 equiv.), dppo $(9.7 \text{ mg}, 0.020 \text{ mmol}, 0.10)$ equiv.), and **2.19a** (45.3 mg, 0.200 mmol, 1.00 equiv.). The reaction vessel was capped, removed from the glove box and kept under a nitrogen atmosphere. Toluene (1.5 mL) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min. Isopropylmagnesium iodide (0.23 mL, 1.7M, 0.40 mmol, 2.0 equiv.) was added then the reaction mixture was stirred for 48 h. The reaction was quenched with an excess of methanol and run through a silica plug $(100\%$ Et₂O). Analysis by ¹H NMR with an internal standard (PhTMS) revealed 62% yield of product. Purification by

silica-gel flash column chromatography provided a small amount of analytically pure material: **TLC Rf** = 0.4 (100% hexanes); **¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.00 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.64 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.47 (ap t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.37 (ap t, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.17 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 6.31 (s, 1H), 3.24 (t, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 2.40 (t, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 1.98 (s, 3H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 138.1, 132.9, 132.2, 131.5, 128.7, 128.4, 126.4, 126.0, 125.3, 124.6, 123.4, 123.3, 28.9, 23.5, 23.3; **IR** (thin film in CDCl3) 3047, 2960, 2920, 2828, 1434 cm⁻¹; **HRMS** (TOF MS CI+) m / z calcd for C₁₄H₁₅ [M + H]⁺ 195.1174, found 195.1080.

Chapter 3

Selective Synthesis of Either Enantiomer of an Anti Breast Cancer Agent from a Common Enantioenriched Intermediate

3.1. Introduction

Triarylmethanes are important targets owing to their application in materials 1 and medicinal chemistry (Figure 3.1).² In particular, the triarylmethane motif is found in anti-cancer lead compounds.^{2b} One such compound is anti breast cancer agent 3.1 .^{2bi} In 2006, (\pm) -3.1 was shown by Panda and co-workers to inhibit proliferation of the MCF-7 breast cancer cell line, with an in vitro IC₅₀ of 3.88 μM. In vivo, (\pm) -3.1 was shown to inhibit tumor growth and induce significant regression of mammary tumors in mice. Synthetic access to enantioenriched samples of triarylmethanes is critical for their evaluation as medicinal agents and in determining threedimensional structure-activity relationships.

Figure 3.1. Bioactive TriaryImethanes

 \overline{a}

¹ (a) Duxbury, D. F. *Chem. Rev.* **1993**, *93*, 381. (b) Shchepinov, M. S.; Korshun, V. A. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2003**, *32*, 170. (c) Xu, Y.-Q.; Lu, J.-M.; Li, N.-J.; Yan, F.; Xia, X.-W.; Xu, Q.-F. *Eur. Polym. J.* **2008**, *44*, 2404. (d) Herron, N.; Johansson, G. A.; Radu, N. S.; US Patent Application 2005/0187364A1, Aug 25, 2005.

² (a) For an overview of synthesis and medicinal properties of triarylmethanes, see: Mondal, F. S.; Panda, G. *RSC Adv.* **2014**, *4*, 28317. (b) Anti-cancer: (i) Shagufta; Srivastava, A. K.; Sharma, R.; Mishra, R.; Balapure, A. K.; Murthy, P. S. R.; Panda, G. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.* **2006**, *14*, 1497. (ii) Finer, J. T.; Chabala, J. C.; Lewis, E. US Patent Application 2004/0132830 A1, Jul 8, 2004. (iii) Palchaudhuri, R.; Nesterenko, V.; Hergenrother, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 10274. (c) Anti-tuberculosis: (i) Panda, G.; Parai, M. K.; Das, S. K.; Shagufta; Manish, S.; Chaturvedi, V.; Srivastava, A. K.; Manju, Y. S.; Gaikwad, A. N.; Sinha, S. *Eur. J. Med. Chem.* **2007**, *42*, 410. (ii) Parai, M. K.; Panda, G.; Chaturvedi, V.; Manju, Y. K.; Sinha, S. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **2008**, *18*, 289. (d) Antidiabetes: Ellsworth, B. A.; Ewing, W. R.; Jurica, E. U.S. Patent Application 2011/0082165 A1, Apr 7, 2011. (e) Anti-implantation: Srivastava, N.; Sangita; Ray, S.; Singh, M. M.; Dwivedi, A.; Kumar, A. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.* **2004**, *12*, 1011.

Traditional syntheses of triarylmethanes, including **3.1**, have relied on Friedel-Crafts reactions that lead to racemic products.^{3,4} To broaden substrate scope beyond electron-rich aromatic compounds, access alternative regioisomers, and achieve stereocontrol, new methods have been developed.^{5,6} Recent advances include methods that utilize chiral Brønsted acids and C $-H$ bond activation.⁷ Approaches that develop Suzuki and Kumada cross-coupling reactions have further increased access to enantioenriched triarylmethanes. Crudden and co-workers have demonstrated a palladium-catalyzed Suzuki reaction of enantioenriched boronic esters and aryl iodides.⁸ Our group has developed the umpolung approach in which benzylic ethers or esters are coupled with arylmetal reagents.⁹

The contributions of the Jarvo laboratory provide a strategy to prepare both enantiomers of a triarylmethane from a common enantiomer of an alcohol intermediate (Scheme 3.1). In 2012, our group reported a stereospecific nickel-catalyzed Kumada cross-coupling reaction that allows for the preparation of optically active triarylmethanes from enantioenriched benzylic ethers such as **3.3**. The reaction proceeds with inversion at the benzylic center. This Kumada

³ (a) Nair, V.; Thomas, S.; Mathew, S. C.; Abhilash, K. G. *Tetrahedron* **2006**, *62*, 6731. (b) Pratt, E. F.; Green, L. Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1953**, *75*, 275. (c) Muthyala, R; Katritzky, A. R.; Lan, X. *Dyes Pigm.* **1994**, *25*, 303.

⁴ For more recent advances in transition-metal catalyzed Friedel-Crafts reactions, see: (a) Lin, S.; Lu, X. *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, *72*, 9757. (b) Esquivias, J; Arrayás, R. G.; Carretero, J. C. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 629. (c) Iovel, I.; Mertins, K.; Kischel, J.; Zapf, A.; Beller, M. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 3913.

⁵ (a) Nambo, M.; Crudden, C. M. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 742. (b) Xia, Y.; Hu, F.; Liu, Z.; Qu, P.; Ge, R.; Ma, C.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, J. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*, 1784.

⁶ For cross-coupling strategies that provide racemic products, see: (a) Molander, G. A.; Elia, M. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **2006**, *71*, 9198. (b) Yu, J.-Y.; Kuwano, R. *Org. Lett*. **2008**, *10*, 973. (c) Tabuchi, S.; Hirano, K.; Satoh, T.; Miura, M. *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 5401.

⁷ (a) Sun, F.-L.; Zheng, X.-J.; Gu, Q.; He, Q.-L., You, S.-L. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, 47. (b) Zhuo, M.-H.; Jiang, Y.-J.; Fan, Y.-S.; Gao, Y.; Liu, S.; Zhang, S. *Org. Lett.* **2014**, *16*, 1096. (c) Saha, S.; Alamsetti, S. K.; Schneider, C. *Chem. Commun.* **2015**, *51*, 1461. (d) Shi, B.-F.; Maugel, N.; Zhang, Y.-H.; Yu, J.-Q. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 4882. (e) Li, Y.-Z.; Li, B.-J.; Lu, X.-Y.; Lin, S.; Shi, Z.-J. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 3817. (f) McGrew, G. I.; Temaismithi, J.; Carroll, P. J.; Walsh, P. J. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 5541. (g) Zhang, J.; Bellomo, A.; Creamer, A. D.; Dreher, S. D.; Walsh, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 13765. (h) Zhang, J.; Bellomo, A.; Trongsiriwat, N.; Jia, T.; Carroll, P. J.; Dreher, S. D.; Tudge, M. T.; Yin, H.; Robinson, J. R.; Schelter, E. J.;Walsh, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 6276. (i) Niwa, T.; Yorimitsu, H.; Oshima, K. *Org. Lett.* **2007**, *9*, 2373.

⁸ Matthew, S. C.; Glasspoole, B. W.; Eisenberger, P.; Crudden, C. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 5828.

⁹ (a) Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790. (b) Harris, M. R.; Hanna, L. E.; Greene, M. A.; Moore, C. E.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3303. (c) For a related transformation, see: Zhou, Q.; Srinivas, H. D.; Dasgupta, S.; Watson, M. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3307.

method was employed in an enantioselective synthesis of **3.1**. ¹⁰ In 2013 our group reported a nickel-catalyzed stereospecific Suzuki-Miyaura reaction of enantioenriched diaryl carbamates, such as 3.4 , with arylboronic esters.¹¹ In contrast to the Kumada protocol, the Suzuki reaction can proceed with retention of configuration at the benzylic center if tricyclohexylphosphine is used as ligand or inversion if SIMes is employed. Together, the Kumada and Suzuki reactions provide complementary methods to synthesize both enantiomers of **3.1** from the same enantiomer of alcohol **3.2**. Herein we report the synthesis of the opposite enantiomer of **3.1** via the Suzuki reaction. 12

Scheme 3.1. Strategies to Prepare Both Enantiomers of a TriaryImethane from a Common Enantioenriched Intermediate

3.2. Synthesis of a Bioactive Triarylmethane

 \overline{a}

The synthesis was carried out as described in Scheme 3.2. Enantioenriched alcohol **3.2** was prepared from commercially available boronic acid **3.6** and phenanthrene-9-carboxaldehyde **3.7** via an asymmetric arylation using chiral aziridine catalyst **3.8**. [9a](#page-114-0),13 Alcohol **3.2** is the common intermediate for both the Kumada and Suzuki protocols. The Kumada protocol requires

¹⁰ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

¹¹ Harris, M. R.; Hanna, L. E.; Greene, M. A.; Moore, C. E.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3303.

¹² This chapter will focus on content from the following publication: Johnson, A. G.; Tranquilli, M. M.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2015**, [online early access]. DOI: [10.1016/j.tetlet.2015.02.121.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tetlet.2015.02.121) Published Online: March 2, 2015. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040403915004141 (accessed May 4, 2015). ¹³ (a) Braga, A. L.; Paixão, M. W.; Westermann, B.; Schneider, P. H.; Wessjohann, L. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 2879. (b) Bolm, C.; Rudolph, J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 14850.

that the alcohol be converted into a methoxyethyl ether leaving group. The Suzuki reaction is more efficient if the alcohol is converted to an electron-withdrawing carbamate. The carbamate is installed by treatment of **3.2** with sodium hydride and 1-pyrrolidinecarbonyl chloride resulting in compound **3.4**.

With carbamate **3.4** in hand, we were poised to test the key step, the stereospecific Suzuki cross-coupling reaction. Subjection of **3.4** to Suzuki conditions with tricyclohexylphosphine as ligand led to the efficient formation of triarylmethane 3.5 in 93% yield and 88% ee (92% es).¹⁴ Importantly, analysis of the reaction product by chiral SFC chromatography and comparison to material obtained by the Kumada route confirmed that the Suzuki reaction proceeds with overall retention. To achieve the highest yield, **3.4** was recrystallized prior to the cross-coupling reaction, as residual alcohol **3.2** diminishes the yield in the Suzuki coupling. Interestingly, when PCy³ is replaced with SIMes, compound **3.4** provides low yields of the desired Suzuki product.¹⁵

 \overline{a}

¹⁴ es = enantiospecificity = (ee starting material)/(ee product) see, Denmark, S. E.; Vogler, T. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009***, 15,* 11737.

¹⁵ Although effective with many benzhydryl carbamates, subjection of carbamate **3.4** to cross-coupling conditions using a catalyst prepared in situ from Ni(cod)2 and SIMes resulted in only 10% yield of triarylmethane **3.5**. See reference 11.

Completion of the synthesis was achieved by introduction of the requisite side chain. In the penultimate step of the synthesis the MOM group was removed under acidic conditions to form phenol **3.10**. Finally, alkylation of the phenol by treatment with sodium hydride and 2 dimethylaminoethylchloride hydrochloride afforded target compound **3.1**. ¹⁶ This synthesis allowed for the preparation of **3.1** in 34% overall yield and 88% ee.

3.3. Conclusion

 $\overline{}$

In summary, either enantiomer of anti-cancer triarylmethane **3.1** can be synthesized using a complementary pair of nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions from a common enantiomer of a chiral alcohol intermediate. For the synthesis of anti-cancer agent **3.1**, when the Kumada protocol is followed, the reaction occurs with inversion at the benzylic stereogenic center. When the Suzuki protocol is followed, the reaction occurs with retention at the benzylic stereogenic center, providing the opposite enantiomer of **3.1**. These syntheses allow for efficient and selective preparation of either enantiomer of triarylmethanes for biological testing. With the exception of the alcohol protection and the subsequent nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling steps, both syntheses are identical and provide optically active **3.1** in five synthetic steps from commercially available starting materials.

¹⁶ McCague, R.; Leclercq, G.; Jordan, V. C. *J. Med. Chem.* **1988**, *31*, 1285.

3.4. Experimental Section

3.4.1. General Procedures

All reactions were carried out under an atmosphere of N_2 using glassware that was either ovenor flame-dried prior to use. Methanol (MeOH) was purchased commercially and used without further purification. *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF), tetrahydrofuran (THF), and toluene (PhMe) were degassed with argon and then passed through two 4 x 36 inch columns of anhydrous neutral A-2 alumina (8 x 14 mesh; LaRoche Chemicals; activated under a flow of argon at 350 ºC for 12 h) to remove H2O. All other solvents utilized were purchased anhydrous commercially, or purified as described (vide infra). ${}^{1}H$ NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker GN-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C), CRYO-500 (500 MHz ¹H, 125.7 MHz ¹³C) or DRX-400 (400 MHz ¹H, 100 MHz ¹³C) spectrometers. Proton chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to internal tetramethylsilane (TMS, δ 0.00). Data are reported as follows: chemical shift (multiplicity [singlet (s), broad singlet (br s), doublet (d), triplet (t), multiplet (m), apparent doublet (ap d), apparent triplet (ap t)], coupling constants [Hz], integration). Carbon chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to TMS with the respective solvent resonance as the internal standard (CDCl₃, δ 77.16 ppm). Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed using Silica Gel 60 F₂₅₄ pre-coated plates (0.25 mm thickness). Visualization was accomplished by irradiation with a UV lamp. Flash chromatography was performed using Silica Gel 60Å (170-400 mesh) from Fisher Scientific. Melting points (m.p.) were obtained using a Mel-Temp melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Infrared spectra were obtained on a Nicolet[™] iS™5 FT-IR spectrometer system and are reported in terms of frequency of absorption (cm^{-1}) . High resolution mass spectrometry was performed by the University of California, Irvine Mass Spectrometry Center. Optical rotations were measured with a Rudolph Research Analytical

Autopol IV Automatic Polarimeter or a Jasco P-1010 digital polarimeter. SFC determinations of enantiopurity were performed on a Berger Analytical instrument using a Daicel™ Chiralpak® column (AD-H; 100 bar, 50 °C, 254 nm).

(*S*)-α,α-diphenyl-1-(triphenylmethyl)-2-aziridinemethanol (**3.8**) was prepared according to a procedure described by Braga.¹⁷ p -[(Methoxymethyl)oxy]phenylboronic acid (3.6) was prepared from the corresponding methoxymethyl protected aryl bromide. ¹⁸ 2-(4- Methoxyphenyl)-5,5-dimethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborinane (**3.9**) was prepared from the corresponding boronic acid and 2,2-dimethylpropane-1,3-diol. ¹⁹ 4-Methoxymethoxybenzaldehyde was prepared from the corresponding 4-hydroxybenzaldehyde and chloromethyl methyl ether.²⁰ Ni(cod)₂ was purchased from Strem, stored in a glove box freezer (–20 °C) under an atmosphere of N2, and used as received. Tricyclohexylphosphine (PCy3) was purchased from Strem, stored in a glove box, and used as received. All other chemicals were purchased commercially and used as received.

3.4.2. Preparation and Characterization of Products

l

(4-(Methoxymethoxy)phenyl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methanol (3.2) was prepared according to a procedure reported by Jarvo modified from a procedure developed by Braga.²¹ A flame-dried

¹⁷ Braga, A. L.; Paixão, M. W.; Westermann, B.; Schneider, P. H.; Wessjohann, L. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 2879.

¹⁸ Choshi, T.; Yamada, S.; Sugino, E.; Kuwada, T.; Hibino, S. *J. Org. Chem.* **1995**, *60*, 5899.

¹⁹ Tivola, P. B.; Deagostino, A.; Prandi, C.; Venturello, P. *Org. Lett.* **2002**, *4*, 1275.

²⁰ Fruit, C.; Turck, A.; Plé, N.; Mojovic, L.; Quéguiner, G. *Tetrahedron* **2001**, *57*, 9435.

²¹ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

round bottom flask was charged with boronic acid **3.6** (717 mg, 3.94 mmol, 1.63 equiv.). Toluene (6.5 mL) was added, followed by a solution of Et_2Zn in PhMe (22.3 mL, 22.3 mmol 1.00 M, 9.20 equiv.). The reaction mixture was heated to 60 $^{\circ}$ C and allowed to stir for 12 hours, then cooled to room temperature. A solution of (*S*)-α,α-diphenyl-1-(triphenylmethyl)-2 aziridinemethanol (**3.8**) (113 mg, 0.240 mmol, 0.100 equiv.) in toluene (5 mL) was added and the reaction was stirred for 15 minutes. A solution of phenanthrene-9-carbaldehyde **3.7** (499 mg, 2.42 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) in toluene (4.8 mL) was added and the reaction was stirred for 14 hours at room temperature. The reaction was quenched with an excess of 1 M HCl. The crude mixture was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 30 \text{ mL})$, washed with brine, dried over Na₂SO₄, and purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (1% EtOAc/benzene) to afford the target compound as a white solid (820 mg, 2.38 mmol, 98% yield, 94% ee): **[α]23D** +79.1 (*c* 1.35, CHCl3). The product was recrystallized in a mixture of 20:1 Et₂O:H₂O to improve ee. After recrystallization, SFC analysis indicated 97% ee (689 mg, 2.00 mmol, 83% yield, 97% ee). Analytical data are consistent with literature values:^{22 **1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.73 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 8.67} (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 8.01 (s, 1H), 7.99 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.92 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 7.68–7.59 (m, 3H), 7.51 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 7.36 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.99 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.50 (d, *J* = 3.4 Hz, 1H), 5.14 (s, 2H), 3.45 (s, 3H), 2.31 (d, *J* = 3.8 Hz, 1H); **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 35% MeOH, 3.5 mL/min, 254 nm) indicated 97% ee: t_R (major) = 4.4 min, t_R (minor) = 6.2 min.

²² Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

*racemic-***(4-(Methoxymethoxy)phenyl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methanol (***rac***-3.2)** was prepared according to a procedure reported by Jarvo.²³ To a solution of 4-(methoxymethoxy)benzaldehyde **3.11** (1.66 g, 10.0 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) in THF (10 mL) was added 9-phenanthrenylmagnesium bromide 3.12 (12 mL, 12 mmol, 1.0 M in THF, 1.2 equiv.) at 0 °C. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 4 hours. Saturated aqueous NH4Cl was added, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc (3 x 20 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried over MgSO4, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction mixture was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (10–20% EtOAc/hexanes) to afford the title compound as a white solid (1.80 g, 5.23 mmol, 52% yield). Analytical data are consistent with the values listed above for compound **3.2**.

4-(Methoxymethoxy)phenyl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methyl pyrrolidine-1-carboxylate (3.4) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Ishihara and co-workers.²⁴ A flamedried round bottom flask was charged with NaH (86 mg, 3.6 mmol, 1.8 equiv.) and alcohol **3.2** (689 mg, 2.00 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) and cooled to 0 °C. DMF (3 mL) was added to the reaction vessel at 0 \degree C, and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 1 hour at 0 \degree C. 1-

l

²³ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

²⁴ Ishihara, K.; Kosugi, Y.; Umemura, S; Sakakura, A. *Org. Lett.* **2008**, *10*, 3191.

Pyrrolidinecarbonyl chloride (0.243 mL, 2.20 mmol, 1.10 equiv.) was then added. The reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 3 hours at room temperature and quenched with an excess of saturated aqueous NH4Cl. The crude mixture was extracted with EtOAc (4 x 5 mL), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine and dried over Na2SO4. Silica gel flash column chromatography (20% EtOAc/hexanes) followed by recrystallization from hexanes afforded the target compound as a white solid (604 mg, 1.37 mmol, 68% yield, 96% ee): $\mathbf{m}.\mathbf{p} = 54-57$ °C; **TLC R_f** = 0.5 (30% EtOAc in hexanes); ¹**H** NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.72 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 8.67 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 8.07 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.90–7.87 (m, 2H), 7.67–7.58 (m, 3H), 7.53– 7.50 (m, 2H), 7.35 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.97 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 5.14 (s, 2H), 3.56–3.40 (m, 7H), 1.92–1.83 (m, 4H); **¹³C NMR** (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 157.0, 154.4, 134.5, 133.9, 131.3, 131.0, 130.6, 129.9, 129.1, 129.0, 127.0, 126.8, 126.74, 126.70, 126.4, 125.5, 123.2, 122.6, 116.2, 94.5, 75.3, 56.2, 46.5, 46.0, 25.9, 25.1; **IR** (neat) 2951, 2876, 1696, 1409, 1509, 1078 cm-1; **HRMS** (TOF MS ES+) m/z calcd for C₂₈H₂₇NO₄Na [M + Na]⁺ 464.1838, found 464.1830; [α]²⁵D +52.9 $(c 5.00, CDCl₃)$; **SFC** analysis (AD-H 30% MeOH, 2.5 mL/min, 254 nm) indicated 96% ee: t_R $(major) = 7.8 \text{ min}, t_R (minor) = 8.7 \text{ min}.$

9-((4-(Methoxymethoxy)phenyl)(4-methoxyphenyl)methyl)phenanthrene (3.5) was prepared according to a modified procedure reported by Jarvo.²⁵ In a glove box, a 7 mL vial was charged with carbamate **3.4** (200 mg, 0.450 mmol, 1.00 equiv.), boronic ester **3.9** (266 mg, 1.21 mmol, 2.66 equiv.), and KO*t*-Bu (135 mg, 1.21 mmol, 2.66 equiv.). PCy3 as a solution in 1:1

²⁵ Harris, M. R.; Hanna, L. E.; Greene, M. A.; Moore, C. E.; Jarvo, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 3303.

THF:PhMe $(0.020 \text{ M}, 3.0 \text{ mL}, 0.060 \text{ mmol}, 0.13 \text{ equiv})$ was added followed by Ni $(\text{cod})_2$ as a solution in 1:1 THF:PhMe (0.010 M, 3.0 mL, 0.030 mmol, 0.070 equiv.). The reaction was then stirred for 24 h in the glove box. The reaction vessel was removed from the glove box, and the crude mixture was passed through a silica plug with $1:1$ Et₂O:hexanes. Silica gel flash column chromatography (100% benzene) afforded a mixture of desired product and boronic ester. A second flash column (100% benzene) afforded a pure sample of the target compound as a white solid (182 mg, 0.419 mmol, 93% yield, 88% ee). NMR data are consistent with the values previously reported by Jarvo:²⁶ **1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.72, (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 8.65 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 8.04 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 7.61 (t, *J* = 1.5 Hz, 2 H), 7.60–7.47 (m, 2H), 7.16 (s, 1H), 7.07 (apt d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 4H), 6.96 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.82 (d, *J* $= 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.15 (s, 1H), 5.15 (s, 2H), 3.78 (s, 3H) 3.48 (s, 3H); $[\alpha]^{23}$ D -3.3 (*c* 3.8, CHCl₃)²⁷; **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 10% MeOH, 3.5 mL/min, 254 nm) indicated 88% ee, 92% es: t_R (major) = 13.3 min, t_R (minor) = 14.0 min.

4-((4-Methoxyphenyl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methyl)phenol (3.10) was prepared according to a procedure reported by Jarvo.²⁸ To a solution of triarylmethane **3.5** (182 mg, 0.419 mmol, 1.00) equiv.) in DCM (12.1 mL) was added a solution of HCl in MeOH (2.00 M, 12.1 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight and then quenched with an excess of NaHCO₃. The crude

²⁶ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

 27 Optical rotation data are inconsistent with literature values (ref. 26). SFC data, however, are consistent with formation of the opposite enantiomer (vide infra).

²⁸ See reference 26.

mixture was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 30 \text{ mL})$, washed with brine, and dried over Na₂SO₄. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (30% EtOAc/hexanes) yielded the target compound as a white solid (160 mg, 0.410 mmol, 98% yield, 88% ee). NMR data are consistent with literature values:²⁹ **1H NMR** (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.72 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 8.65 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 8.03 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 7.63–7.57 (m, 2H), 7.54–7.46 (m, 2H), 7.15 (s, 1H), 7.06 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 7.02 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.83 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.75 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 2H), 6.14 (s, 1H), 4.65 (br s, 1H), 3.77 (s, 3H); $[\alpha]^{23}D - 2.6$ (*c* 1.5, CDCl₃)³⁰; **SFC** analysis (AD-H, 25% MeOH, 2.5 mL/min, 254 nm) indicated 88% ee: t_R (major) = 9.0 min, t_R (minor) = 11.0 min.

2-(4-((4-Methoxyphenyl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methyl)phenoxy)-*N***,***N***-dimethylethanamine (3.1)** was prepared according to a procedure reported by Jarvo, adapted from McCague.^{31,32} In a glove box, a flame dried round bottom flask was charged with NaH (129 mg, 5.38 mmol, 15.0 equiv.). The reaction vessel was removed from the box and phenol **3.10** (140 mg, 0.359 mmol, 1.00 equiv.) was added as a solution in DMF (7.0 mL). The reaction mixture was heated to 60 $^{\circ}$ C and stirred for 10 min. The reaction mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature before addition of 2-dimethylaminoethylchloride hydrochloride (211 mg, 1.47 mmol, 4.10 equiv.) as a slurry in DMF (7.0 mL; a large gauge needle is recommended to prevent clogging of the syringe).

 \overline{a}

²⁹ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

³⁰ Optical rotation data are inconsistent with literature values (ref. 29). SFC data, however, are consistent with formation of the opposite enantiomer (vide infra).

³¹ See reference 29.

³² McCague, R.; Leclercq, G.; Jordan, V. C. *J. Med. Chem.* **1988**, *31*, 1285.

The reaction mixture was again heated to 60 \degree C and stirred for 4 hours, at which time the mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature. The reaction was then quenched with an excess of isopropanol. The crude mixture was diluted with H_2O , and extracted with EtOAc (4 x 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine and dried over Na₂SO₄. Purification by silica gel flash column chromatography (3% Et₃N/EtOAc) yielded the target compound as an off-white solid (110 mg, 0.239 mmol, 67% yield). NMR data are consistent with reported values:³³ **1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.72 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 8.65 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 8.04 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.67 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 7.60 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 7.58–7.48 (m, 2H), 7.15 (s, 1H), 7.07–7.04 (m, 4H), 6.83 (apt t, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 4H), 6.14 (s, 1H), 4.04 (t, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 2H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 2.71 (t, $J = 5.8$ Hz, 2H), 2.32 (s, 6H); $\alpha l^{25}D - 0.06$ (*c* 8.83 CHCl₃).³⁴

³³ Taylor, B. L. H.; Harris, M. R.; Jarvo, E. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 7790.

³⁴ Optical rotation data are inconsistent with literature values (ref. 33). SFC data, however, are consistent with formation of the opposite enantiomer (vide infra).

APPENDEX A

¹H and ¹³C NMR Spectra

113

123

126

APPENDEX B

SFC Traces

AGJ-2_1655.DATA - HP1100 DAD Signal A

Total

100.00

119.4

23.3

100.000

Total

100.00 1235.9

 169.9

100.000

TNU

Total

100.00 1746.0

199.4 100.000

100.000

291.7

100.00

Total

