# Mechanistic Investigations and Development of Ni-Catalyzed CrossElectrophile Coupling Reactions 

Thesis by
Raymond F. Turro

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Pasadena, California

2023
(Defended May 22, 2023)

## Raymond Turro

ORCID: 0000-0001-9774-4556

All Rights Reserved

To my parents for unwavering support, Bridget for inspiration, and Larissa for compassion and strength.
I couldn't have made it without you.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful for all the opportunities and support that I have been given that has led to where I am today. It has been such a privilege to join the ranks of the brilliant minds of the scientists and engineers here at Caltech. I have gained so much from interacting with my peers and mentors here and it truly is a "special place" as many before me have said. I would not have made it to this point without all of the love and support I received during my time before Caltech and while I was here

I have to begin by thanking my advisor, Professor Sarah Reisman, for giving me the opportunity to research in her lab for my Ph.D. studies. My time under Sarah's guidance over these years has forged who I am as a scientist. I could not have asked for a more supportive, motivating, rigorous, and exciting environment to do my graduate studies. I'm not sure there would be another place where I could be aligning light sources for spectroelectrochemical detection of a key reaction intermediate with an exotic electronic structure one day, then scaling up material to scout out new routes in our synthesis the next. Sarah has shown compassion and kindness when it matters and has pushed me to achieve the best of my abilities. I am grateful to have worked for someone who puts so much into what she loves and is such a force for good in our field.

I would also like to thank the rest of my committee: Prof. Max Robb, Prof. Brian Stoltz and Prof. Theo Agapie, for their insight over the years and constructive feedback on my progress. As stressful as our meetings have been, they are such an opportunity for intellectual growth. You are all perfect role models for the scientist that I should be and have always been so respectful and facilitative during my journey. I would like to thank Max for being a great committee chair who has made each step of this degree feel
productive and treats me with a refreshing combination of kindness and professionalism. Theo has been a great committee member yet I think I will remember him more for his excellent teaching skills as I don't think I would have passed Ch112 with another professor or set of TAs. I would also like to specifically thank my committee member, and "academic grandfather", Brian for being a great second advisor to us in the Reisman lab and a friend outside of the lab. You are another great example of a compassionate researcher who is truly an expert in their field and always can offer a fresh perspective.

I have had the pleasure of working with many talented scientists over the years on the $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ floor of Schlinger. I need to start by acknowledging my amazing mentor, Dr. Julie L. H. Wahlman, for welcoming me into the lab and introducing me to graduate-level research. Although we only overlapped in the lab briefly, I learned so much about how to be a successful graduate student in terms of time management, data acquisition, and good scientific practices. I am truly lucky to have worked with Julie and I am relieved to know that you are training the next generation of scientists at Cal State Long Beach. I would also like to acknowledge all of the previous work done by Julie and the rest of Team Nickel Dr. Kelsey Poremba, Dr. Caitlin Lacker, Dr. Alex Shimozono, and Dr. Travis DeLano who dedicated time with me to ensure their knowledge and skills survived in the lab after they left.

I would also like to acknowledge my other senior student mentor in the group, and close friend, Dr. Nicholas Fastuca. Over the years in Pasadena, I had so many positive experiences with him in and out of the lab. He eventually recruited me onto his new synthesis project and taught me about the practical aspects of total synthesis research. When we weren't making natural products in the lab, we were making them in my
apartment as we learned how to brew beer together. Many of these experiences kept me grounded and gave me much needed perspective during my time in graduate school. It also helps that Nick was a part of a wonderful class with Dr. Catilin Lacker and Dr. Skyler Mendoza who were also great friends (and cat sitters) to me. The three of you really lead by example by gave so much of yourselves to the lab and the people in it over the years. The lab has never really been the same without you all.

Another star Reisman class that made a huge impression on me was the year ahead of me consisting: Dr. Mike Maser, Dr. Alex Shimozono, Dr. Travis DeLano, and Dr. Karli Holman. All of these people were model senior lab members when I joined and made us all feel welcomed and wanted. Alex not only played a big role in recruiting me to the Reisman lab but also went above and beyond in supporting me early on. I look forward to our continued friendships into the future, especially with my future neighbors, Karli and Travis, in Boston.

I was fortunate enough to have many great project partners and collaborators over the years. These people were essential intellectual collaborators and spent the time to teach me so much about different aspects of organic, physical, or analytical chemistry. In particular, my partner in Ni , Jaron Tong has been an invaluable asset to my degree and a great friend. I truly would have been lost if it weren't for Jaron's intelligence and patience as a collaborator and was thrilled when he joined our lab. I also was lucky enough to work on a project with Dr. Marco Brandstätter whose creativity, attention to detail, and laboratory skills was such an inspiration. I also worked on projects with Emily Chen and Nathan Friede in our lab and collaborated with Dr. Brendon McNicholas, Dr. Daniel Bim, and Professor Ryan Hadt. While not an official project partner I have to also thank Dr.

David Hill for his mentorship, friendship, and help with analytical techniques I never thought I would be doing. I learned so much from these people and developed so many skills I never thought I would pick up in graduate school which I am truly grateful.

I was joined by two very talented post-docs on the total synthesis project Dr. Sven Richter and Dr. Philip Böhm. Both of them came to the lab with excellent experimental skills in method development which they were both quickly able to translate to progress on our synthesis. It's always a pleasure to sit down with them as a team and brainstorm new ideas. I was also joined by a very impressive and ambitious Caltech undergraduate student, Tessa Pierce, who joined our group as an FSRI student before her freshman year. Despite having no college-level chemistry background she tackled a summer of organic chemistry research and signed up to continue to work on total synthesis throughout her Freshman year into that summer. It was a pleasure working with a beginning scientist like Tessa and I can't wait to see what she does after Caltech.

I have really felt like I was a part of a community these last 5 years (COVID aside) working on the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor of Schlinger. Working so close to the Stoltz lab has allowed me to make some important connections with them over the years in particular: Zack Sercel, Alexia Kim, Tyler Casselman, Ali Stanko, Dr. Eric Welin, Dr. Nick Hafeman, Dr. Eric Alexy, Dr. Chris Reimann (go Yankees!), and especially Alex Cusumano. Whether it was in the classroom or playing ping-pong I gained a lot from overlapping with these amazing scientists. I could say the same to the friends I've made beyond the $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ floor including: Dr. Brooke Versaw, Anna Overholts, May Zeng, Chloe Williams, and Sepand Nistanki.

I didn't have to leave the lab to forge great friendships over the years with Reisman lab members. I am incredibly grateful to have had such tight-knit class of students to join
the group with me. Dr. Yujia Tao, Dr. Sara Dibrell, and Jeff Kerkovius are all incredibly hard-working and intelligent scientists who have never stopped making me feel humble. I have to credit a lot of my education over the last few years by just working in proximity to such ambitious and intelligent people. I can't wait to see what we all do from here.

It is very safe to say that I would not be a scientist if it were not for my undergraduate institution, Juniata College, and the stellar Chemistry \& Biochemistry Department. I got to learn amongst an amazing class of students including: James McGettigan, Kevin Schofield, Sam Gary, Andrew Guide, Margret Vos, and Larissa Bubb who all made college as fun as it was educational. In particular James McGettigan was truly a great friend who toughed out so many difficult classes and assignments with me. I was a part of the last class at Juniata to take part in the "organic first" experiment where all (STEM) students take organic chemistry as the introductory chemistry course. It was here that a science class actually clicked for me and I realized that this "boogeyman" of a subject was perfect for someone like me. This spark of passion was truly nurtured in the chemistry department by the best teachers I have ever had. The amount of work that professors like Dr. William Ames, Dr. Richard Hark, Dr. Dan Dries, Dr. Ursula Williams, Dr. Sharon Yohn, Dr. Peter Baran, Dr. Alec Brown, and Dr. John Unger put into teaching students and introducing them to research felt truly unique.

I could probably write a page to each of those people but I have explicitly thank my advisor Dr. John Unger. John is a great teacher who always kept are attention like when he brought the president of Juniata into class to drink enough scotch that blowing on some Jones reagent would cause it to change color. He is also a great research advisor who was always encouraging and willing to get in the lab to show you a new technique or decode a
mysterious piece of data. All of the encouragement he gave me to go to conferences, take up leadership roles in the department, get summer internships, etc... played a huge role in my development as a chemist to get me where I am today.

When I was not doing research at Juniata, was in Dallas working with an incredible set of researchers that taught me a lot about the field and what graduate school was like. In particular I really enjoyed working with and learning from Dr. Aaron Nash, Dr. Chris Sleet, Dr. Vaishnavi Nair, Dr. Mohammed Sharique, Dr. Bin Xu, and Dr. Madhu Manna. Others in the group, like Dr. Liela Bayeh-Romero and Dr. Jackson Gartman, went above and beyond with mentoring me in not only how to be successful in the lab but also taught me important lessons that prepared me for graduate school. Of course I need to thank Dr. Uttam Tambar who I can probably credit for most of the opportunities I have been afforded on my path to a career in research. It was during that first summer in Uttam's group that I knew I wanted to get a Ph.D. in organic chemistry. Even though I was in undergrad he spent so much time talking to me about chemistry and introducing me to advanced topics as well as showing me how to do basic lab techniques like column chromatography and pTLC. Even now as I look back, I think I am still riding the enthusiasm he instilled in me to the end of this degree.

None of my research would have been possible without the amazing support staff and facilities we have access to at Caltech. Most importantly, I have to thank Dr. Scott Virgil who never hesitates to help you solve a problem, develop an assay, or purify the impossible. Beyond all he does for us in the lab I will miss his and Silva's wonderful Christmas parties as they really made me feel like I was at a home away from home. I would also like to thank the instrumentation staff: Dr. David VanderVelde, Dr. Mona

Shahgholi, Dr. Paul Oyala, Dr. Nathan Dalleska, and Dr. Jay Winkler.
I have to thank those who are closest to me for helping me get to Caltech as much as they helped me get through it. My younger sister Bridget is such an inspiration to me and a joy in my life. Despite all of the adversity she faces, she always perseveres and laughs while doing it. She truly keeps me grounded and I am happy we have become so close even though I have been living across the country. Her and I have always found relentless support from our parents, whose love fuels us to keep moving. They have been great role models teaching me to be compassionate towards others and do the right thing. Throughout my life they have also been there to listen and provide support even if I didn't want it at the time or know what was best for me. I hope I have reflected the values they instilled in me while I was at Caltech and continue to do so with my own family.

I have to thank the Bubbs/Hackenbergs as well who have welcomed me into their family with open arms. I fondly look back at all the visits or vacations we took with Mike and Tammy over the years. Whether it is playing board games, fishing, horse-riding, or a raucous Hackenberg family gathering, you all really feel like family. You were also able to make Pasadena feel more like home by visiting during Thanksgiving and other important life events. I admire all your hard-work and ambition and will carry that with me as I start my new life.

Most importantly, I have to thank the most impactful person in my life, Larissa. Without of the support, love, and companionship over the last eight years this book would end right here. I could not have asked for a better partner to take on this monumental task while you achieve so much on your own. She took a big chance on me to move across the country and stick out the madness of graduate school and now we leave as a married couple
with a bright future. I am proud to be your partner and will never forget all you have done for me. I cannot wait to start our new life together in Cambridge and begin a new chapter of our story.


#### Abstract

Transition metal-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions have proven to be a powerful technology for the modular construction of carbon-carbon and carbon-heteroatom bonds over the last half century. More recently, reductive cross-coupling catalyzed by nickel has emerged as a complementary synthetic approach that couples electrophilic fragments and is rendered catalytic by the inclusion of a terminal reductant. These reactions are advantageous because the use electrophiles as coupling partners which display greater stability, functional group tolerance, and commercial availability over the corresponding nucleophilic coupling partners. Additionally, Ni catalysts are less prone to $\beta$-hydride elimination compared to later transition metals which enables $C\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ couplings. The challenge with using coupling partners of the same polarity is developing a catalyst that can activate each electrophile in a mechanistically distinct way in order to get high levels off cross-selectivity, over statistical mixtures of cross- and homocoupled products.

Herein, we describe a mechanistic investigation on Ni-catalyzed cross-electrophile couplings developed in our lab; specifically, the asymmetric reductive alkenylation of N hydroxyphthalimide (NHP) esters and benzylic chlorides. Investigations of the redox properties of the Ni-bis(oxazoline) catalyst, the reaction kinetics, and mode of electrophile activation show divergent mechanisms for these two related transformations. Notably, the mechanism of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ activation changes from a Ni-mediated process when benzyl chlorides and $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ are used to a reductant-mediated process that is gated by a Lewis acid when NHP esters and tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene is used. Kinetic experiments show that changing the identity of the Lewis acid can be used to tune the rate of NHP ester reduction. Spectroscopic studies support a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$-alkenyl oxidative addition complex as the


catalyst resting state. DFT calculations suggest an enantiodetermining radical capture step and elucidate the origin of enantioinduction for this Ni-BOX catalyst.

Efforts to expand the scope of coupling partners in XEC reactions to include novel classes of electrophiles, such as $N$-alkyl imines, are also described. The preparation of heterobenzylic amines by a Ni-catalyzed reductive cross-coupling between heteroaryl imines and $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophiles is reported. This umpolung-type alkylation proceeds under mild conditions, avoids the pre-generation of organometallic reagents, and exhibits good functional group tolerance. Mechanistic studies are consistent with the imine substrate acting as a redox-active ligand upon coordination to a low-valent Ni center. The resulting bis(2-imino)heterocycle $\cdot \mathrm{Ni}$ complexes can engage in alkylation reactions with a variety of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophiles, giving heterobenzylic amine products in good yields.
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| mol \% | mole percent |
| Ms | methanesulfonyl (mesyl) |
| MS | molecular sieves |
| MsCl | methanesulfonyl chloride |
| MSD | mass selective detector |
| ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}$ | nitrogen-14 isotope |
| n | number |
| $v$ | scan rate |
| $n-\mathrm{Bu}$ | norm-butyl |
| $n-\mathrm{BuLi}$ | norm-butyl lithium |
| n -Hex | norm-hexyl |
| $n-\operatorname{Pr}$ | norm-propyl |
| NaOTf | sodium triflate |
| NBS | N -bromosuccinimide |
| Nf | perfluorobutanesulfonyl |
| NHP | N -hydroxyphthalimide |
| NIR | near infrared |
| nm | nanometer(s) |
| NMP | N -methyl pyrrolidinone |
| NMR | nuclear magnetic resonance |
| Nuc ${ }^{-}$ | nucleophile |
| $o$ | ortho |
| ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ | phosphorus-31 isotope |
| $p$ | para |
| $p-\mathrm{TsOH}$ | para-toluenesulfonic acid |
| Pc | phthalocyanine |
| PDT | product |
| pH | hydrogen ion concentration in aqueous solution |
| Ph | phenyl |
| phen | 1,10-phenanthroline |
| PhH | benzene |
| PhMe | toluene |
| PHOX | phosphinooxaozoline |
| Phth | phthalimide |


| Pin | pinacol |
| :--- | :--- |
| pm | picometer(s) |
| PMP | para-methoxyphenyl |
| ppm | parts per million |
| Pr | propyl |
| psi | pounds per square inch |
| Py | pyridine |
| PyBOX | pyridine bis(oxazoline) |
| pyr | pyridine |
| q | quartet |
| quant. | quantitative |
| R | generic (alkyl) group |
| $R$ | rectus (right) |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | coefficient of determination |
| RCC | reductive cross-coupling |
| ref | reference |
| RVC | reticulated vitreous carbon foam |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{F}}$ | pefluorinated alkyl |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | retention factor |
| RF | response factor |
| RPKA | reaction progress kinetic analysis |
| rpm | tert-butyl lithium |
| rr | revolutions per minute |
| RS | regioisomeric ratio |
| rt | Randles-Sevcik |
| $\sigma$ | rom |


| taut. | tautomerize |
| :---: | :---: |
| TBA | tetra-n-butylammonium |
| TBABr | tetra- $n$-butylammonium bromide |
| TBACl | tetra- $n$-butylammonium chloride |
| TBAF | tetra- $n$-butylammonium fluoride |
| TBAI | tetra-n-butylammonium iodide |
| TBAX | tetra-n-butylammonium salt |
| TBDPS | tert-butyldiphenylsilyl |
| TBDPSCl | tert-butyldiphenylsilyl chloride |
| TBS | tert-butyldimethylsilyl |
| TBSCl | tert-butyldimethylsilyl chloride |
| TDAE | tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene |
| TD-DFT | time-dependent density functional theory |
| TEA | triethylamine |
| temp | temperature |
| TEMPO | 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine 1-oxyl |
| TEOA | triethanolamine |
| TES | triethylsilyl |
| Tf | trifluoromethanesulfonyl |
| $\mathrm{Tf}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride |
| TFA | trifluoroacetic acid |
| THF | tetrahydrofuran |
| TIPS | triisopropylsilyl |
| TLC | thin layer chromatography |
| TMEDA | $N, N, N^{\prime}, N^{\prime}$-tetramethylethylenediamine |
| TMHD | 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione |
| TMS | trimethylsilyl |
| TMSBr | trimethylsilyl bromide |
| TMSCl | trimethylsilyl chloride |
| TMSOTf | trimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate |
| TOF | time-of-flight |
| Tol | tolyl |
| terpy | 2,2';6',2"-terpyridine |
| $t_{\text {R }}$ | retention time |
| trans | on the opposite side |
| TS | transition state |
| Ts | para-toluenesulfonyl (tosyl) |


| TTF | tetrathiafulvalene |
| :--- | :--- |
| UV | ultraviolet |
| V | volt(s) |
| vide infra | see below |
| vide supra | see above |
| V max | maximum rate |
| vs. | versus |
| VTNA | Variable Time Normalization Analysis |
| W | watt(s) |
| w/ | with |
| wt\% | weight percent |
| X | anionic ligand or halide or chiral auxillary |
| XAT | x-atom abstraction |
| XC | cross-coupled |
| XEC | cross-electrophile coupling |
| X major | fraction of mixture as major enantiomer |
| X minor $^{Z}$ | fraction of mixture as minor enantiomer |
| $Z$ | cis (zusammen) olefin geometry |

## Chapter 1

# Mechanistically-Guided Strategies for Developing Selective Ni- <br> Catalyzed Cross-Electrophile Couplings 

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Transition metal-catalyzed cross-coupling reactions have proven to be one of the most powerful developments in synthetic chemistry over the last few decades. This technology has enabled the efficient and selective formation of carbon-carbon and carbon-heteroatom bonds with applications ranging from bioactive pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals, to materials science, as well as electronics. ${ }^{1}$ More recently, cross-electrophile coupling (XEC) reactions have emerged as a complementary method to couple electrophilic fragments. These electrophilic fragments, usually organic halides, make up a class of compounds that are abundant from commercial sources or can be readily synthesized; making them an attractive alternative to organometallic nucleophiles used in traditional, redox-neutral, cross-coupling reactions which are less stable and less tolerant of functional
groups. In the context of cross-coupling, electrophiles are substrates that undergo C-X activation through a reductive mechanism such as oxidative addition or single-electron reduction. As a consequence of using two electrophiles, a stoichiometric reductant is needed in order to render the process catalytic. ${ }^{2}$

Figure 1.1. Comparison of Ni and Pd as catalysts in cross-coupling reactions.


Nickel has proven to be an effective transition-metal catalyst for XEC reactions. This is due to the favorable properties of the metal in terms of reactivity, cost, and sustainability relative to $2^{\text {nd }}$ or $3^{\text {rd }}$ row transition metals popular in traditional cross-couplings. Ni has accessible odd-electron oxidation states $\left(\mathrm{Ni}^{0 / / I I / I I I / V}\right)$ meaning it can engage in either one or two-electron elementary steps with a substrate. Compared to $\operatorname{Pd}\left(\mathrm{Pd}^{0 / I I}, \mathrm{E}^{0}=0.95 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs. SHE), there is a greater driving force for oxidation of $\mathrm{Ni}\left(\mathrm{Ni}^{0 / I I}, \mathrm{E}^{0}=-0.26 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs. SHE $)$ making substrate reduction reactions, like oxidative addition, facile. Additionally, intermediate Ni -alkyl complexes are less prone to $\beta$-hydride elimination making Ni
amenable to $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ couplings. ${ }^{3}$ The intrinsic reactivity of Ni makes it attractive for XEC reactions as it can activate substrates through a variety of mechanisms; however, its promiscuity can make the design of a general and selective catalyst challenging (Figure 1.1). ${ }^{4}$

Figure 1.2. General scheme for Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions.


The challenge that arises from using two electrophilic coupling partners (1 and 2) is achieving high levels of cross-selectivity over statistical mixtures of cross- (3) and homocoupled (4-5) products. A cross-selective reaction is achieved by using a catalyst system that activates each electrophile through a distinct mechanism, such that the activation of $\mathbf{1}$ then $\mathbf{2}$ can outcompete sequential activation of two equivalents of $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{2}$ (Figure 1.2). ${ }^{5}$ This poses a challenge when designing or optimizing XEC reactions due to the ambiguity in how modifying reaction parameters influences the relative rates of electrophile activation (e.g., how electronic perturbations on a ligand may impact the reduction of one coupling partner over the other). Over the last decade of research on XEC reactions, several mechanistically-guided strategies have emerged to achieve remarkable selectivity, enabling exceptionally mild methods for modular construction of strategic bonds.

### 1.2 Background and Scope

### 1.2.1 Evolution of Selective Ni-Catalyzed XEC

Scheme 1.1. Early examples of reductive couplings using Ni.
(

Early investigations of Ni in reductive coupling reactions were performed by Semmelhack and coworkers through the 1970-1980s. These examples utilized stoichiometric $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ complexes and were limited to homocoupling of reactive aryl halides $\mathbf{6}$
but demonstrated functional group tolerance (7) not seen with traditional couplings that employ organometallic coupling partners (Scheme 1.1a). ${ }^{6,7,8}$ Following these early reports, Kumada and coworkers in the late 1970s demonstrated that aryl bromide homocoupling could be made catalytic in Ni when $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ is used as a stoichiometric reductant. Kumada also observes a significant rate acceleration upon the inclusion of KI as an additive enabling the reaction to proceed at room temperature to give $\mathbf{8}$ in $85 \%$ yield (Scheme 1.1 b ). ${ }^{9}$ It was not until 1986 that Périchon and coworkers observed the first cross-coupled products in an electroreductive coupling using aryl bromides ( $\mathbf{9}$ and 10) with similar reactivity, albeit as a statistical mixture of cross- (11) and homocoupled (8 and 12) products. ${ }^{10}$ Subsequent reports showed the distribution of products (15-17) could be perturbed as a function of varying steric and electronic properties of an aryl halide coupling partner $\mathbf{1 3}$ when the other coupling partner was an ortho-substituted aryl halide $\mathbf{1 4}$ (Scheme 1.1c). ${ }^{11}$

Scheme 1.2. Early example of Ni-catalyzed XEC and proposed mechanism.


Shortly after their initial report, Périchon and coworkers attained greater crossselectivity in an electroreductive coupling with electrophiles of different hybridization, in this case, $\alpha$-bromoesters 18 and aryl halides produced high yields of $\alpha$-arylated products
19. ${ }^{12}$ Subsequent electroanalytical experiments suggest that the origin of selectivity in this case is due to a change in the relative rates of electrophile activation at different oxidation states of Ni where a $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ complex 20 preferentially reacts with aryl halides and the subsequent nickelate complex $\mathbf{2 1}$ would react with $\mathbf{1 8}$ (Scheme 1.2). ${ }^{13}$ These studies in the 1980s and 1990s laid the foundation for how the field would come to think about XEC reactions going forward. Although redox-neutral cross-couplings dominated the literature in the 1990s and 2000s, reductive couplings would undergo a renaissance in the early 2010s that continues to this day.

### 1.2.2 Proposed Mechanisms of Substrate Activation by Ni in XEC

Mechanistic studies on the oxidative addition of reduced Ni complexes into $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ bonds constitute an ongoing area of research that predates Ni-catalyzed XEC. It is evident that there are numerous pathways that could be operative for a given combination of substrates, ligand environment, and reductant. ${ }^{3}$ The evidence and origin of these mechanistic nuances are beyond the scope of this review and unnecessary as a guiding principle in reaction optimization. Instead, we will focus on a practical overview of general mechanisms that have been proposed for $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ and $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile activation in XEC reactions.

The mechanisms of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{X}$ oxidative addition with Ni have been proposed to proceed through both one- and two-electron mechanisms. These reactions have been studied extensively for aryl $\mathbf{2 2}$ electrophiles but are underexplored for the corresponding alkenyl 23 or acyl 24 electrophiles. In the context of catalytic couplings as well as stoichiometric reactions, oxidative addition with aryl halides have been proposed from both $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} .}$. ${ }^{1,16,43,15}$ Proposed $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ activation mechanisms can be summarized as either a
concerted oxidative addition ${ }^{16,17,43}$, polar $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{Ar},{ }^{18}$ or a stepwise $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{RN}} 1{ }^{19}$ mechanism (Figure 1.3a).

Figure 1.3. Mechanisms of oxidative addition into $C\left(s p^{2}\right)-X$ bonds.


Reactions involving oxidative addition from a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ complex (26) yield a high-valent $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Ar}$ (27) via a radical or two-electron mechanism (Figure 1.3a). This electron-poor intermediate 27 will undergo subsequent reduction reactions by either comproportionation with another equivalent of $\mathbf{2 6}$ or by single electron transfer (SET) from the terminal reductant to give $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$ (28). ${ }^{20,101}$ Alternatively, oxidative addition from $\mathrm{Ni}^{0} \mathbf{2 5}$ would directly furnish complex 28. Deleterious $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ homocoupling reactions have been proposed to occur from disproportionation of $\mathbf{2 8}$ to $\mathbf{3 0}$ followed by reductive elimination. ${ }^{21}$

Subsequent reduction of oxidative addition complex $\mathbf{2 8}$ to a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}-\mathrm{Ar} \mathbf{2 9}$ has been proposed in Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions, and is a key step in sequential activation mechanisms (vide infra). ${ }^{3,22}$ Alternatively, 29 can undergo a second oxidative addition of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{X}$ and furnish $\mathrm{Ni}^{\text {III }}$ species $\mathbf{3 1}$ which can undergo reductive elimination to give biaryl product $\mathbf{3 2}$ (Figure 1.3b).

Figure 1.4. Mechanisms of oxidative addition into $C\left(s p^{3}\right)-X$ bonds.
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The oxidative addition of Ni into $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophiles can proceed through several mechanisms depending on the substitution on C , identity of the coupling handle, and ligand environment of the Ni catalyst. This includes two-electron reactions that proceed through an $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ mechanism to displace the leaving group to forge a $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{C}$ bond. ${ }^{23}$ This polar mechanism is favored for oxygen-based electrophiles, primary electrophiles, or $\mathrm{Ni}-$ phosphine/NHC catalysts. ${ }^{24}$ Radical mechanisms have been proposed for various alkyl halide and redox-active coupling handles that proceed through an inner-sphere X -atom transfer (XAT) $)^{25,26,27,28}$ or by an outer-sphere $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{RN}} 1$ process. ${ }^{29,30,31,32}$ These proceed through
an alkyl radical intermediate $\mathbf{3 3}$ that either rapidly recombines or will escape the solvent cage to be intercepted by another Ni complex (Figure 1.4). In this review, cases will also be discussed where the $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ bond is formed by capture of a free radical that was generated through a non-Ni mediated process, ${ }^{69,33,34,118,83}$ or by transmetalation of an in situ generated organometallic species. ${ }^{35}$

### 1.2.3 Mechanistic Models of Ni-Catalyzed XEC Reactions

From studies on Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions, several mechanistic frameworks have emerged that can be used to rationalize reactivity during reaction development. Here, we will define two general categories that encompass proposed mechanisms of Ni-catalyzed XEC: 1) sequential activation ${ }^{36}$ and 2) parallel activation. ${ }^{37}$ Practically, these models are not always distinguishable without extensive mechanistic studies as the difference can come down to accessibility of certain oxidation states for the Ni catalyst, or whether the reduction of a given catalytic intermediate is kinetically feasible. ${ }^{38}$ These models can be useful for honing in on challenging processes in a XEC that are responsible for their poor performance such that hypothesis-driven modifications to the reaction conditions can be made in subsequent optimization experiments.

In a $\mathrm{Ni}^{1 / I I I}$ sequential activation mechanism, a reduced Ni catalyst (26) is proposed to activate the more reactive electrophile $\mathbf{1}$ via oxidative addition to give $\mathbf{3 4}$. This high-valent intermediate $\mathbf{3 4}$ is then reduced to $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}(\mathbf{3 6})$ by the terminal reductant which can react with the other electrophile 2 via oxidative addition. The resulting $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}$ (37) can then undergo reductive elimination to regenerate $\mathbf{2 6}$ and furnish product $\mathbf{3}$ (Figure 1.5a). For this to be cross-selective, the oxidative addition of $\mathbf{1}$ by $\mathbf{2 6}$ must outcompete pathways leading to
homocoupling that can arise from $\mathbf{2 6}$ reacting with $\mathbf{2}$ or $\mathbf{3 6}$ reacting with $\mathbf{1}$. The preference for $\mathbf{2 6}$ reacting with $\mathbf{1}$ over $\mathbf{2}$ has been attributed to matching of the steric and electronic properties of reduced Ni intermediates $\mathbf{2 6}$ and $\mathbf{3 6}$ modulating their respective reactivities towards oxidative addition of either $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{2}$ (Figure 1.5b). ${ }^{3,27,39}$

Figure 1.5. Sequential activation mechanism.


In a $\mathrm{Ni}^{1 / I I I}$ parallel activation mechanism, a reduced Ni catalyst (26) will react with electrophile $\mathbf{1}$ to give $\mathbf{3 4}$ which is followed by reduction to $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathbf{3 5}$. This intermediate $\mathbf{3 5}$ then intercepts the activated form of the other electrophile $\mathbf{4 0}(\mathrm{Y}=$ radical or metal $)$, to forge the second $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{C}$ bond and give 37 . This $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}} 37$ can then undergo reductive elimination to give 26 and cross-coupled product 3. In versions of this mechanism where 26 acts as chain carrying radical, 26 then goes on to activate electrophile 2 followed by reduction of $\mathbf{4 1}$ to turn over the catalyst. This can also be thought of as two parallel catalytic cycles where one Ni catalyst 26 activates one electrophile and another catalyst (possibly
26) can activate the other electrophile. In either case, the origin of cross-selectivity can be explained by comparable rates of converting electrophiles $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ to their corresponding activated intermediates $\mathbf{3 5}$ and $\mathbf{4 0}$ in combination with slow homocoupling of the activated intermediate $\mathbf{3 5}$ derived from the more reactive electrophile (Figure 1.6). This framework is analogous to the persistent radical effect ${ }^{40}$ and the terminology has been extended to cross-coupling as the persistent metal effect (PME). ${ }^{41}$

Figure 1.6. Parallel activation mechanism.


These models can be used to interpret the reaction outcomes in a Ni-catalyzed XEC optimization. No different from any other optimization, the conversion of the starting materials and their distribution among potential products is the experimental output for every input set of conditions. Specifically, the electrophile conversion as a ratio of desired cross-coupled to undesired homocoupled or decomposed products can be informative of the relative rates electrophile activation. For example, if a set of conditions results in significant conversion of one electrophile $\mathbf{A}$ to homocoupled $\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{A}$ with poor conversion of the other electrophile $\mathbf{B}$ then this may indicate that $\mathbf{A}$ activation needs to be slowed or $\mathbf{B}$
activation needs to be accelerated (Figure 1.7a).
Figure 1.7. Ni-catalyzed XEC principles of cross-selectivity relevant to optimization.


The output obtained from typical optimization by screening (i.e., the yield/ee/dr at the end of the reaction) may not be sufficiently representative of relative rates and obtaining temporal conversion data may be necessary. For example, if it is found that both electrophiles ( $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ ) convert to their corresponding homocoupled products ( $\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{A}$ and
$\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}$, respectively) at the end of the reaction then it is not clear which one is activated faster as one could be completely consumed before the other starts converting. This can be investigated by monitoring the electrophile conversion over time to gauge the relative activation rates. Reaction monitoring like this is certainly more resource intensive and may not be feasible for every set of conditions tested, but can be informative for calibrating optimization efforts and generating mechanistic hypotheses (Figure 1.7b).

### 1.2.4 General Strategies for Cross-Selective XEC Reactions

In this review we will attempt to formalize general classes of strategies that researchers have employed to achieve selectivity in Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions. Specifically, these methods utilize a mechanistic hypothesis regarding the rate of electrophile activation in order to increase yields of cross-coupled products. This notably does not include the wellestablished, and still frequently employed, strategy of using a large excess of one coupling partner to get high yields of cross-coupled product. This strategy is undoubtedly effective but typically results in concomitant formation of undesired homocoupled products, limiting the efficiency of these transformations. For this reason, examples that use greater than 2fold excess of one coupling partner are not considered successful examples of crossselective XECs in this review.

Given the explosion in XEC literature that has evolved after Weix initially formalized XEC optimization strategies in $2014,{ }^{5}$ the community's understanding of how these reactions work has grown with the field. The principles that dictate how a given combination of substrates may perform in an XEC still hold true but recent advances have given synthetic chemists more options to modulate substrate reactivity in order to improve
cross-selectivity. These strategies will be classified as: 1) electrophilic coupling-handle modifications, 2) Ni-catalyst or co-catalyst design, 3) reductant or external driving force control (Figure 1.8). Each of these methods uses a mechanistically-driven hypothesis to accelerate the rate of activation of one electrophile over the other. These strategies are attractive in that they are readily accessible within a traditional reaction optimization campaign and do not require expensive mechanistic studies or extensive ligand design.

Figure 1.8. Summary of strategies for cross-selective XEC reactions.


### 1.3 Tuning the Electrophilic Coupling Handle

The rate of electrophile $(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{X})$ activation is dictated by the identity of the electrophile $(\mathrm{X})$ as much as it is dictated by the inherent stereoelectronic properties of the substrate (R). As previously mentioned, the coupling handle can also influence particular mechanisms of oxidative addition by the Ni-catalyst from a concerted, two-electron process to a step-wise,
radical sequence (Figure 1.4). For a given combination of fragments in a cross-coupling, the reactivity of the electrophiles is directly modulated through the choice of coupling handles. Tuning the reactivity of the coupling handle is a complementary strategy to the later-discussed (Section 1.4) catalyst-based strategies, but obviates resource-intensive screening of catalysts which can be difficult to rationally design a priori. In these cases, selectivity is achieved through careful consideration of coupling partners that are synthetically accessible or can be generated in situ at a controlled rate.

### 1.3.1 Coupling Handle Modifications for Changing C(sp $\left.{ }^{2}\right)-X$ Activation <br> Rates

While there continues to be major advances in our understanding the mechanism of Nicatalyzed XEC reactions, extensive studies on the relative rates of oxidative addition as a function of coupling handles across ligand-catalyst frameworks is limited. Kinetic studies using a bidentate phosphine $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ catalyst $(\mathbf{L} 1 \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD}))$ with various aryl electrophiles 42 have observed, in the case of aryl halides, that weaker $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{X}$ bonds undergo faster oxidative addition $(\mathrm{I}>\mathrm{Br}>\mathrm{Cl} \gg \mathrm{F})$ via a concerted mechanism. Interestingly, sulfonates or esters were all slower than $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{Cl}$ following the trend $\mathrm{Cl}>\mathrm{OTs}>\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{R}>\mathrm{OTf} \gg \mathrm{OMe}$ (Figure 1.9a). ${ }^{42}$ Studies on acyl 43 and alkenyl halides $\mathbf{4 4}$ have observed much faster reactivity over aryl substrates, although the quantitative rate was not determined for a more precise comparison (Figure 1.9b). ${ }^{43}$

Figure 1.9. Highlighted mechanistic studies on aryl halide oxidative addition.


In addition to the coupling handle, it is important to consider stereoelectronic effects of the substrate itself. For example, electron-deficient aryl electrophiles $\mathbf{4 6}$ will undergo faster oxidative addition than the corresponding electron-rich substrates $45 .{ }^{15,16,42}$ Sterics also play an important role where a more hindered $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ bond will undergo slower oxidative addition, ${ }^{42}$ however the resulting oxidative addition complexes display greater kinetic stability towards homocoupling (Figure 1.9b). Error! Bookmark not defined.,27 There are also significant substituent effects that can impact the reactivity that are well understood to the
point where the regioselectivity of polyhalogenated (hetero)arenes oxidative addition can be reliably predicted. ${ }^{44,45}$ Additionally, substituents that can assist in the binding or association of the Ni catalyst with the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ electrophile can also effect a profound rate increase (Figure 1.9c). ${ }^{43}$

Scheme 1.3. Selective $C\left(s p^{2}\right)-C\left(s p^{2}\right)$ cross-couplings.


Out of these guiding principles, selective XEC reactions of aryl halides have been developed with remarkable cross-selectivity. In a report from Lautens and coworkers, the XEC of aryl chlorides 50 and heteroaryl chlorides 49 was achieved with a 1.5:1
stoichiometry. This sequential activation mechanism leverages the fast oxidative addition into 2-chlorobenzimidazoles $\mathbf{5 2}$ as well as the slow homocoupling of the oxidative addition complex 54 due to the electron-deficient nature of the C bound to Ni and the steric environment. For less reactive aryl chlorides they demonstrate that the cross-selectivity can be recovered by moving to the more reactive Br coupling handle. ${ }^{46}$ This has also been leveraged in an electroreductive biaryl synthesis from heteroaryl chlorides and aryl bromides. Notably, the high cross-selectivity here is also attributed to the faster reduction of the electron-deficient $\mathrm{Ni}^{I I}$ complex 53 to give $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$-heteroaryl 54. This complex is hindered and reactive enough to activate the electron-rich aryl bromide, outcompeting deleterious homocoupling processes (Scheme 1.3a). ${ }^{47}$

The corresponding strategy can be used for the cross-coupling of alkenyl (pseudo)halides to make unsymmetrical dienes. Important considerations with alkenyl electrophiles are that 1 ) oxidative addition is faster, ${ }^{43}$ and 2$) \mathrm{Ni}$ insertion to $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ - X bonds is more readily reversible for alkenyl halides compared to that of aryl halides. Error! Bookmark not defined. This means in systems with multiple halides, scrambling of the alkenyl halide can occur, thus accumulating the thermodynamic $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ species. ${ }^{48}$ In an example from Shu and coworkers, the more reactive bromide coupling handle was used on the more sterically hindered boron-substituted alkenyl electrophile $\mathbf{5 5}$ and the triflate handles were used on the more reactive alkenyl electrophile 56 to achieve impressive cross-selectivity. Evidence supports the interaction of the Bpin group with the adjacent Ni-center 58 which occupies a coordination site to stabilize the intermediate towards homocoupling (Scheme 1.3b). ${ }^{49}$

### 1.3.2 Coupling Handle Modifications for Changing C(sp $\left.{ }^{3}\right)$-X Activation

## Rates

Analogous principles from $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{X}$ modifications can be applied to tune the reactivity of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophiles. However, there are additional considerations with $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ substrates because activation via an organic radical intermediate can occur depending on the substrate, coupling handle, and the catalyst. For $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ halides, the rate of activation generally follows trends according to $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ bond strength $(\mathrm{I}>\mathrm{Br}>\mathrm{Cl}) .{ }^{50}$ In the cases where oxygen electrophiles are employed or when ligands that favor 2-electron pathways are used, the relative reactivity is dependent on the stability of the displaced coupling handle, similar to leaving group stability trends in organic $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$-type reactions. ${ }^{51}$

There are many examples where modifications of the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile's coupling handle improves cross-selectivity when the activation rate of the other substrate is vastly different than what the system was optimized for. A informative case study of this in practice from Baran and coworkers is the Ni-catalyzed XEC of in situ generated anhydrides 60 (from the corresponding carboxylic acid 59) with NHP esters 61 to make ketone products 62. This reaction is uniquely modular given both electrophiles are derived from carboxylic acids meaning either coupling fragment can be employed as the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ electrophile (59) or the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile (61) if it is pre-functionalized as the NHP ester to access the same product. The authors report a reactivity guide for how different alkyl electrophiles perform as either the "acyl electrophile" 60 or the "radical electrophile" 63 across different substrate classes which reflects the combinations that are activated at similar rates (Figure 1.10a). ${ }^{52}$

Figure 1.10. Examples of changing $C\left(s p^{3}\right)$ coupling handle for different $C\left(s p^{2}\right)$ electrophiles.


Another case study can be seen in the XEC of redox-active imines $\mathbf{6 4}$ and alkyl electrophiles $\mathbf{6 5}$ to give benzyl amine products $\mathbf{6 6}$ from Reisman and coworkers. In this
reductive alkylation reaction, more hindered N -alkyl imine 69 produced significant quantities of homocoupled diamine 67 with $2^{\circ}$ alkyl electrophiles (70), while the less hindered $N$-alkyl imine 68 exclusively produced the desired cross-coupled product 66 . It was found that by using alkyl radical precursors that were easier to reduce than alkyl bromides or iodides $\left(\mathrm{E}^{\text {red }}=-2.06 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs. SCE for $\left.70 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{I}\right),{ }^{53}$ like NHP esters $\left(\mathrm{E}^{\text {red }}=-1.4\right.$ V vs. SCE), ${ }^{54}$ cross-coupling could then outcompete deleterious homocoupling for the more challenging sterically-hindered imines (Figure 1.10b). ${ }^{55}$

Scheme 1.4. Controlled in situ generation of alkyl halide electrophile.


Another approach is to keep the concentration of the active electrophile low by generating it in situ from a less reactive precursor. While this strategy is not limited to reductive Ni-catalysis, ${ }^{56,57}$ it has been used both intentionally to improve selectivity or uncovered as an operative mechanism afterwards. Alkyl tosylates ${ }^{58}$ or mesylates 71 have been used as precursor electrophiles to generate alkyl halides from the addition of a catalytic halide salt or from the halide counter ions on the Ni precatalyst. Here, the tridentate Ni catalyst is slow at alkyl mesylate $\mathbf{7 1}$ activation via a polar mechanism but can rapidly react with $1^{\circ}$ alkyl iodides $\mathbf{7 2}$ via a radical mechanism to give a radical intermediate 73. This allows for control of the concentration of the active electrophile by changing the
halide additive concentration enabling higher yields of cross-coupled products compared to using the alkyl iodide (72) as a coupling partner directly (Scheme 1.4). ${ }^{59}$ This has also been used to convert relatively unreactive halide precursors to more reactive halide electrophiles. Weix and coworkers utilized this halide exchange in the cross-coupling of challenging aryl chlorides with alkyl chlorides employing catalytic iodide to generate low concentrations of alkyl iodide in situ from the alkyl chloride. ${ }^{60}$

Figure 1.11. Regioselective activation of strained heterocycles with additives.


Strained heterocycles, like azirines and epoxides 74, have been used extensively as $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophiles. These substrates can be directly activated by the Ni-catalysts via oxidative addition, ${ }^{616263}$ or they can undergo $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{N}$ bond activation through other mechanisms for a controlled release of the activated species. Redox-active co-catalyst systems will be addressed later (see section 1.4.2), but halide additives have also been used to generate reactive bromo/iodohydrin intermediates ( $\mathbf{7 5}$ or 76 ) that proceed through
radical intermediates (77 or 78) like other alkyl halides (Figure 1.11a).
The Doyle group has leveraged this to achieve selective coupling to give arylated products at either the more substituted position, if benzylic, or less substituted position if aliphatic. ${ }^{64}$ This has also been used by Nevado and coworkers in an electroreductive alkenylation of aziridines. In this transformation, anodically-generated acid mediates the formation of $\beta$-amino halide from the aziridine $(\mathbf{7 5}, \mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{NTs})$ as the active electrophile. ${ }^{65}$ The regioselectivity here in these cases is dictated by the substitution of the heterocycle towards nucleophilic substitution where resonance stabilizing groups can direct addition to the more substituted position otherwise the more sterically accessible position is preferred. These examples exhibit great regioselectivity along with improved cross-selectivity over using the less stable $\beta$-halo amines of halohydrins directly (Figure 1.11b).

Coupling handle-based rate-tuning has also been achieved by derivatizing or modifying a parent coupling handle. The Baran lab has popularized the use of redox-active radical precursors, like NHP esters or Barton esters, in Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions. They have used both the parent NHP ester as well as more reactive derivatives for a myriad of Nicatalyzed reactions, albiet in fairly unselective processes requiring $>3$ equivs of one component in some cases. ${ }^{66}$ Recently, the Weix group has used these derivatives $\mathbf{8 1}$ to rationally optimize a selective cross-couplings with aryl iodides $\mathbf{8 2}$. For less reactive aryl iodides they observed improved yields when more electron-rich (harder-to-reduce) NHP ester derivatives were employed. They could also extend the scope to include aryl bromides when electron-rich NHP ester derivatives are used (Figure 1.12a). ${ }^{67}$

Figure 1.12. Methods of controlling rate of NHP ester activation.


A conceptually related strategy from Reisman and coworkers uses Lewis acid additives to gate the reduction of NHP esters. In this specific system, it was determined that the NHP ester electrophile $\mathbf{X}$ was not activated by the Ni catalyst $\mathbf{X}$ but instead by the terminal
reductant, $N, N$ '-tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethane (TDAE), in the reported asymmetric XEC of alkenyl bromides $\mathbf{8 4}$ with NHP esters $\mathbf{8 3} .{ }^{68}$ It was found that the TMSBr additive facilitates NHP ester activation by acting as a Lewis acid to give a species $\mathbf{8 5}$ that is easier to reduce such that SET from TDAE is kinetically competent. The rate of reduction can then be modulated by changing the Lewis acid where less hindered acids and better leaving groups led to faster radical generation (Figure 1.12b). This could then be used to lower the catalyst loading to $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ of the chiral catalyst to achieve highly cross-selective coupling when a less reactive Lewis acid was used. ${ }^{69}$ Similar Lewis acid effects with NHP esters have been observed in other XECs that employ metal powder reductants. ${ }^{70}$

Scheme 1.5. Additive-gated activation of aldehyde electrophiles


Lewis acids have also been used to activate aldehyde electrophiles for Ni-catalyzed XEC. The Montgomery group has published several XEC couplings of aliphatic aldehydes 86 and alkyl electrophiles 87 to synthesize $2^{\circ}$ silyl ether products $\mathbf{8 8}$. These reactions are proposed to proceed through $\alpha$-oxy-Ni species 89 mediated by the halosilane additive.

Accessing these products from a direct alkyl-alkyl coupling would be quite challenging due to the matched hybridization of the electrophiles, ${ }^{71}$ but by activating the aldehyde in situ to generate the alkyl-Ni intermediate $\mathbf{8 9}$ through an orthogonal mechanism to other pathways to access an alkyl-Ni. ${ }^{72}$ Silyl halides have also been used to trigger the generation of oxonium ions from the corresponding dialkyl acetals in Ni-catalyzed XEC to access similar products. ${ }^{73}$ In related mechanistic studies, it was found the efficiency of this reaction is sensitive to the sterics of the halosilane, suggesting that the rate of acetal activation could also be tuned by the Lewis acid additive (Scheme 1.5). ${ }^{74}$

### 1.4 Modulating Electrophile Activation Rates with Ni Catalysts and Co-Catalyst

A conceptually distinct strategy from the aforementioned substrate control-based approaches is to achieve selective reactions through catalyst-control. While there are many examples of Ni catalysts that alone can activate each electrophile in a mechanistically distinct way, this reactivity is challenging to predict as changes to the catalyst can impact the rate of activation for both electrophiles. Instead of relying on one Ni catalyst to activate both substrates, it can be enabling to employ a co-catalyst system where a Ni catalyst activates one electrophile and a different catalyst activates the other. The added complexity of optimizing two catalyst systems is offset by the ability to tune the activation rate of each electrophile independently. This is achieved by changing the chemical properties of the catalysts or their relative concentration to modulate the rate of one electrophile conversion to match the other.

### 1.4.1 Dual Ni Catalyst Systems

The use of two Ni-catalysts in XEC reactions has proven to be a powerful technique for achieving high levels of cross-selectivity. This is typically done by using two ligands whose sum is approximately equal to the amount of nickel precatalyst that is added. In this case one ligand forms a catalyst that is optimal for the activation of one substrate and is slow to react with the other electrophile and vice versa. The substrate activation rates are then tuned by changing the relative ligand ratio and thus the concentration of each active catalyst in solution. Considerations about the speciation, equilibrium binding to Ni , and reduction potentials of each catalyst must be taken into account when designing these systems.

Scheme 1.6. Dual Ni-catalysis with bidentate phosphine and nitrogen catalysts.


This strategy was used by Weix and coworkers in 2010 for the coupling of alkyl iodides 91 and aryl iodides 90 . In this report, a combination of a bidentate phosphine ligand $\mathbf{L 6}$ and a bidentate pyridine ligand $\mathbf{L 5}$ in a $1: 1$ ratio with $\sim 2$ equiv of $\mathrm{Ni}^{\text {II }}$ precatalyst. Here,
good selectivity is only seen when both ligands are employed and if one is omitted, significant quantities of homocoupled product is observed. The observed homocoupling trends suggests that the bidentate phosphine-ligated $\mathbf{L 6 N i}$ catalyst is well-suited to activate the aryl electrophile $\mathbf{9 0}$ via a 2 -electron oxidative addition, ${ }^{43}$ while the $\mathbf{L 5 N i}$ complex preferentially reacts with the alkyl halide electrophile 91 via a radical mechanism. For particularly activated aryl iodides, it was found the phosphine ligand can be omitted, as oxidative addition with the $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{5 N i}$ ligand is fast enough to match activation of $\mathbf{9 1}$ (Scheme 1.6). ${ }^{75,76}$

This strategy was used by Kishi and coworkers in a method for the coupling of alkyl iodides $\mathbf{9 2}$ with thiopyridine esters $\mathbf{9 3}$ to make ketone products $\mathbf{9 4}$. Here, they observe that the activation of the acyl electrophile $\mathbf{9 3}$ was fast with bidentate Ni complex $\mathbf{L 8 N i}$ and alkyl halide $\mathbf{9 2}$ activation was slow. Conversely, a tridentate $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ complex $\mathbf{L} 7 \mathrm{Ni}^{29}$ was found to rapidly react with the alkyl halide 92 and was relatively inert towards thioester 93 activation. By using these independently prepared catalysts in a $1: 1$ ratio efficient crosscoupling was achieved with 1:1 electrophile equivalency and catalyst loadings as low as 1 $\mathrm{mol} \%$ (Scheme 1.7a). Once optimized, this was applied in a convergent fragment coupling towards the synthesis of Halichondrin B, using significantly more complex substrates 96 and $\mathbf{9 7}$. By modifying the conditions for these substrates to a $4: 1$ ratio of $\mathbf{L 8 N i}: \mathbf{L} 7 \mathrm{Ni}$ the complex ketone product $\mathbf{9 8}$ was obtained in $80 \%$ yield on 100 mg scale (Scheme 1.7 b ). ${ }^{77}$

Scheme 1.7. Dual Ni-catalyzed XEC with application to complex molecule synthesis.


Dual Ni catalysts has also found use in selective electroreductive XEC reactions. This was first done in a collaborative study from between the Weix group and the Pfizer process team in a reductive coupling of $1^{\circ}$ alkyl bromides $\mathbf{9 9}$ and aryl bromides $\mathbf{1 0 0}$. This reaction utilized a divided cell under constant current electrolysis (CCE) as a means to drive the
reaction in their dual catalytic system. Selective coupling was achieved by using a combination of tridentate L9 and bidentate L5 ligands with varied stoichiometric ratios of L9:L5 based on the substrate combination. The reaction could also be extended to more reactive $2^{\circ}$ alkyl bromides $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ by increasing the relative amount of $\mathbf{L 5}$ (Scheme 1.8a). ${ }^{78}$ A follow-up study from the Weix group achieved the same transformation in an undivided cell and highlights how the selectivity changes as a function of $\mathbf{L 9}: \mathbf{L 5}$ for several substrates. This provides a roadmap for how to extend this methodology to new substrates that are not included in the scope by performing a small screen varying $0-100 \%$ L9:L5 to identify the ideal ligand ratio (Scheme 1.8 b ). ${ }^{79}$

Another example of dual Ni catalysts in electrochemical XEC comes from Sevov and coworkers. This mechanistically-guided study identified the optimal combination of ligands to be bidentate $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N}$ ligand $\mathbf{L 1 1}$ and tridentate $\mathbf{L 1 0 \mathrm { NiBr } _ { 2 }}$, for the coupling of aryl (pseudo)halides (102, $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{OTf}$ ) with $3^{\circ}$ alkyl bromides (103). The design principle here is based on the observations that $\mathbf{L 1 0 N i X} \mathbf{X}_{2}$ is readily reduced at the cathode ( -1.4 V vs. $\mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}, 0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KPF}_{6}$ in DMF ) to give a $\mathbf{L 1 0} \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ complex (104) that can readily react with $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ to give radical $\mathbf{1 0 5}$. This is in contrast to $\mathbf{L 1 1 N i X}_{2}$ which is difficult to reduce (no cathodic wave in solvent window), but the $(\mathbf{L} 11)_{2} \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ complex rapidly reacts with $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ and slowly reacts with 103. Spectroelectrochemical experiments reveal that ligand exchange is possible following reduction of $\mathbf{L 1 0 N i X}{ }_{2}$ resulting in the formation of $(\mathbf{L 1 1})_{2} \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ when $\mathbf{L 1 1}$ is present in solution. Additionally, they show that following oxidation addition of $(\mathbf{L 1 1})_{2} \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ to $\mathbf{1 0 2}$, the resulting complex (106) can undergo another ligand exchange with $\mathbf{L 1 0}$ to give $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ which is competent at capturing the hindered radical $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ to give product

108 (Figure 1.13). This leverages the dual ligand strategy to not only influence the relative concentration active catalyst in solution, but also the accessible oxidation states of Ni where $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ have can have different rates and mechanisms of oxidative addition. ${ }^{80}$

Scheme.1.8. Dual Ni-catalyzed electroreductive coupling.


Figure 1.13. Dynamic ligand exchange for dual catalytic sequential activation.


### 1.4.2 Transition Metal Co-Catalysts for $C\left(s p^{3}\right)-X$ Activation

Beyond dual Ni catalysis, other transition metals capable of oxidative addition to activate substrates have also been used as co-catalysts for Ni-catalyzed XEC. Perhaps the most popular is the use of cobalt catalysts to activate $C\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-X$ electrophiles through
orthogonal mechanisms invoked for Ni . Specifically, nucleophilic square planar $\mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{I}}$ complexes $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ will rapidly react with alkyl electrophiles $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ to give an alkyl-Co ${ }^{\text {III }} \mathbf{1 1 1}$ via an $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ reaction. Reduction or photolysis of $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ triggers $\mathrm{Co}-\mathrm{C}$ homolysis thus releasing an alkyl radical that can be captured by a Ni catalyst (Figure 1.14). ${ }^{81}$ This is complementary to Ni catalysis because it proceeds though an overall distinct mechanism to generate alkyl radicals and, unlike Ni , they are slow to react with $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{X}$ electrophiles. ${ }^{25,26,27,28}$ This allows for more precise control of alkyl radical generation by making changes to the ligand on Co as well as the Co catalyst loading.

Figure 1.14. Mechanism of alkyl radical generation with square-planar $C o^{\prime}$ catalysts.


This strategy was first used in Ni-catalyzed XEC by Weix coworkers for the coupling of benzyl electrophiles $112\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{OMs} \mathbf{1 1 2}, \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{OEt})_{2} \mathbf{1 1 3}\right)$ with aryl halides $\mathbf{1 1 4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Br}$ or I). Activation of $1^{\circ}$ benzyl halides with reduced $\mathbf{L} 5 \mathrm{Ni}$ (117) is much faster than activation of the aryl halide $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ coupling partner to such a degree that selective crosscoupling is challenging and would require extensive ligand optimization. The reaction of reduced Ni complex $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ with the corresponding benzyl mesylate $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ is much slower and provides some cross-coupled product 115 with reactive coupling partners, like aryl iodides.

They observed greater control over the rate of benzyl radical (118) formation when CoPc was used as the mesylate $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ activator in a 7:1 ratio of $\mathbf{L} 5 \mathrm{Ni}: \mathrm{CoPc}$ to successfully suppress formation of $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ and favor product $\mathbf{1 1 5}$. For less reactive benzyl electrophiles like 113, the concentration of CoPc had to be increased to compensate for the slower benzyl electrophile activation where $\sim 1: 1 \mathrm{Co}: \mathrm{Ni}$ was found to be optimal (Scheme 1.9). ${ }^{82}$

Scheme 1.9. Dual Ni/Co arylation of benzyl electrophiles.


In a related system reported by Hazari and coworkers, CoPc was used to facilitate the coupling of various alkyl electrophiles $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ with aryl and alkenyl halides $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ employing a TDAE as a reductant. Here, they show how adjusting the ratio of Ni:Co can enable crosscoupling of fragments to accommodate diverse coupling handles, electronics, and steric properties (Scheme 1.10a). They also show how this could be used for a 3-component alkylation of dihalogenated aryl substrates $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ containing an iodo and bromo coupling
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handle. In this system, alkylation first occurs at the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{Ar}}-\mathrm{I}$ position with the more activated alkyl electrophile $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ then at the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{Ar}}-\mathrm{Br}$ position with a less activated alkyl halide substrate 123. This can be achieved in one pot with fine tuning of the catalyst concentrations or by supplementing the reaction after the first cross-coupling is complete with additional catalyst to change the ratio so that it is optimal for the second coupling (Scheme 1.10b). ${ }^{83}$

Scheme 1.10. Varying catalyst ratios for different substrates in Ni/Co catalyzed XEC.


The ligand environment on the Co catalyst can also be used to modulate the reactivity in order to achieve high levels of selectivity. In the coupling of aryl iodides with epoxides 124 developed by Gryko, Giedyk, and coworkers, the regioselective epoxide opening was achieved with cyanocobalamin (Vitamin $B_{12}$ ), a square planar Co complex, as a cocatalyst. Notably, the opposite regioselectivity is observed in this system for styrenyl epoxides
compared to other epoxide couplings (Figure 1.11) that proceed through the more stable benzyl radical intermediate 77. Arylation occurs at the less sterically hindered carbon as it is more accessible for the large Co catalyst toward activation via $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ oxidative addition. The alkyl radical $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ is then generated by photolysis of the $\mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{III}}$-alkyl which can outcompete the thermal pathway that requires reduction to $\mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{II}}$ by the heterogenous Zn reductant. Judicious choice of Co catalyst and Co-R homolysis mechanism allows for precise control of the concentration of the desired activated epoxide intermediate $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ to achieve high levels of regioselective cross-coupling product 126 (Scheme 1.11). ${ }^{84}$

Scheme 1.11. Ti and Co co-catalyzed epoxide openings.


Ti catalysts, or more specifically titanocenes, have been used as co-catalysts with Ni in XEC with epoxide electrophiles. In contrast to the aforementioned iodide ${ }^{64 \mathrm{a}}$ or $\mathrm{Co}^{84}$ cocatalyst systems, epoxide $\mathbf{1 2 6}$ activation occurs by coordination of a $\mathrm{Ti}^{\mathrm{III}}$ species $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ to the oxygen resulting in $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}$ homolysis to give an alkyl radical 128. The regioselectivity of epoxide opening is dictated by the stability of the resulting radical species. Weix and coworkers have demonstrated that XEC with aryl halides can be achieved with $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{TiCl}_{2}$ to access regioisomer $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ (Scheme 1.11). ${ }^{85}$ In a subsequent report they demonstrate that
by using a chiral titanocene catalyst, meso-epoxides could be symmetrized to give the chiral Ti-alkoxide radical intermediate. This intermediate can then engage with a Ni-aryl oxidative addition complex 130 to give the chiral ring-opened products in good yields, diastereoselectivity, and enantioselectivity. ${ }^{86}$

### 1.4.3 Transition Metal Co-Catalysts for $C\left(s p^{2}\right)-X$ Activation

Pd has been used as a co-catalyst to achieve highly cross-selective Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions. As previously discussed, the reactivity of Pd is quite different than Ni despite both being group 10 metals. This includes differences with Pd including: trends in relative rates of oxidative addition, affinity for 2-electron elementary steps, and stability of key organometallic intermediates. For example, oxidative addition into aryl triflates is faster than aryl bromides for $\mathrm{Pd}^{0},{ }^{87}$ although this can be overturned with ligand design, ${ }^{88}$ this is inherently different than Ni , where aryl bromide oxidative addition is intrinsically faster. ${ }^{43}$ The ligand transfer in these systems is distinct to the aforementioned first row co-catalyst systems and instead of proceeding through a radical intermediates, $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond formation is proposed to occur through the transmetalation of a fragment on one catalyst to the other. ${ }^{41}$

In the seminal example from Weix and coworkers, a selective aryl-aryl cross-coupling of aryl bromides $\mathbf{1 3 2}$ and aryl triflates $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ is achieved with a dual $\mathbf{L 1 2 N i}$ and $\mathbf{L 1 3 P d}$ system. This system takes advantage of the fact $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{1 2 N i}$ oxidative addition of $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{X}$ follows $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{oa}} \mathrm{Br}>$ OTf and $\mathbf{L 1 3 P d}$ oxidative addition of $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{X}$ follows $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{oa}} \mathrm{Br}<\mathrm{OTf}$. This results in the generation of a $\mathbf{L 1 2} \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Ar}$ complex $\mathbf{1 3 7}$ that can transmetalate the $\mathrm{Ar}^{1}$ fragment to L13Pd ${ }^{\text {II }} \mathrm{Ar}$ intermediate $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ which can then undergo reductive elimination from $\mathrm{Pd}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathbf{1 3 9}$ to form the cross-coupled product 133. They demonstrate that both catalysts are necessary
for cross-coupling and that changing the ratio of $\mathrm{Pd}: \mathrm{Ni}$ from the optimized conditions lowers the selectivity resulting in homocoupled $\mathbf{1 3 4}$ and $\mathbf{1 3 5} .{ }^{89}$ This was later extended to aryl chlorides (activated by Ni ) with the addition of LiCl as a key additive which is hypothesized to accelerate the rate of oxidative addition by $\mathbf{L 1 2 N i}$ such that it is competitive with L13Pd activation of the aryl triflate. ${ }^{90}$ Subsequent reports found heteroaryl substrates could be cross-coupled when a less-activated tridentate ligand was used on Ni (Scheme 1.12a). ${ }^{91}$

A follow-up study achieved a similar cross-coupling to prepare dienes from alkenyl bromides and alkenyl triflates. Mechanistic studies revealed that the $\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}$ salts from the $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ reductant were non-innocent in the reaction where stoichiometric alkenyl- Zn species were detected in the reaction mixture. ${ }^{92,93}$ The beneficial role of Zn salts was further explored and enabled the challenging coupling of aryl triflates $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ with aryl tosylates $\mathbf{1 3 6}$ by a $\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{Pd}$ catalyst system. Mechanistic studies reveal that the concentration of $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{M}$ (where $\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Zn}$, or Pd ) never exceeds the combined catalyst loading $(\mathrm{Pd}+\mathrm{Ni})$ when both Pd and Ni are present but will accumulate in the absence of Pd . This suggests the steady state concentration of $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ is very low and transmetalation from Ni to Zn to Pd is faster than the direct Ni to Pd transmetalation outcompeting homocoupling pathways. A low concentration of $\mathbf{1 3 7}$ or $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ is desirable as the accumulation of either activated electrophile will result in unproductive homocoupling. Given this net aryl transfer from Ni to Pd is the selectivity-determining step, the acceleration afforded by $\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}$ results in higher levels of selectivity (Scheme 1.12b). ${ }^{94}$

Scheme 1.12. Dual Ni/Pd-catalyzed biaryl formation.


### 1.5 Modulating Electrophile Activation with Reductants

Figure 1.15. Mechanisms of reduction and important redox potentials. ${ }^{95}$


A crucial component to any XEC is the reductant that renders this net reductive reaction catalytic in Ni. The source of electrons and the means by which they are delivered to a substrate or catalyst has a profound impact on the outcome of these transformations. The
use of mediators, or electron-transfer catalysts, can be used as an additional control element in the net reduction of a catalytic intermediate or substrate. An external driving force, like photon absorption or a potential gradient, can also be used to drive XEC from otherwise prohibitively weak reductants (Figure 1.15 a ). ${ }^{96}$ Over the last decade, reductants with diverse properties and reduction potentials have proven competent for driving XEC reactions (Figure 1.15b). 2,97,98

### 1.5.1 Leveraging Reduction Mechanisms for Selectivity

More important than the thermodynamic aspects of the reductant in the context of catalysis are the kinetics of electron transfer (ET) from the reductant to other species in solution. While the redox potentials of the reductant and reaction components do impact the rate of electron transfer, the solubility and reduction mechanism play an outsized role. Heterogenous reductants (e.g., $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}, \mathrm{Zn}^{0}, \mathrm{Mg}^{0}, \mathrm{Sm}^{0}$ ) are most commonly employed in Nicatalyzed XEC. These species have well-defined reduction potentials, are generally inexpensive, ${ }^{99}$ and can be handled under air. Their insolubility means reduction is plagued by capricious mass-transfer effects rendering scale up ${ }^{100}$ and mechanistic studies challenging. This is reflected in kinetics studies on Ni-catalyzed XEC, which uniformly show significant reaction rate dependence on stir rate and suggest rate-limiting reduction of the Ni-catalyst. ${ }^{69,76,101}$

Homogenous reductants, like TDAE, $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{Pin}_{2}$, dimethoxymethylsiloxane (DEMS), MeLi, etc... are generally more expensive and air sensitive but do not suffer from mass transport limited reduction and can proceed through inner- and outer-sphere mechanisms (Figure 1.15a). This can have significant effects on the mechanism of the reaction as
reduction of the catalyst may no longer be turnover-limiting or other electron-transfer reactions may become kinetically competitive. For example, Reisman and coworkers observed divergent kinetics across two related asymmetric reductive alkenylation reactions (ARA). By using a soluble reductant TDAE, they found the reaction is under saturation kinetics with regards to the Ni catalyst while the $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$-mediated reaction is first order in catalyst $\left(\mathbf{L} 3 \mathrm{NiX}_{2}\right)$ reflecting the turnover-limiting catalyst reduction (Scheme 1.13a). ${ }^{69}$

Scheme.1.13. Mechanistic changes with soluble reductant and their tunability.


For homogenous reductants, the sterics and electronics influence the chemical properties, including reduction potential. In an example from Hazari and coworkers, various dialkyltetraaminoethylenes (142-145) were synthesized and compared to TDAE in an XEC coupling of Katritzky salts $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ with aryl iodides. These TDAE derivatives span $\sim 500 \mathrm{mV}$ in reducing strength and some of the less reactive agents can be handled under air. The reduction of Katritzky salts by any of these designer reductants is reversible and the subsequent $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}$ homolysis to generate the alkyl radical intermediate is rate-limiting, meaning the rate of alkyl radical generation is dependent on the reduction potential of the reductant. They further demonstrate highly selective XEC reactions achieved by changing the strength of the reductant to modulate the rate of radical generation to match the activation of aryl iodides (Scheme 1.13b). ${ }^{102}$

Figure 1.16. Mechanism of reduction with diborane and thermodynamics.


ET from a reductant to a substrate or catalyst can occur via a covalently-bound intermediate (i.e., inner-sphere). For homogenous reductants, both mechanisms can be operative depending on the identity of the reductant and the substrates. ${ }^{97}$ The mechanisms of inner-sphere reduction makes the ET highly selective for components that can form a favorable covalent adduct with the reductant. Several examples can be found from Gong
and coworkers of selective reactions using diboranes as inner-sphere terminal reductants, like $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{pin}_{2}$. Reduction with diboranes is proposed to proceed through a $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{BR}_{2} 147$ intermediate. This can form either from transmetalation of $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{2} \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{BR}_{2}$ driven by the formation of a strong $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{X}$ bond over the weak $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ bond to give 149 . From these $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{B}$ intermediates, either direct or base-promoted reductive elimination of X -Bpin 151 yields the reduced Ni complex $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ (Figure 1.16). ${ }^{103}$

Figure 1.17.Diborane-mediated alkyl-alkyl couplings.


In the Gong group's $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ coupling of $2^{\circ} \mathbf{1 5 2}$ and $1^{\circ} \mathbf{1 5 3}$ alkyl halides, the diborane reductant is credited for selective cross-coupling of these chemically similar electrophiles via a sequential activation mechanism. Upon reduction with $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{Pin}_{2}$, a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}-$

Bpin 154 is formed which will react with the $1^{\circ}$ electrophile $\mathbf{1 5 3}$ faster than the $2^{\circ}$ electrophile $\mathbf{1 5 2}$ due to the steric bulk of the Bpin group. This ultimately gives alky-Ni $\mathbf{1 5 5}$ after LiOMe-promoted XBpin reductive elimination. This less hindered $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$-alkyl complex 155 can then undergo oxidative addition with the more activated $2^{\circ}$ substrate $\mathbf{1 5 2}$ which give product $\mathbf{1 5 6}$ following reductive elimination. Overall the cross-selectivity is attributed to the steric environment of the covalently-bound reductant in $\mathbf{1 5 4}$ as well as the mechanism of catalyst reduction via X -BPin-producing reductive elimination which is practically selective for $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}-\mathrm{X}$ intermediates. It is notable that the yield of cross-coupled product decreases when either $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ or $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ reductants are employed, supporting the important mechanistic role of $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{Pin}_{2}$ (Figure 1.17 a ). ${ }^{104}$ This same strategy was used by Wang and coworkers to cross-couple $1^{\circ}$ alkyl halides 157 with $\alpha$-fluoro $1^{\circ}$ bromides 158 , a combination that is less sterically differentiated than the previous example. Adjusting the sterics of the diborane reducing agent led to impressive levels of cross-selectivity where $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ (neo) $)_{2}$ was found to be optimal (Figure 1.17b). ${ }^{105}$

### 1.5.2 Selectivity in Electroreductive Systems

Electrolysis is well-suited for Ni-catalyzed XEC reactions as it enables direct manipulation of the rate electrons are delivered to the reaction (current, $i$ ) as well as their reducing power (potential, $E$ ). These are fundamentally heterogenous reactions as the reduction of intermediates, mediators, or substrates occurs at the surface of the cathode with oxidation of the reductant at the anode or oxidation of the anode itself. ${ }^{106}$ These considerations offer several methods to favorably tune the delivery of electrons into the catalytic cycle by changing the cell current, the electrode materials, or by adding an
electroactive mediator with desirable electrochemical properties.
The use of Ni complexes as mediators in Ni-catalyzed XEC has been shown to ameliorate the challenges associated with heterogenous cathodic reduction. Sevov and coworkers have used coordinatively-saturated Ni complexes $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathbf{S} 1$ in combination with a Ni XEC catalyst L16Ni to couple aryl bromides 159 and alkyl bromides 160 in good yields. The mediators, like $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathbf{S} 1$, are not reactive towards alkyl or aryl bromides, but have favorable ET kinetics given the minimal reorganization upon reduction and demonstrate remarkable stability in both oxidation states (Figure 1.17a). ${ }^{107}$

The authors reason that the mediator can not only deliver electrons to the Ni complex catalyzing the XEC in the bulk solution, but also prevent deleterious reactions caused by cathodic reduction of the substrates. This is because the catalyst turnover frequency (TOF) operative at the beginning of the reaction, when there are ample quantities of substrates, is higher than later stages of the reaction, after most substrates are consumed. This is accompanied by an increase in cell potential as the reaction progresses due to the lower driving force for product formation. The electrochemical stability of the mediator prevents this "overcharging" of the cell as it can undergo anodic oxidation if there is not enough L16Ni catalyst to reduce ( $i>k_{\text {cat }}$ ), satisfying the reaction current while avoiding deleterious overreduction. While this reduces the faradaic efficiency of the reaction due to the unproductive reduction then reoxidation of the mediator $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{S} 1$ (i.e., short circuiting), it can also maintain a more mild cell potential, resulting in a more selective reaction (Figure 1.17b). ${ }^{108}$

Figure 1.17. Electrochemical mediators for overcharge protection.


Subsequent studies demonstrated that this can be generalized to other catalysts and mediators ( $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathbf{S 1} 1-\mathrm{Ni}-\mathbf{S 3}$ ) where the combinations of catalysts (L16, L17, L5, and L19) and mediators ( $\mathbf{S} 1, \mathbf{S 2}$, and $\mathbf{S 3}$ ) with similar cathodic onset potentials results in higher
yields. The Sevov group demonstrate how this can be used to optimize the reaction for particular substrate combinations where catalyst/mediators can be screened as pairs (4 reactions for 4 mediators and 4 catalysts) as opposed to a more laborious combinatorial screening approach (12 reactions for 4 catalysts and 3 mediators) (Figure 1.17c). ${ }^{109} \mathrm{~A}$ similar effect could presumably be achieved by running the reaction under constant potential electrolysis where the cell potential is set to the reduction potential of the Ni catalyst and anodic to the reduction potential substrates. This may be less general, as the overpotential (kinetic barrier) may change for a given set of substrates and issues with conversion are known for constant potential reactions. ${ }^{110}$

Figure 1.18. Functionalized electrodes to favor productive catalyst reduction.


Manipulating the rates of electron transfer to specific reaction components can also be achieved by modifying the cathode itself as demonstrated in a Ni-catalyzed coupling of NHP esters 163 and alkenyl iodides 164 from Baran and coworkers. Initial optimization efforts were hampered by catalyst decomposition, overreduction of the activated alkenyl
electrophile 165, and unproductive reduction of the NHP ester $\mathbf{1 6 3}$ at the RVC cathode. After extensive optimization, selectivity was improved when the cathode was functionalized by electrodeposition of Ag nanoparticles onto the surface. Monitoring the potential of the reaction with a reference electrode revealed a more mild cell potential during the electrolysis with the functionalized electrode, thus mitigating the undesired reduction processes. Electroanalytical studies revealed that deleterious deposition of the Ni catalyst L12Ni was decreased with the $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{RVC}$ electrode and diffusion of the NHP ester 163 to the electrode surfaced was slowed thus slowing unproductive cathodic reduction. Taken together, the passivation of the electrode surface with Ag nanoparticles tuned the electron transfer kinetics, mass-transport, and cell potential to a regime where the major reaction occurring at the cathode was productive turnover of the catalyst (Figure 1.18). ${ }^{111}$

Another benefit to electrochemical reactions is that the potential gradient generated by the power source (potentiostat or battery) expands the pool of reductants that can be used. This enables the use of mild reductants that would not be able to reduce catalytically relevant Ni complexes directly (Figure 1.15), to act as an electron source by anodic oxidation. Pairing the electroreductive reaction with oxidation of a soluble species is beneficial from a sustainability and scalability perspective, ${ }^{106}$ while also allowing for more functional group tolerant reductants to be employed in these reactions (e.g., $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{NEp}_{12}=\sim$ 0.41 V vs. $\mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+112}$ while most Ni catalysts are $\left.\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}<-1.0 \mathrm{Vvs} . \mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}\right) .{ }^{113}$ There are several examples of reductants like alkyl amines, phosphines, and silanes being used as reductants for Ni-catalyzed XEC in both undivided ${ }^{79,114,115,116}$ and divided cells ${ }^{78}$ for cases where the oxidized reductant could interfere with productive catalysis.

### 1.5.3 Coupled Reductant Oxidation with Substrate Activation

The emergence of photoredox in XEC coupling reactions has enabled selective Ni catalyzed XEC reactions and has expanded the classes of competent electrophiles. Like electrochemistry, tapping into an external driving force enables the generation of highly reactive intermediates under otherwise mild conditions, except in this case through photon absorption. This energy can be used to mediate the reduction of a Ni catalyst, co-catalyst, reagent, or electrophile from exceptionally mild reductants like triethanolamine, ${ }^{117}$ silanes, ${ }^{118,119}$ as well as dihydropyridines. ${ }^{120}$

In the seminal photoredox Ni-catalyzed XEC report from MacMillan and coworkers, a silane reductant, (TMS) ${ }_{3} \mathrm{SiH}$, was used in combination with Ir photoredox catalyst as a mediator to couple aryl 166 and alkyl bromides 167. In this system, the excited state photoredox catalyst can oxidize bromide ions to generate a bromine radical which can undergo exothermic HAT with $(\mathrm{TMS})_{3} \mathrm{SiH}$ yielding HBr and silyl radical 169. This can then activate the alkyl bromide $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ substrate via XAT to give alkyl radical $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ that can be intercepted by 171 generated from the reduced photocatalyst. They demonstrate that the rate of $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ activation can be tuned by changing the properties of the silane where the bulky and more electron rich (TMS) $)_{3} \mathrm{SiH}$ was found to be optimal (Scheme 1.14a). ${ }^{118}$

In a follow-up study, they were able to achieve selective alkyl-alkyl coupling of alkyl bromides 172 and in situ generated alkyl bromide from alkyl tosylates 173. Key to achieving high levels of selectivity was the reoptimization of the reductant to (TMS) $3_{3} \mathrm{SiOH}$ in addition to slow generation of the less hindered electrophile (Scheme 1.14b). ${ }^{119}$ Mechanistic studies on this system conducted by the Lloyd-Jones group using photo-LED
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NMR reaction monitoring rigorously characterized the kinetic driving forces towards cross-coupled and homocoupled products. Despite the complexity of the system, they determined that the identity of the silane as well as the alkyl bromide are the most important drivers of cross-selectivity. ${ }^{121}$ Some of the decomposition pathways they identified, like photoinduced $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{Ar}$ (171) homolysis, are important considerations for these photoredox reactions as these complexes are known to be light-sensitive. ${ }^{122}$

Scheme 1.14. Silane reductant-mediated substrate activation.


The oxidation of a mild reductant in paired electrolysis has been used for selective electrophile activation in electroreductive couplings. In a report from Mei and coworkers, the asymmetric XEC of $\alpha$-chloroesters $\mathbf{1 7 5}$ and aryl or alkenyl bromides $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ is driven by
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the oxidation of a silane reductant. Mechanistic studies revealed that the activation of the $\alpha$-chloroester $\mathbf{1 7 5}$ is not mediated by $\mathbf{L 2 0 N i}$, but instead by the oxidized silane. This proceeded through a similar pathway as aforementioned photoredox system (Scheme 1.14a) where the bromine-mediated anodic oxidation of the silane affords silyl radical $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ which can undergo a chloride atom abstraction to give the activated radical derived from 175. Given the anodically-trigger $C\left(s p^{3}\right)$ electrophile activation is paired to the cathodically-triggered $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ activation ensures the rate of electrophile activation occurs at similar rates throughout catalysis. Additionally, mediating electrophile's activation with distinct species allows for the independent modulation of each electrophiles activation by modification of either the silane or Ni catalyst (Scheme 1.15). ${ }^{\text {Error! Bookmark not defined. }}$

Scheme 1.15. Paired electrolysis with silane reductant.
Mei and coworkers (2022):


Utilizing the oxidized reductant to activate electrophiles has been leveraged in to make alcohols competent electrophilic coupling handles in electroreductive systems. In an example from Li and coworkers, the electroreductive coupling of aryl bromides $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ and alcohols $\mathbf{1 7 9}$ is driven by the oxidation of a $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ reductant. The anodically generated $\mathrm{Br}_{2}$ reacts with $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ in solution to generate phosphonium ion 181, which undergoes an in situ Appel-type reaction with the alcohol 179 to give the corresponding alkyl bromide 182. The alkyl bromide $\mathbf{1 8 2}$ is then the active electrophile in the Ni-catalyzed XEC to give cross-
coupled product $\mathbf{1 8 0}$. This method is impressive in that it can directly utilize alcohols as coupling handles; however, it is apparent this mode of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile activation is challenging to control as these conditions are not cross-selective, requiring 3 equivalents of $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ for generality (Scheme 1.16). ${ }^{123}$

Scheme 1.16. Paired electrolysis with phosphine reductant for alcohol activation.


In a remarkably more selective arylation $\mathbf{1 8 3}$ of alcohols $\mathbf{1 8 4}$ from MacMillan and coworkers, the terminal reductant is also used for substrate activation. In this metallaphotoredox XEC, a $N$-heterocyclic carbene (NHC) reductant ( $\mathbf{N H C - 1}$ ) is used which can undergo a formal O-H insertion with 184 to give $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ which can be oxidized by the photocatalyst to give radical 187. This triggers a fragmentation process releasing the NHC-derived carbamate 188 and an alkyl radical 189 which can engage with the Ni catalyst and give product 185 (Scheme 1.17). In analogy to the NHP ester derivative strategy for selective reactions (Figure 1.12a), ${ }^{67}$ the rate of alkyl radical generation is perturbed by adjusting the reducing strength of the NHC reductant as changing the NHC is shown to impact yields of cross-coupled product. ${ }^{124}$

Scheme 1.17. Photoredox XEC with NHC reductant for alcohol activation.


MacMillan and coworkers (2021):


### 1.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Herein, we present mechanistic principles to guide cross-selective Ni-catalyzed XEC reaction optimization with examples of practical strategies that have been previously employed. These strategies aim to match the rate of electrophile activation by fine-tuning of the reaction conditions. We categorized the strategies based on the aspects of the reaction they modulated to attain cross-selectivity in the coupling of two fragments: 1) coupling handles, 2) catalyst/co-catalyst system, 3) reductant or mediated reduction. These are much more efficient than methods that obtain high yields of cross-coupled products, at the expense of sacrificing one electrophile by using a large excess.

While it is easy to rationalize why certain aspects of optimized reaction conditions lead to highly selective reactions post-hoc, the challenge remains on how to rationally optimize XEC reactions by determining what factors modulate one electrophile's relative activation/decomposition rate. Additionally, our ability to predict these factors in lieu of resource-intensive, empirically-derived models is lacking, in part due to the complexity of
these reactions, but can largely be attributed to a lack of general understanding of how these transformations work. As a result, identification of optimal reaction conditions by generating large data sets through brute-force screening is usually more rapid, especially as technology makes high-throughput experimentation (HTE) more accessible. ${ }^{125}$ HTE is a powerful way to arrive at relatively general conditions representing a local maxima in chemical space; however, mechanistic understanding opens up an alternative form of generality which provides a road map for traversing into new chemical space. ${ }^{126}$

Valuable mechanistic work has historically been outpaced by reaction development making it challenging to formulate predictive mechanistic hypothesis during an optimization campaign. Recent advances in technology and computer science as well as the cumulative mechanistic knowledge in Ni-catalyzed XEC has facilitate the formulation of these mechanistic models. Modern mechanistic experiments have enabled a more rapid way to perform kinetic analysis of a reaction such as RPKA/VTNA-treated time course studies, ${ }^{127}$ or electroanalytical techniques. ${ }^{17}$ These simplify the process of obtaining qualitative or quantitative data on how different catalysts interact with reaction components and can be used to derive reactivity trends. ${ }^{128}$ It would be enabling if pre-screening reaction conditions for each electrophile could be done in short order to determine parameters that can tune relative rates of activation and indicate which parameters to modulate next in an optimization screening campaign.

Thesis techniques are also being used in conjunction with computational and data science tools to create general models for reaction development. In practice, a machinelearning algorithm is trained on mechanistic data or early screening results so it can learn
about the transformation in order to predict reaction conditions for a given substrate combination. ${ }^{129}$ Due to the fact that these models are usually trained on large, representative data sets, this can be used in tandem with HTE to generate training data. In practice the mechanistic data is used in parameterization of the reaction components and the model can then relate this to performance in a reaction with large HTE data sets. Ideally, this could then be simplified by pre-screening with virtual ligand/catalyst libraries, obviating the need to do expensive HTE screens. ${ }^{130}$
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## Chapter 2

# Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of 

Alkenyl and Benzyl Electrophiles ${ }^{\dagger}$

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

Mechanistic investigations of the Ni-catalyzed asymmetric reductive alkenylation of N hydroxyphthalimide (NHP) esters and benzylic chlorides are reported. Investigations of the redox properties of the Ni-bis(oxazoline) catalyst, the reaction kinetics, and mode of electrophile activation show divergent mechanisms for these two related transformations. Notably, the mechanism of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ activation changes from a Ni-mediated process when benzyl chlorides and $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ are used to a reductant-mediated process that is gated by a Lewis acid when NHP esters and tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene is used. Kinetic experiments show that changing the identity of the Lewis acid can be used to tune the rate of NHP ester reduction.

[^0]Spectroscopic studies support a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$-alkenyl oxidative addition complex as the catalyst resting state. DFT calculations suggest an enantiodetermining radical capture step and elucidate the origin of enantioinduction for this Ni-BOX catalyst.

### 2.2 Background and Scope

Ni-catalyzed reductive cross-couplings (RCCs) of organic electrophiles have emerged as useful reactions for $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ bond formation. ${ }^{2}$ These reactions provide direct access to cross-coupled products from readily available organic electrophiles, such as halides, precluding the need to pre-generate an organometallic coupling partner. The use of a metal powder $\left(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}, \mathrm{Zn}^{0}\right)$ or an organic electron donor such as tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene (TDAE) ${ }^{3}$ provides reducing equivalents to render the system catalytic in Ni. Ni-catalyzed RCC reactions can also be driven electrochemically using either sacrificial anodes or paired electrolysis systems. ${ }^{4}$ A key challenge in the development of these reactions is achieving selectivity for the cross-coupled product over possible homo-coupling products; this requires a catalyst that oxidatively adds each electrophile in sequence, or a catalyst system with mechanistically distinct modes of activating each coupling partner. Despite this challenge, several different Ni catalysis systems have been developed that afford high selectivity for cross-coupled products. ${ }^{2,5,6}$

Our lab has developed several Ni-catalyzed asymmetric reductive alkenylation (ARA) reactions (Figure 2.1), which leverage the intermediacy of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ radicals to enable stereoconvergent, enantioselective bond formation. ${ }^{7,8,9}$ In 2014, we reported an ARA between benzylic chlorides 201 and alkenyl bromides 200 using cyclopropyl-containing IndaBOX ligand (L3) and $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ as the terminal reductant (Figure 2.1a). ${ }^{7}$ We subsequently developed a related ARA that uses the same ligand (L3), but employs redox-active $N$-hydroxyphthalimide (NHP) esters $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ as the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ coupling partner. ${ }^{8}$ In this case, TDAE was used as the reductant, and trimethylsilyl bromide (TMSBr) was identified as a key additive (Figure 2.1b). In addition
to chiral ligand $\mathbf{L 3}$ being optimal for both reactions, the use of DMA as solvent and NaI as an additive was shared between the two transformations. Given their similarities, we identified this pair of transformations as well suited for investigating how the mechanism of Ni-catalyzed RCCs might change depending on the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ coupling partner.

Figure 2.1. Ni-catalyzed $A R A$ investigated in this study.


Since many RCCs use heterogenous terminal reductants, the mechanisms of these reactions have been difficult to elucidate. Nonetheless, insightful studies of reductive arylation have been disclosed by the groups of Weix ${ }^{10}$, Diao ${ }^{11}$; these systems have primarily focused on reactions in which catalytically relevant $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}(\operatorname{aryl}) \mathrm{X}$ complexes can be isolated and characterized. Diao has also recently investigated bi(oxazoline) ${ }^{11 a, \mathrm{~b}}$ and pyridine-oxazoline ${ }^{11 \mathrm{c}}$ ligands in reductive arylation; however, mechanistic studies of reductive alkenylation and of Ni-catalysts supported by chiral bis(oxazolines) such as L3 are lacking. ${ }^{12}$ Here, we report our mechanistic investigations of two $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}$-catalyzed ARA reactions. In this study we sought to: (1) determine the kinetic driving forces and resting state for the homogenous reaction of alkenyl bromide 200 with NHP ester 202; (2) investigate the redox properties of the $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{X}_{2}$ precatalysts and determine whether $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ is accessible using common reductants; (3) interrogate the
mechanism of electrophile activation for both 201 and 202; (4) use computational methods to understand the enantioselectivity determining step. These studies have revealed that chloride 201 and NHP ester 202 are activated through distinct mechanisms and provide insights that can guide the optimization of reaction conditions for Ni-catalyzed RCC reactions.

### 2.3 INVESTIGATION OF HOMOGENOUS ARA REACTION

### 2.3.1 Redox properties of $\mathrm{LSNiX}_{2}$ Precatalyst

Figure 2.2. Cyclic Voltammetry of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiX}_{2}$ complexes.


We first used cyclic voltammetry (CV) to determine the reduction potentials of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{1 I} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$; these complexes (isolable as crystalline solids) catalyze the reductive alkenylations of both benzylic chlorides 201 and NHP esters 202 in comparable yields and slightly improved ee relative to in situ catalyst generation. ${ }^{7,8}$ Electrochemically, $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ exhibit irreversible reduction waves at $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p} / 2}=-1.47 \mathrm{~V}$ and -1.23 V vs. $\mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}$, respectively (Figure 2.2). These reduction events have a large peak separation with the corresponding oxidation events, suggesting that a chemical change, such as halide loss, occurs rapidly upon one electron reduction. More detailed electrochemical studies of these precatalysts, performed by Hadt and coworkers, ${ }^{13}$ support a single-electron reduction event to give
a $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} X} \cdot$ DMA species (204). Notably, these studies suggest that reduction to $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ does not proceed within the solvent window of DMA.

To verify the ability of TDAE to reduce $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ to $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Br}$ (204), a solution of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ in DMA was treated with $\operatorname{TDAE}\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-1.1 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs}. \mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}\right)$; the resulting solution was frozen and analyzed by electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy. A strong signal at $\mathrm{g}=2.02$ is assigned to the organic $\mathrm{TDAE}^{+\bullet}$ radical 205, ${ }^{14}$ and the weaker signal $\left(\mathrm{g}_{1}=2.07\right.$, $\mathrm{g}_{2}=2.08, \mathrm{~g}_{3}=2.330$ ) is assigned to a reduced $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Br}$ species 204 (Figure 2.3, also see section 2.9.8.1). The same $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Br}$ signal is observed when $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ is reduced with $\mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})_{2}$. When $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ is used as the reductant, more pronounced changes are observed, which could potentially arise from the interaction between a $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ species with the $\mathrm{Zn}^{\text {II }}$ formed upon oxidation (Figure 2.3). ${ }^{15}$ We note that electrochemical and spectroscopic studies by Hadt and coworkers suggest that DMA can bind to both $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\text {II }}$ redox states. ${ }^{13}$ Given the strong variation of EPR signals and speciation of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{i}}$ species observed herein, no formal assignments of the EPR signals are provided. Nevertheless, these data support the presence of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{X}$ species forming from reduction under cross-coupling reaction conditions, and the nature of these species is clearly dependent on the reaction conditions.

Figure 2.3. EPR analysis of reduced $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiX}_{2}$ species.




A time course of the $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ revealed that the observed EPR signals decrease over time (Figure 2.76-2.77, section 2.9.8.3) in concert with a change in the
corresponding UV-vis-NIR spectra (Figure 2.79-2.80, section 2.9.8.3), and the terminal EPRsilent mixture was catalytically inactive. Attempts to isolate $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{X}$ complexes were unsuccessful; this might be due to the formation of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ oligomers like $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ in the absence of electrophiles 200-202, or due to the difference in stability between DMA-bound and unbound species (Figure 2.3). ${ }^{10 a, 16,17}$

### 2.3.2 Reactivity of Reduced Precatalyst with Substrates

To test whether the putative $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Cl}$ species formed upon reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ can react with alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$, a series of CV studies were performed in the presence of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ (Figure 2.4). A concentration-dependent increase in current was observed as [200] increased, which was accompanied by a loss of re-oxidation current. Taken together, these studies are consistent with reaction between $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} X}$ and alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$.

Figure 2.4. Investigating the reactivity of reduced $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ with substrates by CV .


200


201

CV studies were also performed to investigate the reaction of in situ generated $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Cl}$ with 201. CVs were acquired for $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.0 \mathrm{mM})$ in the presence of varying concentrations of $201(1-100 \mathrm{mM})$, which also showed a concentration-dependent current with cathodic shifting of the onset potential and loss of the anodic return wave (Figure 2.4). This current
likely results from the reaction of the reduced $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}$ complex reacting with 201, presumably corresponding to the catalytic homocoupling to give 207. In the presence of 100 mM 200 and 201, regardless of the order of addition, a catalytic current consistent with the reaction with 200 is observed (Figure 2.5). The observation of a catalytic current resembling the reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ when both electrophiles are present suggests that the reduced catalyst reacts more rapidly with 200 .

Figure 2.5. Comparison of catalytic currents with substrates.


To interrogate the role of Ni in the activation of benzylic chloride 201, a DMA solution of 201 was treated with $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ (3.0 equiv) and NaI ( 0.5 equiv) and the formation of homodimer 207 was monitored (see section 2.9.5). No conversion of $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ or formation of $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ was observed at 0 or $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, even with extended reaction times. In contrast, when $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ was subjected to identical conditions but $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$; standard reaction conditions minus 200) was added, 201 was cleanly converted to homodimer 207 over 60 min (Figure 2.55, section 2.9.5). These findings suggest that $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{X}$ can activate 201. This is consistent with the Mn-mediated Nicatalyzed homodimerization reactions of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 1}$, in which the conversion of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ is faster than the conversion of $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ under otherwise identical conditions (Figure 2.6). Taken together
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with the CV studies, these data qualitatively suggests that the reductively generated $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Cl}$ reacts faster with 200 and is consistent with previous RCC studies investigating the relative rates of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ complexes with aryl and alkyl electrophiles. ${ }^{10 b, 11 a, 19}$

Figure 2.6. Stoichiometric homocoupling for comparing rates of electrophile activation.

200

$$
\xrightarrow[\substack{\mathrm{Mn}^{0}(3 \text { equiv }) \\ \text { DMA }(0.1 \mathrm{M}), 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}]{\substack{\mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \\ \text { (1 equiv) }}}
$$




$$
\xrightarrow[\substack{\mathrm{Mn}{ }^{0}\left(3 \text { equiv) } \\ \text { DMA }(0.1 \mathrm{M}), 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.}]{\stackrel{\mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}}{\text { (1 equiv) }}}
$$




The mechanism shown in Section 2.6 .3 is consistent with our observation that $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} X}$ (204) can react with both 200 and 201, but that 200 reacts with 204 more rapidly. While we have demonstrated that $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Cl}$ can perform the halogen atom transfer from benzylic chloride 201, we cannot rule out the possibility that $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ is reduced and that the corresponding $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{1}$ (alkenyl) species - which is calculated to be a stronger reductant ${ }^{13}$ - mediates the XAT. We note that recent studies by Diao and coworkers have suggested that reduction of similar (biox) $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}(\operatorname{aryl}) \mathrm{X}$ complexes are unlikely to be reduced by $\mathrm{Mn}^{0} .{ }^{11 \mathrm{~b}}$

### 2.3.3 Kinetics of TDAE-Mediated ARA

Since the TDAE-driven $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}$-catalyzed ARA $^{8}$ is homogeneous and does not suffer from an induction period, we initiated our kinetic studies by determining the kinetic orders in 200, 202, and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ under standard reaction conditions (Figure 2.7a). For this, we employed Variable Time Normalization Analysis ${ }^{18}$ (VTNA) to analyze the results of different excess experiments (Figure 2.7b-d). These experiments revealed a $1^{\text {st }}$ order rate dependence on the concentration of NHP ester 202 (Figure 2.7c) and an inverse fractional order rate dependence on the concentration of $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ (Figure 2.7b). The inverse order in $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$ electrophile observed in
this reaction (and the $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$-mediated reaction, vide infra) has also been observed previously for a related (bpy)Ni-catalyzed RCC of aryl and alkyl halides. ${ }^{10 \mathrm{a}}$ Interestingly, there is an apparent $0^{\text {th }}$ order rate dependence on $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ at loadings similar to the optimized conditions (5 and $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$, Figure 2.7d); however, a positive rate dependence develops at low catalyst loadings ( $<1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ). The observation that the catalyst loading does not influence the rate of product 203 formation has not been previously reported for Ni -catalyzed RCC reactions. ${ }^{10,11}$

Figure 2.7. Kinetic orders in substrates and catalyst.


Figure 2.8. Rate dependence on TDAE reductant and TMSBr additive.

$\substack{\mathrm{Me} \\ \mathrm{Me}-\mathrm{S} \mathrm{S} \\ \mathrm{Me}^{\prime}-\mathrm{Br}}$



The reaction rate as a function of [TDAE] and [TMSBr] was also studied by method of initial rates due to the inability to quantify the concentration of the respective species as we did in the VTNA experiments. In the absence of either component no product $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ is produced but 200 is converted to homocoupled 208 in the absence of TMSBr with no conversion of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$. These experiments show that by varying the initial concentration of TMSBr from 1 to 4 equivalents, shows a positive rate dependence with little change to the product distribution (Figure 2.8). Similarly, the TDAE reductant also has a positive rate dependence from 1-2 equiv and then becomes saturated, or pseudo $0^{\text {th }}$-order, at $>2$ equiv (Figure 2.8).

Figure 2.9. Electrophile conversion and byproduct formation as a function of catalyst loading.


To further investigate this unusual rate dependence on catalyst $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$, the concentration of 200, 202, and homodimer $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ were monitored over time, at different concentrations of Ni (Figure 2.9b-d). The conversion of alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ shows a clear rate dependence on the concentration of Ni (Figure 2.9b). In contrast, the rate of conversion of NHP ester $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ is independent of [Ni]: even in experiments where $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ is omitted, $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ is consumed at the same rate as when using $20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Ni}$ (Figure 2.9d). Correspondingly, as the concentration of Ni decreases, the yield of cross-coupled product $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ decreases and the yield of homocoupled product $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ (formed as a 1:1 diastereomeric mixture) increases (Figure 2.9d). These data are consistent with generation of a cage-escaped benzylic radical from 202 by a non-Ni-catalyzed process. This represents a distinct mode of NHP ester activation for the $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}$-catalyzed RCC
in comparison to the (bpy)Ni-mediated coupling of NHP esters reported by Weix ${ }^{19}$ and Baran, ${ }^{20}$ in which a (bpy) $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}-\mathrm{Ar}$ is proposed to reduce the NHP ester by single electron transfer (SET).

### 2.4 DETERMINING THE CATALYST RESTING STATE

### 2.4.1 Using EPR to Detect a Paramagnetic Catalyst Resting State

Figure 2.10. Reaction monitoring by $E P R$ to detect paramagnetic Ni resting state.



At this stage, we sought to determine the resting state of the Ni catalyst under the reaction conditions. If a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ or $\mathrm{Ni}^{\text {III }}$ intermediate were the resting state, then it could be observable by EPR. The Ni-catalyzed reaction of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ was performed using $2 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ under otherwise standard conditions and aliquots were removed, filtered, and frozen in an EPR tube. No signal corresponding to a metal-based radical was observed by EPR; instead, a signal consistent with an organic radical was observed, which decreased in intensity over time (Figure 2.10). This species was assigned as $\mathbf{2 0 5}$ by comparison to an independently prepared sample
(Figure 2.71, section 2.9.8) and previously reported spectra. ${ }^{14}$ Although this does not rule out a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ or $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}$ resting state, we sought to investigate other possibilities.

### 2.4.2 NMR Reaction Monitoring For Diamagnetic Resting State

Figure 2.11. Electrophile conversion and byproduct formation as a function of catalyst.


Given the rapid reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Cl}$ with alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ (Figure 2.5), and prior RCC mechanistic studies, ${ }^{10 b, 11 a}$ we hypothesized that the catalyst resting state likely resides after oxidative addition of the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)$-electrophile. To monitor the reaction by in situ ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ labeled alkenyl bromide 209 was used and all alkenyl bromide-derived species were tracked
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over the course of the reaction (Figure 2.11a). Upon the addition of TDAE ( $0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) to a solution of $\mathbf{2 0 9}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathbf{2 0 2}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(0.015 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $\operatorname{TMSBr}(0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{NaI}(0.075 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMA-d 9 , the signal corresponding to 209 decreases and several signals emerge that were assigned to product $210(\delta=116.5 \mathrm{ppm})$, homocoupled diene 211 ( $\delta=-115 \mathrm{ppm}$ ), and a new, broad signal at $\delta=120 \mathrm{ppm}$ (Figure 2.11b). This species persisted throughout the reaction, maintaining steady concentration corresponding to $15 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, or $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$, which is the concentration of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ used in the reaction. When this experiment was repeated with $20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$, the concentration of this species corresponded to $17 \mathrm{~mol} \%(25 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ for the first 2.5 hours of catalysis and then decreased as the reaction approached the last few turnovers, eventually disappearing at the end of the reaction (Figure 2.11c). Although attempts to isolate this species or prepare it independently have been unsuccessful due to its instability, we assign this intermediate as a diamagnetic $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$ oxidative addition complex 212. ${ }^{21}$

### 2.4.3 Mechanistic Summary of TDAE-Mediated Reaction

Taken together, a mechanism for the TDAE mediated Ni -catalyzed RCC is proposed in Figure 6. Upon reduction of the Ni precatalyst, the resulting $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{Br}(\mathbf{2 0 4})$ rapidly reacts with alkenyl bromide to give $\mathrm{Ni}^{\text {IIII }}$ species $\mathbf{2 1 3}$ which can be reduced to furnish resting state species 212. Given Hadt and coworker's studies, ${ }^{13}$ it is possible that DMA is coordinated to 204 during oxidative addition. While the reductant in this oxidative addition-reduction sequence is not known, we propose that the oxidative addition step is fast and reversible since we can observe the formation of alkenyl iodide and chloride products (when a $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$source is present). ${ }^{8,22}$ The $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$ complex $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ can then intercept NHP ester-derived radical 214 to give $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}$ complex 215 which can undergo reductive elimination to give product 203. NHP ester 202 is activated by TMSBr followed by reduction with TDAE in the turnover-limiting step (vide infra). This reduced species undergoes $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ homolysis and subsequent decarboxylation to give $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ (Figure
2.12).

Figure 2.12. Mechanism of TDAE-mediated ARA.


### 2.5 MECHANISM OF NHP ESTER ACTIVATION

### 2.5.1 NHP Ester Reduction

Given that the kinetic studies revealed that the NHP ester $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ is not reduced by Ni, we hypothesized that it is instead reduced by TDAE. To test this hypothesis, NHP ester $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ was treated with TDAE in DMA and the formation of homodimer $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ was monitored as an indirect measurement of benzylic radical (214) generation. In the absence of additional additives, the mixture of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ and TDAE results in minimal conversion to homodimer 207, even at ambient temperature (Figure 2.13a, purple). This can be rationalized by the difference in reduction potential of NHP ester $202\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p} / 2}=-1.62 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs. $\left.\mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}\right)$, which is 0.5 V more cathodic than TDAE $\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-1.11 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ vs. $\left.\mathrm{Fc}^{0 /+}\right)$; the irreversible loss of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ following SET does not appear to be sufficient to drive the thermodynamically unfavorable process. Similarly, the mixture of 202, TDAE, and NaI also fail to produce homodimer 207 (Figure 2.13a, green).

In contrast, when TDAE is added to a mixture of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ and TMSBr ( 1.0 equiv), $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ is converted to $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ at a rate that is comparable to the rate of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ conversion in the catalytic
reaction (Figure 2.13a, teal). We note that TMSBr is essential to form 203 in high yields under standard reaction conditions ( $19 \%$ yield $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ when TMSBr is excluded). The rate is increased further $\left(\mathrm{k}_{\text {rel }}=1.5\right)$ when both TMSBr and NaI are present, presumably through the in situ generation of TMSI (Figure 2.13a, maroon). We propose that the silyl halide additive functions as a Lewis acid to lower the reduction potential ${ }^{23}$ of the NHP ester through formation of $\mathbf{2 1 6}$ which can be reduced by TDAE to furnish radical 214 (Figure 2.13b).

Figure 2.13. Additive effects on NHP ester reduction by TDAE.


### 2.5.2 Additive Effects on Rate of NHP Ester Reduction by TDAE

The observation that a Lewis acid gates NHP ester reduction inspired us to question whether the rate of radical generation could be tuned by using TDAE in combination with different Lewis acids, similar to Weix's work tuning rate of radical generation by using derivatized NHP esters. ${ }^{24,25}$ To test this, we measured the rate of radical generation (as
$\mathrm{d}[\mathbf{2 0 7}] / \mathrm{dt}$ ) in the presence of a variety of Lewis acids (Figure 2.14a). The more sterically hindered triethylsilyl bromide (TESBr) results in a 3-fold decrease in the rate $\left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=0.34\right)$ of radical generation. Further investigation of different silyl halides revealed an intuitive trend in sterics (TBS $<\mathrm{TES}<\mathrm{TMS}$ ), with larger groups slowing down radical generation, as well as the leaving group identity $(\mathrm{Cl}<\mathrm{Br}<\mathrm{OTf}<\mathrm{I})^{26}$, with the better leaving group accelerating radical generation (Figure 2.14b). As observed with TMSBr (Figure 2.13a, purple), addition of NaI as a co-additive to various $\mathrm{R}_{3} \mathrm{Si}-\mathrm{Cl}$ additives can increase the rate by more than 2 -fold. Increasing the concentration of TMSBr increases the rate ( $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=1.68$ ), presumably by driving the equilibrium to increase the concentration of silylated NHP ester 216. Additionally, non-silyl Lewis acids can also increase the rate of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ reduction by TDAE. We have quantified the ability of several common additives ${ }^{27}$ to modulate the rate of radical generation, with rates spanning three orders of magnitude (Figure 2.14a).

Figure 2.14. Kinetics of NHP ester reduction with different Lewis acids.


### 2.5.3 Reevaluating Optimized ARA Conditions

Figure 2.15. Impact of Lewis acid on optimal catalyst loadings.



203


After demonstrating the rate of NHP ester activation can be tuned with different Lewis acid additives, we sought to investigate how the yield of product was effected by the silyl additive. Although the ARA reaction between 200 and 202 was initially reported using TMSBr, we observed that at lower catalyst loadings, increased amounts of benzyl dimer $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ is formed (Figure 2.9d). We hypothesized that slower rate of radical generation could improve the yield of $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ at low catalyst loadings by better matching of the relative concentrations of the resting state species 212 and benzylic radical 214. Given that TESBr decreases the rate of benzylic radical formation by 3-fold (Figure 2.14a), we performed a series of experiments varying the concentration of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ in the presence of either TMSBr or TESBr (Figure 2.15). First, we note that for this well-performing substrate pair, high yields can be maintained using $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$. Second, we note that TMSBr performs better relative to TESBr when $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ is used (higher concentration of resting state 212) and performs worse than TESBr at $0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$, when rapid release of benzyl radical would outpace radical capture by resting state 212 (Figure 2.15). Using $0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$, higher yield of $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ was obtained
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with $\operatorname{TESBr}(84 \%$ yield) than with $\operatorname{TMSBr}$ ( $72 \%$ yield), which we propose results from slower release of the benzyl radical. Analysis of the product profiles for each bromosilane shows that the ratio of cross-coupled to homocoupled products reaches a maxima at $2.5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Ni}$ for $\operatorname{TMSBr}\left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=1.0\right)$ and $1 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Ni}$ for $\operatorname{TESBr}\left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=0.34\right)$ (Figure 2.82 and 2.83, section 2.9.9), which is consistent with the trends observed in yield. We anticipate these data can serve as a roadmap for optimizing reaction conditions for new substrate combinations.

### 2.6 INVESTIGATION OF HETEROGENOUS ARA REACTION

### 2.6.1 Kinetic Studies on ARA with Benzyl Chlorides

Kinetic studies of the heterogenous metal-powder conditions (Figure 2.1a) proved more challenging than the homogenous TDAE-mediated reaction (Figure 2.1b). We observe long induction periods (up to 90 minutes) and reaction times of 6 hours using previously reported conditions. ${ }^{7}$ The induction period and reaction times can be shortened to 30 and 100 min , respectively, by pre-activating the $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ with HCl . Use of $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ powder further improved the reaction times ( $5-10$ minute induction period and 45 minute reaction times, Figure 2.36, section 2.9.3.1) and provided product in comparable yield and with only slightly lower enantioselectivity as $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ ( Zn : $91 \%$ yield, $90 \%$ ee; Mn : $96 \%$ yield, $96 \%$ ee). Both $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ gave reactions with linear rates of product formation, indicative of mass transport-limited reduction; however, $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ displayed a less significant stir rate dependence that saturated $>1000$ rpm (Figure 2.35, section 2.9.3.1). Use of 6 equiv $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ slightly increased the reaction rate by a factor of 1.1 , similar to observations by Weix ${ }^{10 \mathrm{~b}}$ and Diao ${ }^{11 \mathrm{a}}$ in related arylation reactions (Figure 2.37, section 2.9.3.1). These modified reaction conditions (Figure 2.16a) enabled the collection of reproducible kinetic data where the heterogenous reduction events are not as significantly rate limiting, allowing us to probe the rate influences of other reaction components.

Figure 2.16. Kinetics of Mn-mediated $A R A$ reaction.


Kinetics experiments reveal a first-order rate dependence on $\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]$, unlike the TDAE system, across catalyst loadings ranging from $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ to $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ (Figure 2.16d). The reaction exhibits a negative first-order rate dependence on $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}$ (Figure 2.16 b ), similar the TDAEmediated system but to a lesser extent (Figure 2.7b). The rate dependence on $[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}$ is more complex: a fractional positive rate dependence was observed at 1.0 and 2.0 equivalents of 201, but the rate decreases again when $>2.0$ equiv 201 is employed (Figure 2.16c). Notably, as [201] $]_{0}$ increases, the ee of $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ decreases. Taken together, these data might indicate that there are competing mechanisms that depend on the concentration of [201] ${ }_{0}$. One possibility is that when $[\mathbf{2 0 1}] \gg[\mathbf{2 0 0}]$, the reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} X}$ with $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ begins to compete with the reaction
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between $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{X}$ and 201, therefore reversing the order of oxidative addition of the electrophiles to Ni .

### 2.6.2 Stoichiometric Experiments

Scheme 2.1. Stoichiometric $\mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ couplings with both $C\left(s p^{3}\right)$ electrophiles.


While the inclusion of a stoichiometric reductant is required to render the reaction catalytic, we wanted to investigate if reagents like $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}, \mathrm{Mn}^{0}$, or TDAE are required for product formation. A stoichiometric reaction was conducted using equimolar quantities of $\mathbf{L 3}, \mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})_{2}$, alkenyl bromide 200, and benzyl chloride 201 or NHP ester 202 (Scheme 2.1a) in the absence of exogenous reductant. The Ni-mediated reaction with $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ gave product 203 in $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ yield and 96\% ee while using NHP ester 202 also formed 203 albiet in $24 \%$ yield and $28 \%$ ee. Addition of radical trap 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-1-piperidinyloxy (TEMPO) significantly reduced the yield of $\mathbf{2 0 3}(42 \%$ yield, $96 \%$ ee) due to the formation of the benzyl-tempo adduct 217 ( $31 \%$ yield) (Scheme 2.1b). This shows that the $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{0}$ can facilitate the enantioselective RCC reaction with 202, possibly through a mechanism that is less selective than the optimized reaction conditions.

### 2.6.3 Mechanistic Summary of Mn-Mediated Reaction

Based on our experimental studies, a proposed mechanism for the Mn-mediated Nicatalyzed ARA is shown in Figure 2.17. Upon reduction of precatalyst $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ the resulting complex $\mathbf{2 0 4}$ reacts with alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ in an oxidative addition-reduction step to give $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}($ II $)$ complex 213. This could proceed by a bimolecular oxidative addition as proposed by Diao, ${ }^{11 \mathrm{a}}$ or by reduction of the transiently formed $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{III})$ species $\mathbf{2 1 3}$ by $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$. Ni-catalyzed halide atom abstraction (XAT) from benzylic chloride $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ gives rise to a cage-escaped radical 214 that can be captured by $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ to yield product $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ following reductive elimination.

Figure 2.17. Mechanism of Mn-mediated $A R A$


### 2.7 COMPUTATIONAL INVESTIGATION ON THE ORIGIN OF ENANTIOSELECTIVITY

Figure 2.18. ee's of products produced from Mn- and TDAE-mediated ARA are similar.


A comparison of the enantioenrichment of the common products isolated from the optimized TDAE conditions (Figure 2.1b) and $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ conditions (Figure 2.1a) shows a good correlation across the two reactions (Figure 2.18). ${ }^{8}$ This suggests that despite the differences in mechanism, conditions, and radical precursors, the enantiodetermining step may be the same in both reactions. This inspired our team to investigate the enantiodetermining step of the reaction as well as the origin of enantioinduction in this stereoconvergent transformation.

Figure 2.19. Sterics of chiral ligand effects diastereoselective radical capture.

S $=\mathrm{H}$
(D) $=\mathrm{Me}$
(L) $=\mathrm{Ph}$


TS2-S
$\Delta \Delta G^{\ddagger}=0.0$
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To explore the origins of enantioinduction, the structures and relative Gibbs free energies of the competing transition states for addition of radical $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ to resting state complex $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ were computed (Figure 2.19). The free energy difference between TS2-S and TS2- $\boldsymbol{R}$ is computed to be $3.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, which slightly overestimates the enantioselectivity for the reaction. In both transition states, the smallest substituent of the approaching benzyl radical (214), hydrogen, is pointing towards the sterically bulky part of the ligand (highlighted in teal in Figure 2.19). This allows the largest substituent, the phenyl group, to project away from this region of the ligand in the favored transition state TS2-S. In the disfavored transition state TS2-R, the phenyl group is proximal to the bulky region of the ligand. This results in an almost perfectly staggered approach of the benzyl radical with respect to the Ni ligands in TS2-S, while steric repulsion from the ligand forces the benzyl radical to adopt a more eclipsed conformation in TS2-R. ${ }^{28}$ Subsequent reductive elimination for 215-S is facile with a computed barrier of $0.9 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ (Figure 2.20) for the major pathway. These calculations suggest the facial selectivity of the enantiodetermining radical addition is influenced by the steric environment of BOX ligand L3 (Figure 2.20).

Figure 2.20. Potential energy surface of radical capture and reductive elimination.


### 2.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In summary, we have investigated two Ni-catalyzed asymmetric RCC reactions to determine how changing the reductant and $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile influences the reaction mechanism. These reactions proceed through a $\mathrm{Ni}^{1 / I I I}$ cycle with fast activation of the alkenyl bromide electrophile by a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ species. Both reactions have a rate-determining activation of the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ electrophile to furnish a cage escaped benzyl radical. We have demonstrated that Ni is not required for NHP ester activation; instead, the combination of TDAE and TMSBr results in reductive decarboxylation to give the benzylic radical. The radical can then be intercepted by a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}-\text { alkenyl resting state that we were able to detect spectroscopically. }}$

The fact that reduction of NHP esters by TDAE is Lewis acid-mediated, rate controlling, and independent of the alkenyl bromide activation has significant implications for the development of other $\mathrm{Csp}^{3}-\mathrm{Csp}^{\mathrm{n}}$ RCCs. This mechanistic regime allows for independent tuning of the rates of electrophile activation where $\mathrm{d}\left[\mathrm{Csp}^{3}\right] / \mathrm{dt}$ can be tuned with additives and $\mathrm{d}\left[\mathrm{Csp}^{2}\right] / \mathrm{dt}$ through catalyst design. It is our hope that these findings aid in the adoption of $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{X}$ reductive couplings with NHP ester fragments in more complex settings by providing a framework to guide reaction optimization.
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### 2.9 EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

### 2.9.1 Materials and Methods

Unless otherwise stated, reactions were performed under a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere using freshly dried solvents. All reagents were purchased from commercial suppliers (Sigma Aldrich, Combi- Blocks, TCI, Enamine, Strem) and used without further purification unless mentioned otherwise. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), acetonitrile (MeCN), and methylene chloride $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ were dried by passing through activated alumina columns. Anhydrous dimethylacetamide (DMA) was purchased from Aldrich and stored in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox. $\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot$ dme was purchased from Strem and stored in the glovebox. Manganese powder ( $\sim 325$ mesh, 99.3\%) was purchased from Alfa Aesar. Zinc dust (97.5\%) was purchased from Strem. NaI (anhydrous, $99 \%$ ) was purchased from Strem and stored in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filed glovebox. Flash column chromatography was performed as described by Still et al. using silica gel (230-400 mesh, Silicycle). ${ }^{29}$ Purified compounds were dried on a high vacuum line ( 0.2 torr) to remove trace solvent. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker Avance III HD with Prodigy cryoprobe (at 400 MHz and 101 MHz , respectively), a Varian 400 MR (at 400 MHz and 101 MHz , respectively), or a Varian Inova 500 (at 500 MHz and 126 MHz , respectively). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19}$ F NMR spectra were also recorded on a Varian Inova 300 (at 300 MHz and 282 MHz , respectively). NMR data is reported relative to internal $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, \delta=7.26\right)$ and $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right.$, $\delta=77.0)$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\left({ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}-164.9 \mathrm{ppm}\right)$. HRMS were acquired from the Caltech Center for Catalysis and Chemical Synthesis Facility using electrospray ionization (ESI-TOF). Analytical chiral SFC was performed with a Mettler SFC supercritical $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ analytical chromatography system with Chiralcel AD-H, OD-H, AS-H, OB-H, and OJ-H columns ( $4.6 \mathrm{~mm} \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). Analytical achiral GC was performed with an Agilent 6850 GC utilizing an HP-1 capillary column (methyl siloxane, $30.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 320 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, Agilent) column with a splitless injection and a helium
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flow of $7.3 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$. The temperature program began at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and was held for 2 min , increased to $250{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$ and then held at $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min . X-band perpendicular mode EPR spectra were recorded on a Bruker EMX spectrometer at 77 K using a $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ immersion dewar. Parallel mode EPR were recorded at 5 K using a LHe cryostat. EPR spectra were simulated with Easyspin (version 5.2.35) ${ }^{30}$. Electronic absorption spectra were obtained using CARY 300 spectrophotometer. Electroanalytical experiments were conducted in the Beckman Resource Laser Resource Center at the California Institute of Technology using a Bio-Logic SP300 potentiostat/galvanostat. Cyclic voltammetry experiments we conducted with a glassy carbon disk working electrode, a platinum wire counter electrode, and a silver wire reference electrode containing a 10 mM AgNO 3 solution with $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}$ in MeCN .

### 2.9.2 Synthetic Procedures

### 2.9.2.1 Substrate and Catalyst Synthesis

Figure 2.21. Substrates and catalysts used in mechanistic studies

Substrates/Products:


200


209


218


202


207

Catalysts:



$\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$

Catalysts:(3aR,3a'R,8aS,8a'S)-2,2'-(Cyclopropane-1,1-diyl)bis(3a,8a-dihydro-8H-indeno[1,2-d]-oxazole) (L3) was synthesized according to our previously published procedure ${ }^{31}$ Complexation with $\mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ were prepared according to previously reported synthesis of
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$\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}{ }^{9 \mathrm{ag}}$ and $\mathbf{L \mathbf { 3 }} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} .{ }^{8}$ Complexes were recrystallized once by vapor diffusion of pentane in a saturated DCM solution for use in catalytic reactions and 3 times for use in electroanalytical experiments.

Substrates: Coupling partners 200, 209, and 202 were synthesized according to the procedure described in the initial disclosure. ${ }^{7,8}$

( $\boldsymbol{E}$ )-1-fluoro-4-(2-iodovinyl)benzene (218): To a 250 mL oven-dried round bottom flask with a stir bar was added $(E)$-4-fluorocinnamic acid ( $831.6 \mathrm{mg}, 5.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv). The acid was then suspended in $50 \mathrm{~mL}(0.1 \mathrm{M}) \mathrm{DCM}$ then triethylamine ( $105 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.75 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.15$ equiv) was added and the reaction was stirred under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$. To the stirring solution was then added N iodosuccinimide ( $1.41 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.25$ equiv) in one portion. After 12 minutes, the reaction solution had turned red and then deep black after 20 minutes. After 1 h the starting material was consumed by TLC and the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. Residue was taken up in 30 mL EtOAc and washed with 25 mL sat. $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ solution. The aqueous layer was then extracted two more times and combined organics were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered through celite, rinsed with EtOAc then concentrated in vacuo to give a brown solid. The crude was then purified by filtration through $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ with pentane to give alkenyl iodide $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ ( $558 \mathrm{mg}, 2.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, $45 \%$ yield). Note: we observed significant discoloration and decomposition upon prolonged exposure to light so storage at $-20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the darkness under Ar is essential to prevent decomposition. Spectral data is in good agreement with literature reports. ${ }^{32}$

Chapter 2 - Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of Alkenyl and 108 Benzyl Electrophiles

### 2.9.3 Kinetics and Time Course Experiments

Methods of GC-FID Quantification: For each reaction component and product, authentic samples were isolated to determine response factors for GC-FID analysis. Three standards were made for each analyte to normalize the GC-FID area counts and convert the obtained data into reaction concentration (M) values. The analyte and dodecane standard were each added to a 20 mL vial and massed on a balance. The mixture was dissolved in 10 mL of EtOAc and transferred to a GC vial for analysis. The density of dodecane $(0.75 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$ was also used to convert the area values to concentration.

### 2.9.3.1 Heterogeneous Reaction Kinetics



General Procedure 2.1 ( $\mathbf{Z n}^{0}$ powder): A 10 mL round bottom flask with a small magnetic stirring rod was charged with the sodium iodide ( $22.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5$ equiv) and zinc powder ( $58.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv). The flask was sealed with a rubber septum, purged with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by being placed in an ice water bath. The alkenyl bromide $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ (85.2 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ complex ( $19.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to a 2 mL volumetric flask, sealed with a rubber septum, and purged with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$. The benzyl chloride $201(53 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.4$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $n$-dodecane $(48 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ as an internal standard were added via syringe to the volumetric flask. Then anhydrous DMA was added to the volumetric flask until it reached the 2 mL line. A small stir bar was added to the volumetric flask and the solution was stirred until all of the $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ complex was dissolved. The solution was taken up into a 2 mL syringe to ensure homogeneity, and then 1.5 mL of the solution was added to the round bottom flask. The reaction was stirred under a positive $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ flow by using an IKA stir plate set to a stirring speed
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of 1500 rpm . At appropriate time points, approximately $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of the solution was removed by syringe (syringe and needle were pre-flushed with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ ), loaded onto a short silica plug ( 1 cm ) in a glass pipette packed with cotton. The crude mixture was flushed through the silica plug with 2 mL of $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane directly into GC vials and analyzed by GC-FID.

All data runs obtained from the GC-FID instrument were appropriately integrated for the product and the dodecane standard. The integrated data points were further processed by normalizing each product area value by its corresponding standard area value. The normalized areas were then converted to concentration by using calculated response factors obtained from preparing known mixtures of the standard and purified reaction product. Each reaction was analyzed and graphed to show the product concentration $(\mathrm{M})$ as a function of reaction time $(\mathrm{min})$. All data points were plotted with black markers $(\bullet)$ as shown below, while only the data points included in the linear fit are shown with red markers $(\bullet)$. The best-fit linear regression line is also shown and the $y=m x+b$ equation is given. Each reaction was run in duplicates as indicated by Trial 1 and Trial 2.

Figure 2.22. Standard reaction conditions: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=$ 0.02 M .
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## Effect of Changing [ $\mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ ]

The general procedure 2.1 was followed except varying the amounts of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ were used to give final loadings of $5 \%, 7 \%, 14 \%$, and $20 \%$.

Figure 2.23. Catalyst loading $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.01$ M.


Figure 2.24. Catalyst loading $7 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.014$ M.


Figure 2.25. Catalyst loading $14 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.028$ M.


Figure 2.26. Catalyst loading $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.04$
M.



## Effect of Changing Alkenyl Bromide (200) Equivalents

The general procedure 2.1 was followed except varying the amounts of $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}$ were used to give final amounts of 1.5, 2, 3, and 4 equivalents.

Figure 2.27. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 0} 1.5$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.3 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.
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Figure 2.28. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 0} 2.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.4 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.29. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 0} 3.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.6 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.30. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 0} 4.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.8 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.



## Effect of Changing Benzyl Chloride (201) Equivalents

The general procedure 2.1 was followed except varying the amounts of $[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}$ were used to give final amounts of $1.5,2,3$, and 4 equivalents.
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Figure 2.31. Order in 2011.5 equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.3 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.32. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 1} 2.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.4 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.
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Figure 2.33. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 1} 3.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.6 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.34. Order in $\mathbf{2 0 1} 4.0$ equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}=0.8 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]=0.02 \mathrm{M}$.
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## Tabulated Summary of Heterogeneous Kinetics Data:

Table 2.1. Tabulated rate data for each run varying $\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]$.

| $\left[\mathbf{L} 3 \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\right]_{0}$ <br> (M) | Trial 1 Rate (M/min) | Trial 2 <br> Rate (M/min) | Average <br> Rate <br> (M/min) | Standard deviation | 203 ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 1 | 203 ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02 | 0.0050 | 0.0051 | 0.0050 | 0.0001 | 93 | 93 |
| 0.01 | 0.0025 | 0.0021 | 0.0023 | 0.0003 | 87 | 88 |
| 0.014 | 0.0035 | 0.0037 | 0.0036 | 0.0001 | 89 | 89 |
| 0.028 | 0.0061 | 0.0059 | 0.0060 | 0.0002 | 86 | 85 |
| 0.04 | 0.0099 | 0.011 | 0.010 | 0.0004 | 85 | 85 |

Table 2.2. Tabulated rate data for each run varying [200]o.

| $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}(\mathrm{M})$ | Trial 1 Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Trial 2 <br> Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Average <br> Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Standard <br> deviation | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 1 | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.2 | 0.0050 | 0.0051 | 0.0050 | 0.0001 | 93 | 93 |
| 0.3 | 0.0030 | 0.0031 | 0.0030 | 0.0001 | 93 | 91 |
| 0.4 | 0.0025 | 0.0025 | 0.0025 | 0.0001 | 94 | 94 |
| 0.6 | 0.0016 | 0.0017 | 0.0017 | 0.00003 | 95 | 95 |
| 0.8 | 0.0018 | 0.0015 | 0.017 | 0.0002 | 95 | 95 |

Table 2.3. Tabulated rate data for each run varying [201]o.

| $[\mathbf{2 0 1}]_{0}(\mathrm{M})$ | Trial 1 Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Trial 2 <br> Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Average <br> Rate <br> $(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{min})$ | Standard <br> deviation | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 1 | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ ee at <br> End of <br> Trial 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.2 | 0.0050 | 0.0051 | 0.0050 | 0.0001 | 93 | 93 |
| 0.3 | 0.0069 | 0.0067 | 0.0068 | 0.0001 | 83 | 84 |
| 0.4 | 0.0075 | 0.0085 | 0.0080 | 0.0007 | 84 | 83 |
| 0.6 | 0.0055 | 0.0059 | 0.0057 | 0.0003 | 82 | 83 |
| 0.8 | 0.0052 | 0.0053 | 0.0053 | 0.0001 | 83 | 83 |

## Impact of Stir Rate

Figure 2.35. Rate of product 203 formation at different stir rates.


Rate of $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ formation at different stir rates (average of 2 runs shown). There is a significant rate dependence on stirring from 500 rpm to 1000 rpm and a smaller difference between 1000 rpm and 1500 rpm . The stir rate dependence is smaller at high stir rates and kinetic runs measured runs at 1500 rpm are reproducible.
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## $\mathbf{M n}{ }^{0}$ vs. $\mathbf{Z n}^{0}$ Profile:

Figure 2.36. Rate of product 203 formation with $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ reductants.



Rate of $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ formation at 1500 rpm shows a longer induction period and overall longer reaction times with $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ reductant compared to $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$.

## Excess Zn ${ }^{0}$ Profile

Figure 2.37. Rate of product $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ formation with 3 and 6 equivalents of $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ reductant.



### 2.9.3.2 Homogenous Reaction Kinetics



General Procedure 2.2: To a 2 mL volumetric flask was added (E)-1-(2-bromovinyl)-4methoxybenzene (200, $65.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.308 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv), 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 2 phenylpropanoate ( $\mathbf{2 0 2}, 90.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.308 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv) and $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(8.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0154 \mathrm{mmol}$, $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) on the bench. The volumetric flask was then placed under argon and sealed with a septa. In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox was then added sodium iodide ( $23.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.154 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5$ equiv) to the volumetric flask which was then filled to volume with DMA $(0.154 \mathrm{M})$. A stir bar was then added and the solution was stirred for 15 minutes. In a 1 mL volumetric flask was added $N, N$ '-tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene (TDAE, $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.43 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) and then filled to volume with DMA $(0.43 \mathrm{M})$ in the glovebox and sealed with a rubber septum and tape. Then 1.3 mL of the homogeneous solution in the 2 mL volumetric flask was then added to a 10 mL oven-dried round bottom flask with a 2 dram stir bar. The flask was then sealed with a rubber septum and electrical tape. To the 10 mL round bottom flask was added $15 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of dodecane as the internal standard followed by $\operatorname{TMSBr}(26.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv). The round bottom flask was then quickly removed from the glovebox and placed in an ice bath under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred. $\mathrm{A} \sim 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ aliquot were removed by an $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-purged 1 mL syringe for a $\mathrm{t}=0$ timepoint. Once cooled, $\operatorname{TMSBr}(26.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv) was added via syringe and the reaction was stirred for 30 seconds before 0.7 mL of the cooled TDAE solution was added initiating the reaction. $\sim 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ aliquots were removed by an $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-purged 1 mL syringe and quenched into a 1dram vial containing EtOAc and $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}_{\text {(aq) }}$. The vial was then capped and shaken then the organic layer was removed and pushed through a $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ plug into a GC vial for analysis. All
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samples were analyzed directly by GC-FID. Each experiment was run in duplicate with representative profiles shown below.

Figure 2.38. Standard reaction conditions under general procedure 2.2: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$, $[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.005 \mathrm{M}$.


## Reaction Profiles for Experiments Varying [ $\left.\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i B r}_{2}\right]_{0}$

Figure 2.39. Order in $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=$ 0.02 M .
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Figure 2.40. Order in $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=$ 0.01 M .


Figure 2.41. Order in $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L} \mathbf{3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.05$ M.
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Figure 2.42. Order in $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.01$ M.


Figure 2.43. Order in $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2} \mathrm{O} \mathrm{mol} \%:[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0 \mathrm{M}$.


## Reaction Profiles for Experiments Varying [200]0

Figure 2.44. Order 2002 equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.05 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.45. Order 2005 equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.5 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.05 \mathrm{M}$.
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## Reaction Profiles for Experiments Varying [202]0

Figure 2.46. Order 2022 equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.05 \mathrm{M}$.


Figure 2.47. Order 2023 equiv: $[\mathbf{2 0 0}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathbf{2 0 2}]_{0}=0.3 \mathrm{M},\left[\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\right]=0.05 \mathrm{M}$.

$$
[202]_{0}=0.3 \mathrm{M}
$$



Figure 2.48. Grid of reactions analyzed by Variable Time Normalization Analysis (VTNA) showing the coefficients that result in the best profile overlay next to coefficients that show poor overlay.










### 2.9.4 Mechanism of Substrate Activation Experiments

### 2.9.4.1 Additive Effects on NHP Ester Reduction Rate
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General Procedure 2.3: To an oven-dried 10 mL round bottom flask with a stir bar was added 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 2-phenylpropanoate (202, $59.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0$ equiv). The flask was then brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox where NaI (if applicable), DMA ( $2.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) and $n$-dodecane (target: $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.088 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.44$ eqiuv, actual mass was recorded for each experiment) internal standard was added. The solution was stirred until homogenous and then the respective Lewis acid ( $0.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added and the flask was sealed with a septa and electrical tape. The flask was removed from the glovebox and placed under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred. A $\sim 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ aliquot of the solution was removed with a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-purged syringe then quenched into a 1-dram vial containing EtOAc and $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}_{(\mathrm{aq})}$ and the organic layer was passed through a $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ plug into a GC vial then further diluted with EtOAc for the appropriate concentration for GC analysis. To the stirring solution was then added $N, N$ '-tetrakis(dimethylamino)ethylene ( $93.1 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0$ equiv) to start the reaction $(t=0)$. The reaction was then aliquoted with the same procedure previously described at regular intervals.

Data Analysis: The calculated concentrations of 202, meso-207 and dl-207 were calculated from the analyte:standard integral ratios measured by GC-FID at each timepoint. The measured response for each component was used to calculate the amount of analyte which was then converted to concentration corresponding to 2 mL reaction volume. In all cases, diastereomers of $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ were produced in a 1:1 ratio and summed to determine the total amount of product produced $\left([\mathbf{2 0 7}]_{\text {meso }}+[\mathbf{2 0 7}]_{\mathrm{dl}}=[\mathbf{2 0 7}]_{\text {tot }}\right.$, noted as $[\mathbf{2 0 7}]$ throughout the remainder of the text $)$. Due to the fact that the formation of $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ from the diffusion-limited termination of two 202derived radicals is much faster than the reactions leading to the generation of the radical species it is reasonable to treat the rate of radical generation as the rate of [207] formation.

The relative rate of $\mathbf{2 0 2}$-derived radical formation was determined from the [207] vs. time profiles for each Lewis acid additive. The rates were determined in a similar method as described by Weix and coworkers ${ }^{33}$ using equation 2.1 to linearize the data.
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$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{(1-f)}=m t \tag{equation2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f$ is the fraction of $[\mathbf{2 0 7}]_{t}$ over the theoretical yield of [207]. The rate was then extracted from the slope determined from least-squares linear regression. To calculate the relative rate $\left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}\right)$ the absolute rate obtained from experiments employing 1 equivalent of TMSBr was used as a baseline according to equation 2.2 due to its use in the optimized catalytic reaction.

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{\text {rel }}=\frac{k_{\text {Lewis acid }}}{k_{T M S B r}} \tag{equation2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Representative Concentration Profiles and Rate Determination:

Figure 2.49. Representative profile from general procedure 2.3 with product 207 shown as individual diastereomers (left) and combined yield (right).
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Figure 2.50. Representative profile from general procedure 2.3 under standard conditions in duplicate to show reproducibility.



Figure 2.51. Comparative reaction profiles for different Lewis acids (left) and the corresponding linearized data.
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## Tabulated Rate Data:

Table 2.4. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S B r]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSBr | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.002625 |  |
| krel | 1.000 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F )}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 60 | 0.006 | 1.13 |
| 120 | 0.011 | 1.27 |
| 180 | 0.016 | 1.45 |
| 300 | 0.022 | 1.78 |
| 450 | 0.028 | 2.27 |
| 630 | 0.033 | 2.91 |
| 900 | 0.038 | 4.04 |
| 1200 | 0.039 | 4.70 |
| 1500 | 0.040 | 5.20 |
| 1800 | 0.041 | 5.59 |
| 2700 | 0.041 | 5.62 |
| 3600 | 0.041 | 5.88 |
| 5400 | 0.039 | 4.61 |
| 7202 | 0.043 | 6.88 |

Table 2.5. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S I]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSI | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.00317 |  |
| krel | 1.210 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 60 | 0.007 | 1.17 |
| 120 | 0.013 | 1.35 |
| 180 | 0.018 | 1.57 |
| 300 | 0.025 | 1.97 |
| 450 | 0.030 | 2.48 |
| 600 | 0.033 | 3.02 |
| 960 | 0.037 | 3.83 |
| 1200 | 0.038 | 4.03 |
| 1500 | 0.037 | 3.85 |
| 1800 | 0.038 | 4.25 |
| 2700 | 0.038 | 4.27 |
| 3600 | 0.038 | 4.15 |
| 5400 | 0.039 | 4.42 |

Chapter 2 - Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of Alkenyl and 130 Benzyl Electrophiles

Table 2.6. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S O T f]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSOTf | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.00296 |  |
| krel | 1.128 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F )}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 60 | 0.007 | 1.16 |
| 120 | 0.013 | 1.36 |
| 180 | 0.018 | 1.55 |
| 300 | 0.023 | 1.88 |
| 450 | 0.028 | 2.24 |
| 600 | 0.030 | 2.52 |
| 960 | 0.033 | 2.91 |
| 1200 | 0.033 | 2.97 |
| 1500 | 0.034 | 3.08 |
| 1800 | 0.034 | 3.16 |
| 2700 | 0.035 | 3.24 |
| 3600 | 0.034 | 3.22 |
| 5400 | 0.034 | 3.19 |

Table 2.7. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T E S B r]_{o}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TESBr | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.00088 |  |
| krel | 0.335 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 60 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 120 | 0.005 | 1.10 |
| 180 | 0.007 | 1.15 |
| 300 | 0.011 | 1.27 |
| 450 | 0.015 | 1.41 |
| 600 | 0.018 | 1.56 |
| 960 | 0.023 | 1.87 |
| 1200 | 0.027 | 2.21 |
| 1500 | 0.030 | 2.51 |
| 1800 | 0.032 | 2.84 |
| 2700 | 0.036 | 3.53 |
| 3600 | 0.037 | 3.85 |
| 5400 | 0.038 | 4.05 |
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Table 2.8. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S B r]_{0}=0.2 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSBr | 2 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.0044 |  |
| krel | 1.676 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.005 | 1.11 |
| 60 | 0.010 | 1.24 |
| 120 | 0.016 | 1.47 |
| 180 | 0.021 | 1.75 |
| 300 | 0.029 | 2.38 |
| 450 | 0.035 | 3.39 |
| 600 | 0.039 | 4.73 |
| 900 | 0.045 | 10.23 |
| 1200 | 0.048 | 32.81 |
| 1500 | 0.051 | -70.94 |

Table 2.9. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S C I]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSCl | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.00024 |  |
| krel | 0.091 |  |
| Time (s) | $[\mathbf{2 0 7 ]}(\mathbf{M})$ | $1 /(1-\mathrm{F})$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 60 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 120 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 180 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 300 | 0.004 | 1.08 |
| 450 | 0.005 | 1.12 |
| 600 | 0.007 | 1.15 |
| 900 | 0.010 | 1.24 |
| 1200 | 0.013 | 1.34 |
| 1500 | 0.015 | 1.44 |
| 1800 | 0.017 | 1.53 |
| 2700 | 0.023 | 1.84 |
| 3600 | 0.026 | 2.06 |
| 5400 | 0.031 | 2.59 |
|  |  |  |
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Table 2.10. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[\text { TESCI }]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TESCI | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000031 |  |
| krel | 0.012 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 60 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 120 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 180 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 300 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 450 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 600 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 960 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 1200 | 0.001 | 1.03 |
| 1500 | 0.001 | 1.03 |
| 1800 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 2700 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 3600 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 5400 | 0.005 | 1.12 |

Table 2.11. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[\text { TBSCI }]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TBSCl | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.0000049 |  |
| krel | 0.002 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $1 /(1-F)$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 300 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 600 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 900 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 1800 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 2700 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 3600 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 5400 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 7200 | 0.001 | 1.03 |
| 9000 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 10860 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 12600 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 14400 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 18000 | 0.004 | 1.10 |
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Table 2.12. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $\left[\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}\right]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | MnCl 2 | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000094 |  |
| krel | 0.036 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 60 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 120 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 180 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 300 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 450 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 600 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 900 | 0.004 | 1.10 |
| 1200 | 0.006 | 1.13 |
| 1500 | 0.007 | 1.15 |
| 1800 | 0.007 | 1.18 |
| 2700 | 0.010 | 1.26 |
| 3600 | 0.013 | 1.35 |
| 5400 | 0.016 | 1.49 |

Table 2.13. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $\left[\mathrm{MgBr}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}\right]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | MgBr 2 (OEt2) | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.00044 |  |
| krel | 0.147 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 60 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 120 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 180 | 0.004 | 1.08 |
| 300 | 0.006 | 1.13 |
| 450 | 0.008 | 1.20 |
| 600 | 0.011 | 1.27 |
| 900 | 0.014 | 1.39 |
| 1200 | 0.016 | 1.47 |
| 1500 | 0.017 | 1.53 |
| 1800 | 0.019 | 1.59 |
| 2700 | 0.019 | 1.59 |
| 3600 | 0.019 | 1.64 |
| 6300 | 0.020 | 1.67 |
| 9000 | 0.021 | 1.70 |
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Table 2.14. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $\left[S c(O T f)_{3}\right]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | Sc (OTf)3 | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.00038 |  |
| krel | 0.127 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 60 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 120 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 180 | 0.004 | 1.08 |
| 300 | 0.006 | 1.14 |
| 450 | 0.008 | 1.20 |
| 600 | 0.010 | 1.25 |
| 900 | 0.013 | 1.36 |
| 1200 | 0.016 | 1.47 |
| 1500 | 0.018 | 1.57 |
| 1800 | 0.021 | 1.72 |
| 2700 | 0.026 | 2.07 |
| 3600 | 0.030 | 2.51 |
| 5400 | 0.036 | 3.70 |

Table 2.15. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[L i B r]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | LiBr | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000043 |  |
| krel | 0.014 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 60 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 120 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 180 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 300 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 450 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 600 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 900 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 1200 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 1500 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 1800 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 2700 | 0.005 | 1.12 |
| 3600 | 0.007 | 1.15 |
| 5400 | 0.010 | 1.26 |
| 7200 | 0.013 | 1.35 |
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Table 2.16. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $\left[Z n I_{2}\right]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | ZnI2 | 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000037 |  |
| krel | 0.012 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 60 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 120 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 180 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 300 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 450 | 0.002 | 1.05 |
| 600 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 900 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 1200 | 0.004 | 1.08 |
| 1500 | 0.004 | 1.09 |
| 1800 | 0.004 | 1.10 |
| 2700 | 0.005 | 1.12 |
| 3600 | 0.006 | 1.14 |
| 5400 | 0.007 | 1.17 |
| 7200 | 0.008 | 1.19 |

Table 2.17. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S B r]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathrm{NaI}]_{0}=0.05 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TMSBr, Nal | 1 equiv, 0.5 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.0046 |  |
| krel | 1.533 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F )}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.004 | 1.09 |
| 60 | 0.008 | 1.20 |
| 120 | 0.015 | 1.43 |
| 180 | 0.020 | 1.69 |
| 300 | 0.028 | 2.24 |
| 450 | 0.033 | 2.96 |
| 600 | 0.037 | 3.79 |
| 900 | 0.038 | 4.01 |
| 1200 | 0.039 | 4.68 |
| 1500 | 0.040 | 5.11 |
| 1800 | 0.040 | 4.98 |
| 2700 | 0.041 | 5.60 |
| 3600 | 0.041 | 5.76 |
| 5400 | 0.042 | 6.07 |
|  |  |  |
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Table 2.18. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T M S C I]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathrm{NaI}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$

| Lewis Acid | TMSCI, Nal | 1 equiv, 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000549 |  |
| krel | 0.209 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 60 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 120 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 180 | 0.004 | 1.10 |
| 300 | 0.007 | 1.16 |
| 450 | 0.009 | 1.23 |
| 600 | 0.012 | 1.31 |
| 960 | 0.015 | 1.43 |
| 1200 | 0.018 | 1.58 |
| 1500 | 0.021 | 1.72 |
| 1800 | 0.022 | 1.76 |
| 2700 | 0.026 | 2.07 |
| 3600 | 0.028 | 2.28 |
| 5400 | 0.031 | 2.65 |
| 7200 | 0.034 | 3.10 |

Table 2.19. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T E S C I]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathrm{NaI}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TESCI, Nal | 1 equiv, 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{k}$ | 0.000068 |  |
| krel | 0.026 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | $\mathbf{1 / ( 1 - F ) ~}$ |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 60 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 120 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 180 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 300 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 450 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 600 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 1200 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 1500 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 1800 | 0.003 | 1.07 |
| 2700 | 0.004 | 1.09 |
| 3600 | 0.006 | 1.13 |
| 5400 | 0.008 | 1.18 |
| 7200 | 0.010 | 1.25 |
|  |  |  |
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Table 2.20. Reaction data and linearization by general procedure 2.3. $[T B S C I]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M},[\mathrm{NaI}]_{0}=0.1 \mathrm{M}$.

| Lewis Acid | TBSCI, Nal | 1 equiv, 1 equiv |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| k | 0.000032 |  |
| krel | 0.012 |  |
| Time (s) | [207] (M) | 1/(1-F) |
| 0 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 30 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 60 | 0.000 | 1.00 |
| 120 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 180 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 300 | 0.000 | 1.01 |
| 450 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 600 | 0.001 | 1.01 |
| 900 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 1200 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 1500 | 0.001 | 1.02 |
| 1800 | 0.001 | 1.03 |
| 2700 | 0.002 | 1.03 |
| 3600 | 0.002 | 1.04 |
| 5400 | 0.003 | 1.06 |
| 7200 | 0.003 | 1.07 |

### 2.9.4.2 Comparison of 200 and 201 Activation Rates by $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$



Reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i C l}_{\mathbf{2}}$ with 200: To an oven-dried 10 mL round bottom flask with a stir bar was added (E)-1-(2-bromovinyl)-4-methoxybenzene (200, $85.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) and $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ powder ( $65.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv). In a 2 -dram oven-dried vial with a stir bar was added $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ (1.1 times the needed amount, $213.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.44 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv). The flask and vial were then brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox where 4.4 mL of DMA was added to the vial and the contents were stirred until homogenous to make a 0.1 M stock solution of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$. To the flask was then added $n$-dodecane (target: $40 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $0.176 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.44$ eqiuv, actual mass was recorded for each experiment) internal standard was added followed by 4 mL of the $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ stock solution. The flask was then sealed with a septa and electrical tape then removed from the glovebox where it was placed under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and submerged in an ice bath. $\mathrm{A} \sim 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ aliquot of the solution was removed with a $\mathrm{N}_{2}-$ purged syringe then pushed through a $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ plug and eluted with $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ :hexanes into a GC vial then further diluted with EtOAc. Once cooled, the solution was then stirred at 1500 rpm to start the reaction $(\mathrm{t}=0)$. The reaction was then aliquoted with the same procedure previously described at regular intervals.
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Figure 2.52. Profile for the stoichiometric reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ and 200.



Reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i C l}_{\mathbf{2}}$ with 201: To an oven-dried 10 mL round bottom flask with a stir bar was added $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ powder ( $65.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv). In a 2 -dram oven-dried vial with a stir bar was added $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ (1.1 times the needed amount, $213.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.44 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.1$ equiv). The flask and vial were then brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox where 4.4 mL of DMA was added to the vial and the contents were stirred until homogenous to make a 0.1 M stock solution of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$. To the flask was added (1-Chloroethyl)benzene (201, 53.1 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) and $n$-dodecane (target: $40 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.176 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.44$ equiv, actual mass was recorded for each experiment) internal standard. The $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ stock solution was then added to the flask before it was sealed with a septa and electrical tape
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then removed from the glovebox where it was placed under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and submerged in an ice bath. A $\sim 50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ aliquot of the solution was removed with a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-purged syringe then pushed through a $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ plug and eluted with $10 \%$ EtOAc:hexanes into a GC vial then further diluted with EtOAc. Once cooled, the solution was then stirred at 1500 rpm to start the reaction ( t $=0$ ). The reaction was then aliquoted with the same procedure previously described at regular intervals.

Figure 2.53. Profile for the stoichiometric reaction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ and 201.


Figure 2.54. Overlaid reaction profiles of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ with 200 and 201 (left) with simulated starting material consumption curves (right).
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## Estimating $k_{\text {rel }}$ for 200 and 201 Activation

To estimate the relative rates of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ activation the concentration profiles were fitted with an appropriate $\mathrm{n}^{\text {th }}$-order polynomial. The simulated profile from these equations (Figure S31, right) were then derived with the power rule to obtain an expression for $\mathrm{d}[\mathbf{2 0 0}] / \mathrm{dt}$ and $\mathrm{d}[\mathbf{2 0 1}] / \mathrm{dt}$. Comparing the rates at $15 \%$ conversion gives a $\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{2 0 1} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=4.1$ whereas comparison of the maximum rates $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\max }\right)$ gives a 200:201 $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{rel}}=1.3$. These values are reasonable based on the reaction kinetic data that shows $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ activation is faster yet $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ is competitive at higher concentrations of 201 (Figure 2.16c).

### 2.9.5 Catalyst-Mediated 201 Activation Control Experiments

Figure 2.55. Control experiments probing necessary components for 201 activation.


Procedure for Control Experiments: To an oven dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was added $\mathrm{Mn}^{0}$ powder ( $8.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv). The vial was then brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ filled glovebox where (1-chloroethyl)benzene (201, $6.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.050 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv), $n$ dodecane internal standard, and the respective additive (if applicable) was added. DMA ( $0.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.2 \mathrm{M}$ ) was then added to the vial before it was sealed with a teflon-lined cap and removed from the glovebox. The reactions were allowed to stir at ambient temperature for 24 h at 1500 rpm . Upon completion the crude reaction mixture was filtered through $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ plug and eluted with $10 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ :hexanes into a GC vial then further diluted with EtOAc,
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then analyzed by GC-FID. Reaction were run in duplicate and no other 201-derived byproducts (other than 207) were detected.

These control experiments show that Ni is required for $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ activation meaning a reductantmediated activation pathway, like 202, is unlikely.

### 2.9.6 Cyclic Voltammetry Experiments

General Details: Cyclic voltammograms were obtained in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox using a standard three electrode cell consisting of a freshly polished ( $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ then $0.05 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ alumina) glassy carbon working electrode, platinum counter electrode, and a silver wire non-aqueous reference electrode containg a $10 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{AgNO} 3,0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}$, MeCN filling solution. Data were collected using a Biologic SP-300 potentiostat and analyzed in EC-Lab. All cyclic voltammograms were measured in DMA with $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}$ or 0.1 M TBAClO 4 supporting electrolyte and then referenced to freshly sublimed ferrocene ( Fc ). . TBAPF ${ }_{6}$ was recrystallized from boiling absolute ethanol and stored in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled gloveox. The reduction potentials are reported versus the reduction potential of the $\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}$peak. Ohmic drop compensation was done with all samples before each scan using positive-feedback iR-compensation at $85 \%$ of uncompensated resistance $\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{u}}\right)$ measured from potentio electrochemical impedence spectroscopy (PEIS). The first scan is shown in the following section and the main text unless otherwise specified.
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### 2.9.6.1 CVs of $\mathrm{L}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{NiX}_{2}$ Complexes and Individual Reaction

## Components

Figure 2.56. CV of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(1 \mathrm{mM})$ in $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}{ }_{6} \mathrm{DMA}, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.
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Figure 2.57. CV of $\boldsymbol{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{mM})$ in $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}{ }_{6} D M A, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.



| Analyte | L3 $3 \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Epc}(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.52 V |
| $\mathrm{Epc} / 2(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.41 V |
| $\mathrm{Epa}(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.13 V |

Figure 2.58. CV of TDAE ( 1 mM ) in $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}{ }_{6} D M A, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.



| Analyte: | TDAE |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{E} 1 / 2(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.11 V |
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Figure 2.59. CV of $202(1 \mathrm{mM})$ in $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}{ }_{6} D M A, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.



| Analyte: | $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Ep}(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.67 V |
| $\mathrm{Ep} / 2(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}+)$ | -1.61 V |

Figure 2.60. CV of $202(1 \mathrm{mM})$ alone and $202(1 \mathrm{mM})$ with $\operatorname{TMSBr}(1 \mathrm{mM})$ in 0.1 $\mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAClO}{ }_{4} \mathrm{DMA}, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.
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### 2.9.6.2 Substrate Titration and Catalytic Current Comparison

Procedure for Substrate Titration for Current response of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i C l}_{\mathbf{2}}$ : For these experiments CVs were taken of $1 \mathrm{mM} \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ followed by the addition of an appropriate amount of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ or $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ was added for subsequent scans. At the end of each titration the substrate that was not previously titrated in was then added in equimolar amounts.

Figure 2.61. CV of titration of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ to $1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ (left) and then addition of a large excess to 201 to compare catalytic currents (right). 0.1 M TBAPF ${ }_{6} D M A, v=$ $100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.
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Figure 2.62. CV of titration of 201 to $1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ (left) and then addition of a large excess to $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ to compare catalytic currents (right). $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}{ }_{6} D M A, v=$ $100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}$.


### 2.9.7 NMR Reaction Monitoring

### 2.9.7.1 Monitoring ARA of NHP Ester with ${ }^{19}$ F NMR



General procedure $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ for ${ }^{19} \mathbf{F}$ Reaction Monitoring: In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox (E)-1-(2-bromovinyl)-4-fluorobenzene (209, $30.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv), 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2yl 2-phenylpropanoate (202, $44.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv), $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(8.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.015 \mathrm{mmol}$, 0.1 equiv), NaI ( $11.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.075 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5$ equiv), and hexafluorobenzene internal standard were added to a dry 1 dram vial with a stir bar. The contents were then dissolved in 0.3 mL
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of DMA- ${ }^{9}$ then transferred to a dry J-young NMR tube. The vial was rinsed with 0.3 mL of DMA ( 0.6 mL final volume, 0.25 M final concentration) to ensure quantitative transfer. The NMR tube was then sealed and removed from the glovebox where it was then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the NMR instrument (air bath cooling to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The sample was locked/shimmed and an initial quantitative ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR measurement was taken in order to determine starting concentration. The tube was then removed from the instrument, submerged in an ice bath, fitted with a septa, and Ar balloon. The tube was opened then $\operatorname{TMSBr}(19.8 \mathrm{uL}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv) was added via syringe and the tube was agitated to ensure adequate mixing. After 30 seconds TDAE ( $52.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.225 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) was added to start the reaction and the tube was immediately sealed, placed back in the NMR instrument, and qNMR (single scan, 27 s interscan delay) scans (measured 3 minute delay from TDAE addition to completion of first measurement). Measurements were taken every 30 seconds for the first 3 hours of the reaction and then every minute for the next 3 hours ( 6 hours total). At the end of the reaction the product was isolated to determine ee of $\mathbf{2 1 0}$ as $93 \%$ by SFC analysis (OJ-H, $\left.7 \% \mathrm{IPA}: \mathrm{CO}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {major }}=7.07 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {minor }}=5.86 \mathrm{~min}\right)$. ${ }^{\text {Error! }}$ Bookmark not defined.

Modifications to General Procedure for 20 mol \% Catalyst Loadings: For this experiment more $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(17.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.030 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.2$ equiv) added to 1 dram vial. The delay between TDAE addition and the first scan was shortened to one minute instead of three minutes. Scan taken every one minute for the entire experiment and the reaction was monitored for 5 hours total.
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## Representative Spectra (full window):

Figure 2.63. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR full window view of reaction mixture before TDAE is added.
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Figure 2.64. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR full window view of reaction mixture 3 minutes after TDAE is added
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Figure 2.65. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR full window view of reaction mixture 3 hours after TDAE is added.

characterization in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ of possible 209-derived species. This includes species like 4 fluorostyrene and $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ that were not observed in the reaction mixture. It is noteworthy that while the absolute chemical shifts of independently prepared species in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ are different than those observed in the reaction mixture in DMA- $d_{9}$ (Figure 2.63-65), the relative shifts are the same (Table 2.21).
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Figure 2.66. ${ }^{19} F$ NMR chemical shifts for reaction components and potential byproducts. No species corresponds to the observed intermediate assigned as 212. Reported shifts are referenced such that $C_{6} F_{6}=-164.9$ ppm.


Table 2.21. Tabulated ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR chemical shifts in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ and $D M A-d_{9}$ as well as relative shifts compared to 209.

|  | $4-F-$ styrene | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 9}$ | Resting State |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDCI3 (ppm) | -117.5 | -110.8 | -117.3 | -118.7 | -116.2 | ND |
| DMA-d9 (ppm) | ND | ND | -116.2 | -117.3 | -115.2 | -120.99 |
| $\Delta$ to 209 ppm (CDCl3) | -1.3 | 5.4 | -1.1 | -2.5 | 0 | - |
| $\Delta$ to209 ppm (DMA-d9) | - | - | -1 | -2.1 | 0 | -5.79 |

Table 2.22. Comparison between observed and DFT-predicted ${ }^{19}$ F chemical shifts.

| $\Delta$ to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ <br> (DMA) | $\mathbf{2 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed | 51.00 | 50.00 | 45.00 |
| DFT Predicted | 47.00 | 46.00 | 37.00 |

## Processed Reaction Data:
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Figure 2.67. Quantified amount of each species for ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR time course shown in main text.


Figure 2.68. Comparison of the resting state concentration for experiments starting with 10 and $20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ including table showing how average concentration was calculated for each experiment.


| L3• $\cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ loading | $\mathrm{Avg} \mathrm{L3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ <br> $(\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{mol} \%)$ | Std Dev (mmol) | Period Used <br> for Avg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ | $0.015 / 10.1$ | 0.0005 | $3 \mathrm{~min}-5 \mathrm{~h}$ |
| $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ | $0.025 / 16.9$ | 0.0008 | $1 \mathrm{~min}-2 \mathrm{~h}$ |
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### 2.9.7.2 Room Temperature NMR Experiments



Ambient Temperature NMR Reaction: In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox ( $E$ )-1-(2-bromovinyl)-4fluorobenzene (209, $40.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv), 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 2phenylpropanoate ( $\mathbf{2 0 2}, 59.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1 equiv), $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(11.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.020 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.1$ equiv), NaI ( $15.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.5$ equiv), and hexafluorobenzene internal standard were added to a dry 1 dram vial with a stir bar. The contents were then dissolved in 0.4 mL of DMA- $d_{9}$ then transferred to a dry J-young NMR tube. The vial was rinsed with 0.4 mL of DMA ( 0.6 mL final volume, 0.25 M final concentration) to ensure quantitative transfer. The NMR tube was then sealed and removed from the glovebox. The sample was locked/shimmed and an initial quantitative ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR measurement was taken in order to determine starting concentration. The tube was then removed from the instrument, fit with a septa, and Ar balloon. To the tube was then added $\operatorname{TMSBr}(26.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added via syringe and the tube was agitated to ensure adequate mixing. After 30 seconds TDAE ( $69.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) was added to start the reaction and the tube was immediately sealed, placed back in the NMR instrument and monitored at $22{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
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Figure 2.69. Concentration of 209-derived species over the course of the reaction (left). Concentration of resting state species 212 during the time course (right).


### 2.9.8 EPR Experiments

### 2.9.8.1 Generation of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ from Chemical Reduction of $\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{NiX}_{2}$

Reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i B r}_{2}$ by TDAE: To an oven-dried 20 mL was added $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(5.7 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv). The vial was brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox and the solid was dissolved in 10 mL of anhydrous DMA. To this vial TDAE ( $2.33 \mathrm{uL}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added. The reaction was stirred for 2 h , after which an aliquot was removed by a syringe, filtered, and transferred to an oven-dried EPR tube. The tube was sealed, removed from the glovebox, and then frozen in $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ for analysis by EPR at 77 K .
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Figure 2.70. Observed and simulated spectra of reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ by $T D A E$. The $E P R$ spectra were collected at 9.371 GHz with a micropower of 2 mW , a modulation amplitude of 4 G, and a conversion time of 40.96 ms. The spectrum shown here was averaged over 4 scans. Nickel signals were simulated with $g=[2.078,2.089,2.335]$ with a linewidth of 4 mT . TDAE ${ }^{\bullet+}$ signals were simulated with $g_{\text {iso }}=2.0069$ with a linewidth of 3 mT . The two species exist in a 1:0.78 ratio.
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Figure 2.71. Observed and simulated spectra of $[T D A E] B r$ (left). Overlay of independent [TDAE]Br and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ from Figure 2.70 (right). The EPR spectra were collected at 9.370 GHz with a micropower of 2 mW , a modulation amplitude of 4 G, and a conversion time of 40.96 ms . The spectrum shown here was averaged over 4 scans. The isotropic signal was simulated with $g_{\text {iso }}=2.006$ with a linewidth of 3.8 $m T$ prepared by mixing TDAE and isolated


Reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i B r}_{\mathbf{2}}$ by $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i}(\mathbf{c o d})$ : In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox $\mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})_{2}(8.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.030$ mmol, 1 equiv) and $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{3}$ ( $10.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.030 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) were added to an oven-dried 20 mL scintillation and dissolved in 7.5 mL of anhydrous DMA. The reaction was stirred for 1.5 h for and then $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(17.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.030 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added. After 1 min of stirring, a 300 uL aliquot was removed by a syringe and transferred to an oven-dried EPR tube. The tube was sealed, removed from the glovebox, and then frozen in $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ for analysis by EPR at 77 K .
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Figure 2.72. Observed and simulated spectra of reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ by $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})$.
The EPR spectra were collected at 9.392 GHz with a micropower of 2.0 mW , a modulation amplitude of 4 G , and a conversion time of 4 ms . The spectrum shown here was averaged over 9 scans. Nickel signals were simulated with $g=[2.075$, 2.085, 2.328] with a linewidth of 4 mT .
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Reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i C l}_{\mathbf{2}}$ by $\mathbf{Z n}$ : For preparation procedure see section 2.9.8.3.
Figure 2.73. Observed and simulated spectra of reduction of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ by Zn at 2.75 h. The EPR spectra were collected at 9.368 GHz with a micropower 2.0 mW , a modulation amplitude of 4 G, and a conversion time of 40.96 ms. The spectrum shown here was averaged over 9 scans. The nickel signals were simulated with $g=$ [2.095, 2.141, 2.471] with a nitrogen superhyperfine tensor $A=[30,40,40] \mathrm{MHz}$ and a linewidth of 4 mT .


### 2.9.8.2 Reaction of $\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})$ with 200



Oxidative addition of 200 by $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i}(\mathbf{c o d})$ : In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox $\mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})_{2}(2.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.010$ mmol, 1 equiv) and $\mathbf{L} 3$ ( $3.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.010 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) were added to an oven-dried 2-dram vial. The mixture was dissolved in DMA and stirred for 24 h at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, after which 200 (2.1
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$\mathrm{mg}, 0.100 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added . In a separate vial, 21.4 mg of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ was dissolved in 100 uL of anhydrous DMA; 10 uL ( $0.010 \mathrm{~mol}, 1$ equiv) or 5 uL ( $0.005 \mathrm{~mol}, 0.5$ equiv) of this 1 M stock solution was added $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}($ cod $)$. The reaction was stirred for 1 min after which an aliquot was removed and transferred to an oven-dried EPR tube. The tube was sealed, removed from the glovebox, and then frozen in $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ for analysis by EPR at 77 K .

Figure 2.74. Truncated observed and simulated spectra of the stoichiometric mixture of $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{cod})$ ( 1.0 equivalent) and 200 (1.0 equivalent). The EPR spectrum was collected at 9.511 GHz with a micropower of 6.4 mW , a modulation amplitude of 4 G, and a conversion time of 40.96 ms . No additional signals were observed for $g$ values between 2.60 and 6.80 that would suggest $S \neq 1 / 2$ species were present. The nickel signals were simulated with $g=[2.078,2.085,2.330]$ with a linewidth of 4 $m T$.
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Figure 2.75. Same as Figure 2.74 but with $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})$ ( 2.0 equivalent) and 200 (1.0 equivalent).


### 2.9.8.3 Time Course Reduction of $\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ with $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$



Reduction Reaction and Sample Preparation Procedure: To an oven-dried 50 mL round bottom flask was added $\mathrm{Zn}^{0}$ powder ( $5.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.080 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2 equiv) and $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}$ ( $19.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.040 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv). The flask was then brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox where DMA ( $20 \mathrm{~mL}, 2 \mathrm{mM}$ ) was added. Before the reaction was stirred, a 2 mL aliquot was removed by a syringe fit with a $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ filter and added to a 10 mm pathlength optical cell and an oven-dried EPR tube. The tube was then removed from the glovebox and frozen in $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ for analysis by perpendicular mode EPR at 77 K and parallel mode EPR at 5 K . The optical cell was sealed and removed from the glovebox for analysis by optical
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spectroscopy. The reaction mixture was then stirred at 1000 rpm to start the reaction and aliquots (same procedure as before) were removed at regular intervals: $0.5 \mathrm{~h}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 1.5 \mathrm{~h}$, $2.75 \mathrm{~h}, 5 \mathrm{~h}, 8 \mathrm{~h}$, and 30 h .

Figure 2.76. Observed perpendicular mode EPR spectra during the first 2.75 h of reaction. The EPR spectra were taken at $9.368 \mathrm{GHz}(0 \mathrm{~h}), 9.364 \mathrm{GHz}(0.5 \mathrm{~h}), 9.375$ $\mathrm{GHz}(1 \mathrm{~h}), 9.368 \mathrm{GHz}(1.5 \mathrm{~h})$, and 9.368 GHz (2.75 h). Spectrum at each timepoint was averaged over 9 scans. The spectra were collected at microwave power of 2.0 mW with a modulation amplitude of 4 G and conversion time of 40.96 ms .
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Figure 2.77. Same reaction as Figure 2.76 showing later timepoints.


Figure 2.78. Concentration of $E P R$ active species quantified with an external calibration curve. ${ }^{34}$
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Figure 2.79. Corresponding optical spectra during the first 2.75 h of the reaction.


Figure 2.80. Corresponding optical spectra after first 2.75 h of the reaction.


### 2.9.8.4 Reaction Monitoring with EPR



Cross-Coupling Reaction and Sample Preparation Procedure: In a dry 20 mL scintillation vial with a stir bar was added (E)-1-(2-bromovinyl)-4-methoxybenzene (200, $63.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 2-phenylpropanoate (202, 88.6 mg , 0.30 mmol , 1 equiv), $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}(3.5 \mathrm{mg}, 6.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.02$ equiv), and $\mathrm{NaI}(22.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15$ mmol, 0.5 equiv). The vial was then placed under Ar, sealed and brought into a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox. The contents of the vial were dissolved in DMA ( $3.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.1 \mathrm{M}$ ) and cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a cold well. Once cooled, $\mathrm{TMSBr}(39.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added and the reaction was stirred for 5 min before TDAE ( $105 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) was added to start the reaction. After 5 minutes, $\mathrm{a} \sim 0.4 \mathrm{~mL}$ aliquot was removed by syringe fitted with a $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ filter and transferred to an oven-dried EPR tube. The tube was then rapidly removed from the glove box and frozen in $\mathrm{LN}_{2}$ for EPR analysis. The same procedure was done at 15 min and 90 min . After the final aliquot was removed, the reaction was quenched with 0.5 mL 1 M HCl , further diluted with $3 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ then extracted three times with 5 mL of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organics were then washed with 3 mL 1 M LiCl , dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, then filtered and concentrated. The crude mixture was then diluted with 10 mLEtOAc and analyzed by GC-FID to confirm the presence of product 203 ( $55 \%$ yield). The EPR spectra were taken at 9.360 GHz ( 5 mins ), 9.360 GHz ( 15 mins ), and 9.362 GHz ( 90 mins ). Spectrum at each timepoint was averaged over 4 scans. The spectra were collected at a modulation amplitude of 4 G and conversion time of 40.96 ms . The spectra were taken at
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0.5 mW (shown here), 2.0 mW , and 8.0 mW , which showed EPR no oversaturation occurred for a microwave power below 2.0 mW .

Figure 2.81. $E P R$ spectra taken over the course of the reaction.


### 2.9.9 Catalyst Loading Study (Figure 2.15)



Changing Lewis Acid at Different Catalyst Loadings Cross-Coupling Procedure: In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox to an oven-dried 20 mL scintillation vial was added 200, 202, $n$ dodecane internal standard and dry DMA to make a 0.4 M stock solution of substrates. In an oven-dried 1-dram vial with a stir bar was added $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ complex followed by dry DMA to make a 0.08 M catalyst stock solution. Stock solutions of substrates and catalyst were added to oven-dried 1 dram vials with a stir bar then diluted with dry DMA (final reaction concentration 0.2 M ). This was done such that there was 6 different catalyst loadings: $20,10,5,2.5,1.0,0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ and done in triplicate for each loading (total 18
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reactions for each Lewis acid). Each reaction was then cooled to $-2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stirred at 200 rpm. Note: Julabo LH45 chiller was set to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ however we measured a reaction temperature of $-2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for these experiments. Once cooled, either $\mathrm{TMSBr}(13.2 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.10$ mmol, 1 equiv) or $\operatorname{TESBr}(17.2 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1$ equiv) was added to each reaction and they were allowed to stir for 10 minutes before TDAE ( $35 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5$ equiv) was added to start the reaction. Each reaction was allowed to stir for 12 hours at $-2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Upon completion the reactions were diluted with EtOAc and quenched with 1 M HCl . An aliquot of the organic layer was extracted and filtered through MgSO 4 then further diluted for GC analysis. For one sample reaction of each Lewis acid/catalyst loading combination the remaining crude was purified by preparative-TLC for chiral SFC analysis to determine ee.

Data analysis: Reaction yields and conversions were determined by GC-FID analysis against $n$-dodecane internal standard. In Figure 2.15 the average of three runs is displayed with the error bars representing the standard deviation of the three runs. Yields of homocoupled products $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ and $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ are not based on their theoretical yields ( 0.05 mmol ) but instead of the reaction product's theoretical yield $(0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$ to allow for facile comparison of relative mass balance across reactions.
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Table 2.23. Raw data from catalyst loading screen with $T M S B r$.

| run \# | Ni mol $\%$ | 203 yield <br> $(\%)$ | $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ yield <br> $(\%)$ | 208 yield <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 20 | 84 | 3 | 0 |
| 2 | 20 | 84 | 3 | 0 |
| 3 | 20 | 85 | 3 | 0 |
| 1 | 10 | 85 | 4 | 0 |
| 2 | 10 | 84 | 5 | 0 |
| 3 | 10 | 85 | 4 | 0 |
| 1 | 5.0 | 87 | 4 | 0 |
| 2 | 5.0 | 88 | 4 | 0 |
| 3 | 5.0 | 88 | 4 | 0 |
| 1 | 2.5 | 93 | 3 | 0 |
| 2 | 2.5 | 93 | 3 | 0 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 94 | 3 | 0 |
| 1 | 1.0 | 87 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 88 | 5 | 0 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 89 | 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 72 | 14 | 0 |
| 2 | 0.5 | 72 | 14 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.5 | 71 | 14 | 0 |
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Table 2.24. Raw data from catalyst loading screen with TESBr.

| run \# | Ni mol \% | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ yield <br> $(\%)$ | $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ yield <br> $(\%)$ | $\mathbf{2 0 8}$ yield (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 20 | 73 | 8 | 13 |
| 2 | 20 | 74 | 8 | 15 |
| 3 | 20 | 71 | 8 | 13 |
| 1 | 10 | 75 | 8 | 12 |
| 2 | 10 | 75 | 9 | 13 |
| 3 | 10 | 73 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | 5.0 | 80 | 7 | 9 |
| 2 | 5.0 | 83 | 7 | 1 |
| 3 | 5.0 | 85 | 7 | 11 |
| 1 | 2.5 | 87 | 5 | 8 |
| 2 | 2.5 | 88 | 5 | 11 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 89 | 5 | 9 |
| 1 | 1.0 | 92 | 3 | 11 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 95 | 3 | 9 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 96 | 3 | 8 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 82 | 9 | 8 |
| 2 | 0.5 | 87 | 3 | 9 |
| 3 | 0.5 | 84 | 9 | 8 |
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Table 2.25. Average yield data and error analysis for all runs.
$\left.\begin{array}{|ccccc|}\hline & & \begin{array}{c}\text { 203 avg yield } \pm \\ \text { STDEV }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\mathbf{2 0 7} \text { avg yield } \pm \\ \text { STDEV }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { 208 avg yield } \pm \\ \text { STDEV }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\mathbf{2 0 3} \\ \text { ee } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array}\right)$
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Figure 2.82. $T M S B r$ reaction data in graphical form similar to Figure 2.15.


Figure 2.83. TESBr reaction data in graphical form similar to Figure 2.15.
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### 2.9.10 Computational Data

Unless otherwise noted, all calculations were carried out with the Gaussian 16 package. ${ }^{35}$ Geometry optimization and energy calculations were performed with B3LYPD3. ${ }^{36}$ The LANL2DZ basis set ${ }^{37}$ with ECP was used for Ni , and the $6-31 \mathrm{G}(\mathrm{d})$ basis set ${ }^{38}$ was used for other atoms. Frequency analysis was conducted at the same level of theory to verify that the stationary points are minima or saddle points. To ensure that the correct unrestricted wave functions were obtained, a stability test was carried out with the Gaussian keyword stable $=$ opt. Single point energies were calculated at the M06 ${ }^{39} / 6-311+\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{p})-$ SDD $^{40}$ level using SMD solvation model ${ }^{41}$ (solvent $\left.=\mathrm{DMA}\right)$. Computed structures were visualized using CYLview. ${ }^{42}$
${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ Chemical shifts were carried out with ORCA 4.2 .1 package. ${ }^{43}$ Geometry optimizations and frequency calculations were performed with BP86. Chemical shifts calculation were performed with TPSSh and accelerated with RIJCOSX approximation using SMD solvation model (solvent $=$ DMA). All atoms were described with def2-TZVPP basis set.
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### 2.9.10.1 DFT-Computed Gibbs Free Energy Barriers for Radical

## Addition and Reductive Elimination

Figure 2.84. DFT-computed Gibbs free energy barriers for radical addition transition states. Energies in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, only the $\alpha$-carbon of aryl group ( $p-\mathrm{OMe}-\mathrm{Ph}$ ) is shown for simplicity.




$G^{\ddagger}=0.0$


$G^{\ddagger}=2.9$


Chapter 2 - Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of Alkenyl 174 and Benzyl Electrophiles

Figure 2.85. DFT-computed Gibbs free energy barriers for reductive elimination transition states. Energies in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, only the $\alpha$-carbon of aryl group ( $p-\mathrm{OMe}-\mathrm{Ph}$ ) is shown for simplicity.

2.9.10.2 Table of Energies
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Table 2.26. Zero-point correction (ZPE), thermal correction to enthalpy (TCH), thermal correction to Gibbs free energy (TCG), energies (E), enthalpies (H), and Gibbs free energies (G) (in Hartree) of the structures calculated at the M06/6$311+G(d, p)-S D D-S M D(D M A) / / B 3 L Y P-D 3 / 6-31 G^{*}-L A N L 2 D Z ~ l e v e l ~ o f ~ t h e o r y . ~$

| structures | ZPE | TCH | TCG | E | H | $\boldsymbol{G}$ | Imaginary <br> Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 | 0.157103 | 0.168714 | 0.118363 | -2994.814718 | -2994.813774 | -2994.864125 | - |
| 214 | 0.143410 | 0.151702 | 0.111157 | -310.086145 | -310.085200 | -310.125745 | - |
| 203 | 0.305310 | 0.322803 | 0.258415 | -733.546167 | -733.545222 | -733.609611 | - |
| 204(Br) | 0.387446 | 0.412098 | 0.330548 | -3888.876796 | -3888.875852 | -3888.957402 | - |
| 213 | 0.545058 | 0.582077 | 0.471467 | -6883.698127 | -6883.697183 | -6883.807793 | - |
| 212 | 0.544906 | 0.579268 | 0.475840 | -4312.265954 | -4312.265010 | -4312.368438 | - |
| 215 | 0.693066 | 0.735906 | 0.613379 | -4622.384353 | -4622.383409 | -4622.505936 | - |
| $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}$ | 0.389305 | 0.415738 | 0.330948 | -6460.314111 | -6460.313167 | -6460.397957 | - |
| $\mathbf{L 3} \cdot \mathbf{N i C l}_{2}$ | 0.390313 | 0.416097 | 0.334385 | -2237.879255 | -2237.878311 | -2237.960023 | - |
| TS1 | 0.544407 | 0.580802 | 0.470800 | -6883.686941 | -6883.685997 | -6883.795998 | $77.97 i$ |
| TS2-S | 0.691161 | 0.733509 | 0.612775 | -4622.377688 | -4622.376744 | -4622.497478 | $86.29 i$ |
| TS2-S-cf2 | 0.690994 | 0.733306 | 0.613450 | -4622.366077 | -4622.365133 | -4622.484988 | 99.49i |
| TS2-S-cf3 | 0.689948 | 0.732831 | 0.609722 | -4622.368744 | -4622.367800 | -4622.490909 | $43.26 i$ |
| TS2-R | 0.690489 | 0.733056 | 0.610999 | -4622.369068 | -4622.368124 | -4622.490181 | $93.39 i$ |
| TS2-R-cf2 | 0.691202 | 0.733535 | 0.613484 | -4622.373867 | -4622.372923 | -4622.492974 | $122.69 i$ |
| TS2-R-cf3 | 0.690101 | 0.732833 | 0.611372 | -4622.363507 | -4622.362563 | -4622.484024 | $29.39 i$ |
| TS3-S | 0.692081 | 0.734347 | 0.612426 | -4622.378747 | -4622.377802 | -4622.499724 | $228.06 i$ |
| TS3-S-cf2 | 0.693128 | 0.735204 | 0.613722 | -4622.360576 | -4622.359631 | -4622.481113 | 188.10i |
| TS3-S-cf3 | 0.692833 | 0.734938 | 0.616204 | -4622.384026 | -4622.383082 | -4622.501816 | 163.77 i |
| TS3-R | 0.692106 | 0.734445 | 0.612125 | -4622.370255 | -4622.369311 | -4622.491631 | $250.12 i$ |
| TS3-R-cf2 | 0.693082 | 0.735002 | 0.614428 | -4622.367556 | -4622.366612 | -4622.487187 | $213.19 i$ |
| TS3-R-cf3 | 0.692876 | 0.734861 | 0.616167 | -4622.379267 | -4622.378323 | -4622.497017 | $195.93 i$ |
| TS4-S | 0.691521 | 0.733615 | 0.613914 | -2511.159973 | -2511.159029 | -2511.278730 | $91.24 i$ |
| TS4-R | 0.690833 | 0.733155 | 0.611956 | -2511.150744 | -2511.149799 | -2511.270998 | $102.88 i$ |
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### 2.9.10.3 Cartesian Coordinates for Calculated Species

| 200 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Br | 3.88090800 | -0.05446600 | -0.00003200 |
| C | 2.04318100 | 0.44922200 | 0.00055600 |
| C | 1.05264300 | -0.45014700 | -0.00077900 |
| H | 1.91071500 | 1.52387800 | 0.00210800 |
| H | 1.32134700 | -1.50469200 | -0.00207000 |
| C | -0.38593400 | -0.16251700 | -0.00053200 |
| C | -1.29087000 | -1.23408600 | -0.00023400 |
| C | -0.92482900 | 1.14221900 | -0.00060600 |
| C | -2.67281500 | -1.03722800 | 0.00012800 |
| H | -0.90780400 | -2.25189200 | -0.00022900 |
| C | -2.29264800 | 1.35456200 | -0.00024800 |
| H | -0.26441000 | 2.00430200 | -0.00106700 |
| C | -3.18250600 | 0.26592200 | 0.00014900 |
| H | -3.33165300 | -1.89772700 | 0.00037100 |
| H | -2.70717900 | 2.35770000 | -0.00033600 |
| O | -4.50597500 | 0.58767300 | 0.00046800 |
| C | -5.45497000 | -0.46821100 | 0.00085400 |
| H | -6.43595400 | 0.01042300 | 0.00109800 |
| H | -5.35854200 | -1.09783700 | -0.89418800 |
| H | -5.35801300 | -1.09766100 | 0.89596200 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ |  |  |  |
| C | 1.83322100 | -0.65199900 | 0.00004500 |
| H | 2.08025400 | -1.71111700 | 0.00002500 |
| C | 0.46218600 | -0.30019600 | 0.00000800 |
| C | -0.54340000 | -1.31146300 | -0.00004900 |
| C | 0.02037200 | 1.05542000 | 0.00002500 |
| C | -1.89146700 | -0.98836800 | -0.00008600 |
| H | -0.23452900 | -2.35444100 | -0.00006300 |
| C | -1.33233400 | 1.36765200 | -0.00001200 |
| H | 0.75473700 | 1.85543900 | 0.00006800 |
| C | -2.30004300 | 0.35380700 | -0.00006800 |
| H | -2.63543400 | -1.78104500 | -0.00012900 |
| H | -1.64206100 | 2.40984800 | 0.00000200 |
| H | -3.35692000 | 0.60491000 | -0.00009600 |
| C | 2.95955100 | 0.33474300 | 0.00010600 |
| H | 3.92999900 | 0.99432600 | 0.88074100 |
| H | -0.16984900 | 0.00014200 |  |
| H |  | 0.92775500 | 0.99434700 |
|  | -0.88051600 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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203

| C | -0.89419600 | 1.51166900 | -0.25111200 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.15813300 | 0.39239600 | -0.18067500 |
| H | -0.39834100 | 2.48271600 | -0.27730500 |
| H | -0.67988500 | -0.56313700 | -0.16658600 |
| C | 1.30641100 | 0.29100500 | -0.12049800 |
| C | 1.90139600 | -0.97895400 | -0.09917500 |
| C | 2.17066300 | 1.40603900 | -0.07970400 |
| C | 3.28615800 | -1.15298300 | -0.04467500 |
| H | 1.26489100 | -1.86058800 | -0.12772600 |
| C | 3.54627000 | 1.25264500 | -0.02497100 |
| H | 1.75879600 | 2.41092300 | -0.08770300 |
| C | 4.11939100 | -0.03019900 | -0.00767100 |
| H | 3.69536400 | -2.15666900 | -0.03153000 |
| H | 4.20849300 | 2.11234000 | 0.00722700 |
| O | 5.48282900 | -0.06751800 | 0.04718400 |
| C | 6.11699800 | -1.33581400 | 0.06792300 |
| H | 7.18939400 | -1.13548200 | 0.11138700 |
| H | 5.82198500 | -1.92183900 | 0.94946400 |
| H | 5.89322300 | -1.91542500 | -0.83845200 |
| C | -3.76795400 | -1.61797800 | 1.24498500 |
| C | -3.09639200 | -0.40683900 | 1.08072400 |
| C | -3.12430200 | 0.27252900 | -0.14728000 |
| C | -3.83962100 | -0.30001600 | -1.20522200 |
| C | -4.51513700 | -1.51275800 | -1.04629100 |
| C | -4.48253500 | -2.17559600 | 0.18098000 |
| H | -3.73292100 | -2.12811700 | 2.20427700 |
| H | -2.53161600 | 0.01210800 | 1.90912000 |
| H | -3.86867400 | 0.21005400 | -2.16565900 |
| H | -5.06563600 | -1.93737500 | -1.88189200 |
| H | -5.00711600 | -3.11878800 | 0.30870500 |
| C | -2.40640000 | 1.60109200 | -0.32528000 |
| H | -2.65336600 | 1.97333900 | -1.33257200 |
| C | -2.92710700 | 2.66358000 | 0.67098300 |
| H | -2.70693900 | 2.37690400 | 1.70482300 |
| H | -2.45217700 | 3.63420100 | 0.48451900 |
| H | -4.01117200 | 2.78605500 | 0.57418800 |

## 204(Br)

C

## C

C
H
H
H
H
C
C
C
H
H
C
C

| C |
| :---: |
| H |

H
H
0
0
N
N
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
C
H
H
H
H
C
C
C

| C |
| :--- |
| H |

H
C
C
C
C
H
H
H
H
H
Ni
Br
-0.36197700
0.00000000
0.36197200 0.36197200
0.18960700
-1.41774200
$-0.18961400$ 1.41773600 -1. 10716600 -3.06015700 $-2.53247600$
-3.01912600
$-2.37605000$ 1.10716800 3.06017000 2.53248400 3.01915100 2.37606300
-2. 10340100 2.10340700
$-1.22318600$
1.22319200
$-4.46409300$ 4.46410100
$-3.54941100$
$-3.48867700$
$-4.60775700$
-4.51932700
-2. 64978600
$-5.63598400$
$-5.58356300$
$-4.49123300$
$-6.46422000$
$-6.37708300$
$-5.22433100$
-4. 55216900 3.54940800 3.48866000 4.60775600 4.51930200 2.64976400 5.63597300 5.58354100 4.49119700 6.46421000 6.37705400 5.22434700 4.55217300 0.00001800
$-0.00000700$
-3. 82183400
$-2.47192800$
-3. 82181600

$$
-0.64799500
$$

$-4.06808200$

$$
1.54864200
$$

$-4.06938300$
$-4.06803400$
$-4.06936800$
$-1.70895600$
$-1.54459400$
$-0.14513900$
$-1.73277600$

$$
0.55621300
$$

$$
-0.00001700
$$

0.65315900
$-1.54872400$
$-0.65324100$
-0.61880500
$-1.76366800$
$-1.32829900$
$-2.83888600$
$-2.15238100$

$$
-1.70897900
$$

$$
-1.54465700
$$

0.61879400

$$
-0.14518800
$$

$$
1.32833100
$$

$$
-1.73287600
$$

$$
0.55613500
$$

$$
2.83885700
$$

$$
-2.46199700
$$

$$
2.15244000
$$

-1.14717300

$$
-2.46203800
$$

$$
-0.43422100
$$ 1.14712900

$-0.70416200$

$$
-0.43424600
$$

$$
0.70418900
$$

$$
-1.72539100
$$

$$
-1.15867200
$$

$$
-1.72543000
$$

$$
0.33992800
$$

$$
1.15862800
$$

$$
-0.31837500
$$

$$
1.49828700
$$

$$
0.45643100
$$

$$
-0.56504900
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
-0.19674200 \\
1.36871600
\end{array}
$$

$$
2.18386500 \quad 0.36262900
$$

$$
-0.32103700 \quad 0.71362800
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
-0.32103700 & 0.71362800 \\
0.83571300 & 1.49640300
\end{array}
$$

$$
2.63128600 \quad 1.98564800
$$

$$
-1.01821700 \quad 0.81551500
$$

$$
1.03668000 \quad 2.21147900
$$

$$
-1.68760200 \quad-1.94973800
$$

$$
-2.70631900 \quad-0.67813200
$$

$$
0.33991900 \quad 0.31841600
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0.33991900 & 0.31841600 \\
1.49830400 & -0.45635000
\end{array}
$$

$$
-0.56505100 \quad 0.19674100
$$

$$
1.73755000 \quad-1.36863500
$$

$$
2.18387300 \quad-0.36252200
$$

$$
-0.32100200 \quad-0.71362900
$$

$$
0.83577600 \quad-1.49636200
$$

$$
2.63136000 \quad-1.98553800
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
-1.01817500 & -0.81554900 \\
1.03677100 & -2.21143800
\end{array}
$$

$$
1.03677100 \quad-2.21143800
$$

$$
-1.68767000 \quad 1.94968900
$$

$$
-2.70633900 \quad 0.67805000
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0.98322500 & 0.00002100 \\
3.30195300 & -0.00002900
\end{array}
$$

| C | 0.20675000 | -2.54672700 | 3.05661000 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C | 0.03498500 | -1.58269300 | 1.87478600 |
| C | 1.19881500 | -2.59681300 | 1.95455000 |

## 213

C

C

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0.20675000 \\
& 0.03498500 \\
& 1.19881500
\end{aligned}
$$

```
-2.54672700
```

```
\[
1.87478600
\]
    1.95455000
``` and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 0.49681700 & -2.08791500 & 3.99491300 \\
\hline H & -0.53276200 & -3.33647300 & 3.12341000 \\
\hline H & 1.15151600 & -3.41383200 & 1.24289500 \\
\hline H & 2.18238300 & -2.16494000 & 2.10339200 \\
\hline C & -1.02381500 & -1.88678400 & 0.88607300 \\
\hline C & -2.39906900 & -3.30249000 & -0.23413400 \\
\hline C & -2.52780200 & -1.84666600 & -0.77356500 \\
\hline H & -1.94855800 & -4.00772800 & -0.93569000 \\
\hline H & -2.27520000 & -1.72498300 & -1.82946800 \\
\hline C & 0.39108200 & -0.16529000 & 2.09780700 \\
\hline C & 1.61222800 & 1.47096700 & 3.04715000 \\
\hline C & 0.61588700 & 2.06680800 & 2.01173600 \\
\hline H & 1.51882700 & 1.88684600 & 4.05026800 \\
\hline H & -0.20560100 & 2.65989000 & 2.42130500 \\
\hline 0 & -1.44839600 & -3.16904600 & 0.87296800 \\
\hline 0 & 1.22156200 & 0.06828800 & 3.14127300 \\
\hline N & -1.52886800 & -1.09422700 & 0.01645900 \\
\hline N & 0.02388000 & 0.84961900 & 1.41041100 \\
\hline C & -3.78662500 & -3.74120000 & 0.27310900 \\
\hline C & 3.03277600 & 1.62805700 & 2.44868000 \\
\hline C & -3.94785300 & -1.44736400 & -0.45393200 \\
\hline C & -4.54915500 & -0.21142200 & -0.68368000 \\
\hline C & -4.63897500 & -2.49450200 & 0.16188100 \\
\hline C & -5.87288400 & -0.03575500 & -0.27509200 \\
\hline H & -3.98994500 & 0.59831800 & -1.13912700 \\
\hline C & -5.96260800 & -2.31747500 & 0.56360500 \\
\hline C & -6.57318500 & -1.07942900 & 0.34257500 \\
\hline H & -6.35636400 & 0.92430500 & -0.43015400 \\
\hline H & -6.51133900 & -3.12545000 & 1.04167100 \\
\hline H & -7.60262700 & -0.92561900 & 0.65570200 \\
\hline H & -4.17874300 & -4.55679000 & -0.34780800 \\
\hline H & -3.71251500 & -4.12758500 & 1.29622500 \\
\hline C & 1.48661700 & 2.83756100 & 1.05038700 \\
\hline C & 1.07592300 & 3.67256600 & 0.01147900 \\
\hline C & 2.83987900 & 2.57987500 & 1.28819700 \\
\hline C & 2.05449200 & 4.23853100 & -0.81063000 \\
\hline H & 0.01718700 & 3.84637600 & -0.15953700 \\
\hline C & 3.81485300 & 3.15802500 & 0.47559400 \\
\hline C & 3.41245700 & 3.98228900 & -0.58069000 \\
\hline H & 1.75755200 & 4.88249400 & -1.63333300 \\
\hline H & 4.87015500 & 2.96486800 & 0.65237600 \\
\hline H & 4.16202600 & 4.43189300 & -1.22636000 \\
\hline H & 3.75170700 & 1.99769700 & 3.18823000 \\
\hline H & 3.39722700 & 0.65175700 & 2.10364100 \\
\hline Ni & -0.92707600 & 0.83769700 & -0.40361100 \\
\hline C & 0.83294900 & 0.37386400 & -1.23372600 \\
\hline C & 1.36680000 & -0.84896800 & -1.26035100 \\
\hline H & 1.36873700 & 1.30987700 & -1.36783000 \\
\hline H & 0.69918200 & -1.70847900 & -1.25223700 \\
\hline C & 2.79813400 & -1.17381100 & -1.18318900 \\
\hline C & 3.20396200 & -2.51663100 & -1.18074700 \\
\hline C & 3.80213800 & -0.19179000 & -1.03335800 \\
\hline C & 4.54430300 & -2.88656200 & -1.04412500 \\
\hline H & 2.45386300 & -3.29677800 & -1.29386700 \\
\hline C & 5.13421400 & -0.54335000 & -0.89371900 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lr} 
H & 3.53290300 \\
C & 5.52095200 \\
H & 4.80906100 \\
H & 5.90493400 \\
O & 6.85661100 \\
C & 7.30923700 \\
H & 8.39296400 \\
H & 6.87577200 \\
H & 7.07274400 \\
Br & -1.32480800 \\
Br & -2.49495900
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rr}
0.85912500 & -1.01500600 \\
-1.89516200 & -0.89761100 \\
-3.93766700 & -1.05440700 \\
0.21273800 & -0.77831600 \\
-2.12784700 & -0.74797000 \\
-3.47240100 & -0.76347400 \\
-3.42633900 & -0.64070000 \\
-4.05496200 & 0.06142100 \\
-3.96747300 & -1.71530300 \\
0.84804800 & -2.78048400 \\
2.56254800 & 0.39800900
\end{tabular}

\section*{212}
\(-3.45641300\)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
3.36847900 & -0.98383400 \\
2.04467700 & -1.00132200 \\
2.50615100 & -2.18818400 \\
3.38899400 & -0.30678800 \\
4.27160800 & -1.02792200 \\
2.80395000 & -3.07468200 \\
1.92925900 & -2.35828100 \\
2.13914900 & -1.15655300 \\
3.11618700 & -1.93015500 \\
1.99017500 & -0.91734500
\end{array}
\]
\[
2.87416100 \quad-2.97495400
\]
\[
1.25570500-1.25560600
\]
\[
0.93986300 \quad-0.17270400
\]
\[
-0.19178200 \quad 0.86671700
\]
\[
-0.94150700 \quad 0.97129300
\]
\[
0.27843000 \quad 1.79271000
\]
\[
-1.21613900 \quad 1.98086600
\]
\[
3.23463800-1.81353300
\]
\[
0.89705500 \quad-0.06265500
\]
\[
1.32645900 \quad-0.71209000
\]
\[
0.02584900 \quad 0.42316000
\]
\[
4.39452300-1.42567600
\]
\[
-1.14659200 \quad 0.23234900
\]
\[
2.74305500 \quad 0.32116100
\]
\[
2.24676400 \quad 1.61277600
\]
\[
4.09959200 \quad 0.03517500
\]
\[
3.13511600 \quad 2.61959000
\]
\[
1.19938800 \quad 1.82532800
\]
\[
4.98330700 \quad 1.04101700
\]
\[
4.49088200 \quad 2.33578700
\]
\[
2.76883500 \quad 3.63322700
\]
\[
6.03897300 \quad 0.82581300
\]
\[
5.16900700 \quad 3.13084200
\]
\[
4.55945700 \quad-1.98193400
\]
\[
5.27176300 \quad-1.59281600
\]
\[
-2.13743600 \quad 0.05516500
\]
\[
-3.05549000 \quad-0.36784300
\]
\[
-2.22524900 \quad-0.38778500
\]
\[
-4.06542300 \quad-1.25254200
\]
\[
-2.97994500 \quad-0.00614400
\]
\[
-3.23510900 \quad-1.26914000
\]
\[
-4.15446000 \quad-1.70168700
\]
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\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
H & -2.37536800 & -4.78897300 & -1.59350200 \\
H & -6.42176300 & -3.30627100 & -1.61647300 \\
H & -4.71837500 & -4.94528700 & -2.39103200 \\
H & -6.52877500 & -1.55687200 & 1.00996600 \\
H & -6.51006600 & -0.61959700 & -0.48457700 \\
Ni & -0.50635000 & -0.30348800 & 0.37724300 \\
C & 1.21759400 & -0.85976400 & -0.14389600 \\
C & 2.36331000 & -1.05674100 & 0.52538300 \\
H & 1.21232300 & -0.98116700 & -1.23799800 \\
H & 2.34159100 & -0.97215500 & 1.61168800 \\
C & 3.68756900 & -1.38278500 & -0.03341400 \\
C & 4.77353900 & -1.57263100 & 0.83417500 \\
C & 3.94746000 & -1.50339200 & -1.41538900 \\
C & 6.05765200 & -1.87079800 & 0.37084200 \\
H & 4.61030500 & -1.48841300 & 1.90633700 \\
C & 5.21449300 & -1.79923300 & -1.89371100 \\
H & 3.13807800 & -1.36609600 & -2.12728500 \\
C & 6.28459400 & -1.98595000 & -1.00402000 \\
H & 6.86073800 & -2.00966600 & 1.08598200 \\
H & 5.40797700 & -1.89336400 & -2.95824300 \\
O & 7.49343300 & -2.27094700 & -1.58046000 \\
C & 8.60330300 & -2.48026700 & -0.72594200 \\
H & 9.45168400 & -2.69609900 & -1.37910300 \\
H & 8.82825100 & -1.58771100 & -0.12474400 \\
H & 8.44144700 & -3.33210200 & -0.05028200 \\
Br & -0.50214400 & -1.74640000 & 2.22145000
\end{tabular}

\section*{215}

\[
4.00627100
\]
\[
\begin{array}{rr}
3.10774600 & -0.42997400 \\
1.96969500 & 0.01765400 \\
2.55854000 & 0.94114300 \\
2.84057200 & -1.17742200 \\
4.07521300 & -0.55267000 \\
3.14072800 & 1.77610400 \\
1.90680100 & 1.15087100 \\
2.35000700 & 0.30527900 \\
3.75994300 & 1.13717900 \\
2.50240200 & 0.49004700 \\
3.77848000 & 2.22825100 \\
1.96133200 & 1.16359700 \\
0.63008000 & -0.55254300 \\
-0.97971200 & -1.29225000 \\
-1.40728500 & -1.46991500 \\
-1.00672400 & -2.20991200 \\
-1.42542000 & -2.49794200 \\
3.60688800 & 0.78885500 \\
0.41637200 & -0.89497300 \\
1.64368100 & 0.15391800 \\
-0.32556400 & -0.76796600 \\
4.99286200 & 0.44903800 \\
-1.87242800 & -0.16936300 \\
3.03146500 & -0.75070500 \\
2.29376400 & -1.79426800 \\
4.42894800 & -0.78480000 \\
2.98935000 & -2.87799700
\end{array}
\]
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & -1.76256400 & 1.20869900 & -1.77613300 \\
\hline C & -1.72540500 & 5.11922800 & -1.86701000 \\
\hline C & -2.29991400 & 4.38927500 & -2.91190900 \\
\hline H & -2.75450300 & 2.43487100 & -3.70645000 \\
\hline H & -1.69716800 & 6.20573100 & -1.90399500 \\
\hline H & -2.72329400 & 4.91445400 & -3.76427200 \\
\hline H & -1.22890000 & 5.47536900 & 1.12047600 \\
\hline H & 0.26761800 & 5.73588800 & 0.22520000 \\
\hline C & 3.15611500 & -2.74374200 & -0.78491700 \\
\hline C & 2.09825500 & -3.64928000 & -0.82643600 \\
\hline C & 4.31062500 & -2.99953800 & -0.03756800 \\
\hline C & 2.20649000 & -4.82900000 & -0.08472000 \\
\hline H & 1.21462600 & -3.41922800 & -1.41603700 \\
\hline C & 4.41609000 & -4.17745100 & 0.70042900 \\
\hline C & 3.35371800 & -5.08767400 & 0.67502200 \\
\hline H & 1.39390400 & -5.54997600 & -0.09754900 \\
\hline H & 5.30844600 & -4.39086500 & 1.28380800 \\
\hline H & 3.42405000 & -6.00974800 & 1.24592900 \\
\hline H & 6.32338100 & -2.22755600 & -0.41050500 \\
\hline H & 5.39592200 & -1.28739000 & 0.75622300 \\
\hline Ni & 0.37394900 & -0.51206900 & -0.36861400 \\
\hline C & -1.47083400 & -0.64491500 & 0.17951300 \\
\hline C & -2.44002300 & -1.34902500 & -0.41843200 \\
\hline H & -1.68423300 & -0.04707100 & 1.06676400 \\
\hline H & -2.19063900 & -1.92639600 & -1.30655100 \\
\hline C & -3.85739000 & -1.39096200 & -0.01669500 \\
\hline C & -4.80051500 & -1.96938400 & -0.87891300 \\
\hline C & -4.33540300 & -0.87892800 & 1.20821900 \\
\hline C & -6.15917200 & -2.03229000 & -0.56069100 \\
\hline H & -4.46386500 & -2.37634900 & -1.82963300 \\
\hline C & -5.67996000 & -0.93147300 & 1.53997100 \\
\hline H & -3.63715900 & -0.43844200 & 1.91477400 \\
\hline C & -6.60708800 & -1.50776900 & 0.65633300 \\
\hline H & -6.84821200 & -2.48742600 & -1.26313600 \\
\hline H & -6.04455100 & -0.53972200 & 2.48483200 \\
\hline 0 & -7.90679000 & -1.51079500 & 1.08103200 \\
\hline C & -8.88488900 & -2.08167900 & 0.22905600 \\
\hline H & -9.83800100 & -1.97836200 & 0.75201000 \\
\hline H & -8.94165000 & -1.55506900 & -0.73395600 \\
\hline H & -8.68864400 & -3.14681900 & 0.04191400 \\
\hline C & 0.71852900 & -1.43197500 & 1.56529900 \\
\hline H & 1.73763300 & -1.70412200 & 1.28227200 \\
\hline C & 0.71604800 & -0.35795100 & 2.57388800 \\
\hline C & 1.88987900 & 0.39168000 & 2.80284500 \\
\hline C & -0.42907600 & -0.00759300 & 3.32005700 \\
\hline C & 1.91152400 & 1.46178300 & 3.69077400 \\
\hline H & 2.78975400 & 0.12634600 & 2.25428000 \\
\hline C & -0.41228200 & 1.07143700 & 4.20518000 \\
\hline H & -1.33795300 & -0.58990900 & 3.21209300 \\
\hline C & 0.75268100 & 1.82009000 & 4.39028400 \\
\hline H & 2.83368000 & 2.01632500 & 3.84613200 \\
\hline H & -1.31249000 & 1.32151200 & 4.76119600 \\
\hline H & 0.76646000 & 2.65370900 & 5.08729400 \\
\hline C & -0.11050500 & -2.67720100 & 1.82296800 \\
\hline H & -0.11115300 & -3.32244100 & 0.94142400 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
H & 0.32641700 & -3.24542000 & 2.65885200 \\
H & -1.15237700 & -2.45879000 & 2.06445000 \\
Br & 0.05704200 & -1.05193200 & -2.80568000
\end{tabular}

\section*{\(\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline C & 0.35281100 \\
\hline C & -0.00013400 \\
\hline C & -0.35326200 \\
\hline H & -0.21169000 \\
\hline H & 1.40866000 \\
\hline H & 0.21120400 \\
\hline H & -1.40914600 \\
\hline C & 1.10618800 \\
\hline C & 3.08896300 \\
\hline C & 2.54537800 \\
\hline H & 3.06155700 \\
\hline H & 2.42435000 \\
\hline C & -1.10635800 \\
\hline C & -3.08902800 \\
\hline C & -2.54538600 \\
\hline H & -3.06148000 \\
\hline H & -2.42432000 \\
\hline 0 & 2.12640500 \\
\hline 0 & -2.12663700 \\
\hline N & 1.20169600 \\
\hline N & -1.20172900 \\
\hline C & 4.47793200 \\
\hline C & -4.47809300 \\
\hline C & 3.50385000 \\
\hline C & 3.40038500 \\
\hline C & 4.56102600 \\
\hline C & 4.37780900 \\
\hline H & 2.57687600 \\
\hline C & 5.53802000 \\
\hline C & 5.43696900 \\
\hline H & 4.31078200 \\
\hline H & 6.36378200 \\
\hline H & 6.18861900 \\
\hline H & 5.25424300 \\
\hline H & 4.58347600 \\
\hline C & -3.50388000 \\
\hline C & -3.40036300 \\
\hline C & -4.56115600 \\
\hline C & -4.37783100 \\
\hline H & -2.57678300 \\
\hline C & -5.53819400 \\
\hline C & -5.43709000 \\
\hline H & -4.31076100 \\
\hline H & -6.36402900 \\
\hline H & -6.18877700 \\
\hline H & -5.25429200 \\
\hline H & -4.58381600 \\
\hline Ni & 0.00005300 \\
\hline Br & -0.60168700 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& -4.05239100-0.65177700 \\
& -2.70088800 \quad 0.00001300 \\
& -4.05231400 \quad 0.65186400 \\
& -4.29370300-1.54590800 \\
& -4.29806600-0.67366300 \\
& -4.29366300 \quad 1.54600700 \\
& -4.29784200 \quad 0.67376300 \\
& -1.93484000 \quad 0.60579700 \\
& -1.75477500 \quad 1.69404700 \\
& -0.35989500 \quad 1.28288300 \\
& -1.95980700 \quad 2.76632300 \\
& 0.35224900 \quad 2.09963700 \\
& -1.93472200-0.60579600 \\
& -1.75444900-1.69419300 \\
& -0.35964000-1.28287600 \\
& -1.95943200 \quad-2.76647500 \\
& 0.35258100-2.09955700 \\
& -2.67546300 \quad 1.07689300 \\
& -2.67523700-1.07693100 \\
& -0.65967400 \quad 0.72599800 \\
& -0.65954600-0.72599400 \\
& -1.92368200 \quad 1.05843500 \\
& -1.92327800-1.05878300 \\
& 0.10838900 \quad 0.20798400 \\
& 1.24656700-0.59231000 \\
& -0.79421500 \quad 0.05383800 \\
& 1.46286200-1.56675500 \\
& 1.94162100-0.46077800 \\
& -0.57207400 \quad-0.91589400 \\
& 0.56115600-1.72801400 \\
& 2.33923800-2.20491400 \\
& -1.26826300-1.04134900 \\
& 0.74382000-2.49142300 \\
& -1.83256200 \quad 1.82931600 \\
& -2.92005600 \quad 0.61476900 \\
& \text {-0.20795400 } \\
& 0.59254000 \\
& -0.05402200 \\
& 1.56695600 \\
& 0.46118700 \\
& 0.91568200 \\
& 1.72799600 \\
& 2.20526300 \\
& \text { 1. } 04096500 \\
& 2.49138000 \\
& -1.82975200 \\
& -0.61527500 \\
& 0.77347900 \quad 0.00001300 \\
& 2.35892200-1.66454900
\end{aligned}
\]
\begin{tabular}{llll}
Br & \(0.60199600 \quad 2.35881200 \quad 1.66461900\)
\end{tabular}

\section*{\(\mathrm{L} 3 \cdot \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\)}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
C & 0.36934700 & 3.67764800 & 0.64258800 \\
C & 0.00000100 & 2.32595500 & 0.00000000 \\
C & -0.36934600 & 3.67764100 & -0.64260100 \\
H & -0.17237100 & 3.91868200 & 1.55077700 \\
H & 1.42551800 & 3.92296700 & 0.63776900 \\
H & 0.17237100 & 3.91866800 & -1.55079200 \\
H & -1.42551800 & 3.92295900 & -0.63778400 \\
C & 1.09063800 & 1.55889300 & -0.63047100 \\
C & 3.04198500 & 1.37425300 & -1.77216800 \\
C & 2.52420300 & -0.01632400 & -1.31750100 \\
H & 2.97370800 & 1.56203300 & -2.84586200 \\
H & 2.39777600 & -0.75012700 & -2.11317000 \\
C & -1.09063600 & 1.55889700 & 0.63047700 \\
C & -3.04198700 & 1.37426400 & 1.77216700 \\
C & -2.52420400 & -0.01631400 & 1.31750900 \\
H & -2.97371400 & 1.56205000 & 2.84586000 \\
H & -2.39778000 & -0.75011300 & 2.11318300 \\
O & 2.09531600 & 2.29789400 & -1.13382400 \\
O & -2.09531400 & 2.29790200 & 1.13382200 \\
N & 1.18788800 & 0.28228600 & -0.74021100 \\
N & -1.18788900 & 0.28229100 & 0.74022000 \\
C & 4.44989400 & 1.56501900 & -1.18871300 \\
C & -4.44989300 & 1.56502700 & 1.18870500 \\
C & 3.51063200 & -0.44384900 & -0.24985100 \\
C & 3.43503000 & -1.55628900 & 0.58899900 \\
C & 4.56515000 & 0.46973700 & -0.15032000 \\
C & 4.43788000 & -1.73471100 & 1.54536000 \\
H & 2.61538800 & -2.26205000 & 0.49551000 \\
C & 5.56698100 & 0.28560300 & 0.80180900 \\
C & 5.49408000 & -0.82146100 & 1.65198300 \\
H & 4.39445600 & -2.59166900 & 2.21140600 \\
H & 6.39045800 & 0.99085500 & 0.88432000 \\
H & 6.26565400 & -0.97493500 & 2.40182100 \\
H & 5.20011200 & 1.44661000 & -1.98147600 \\
H & 4.56967100 & 2.57594200 & -0.78328300 \\
C & -3.51062700 & -0.44384400 & 0.24985700 \\
C & -3.43501700 & -1.55628800 & -0.58898700 \\
C & -4.56514300 & 0.46974100 & 0.15031400 \\
C & -4.43786000 & -1.73471500 & -1.54535500 \\
H & -2.61537500 & -2.26204700 & -0.49549000 \\
C & -5.56696800 & 0.28560300 & -0.80182100 \\
C & -5.49406000 & -0.82146500 & -1.65198900 \\
H & -4.39443100 & -2.59167400 & -2.21139800 \\
& & &
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
H & -6.39044400 & 0.99085500 & -0.88434100 \\
H & -6.26562700 & -0.97494200 & -2.40183300 \\
H & -5.20011400 & 1.44661500 & 1.98146500 \\
H & -4.56967300 & 2.57595000 & 0.78327400 \\
Ni & -0.00000200 & -1.14356200 & 0.00000300 \\
Cl & -0.71978600 & -2.66568700 & 1.48657600 \\
Cl & 0.71975700 & -2.66569100 & -1.48657800
\end{tabular}

TS1

-1.05584700
-0.92083500
-1.06769600
-0.16620700
-1.99528800
-2.00856000
-0.17975200
-2.09530300
-4.29566400
-3.51430500
-4.59199000
-3.63456200
0.41473600
2.66920900
2.14510400
2.98683100
2.49463200
-3.28871500
1.46357000
-2.09915500
0.67950300
-5.44190700
3.72885000
-3.99803800
-3.50273900
-5.05237000
4.7 .70094500
2.46947500
4.
\[
\begin{array}{rr}
0.89662900 & -3.79898300 \\
1.17557100 & -2.29343800 \\
2.30559400 & -3.32646300 \\
0.51693600 & -4.28908200 \\
0.44884900 & -4.10598300 \\
2.84351200 & -3.30064600 \\
2.90975700 & -3.48015400 \\
0.83643400 & -1.46137000 \\
0.90548800 & -0.94148600 \\
-0.02258700 & 0.02688400 \\
1.86533200 & -0.51392300 \\
0.22184900 & 1.08420100 \\
1.05373700 & -1.67121800 \\
0.85510800 & -1.71649500 \\
1.10600700 & -0.28042400 \\
-0.17258200 & -1.91186600 \\
0.37043000 & 0.44594000 \\
1.20140000 & -1.96844900 \\
1.08268800 & -2.52378900 \\
0.19721600 & -0.34813100 \\
0.99420600 & -0.41813200 \\
0.09126400 & -1.55083300 \\
1.92119100 & -2.01636800 \\
-1.41188500 & -0.34834300 \\
-2.64360700 & 0.07883900 \\
-1.34284600 & -1.26646300 \\
-3.81104700 & -0.43326900 \\
-2.68765900 & 0.80437500 \\
-2.50862700 & -1.77612800 \\
-3.74506400 & -1.35621100 \\
-4.77862100 & -0.11001500 \\
4.07902500 & 0.19418300 \\
4.27051000 & 1.98761100 \\
4.62772300 & -1.64372300
\end{array}
\] and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 4.05865700 & 6.08488700 & 0.26687600 \\
\hline H & 4.73044300 & 1.48068300 & -1.92230800 \\
\hline H & 3.63604500 & 2.29146900 & -3.04328800 \\
\hline Ni & -0.62992500 & 0.39158400 & 1.09701700 \\
\hline C & 0.14520600 & -1.46090200 & 1.05306000 \\
\hline C & 1.40732100 & -1.61682700 & 1.50717100 \\
\hline H & -0.31299900 & -2.04962100 & 0.26152600 \\
\hline H & 1.68174300 & -1.10086300 & 2.42747200 \\
\hline C & 2.49157700 & -2.32559200 & 0.82522800 \\
\hline C & 3.74667800 & -2.44072900 & 1.44634600 \\
\hline C & 2.36658500 & -2.85002800 & -0.48193600 \\
\hline C & 4.82896100 & -3.06044800 & 0.82009200 \\
\hline H & 3.87940700 & -2.03847100 & 2.44795200 \\
\hline C & 3.43208400 & -3.46857700 & -1.11546300 \\
\hline H & 1.42078100 & -2.76087600 & -1.00897100 \\
\hline C & 4.67635700 & -3.58135200 & -0.47045400 \\
\hline H & 5.77552200 & -3.12906600 & 1.34371200 \\
\hline H & 3.33380500 & -3.87313600 & -2.11815400 \\
\hline 0 & 5.65806800 & -4.20007800 & -1.18629800 \\
\hline C & 6.93347900 & -4.35406700 & -0.58259200 \\
\hline H & 7.55201700 & -4.87442800 & -1.31620500 \\
\hline H & 7.38965200 & -3.38248300 & -0.34759100 \\
\hline H & 6.87577700 & -4.95503500 & 0.33512900 \\
\hline Br & -1.44118600 & -1.23197500 & 2.80236100 \\
\hline Br & -1.30366700 & 2.56382000 & 1.96385100 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{TS2-S} \\
\hline C & 3.06533600 & 3.75139600 & -0.25459700 \\
\hline C & 2.43773300 & 2.38254800 & 0.08018700 \\
\hline C & 3.34577300 & 3.13862400 & 1.06689800 \\
\hline H & 3.84222100 & 3.73508700 & -1.00992800 \\
\hline H & 2.36947800 & 4.58111900 & -0.30266600 \\
\hline H & 2.84254900 & 3.53642500 & 1.94074400 \\
\hline H & 4.32116600 & 2.69577400 & 1.23789300 \\
\hline C & 0.98949600 & 2.38723100 & 0.34882200 \\
\hline C & -0.90790000 & 3.32868100 & 1.14922800 \\
\hline C & -1.20355200 & 2.05954800 & 0.31764600 \\
\hline H & -1.01878000 & 3.20317500 & 2.22812000 \\
\hline H & -1.83818800 & 1.33816600 & 0.82819300 \\
\hline C & 3.01699600 & 1.19812400 & -0.58757000 \\
\hline C & 4.71129500 & 0.16140800 & -1.67453800 \\
\hline C & 3.49998200 & -0.79599300 & -1.47785700 \\
\hline H & 4.88489600 & 0.46227000 & -2.71024600 \\
\hline H & 3.07288700 & -1.19479400 & -2.39845100 \\
\hline 0 & 0.52167700 & 3.52713300 & 0.89863900 \\
\hline 0 & 4.30538100 & 1.36373500 & -0.95864400 \\
\hline N & 0.13497500 & 1.46911400 & 0.07213000 \\
\hline N & 2.46071500 & 0.06827000 & -0.83920100 \\
\hline C & -1.71954400 & 4.47901300 & 0.54038100 \\
\hline C & 5.94182600 & -0.46804400 & -1.00032700 \\
\hline C & -1.81501400 & 2.60062400 & -0.95816300 \\
\hline C & -2.06009600 & 1.91699000 & -2.14808600 \\
\hline C & -2.08142200 & 3.96888000 & -0.83883600 \\
\hline C & -2.59813500 & 2.62800800 & -3.22388600 \\
\hline H & -1.82825000 & 0.86058600 & -2.22544100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

U
C
H
H
H
H
H
C
C
C
C
\(\stackrel{\mathrm{H}}{\mathrm{C}}\)
C
C
H
H
H
H
H
Ni
C
C
C
H
H
C
C
C
C
H
\begin{tabular}{l}
C \\
H \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
H
C
C
H
H
0
C
\begin{tabular}{c}
H \\
H \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
H
H
C
H
C
C
C
C
H
C
H
C
H
H
H
C
H
H
\(-2.61980300\)
-2.87849700
\(-2.79664300\)
\(-2.82906800\)
-3.29487300
\(-2.61429200\)
\(-1.14110900\) 4.04047400 3.37611200 5.38561300 4.05976700 2.35079300 6.06861400 5.39348000 3.54949600 7.11341300 5.91280700 6.67311400 6.44273400 0.44699700
\(-1.34020500\)
\(-2.37633600\)
\(-1.50812900\)
\(-2.21484800\)
\(-3.75781400\)
\(-4.72552000\)
\(-4.18447600\)
\(-6.05207300\)
\(-4.43240400\)
\(-5.49578300\)
-3.47324100
\(-6.44479700\)
\(-6.75881300\)
\(-5.81838800\)
\(-7.71013800\)
\(-8.70447200\)
\(-9.62325400\)
\(-8.86601900\)
\(-8.44975300\) 0.96679000 1.98701400 0.62295100 1.54986900
\(-0.62920900\) 1. 24074800
2.51855300
\(-0.93846000\)
\(-1.35556900\)
\(-0.01266400\)
1.97704600
\(-1.90633100\)
\(-0.25278200\) 0.26399300 0.35700400 0.70717600
4.67550500
\[
3.99502200
\]
2.11477300
5.73923700
4.53427700
4.66205300
5.40943500
\(-1.88375500\)
\(-3.01122400\)
\(-1.66010800\)
\(-3.88257900\)
\(-3.19728000\)
-2.53117300
\(-3.63875900\)
\(-4.75863800\)
\(-2.35751100\)
\(-4.32347200\)
\(-0.78228400\)
0.26409600
\(-0.43770500\)
\(-0.88513600\)
\(-1.35969400\)
\(-0.62470400\)
\(-1.65504500\)
\(-1.53355200\)
\(-2.08282400\)
\(-1.16739000\)
\(-2.27175300\)
\(-2.37656000\)
\(-1.34795200\)
\(-0.73300000\)
\(-1.90323100\)
\(-2.70301700\)
\(-1.06543100\)
\(-2.03640100\)
\(-2.59637600\)
\(-2.61462100 \quad 0.78063000\)
\(-1.98803700 \quad-0.71091500\)
\(-3.62154800-0.11369100\)
\(-1.54179300 \quad 1.75743500\)
\(-1.52659300 \quad 1.38724500\)
\(-0.48967300 \quad 2.66278100\)
\(0.56303300 \quad 2.90315300\)
\(-0.40880200 \quad 3.33182800\)
\(1.62863500 \quad 3.73492800\)
\(0.51957200 \quad 2.41134200\)
\(0.67044400 \quad 4.15425700\)
\(-1.20472400 \quad 3.20600700\)
\(1.70002100 \quad 4.36291900\)
\(2.40938300 \quad 3.90913800\)
\(0.70466400 \quad 4.64852400\)
\(2.53250400 \quad 5.01856300\)
\(-2.86369700 \quad 1.67067800\)
\(-3.28125500 \quad 0.66461400\)
\(\begin{array}{ll}-3.57850200 & 2.38380900\end{array}\)
\(-1.91329000\)
-3. 10681700
\(-4.16077900\)
\(-1.82895300\)
\(-3.95368700\)
1.15040800
0.53072400
\(-0.57030500\)
-0.08701500
\(-0.25579000\)
0.76377800
\(-0.38330500\)
0.59287900
1.11226200
1.15459900
0.83923700
1.77762700
\(-1.75590000\)
\(-0.35662100\)
\(-0.57422900\)
-0.08926900
\(-0.79547900\)
0.95860100
\(-1.83081300\)
\(-0.30880400\)
\(-1.16277400\)
0.98628500
\(-0.76606700\)
\(-2.16825500\)
1.39760200
1.68389900
0.52425000
\(-1.46618000\)
2.39544400
1.02945800
0.19038300
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & -0.80484800 & -2.79535300 & 1.88649100 \\
\hline Br & 0.56273400 & -2.22066500 & -2.18652600 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{TS2-S-cf2} \\
\hline C & -5.24604100 & 0.93263800 & -1.09771400 \\
\hline C & -3.78020100 & 0.46035300 & -1.07308800 \\
\hline C & -4.72742500 & 0.15407600 & -2.24963500 \\
\hline H & -5.90476600 & 0.43784500 & -0.39323900 \\
\hline H & -5.38939800 & 2.00062000 & -1.21509500 \\
\hline H & -4.50794100 & 0.67868100 & -3.17351100 \\
\hline H & -5.02398900 & -0.88431700 & -2.35061300 \\
\hline C & -2.74655500 & 1.49274900 & -1.29434100 \\
\hline C & -1.98700200 & 3.42406000 & -2.20753000 \\
\hline C & -0.96486100 & 2.81826100 & -1.20851700 \\
\hline H & -1.70266200 & 3.34862100 & -3.26044300 \\
\hline H & 0.03323200 & 2.68154400 & -1.62838100 \\
\hline C & -3.45812900 & -0.65564400 & -0.15661300 \\
\hline C & -3.95584800 & -2.58543100 & 0.89349500 \\
\hline C & -2.56383100 & -2.06153000 & 1.33506700 \\
\hline H & -4.65722600 & -2.72712100 & 1.71631600 \\
\hline H & -2.51102600 & -1.67969700 & 2.35673600 \\
\hline 0 & -3.15146000 & 2.55628200 & -2.02782300 \\
\hline 0 & -4.48810900 & -1.50756000 & 0.07301600 \\
\hline N & -1.53755500 & 1.49752100 & -0.86628200 \\
\hline N & -2.34852700 & -0.89515100 & 0.43738200 \\
\hline C & -2.29907900 & 4.85454200 & -1.74476600 \\
\hline C & -3.71530200 & -3.88040700 & 0.08024000 \\
\hline C & -0.99473400 & 3.77315600 & -0.03206800 \\
\hline C & -0.40792700 & 3.60279400 & 1.22151300 \\
\hline C & -1.76991900 & 4.89979400 & -0.32721500 \\
\hline C & -0.60415400 & 4.59756500 & 2.18260700 \\
\hline H & 0.15652200 & 2.70512100 & 1.45229500 \\
\hline C & -1.95947700 & 5.89195900 & 0.63363600 \\
\hline C & -1.36958100 & 5.73318900 & 1.89111600 \\
\hline H & -0.16606000 & 4.47731500 & 3.16917200 \\
\hline H & -2.56087000 & 6.77063600 & 0.41295500 \\
\hline H & -1.51413000 & 6.49578700 & 2.65203700 \\
\hline H & -1.78308600 & 5.57546900 & -2.39295200 \\
\hline H & -3.37165200 & 5.06429800 & -1.82287900 \\
\hline C & -1.63701400 & -3.22968500 & 1.11404200 \\
\hline C & -0.32240600 & -3.37122400 & 1.55443700 \\
\hline C & -2.29174100 & -4.26218300 & 0.43149700 \\
\hline C & 0.33339800 & -4.58010100 & 1.30880200 \\
\hline H & 0.16271500 & -2.55238700 & 2.07634500 \\
\hline C & -1.63083300 & -5.46401400 & 0.17928500 \\
\hline C & -0.31473600 & -5.61749800 & 0.62868500 \\
\hline H & 1.35947900 & -4.70970400 & 1.63921900 \\
\hline H & -2.13241000 & -6.27485600 & -0.34340400 \\
\hline H & 0.20868400 & -6.55261500 & 0.44675600 \\
\hline H & -4.44056000 & -4.66386700 & 0.32549000 \\
\hline H & -3.82651700 & -3.66274500 & -0.99024600 \\
\hline Ni & -0.57037800 & 0.09954800 & 0.34237500 \\
\hline C & 1.19758600 & 0.77276100 & 0.08725800 \\
\hline C & 2.29005800 & 0.49311700 & 0.81753900 \\
\hline H & 1.34097700 & 1.32648500 & -0.84872600 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Chapter 2 - Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of Alkenyl 190 and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline N & 0.39620500 & 1.98574700 & -0.16097800 \\
\hline N & -1.65885000 & 0.20273300 & 0.83144800 \\
\hline C & 2.29793000 & 4.99243100 & -0.23850800 \\
\hline C & -4.36105700 & -0.72438000 & 2.97740900 \\
\hline C & 2.74952200 & 2.66870500 & -0.66665800 \\
\hline C & 3.51999100 & 1.51158000 & -0.75572400 \\
\hline C & 3.30765900 & 3.86638300 & -0.20588000 \\
\hline C & 4.85776700 & 1.55627900 & -0.35721700 \\
\hline H & 3.07449600 & 0.58488600 & -1.09092100 \\
\hline C & 4.64576200 & 3.91554300 & 0.18410600 \\
\hline C & 5.41685900 & 2.75155600 & 0.11079700 \\
\hline H & 5.45586500 & 0.65005600 & -0.40177800 \\
\hline H & 5.08274300 & 4.84365900 & 0.54515300 \\
\hline H & 6.45803600 & 2.77564800 & 0.42216100 \\
\hline H & 2.51020000 & 5.69618700 & -1.05429700 \\
\hline H & 2.25490200 & 5.57750700 & 0.68685900 \\
\hline C & -4.02804700 & -0.48532300 & 0.60918600 \\
\hline C & -4.36323900 & -0.19793700 & -0.71238300 \\
\hline C & -4.98323300 & -0.43032100 & 1.62852400 \\
\hline C & -5.69301400 & 0.11018000 & -1.00868400 \\
\hline H & -3.59734900 & -0.16207700 & -1.48013800 \\
\hline C & -6.31143000 & -0.12717600 & 1.33040600 \\
\hline C & -6.66179100 & 0.13471300 & 0.00272400 \\
\hline H & -5.97284900 & 0.34671600 & -2.03153200 \\
\hline H & -7.06062600 & -0.08201100 & 2.11725600 \\
\hline H & -7.69214900 & 0.37777400 & -0.24355300 \\
\hline H & -4.63263300 & -1.72489200 & 3.34003100 \\
\hline H & -4.64241300 & -0.00964800 & 3.75859600 \\
\hline Ni & -0.43574700 & 0.13162200 & -0.87840800 \\
\hline C & 1.01519800 & -0.96171900 & -0.10574800 \\
\hline C & 2.04267300 & -1.55781600 & -0.73849400 \\
\hline H & 1.08599800 & -0.87082900 & 0.98616300 \\
\hline H & 2.02095000 & -1.62319100 & -1.83192500 \\
\hline C & 3.30171100 & -2.06014300 & -0.15285600 \\
\hline C & 4.40947000 & -2.29128700 & -0.98127800 \\
\hline C & 3.47755000 & -2.28007300 & 1.22896200 \\
\hline C & 5.64727600 & -2.70041800 & -0.47553000 \\
\hline H & 4.30862500 & -2.13483400 & -2.05347700 \\
\hline C & 4.69504400 & -2.69143000 & 1.74810300 \\
\hline H & 2.63940900 & -2.12598700 & 1.90267900 \\
\hline C & 5.79557200 & -2.90077600 & 0.90085500 \\
\hline H & 6.47385700 & -2.86011500 & -1.15876900 \\
\hline H & 4.82606800 & -2.86218700 & 2.81248500 \\
\hline 0 & 6.95042700 & -3.29973900 & 1.51595100 \\
\hline C & 8.09042500 & -3.52921400 & 0.70660600 \\
\hline H & 8.88821400 & -3.83347200 & 1.38742200 \\
\hline H & 7.91470300 & -4.33011000 & -0.02542300 \\
\hline H & 8.39880500 & -2.61958000 & 0.17185900 \\
\hline C & -1.03792700 & -2.22098700 & -2.20683500 \\
\hline H & 0.04302000 & -2.27980200 & -2.19687400 \\
\hline C & -1.71452400 & -3.03305200 & -1.22790200 \\
\hline C & -3.11634700 & -3.24115700 & -1.25635500 \\
\hline C & -0.97686400 & -3.66936900 & -0.19176800 \\
\hline C & -3.74802900 & -4.01123400 & -0.28423800 \\
\hline H & -3.71289300 & -2.77234000 & -2.03052200 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
C & -1.61287700 \\
H & 0.09515400 \\
C & -3.00571700 \\
H & -4.82702800 \\
H & -1.02567800 \\
H & -3.50239100 \\
C & -1.67313000 \\
H & -1.82654100 \\
H & -2.64517800 \\
H & -1.04290800 \\
Br & -1.53281300
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rr}
-4.44456000 & 0.76839600 \\
-3.51032100 & -0.14714500 \\
-4.61388200 & 0.73658000 \\
-4.13561600 & -0.31873700 \\
-4.91938500 & 1.55049200 \\
-5.21473700 & 1.49369900 \\
-1.85503000 & -3.51482600 \\
-2.76770300 & -4.11535800 \\
-1.36835500 & -3.39782000 \\
-1.16617700 & -4.07804600 \\
1.39671500 & -2.66981400
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS2-R}

4.22818600
3.18356600
4.10022600
5.07893700
3.82535500
3.60416200
4.86238600
1.77025100
0.11011700
-0.41614800
-0.16215500
-1.27687800
3.49150800
4.93449400
3.47790700
5.62177100
3.25789500
1.56199400
4.81611300
0.73657800
2.67228000
-0.28571700
5.39312200
-0.70272700
-0.97249000
-0.60495100
-1.16281400
4.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 2.95283600 & 1.33414200 \\
\hline 1.83386900 & 1.16632000 \\
\hline 1.93023200 & 2.40160700 \\
\hline 2.89766400 & 0.66480300 \\
\hline 3.94320900 & 1.51214100 \\
\hline 2.20321200 & 3.32702500 \\
\hline 1.16238400 & 2.47959900 \\
\hline 2.21715000 & 1.34853600 \\
\hline 3.47711000 & 2.24200700 \\
\hline 2.54064400 & 1.12569800 \\
\hline 3.18544500 & 3.25996600 \\
\hline 1.93439100 & 1.40867100 \\
\hline 0.77343100 & 0.17975100 \\
\hline -0.58545600 & -0.89311200 \\
\hline -0.84540200 & -1.37080100 \\
\hline -0.30810000 & -1.69291400 \\
\hline -0.54356700 & -2.39652100 \\
\hline 3.30125300 & 2.13029500 \\
\hline 0.57575500 & -0.02482100 \\
\hline 1.65885700 & 0.83299700 \\
\hline 0.03861900 & -0.47876200 \\
\hline 4.91117200 & 1.86837500 \\
\hline -1.83634700 & -0.10543400 \\
\hline 3.48572200 & -0.02532200 \\
\hline 3.15932200 & -1.35400500 \\
\hline 4.81774300 & 0.39145000 \\
\hline 4.20186000 & -2.26460100 \\
\hline 2.12333900 & -1.67264500 \\
\hline 5.85488700 & -0.51944800 \\
\hline 5.53726400 & -1.85116500 \\
\hline 3.96896300 & -3.30606200 \\
\hline 6.89263900 & -0.20340200 \\
\hline 6.33543600 & -2.57379900 \\
\hline 5.21540600 & 2.45476500 \\
\hline 5.61618500 & 2.10438400 \\
\hline -2.32335300 & -1.13831600 \\
\hline -3.11743300 & -1.55822600 \\
\hline -2.86790800 & -0.40232700 \\
\hline -4.46753900 & -1.19878300 \\
\hline -2.67481000 & -2.13125200 \\
\hline -4.21613100 & -0.04584700 \\
\hline -5.01137600 & -0.44166400 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} and Benzyl Electrophiles

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 0.38796300 & 3.81603300 & 2.25498200 \\
\hline H & -0.93675300 & 2.28253700 & 0.91035600 \\
\hline C & 3.46816500 & 0.05391000 & -0.05514600 \\
\hline C & 4.62186600 & -1.72761000 & -0.84650200 \\
\hline C & 3.10916500 & -1.84143100 & -1.19080400 \\
\hline H & 5.27264500 & -1.64899100 & -1.71859400 \\
\hline H & 2.87001600 & -1.80945500 & -2.25507300 \\
\hline 0 & 2.07253900 & 3.27406100 & 1.20366000 \\
\hline \(\bigcirc\) & 4.72152900 & -0.45018600 & -0.14762200 \\
\hline N & 0.93544500 & 1.57407900 & 0.26011200 \\
\hline N & 2.51551400 & -0.62810000 & -0.57145400 \\
\hline C & 0.56148300 & 5.08104800 & 0.43954500 \\
\hline C & 4.98595400 & -2.91163700 & 0.07805700 \\
\hline C & -0.34392100 & 3.32173500 & -0.93700200 \\
\hline C & -0.84236800 & 2.72537500 & -2.09574100 \\
\hline C & 0.02679100 & 4.67051900 & -0.91626000 \\
\hline C & -0.98611000 & 3.51596600 & -3.23862000 \\
\hline H & -1.07740900 & 1.66569200 & -2.11962800 \\
\hline C & -0.12241500 & 5.45711100 & -2.05785600 \\
\hline C & -0.63468700 & 4.87114800 & -3.21899200 \\
\hline H & -1.36378400 & 3.06709900 & -4.15281600 \\
\hline H & 0.16242500 & 6.50657500 & -2.04935000 \\
\hline H & -0.75077500 & 5.47140600 & -4.11769200 \\
\hline H & -0.13327900 & 5.75106400 & 0.96307000 \\
\hline H & 1.52680100 & 5.59747700 & 0.39026200 \\
\hline C & 2.65934500 & -3.11805700 & -0.52467600 \\
\hline C & 1.38197600 & -3.67852900 & -0.54102500 \\
\hline C & 3.69683300 & -3.69415100 & 0.21430000 \\
\hline C & 1.15048200 & -4.82762800 & 0.21864400 \\
\hline H & 0.59602800 & -3.21165400 & -1.12667500 \\
\hline C & 3.46430500 & -4.84563000 & 0.96673800 \\
\hline C & 2.18288700 & -5.40455900 & 0.96928600 \\
\hline H & 0.16119600 & -5.27683500 & 0.22658200 \\
\hline H & 4.26320200 & -5.29992700 & 1.54778900 \\
\hline H & 1.98761800 & -6.29760200 & 1.55704300 \\
\hline H & 5.78994800 & -3.51832300 & -0.35582900 \\
\hline H & 5.35451400 & -2.53511000 & 1.03985500 \\
\hline Ni & 0.50392500 & -0.26841200 & -0.58224000 \\
\hline C & -1.39415800 & -0.17808200 & -0.41733900 \\
\hline C & -2.29751800 & -1.09707200 & -0.79584600 \\
\hline H & -1.74718000 & 0.68600700 & 0.14846000 \\
\hline H & -1.95679300 & -1.95601700 & -1.37243900 \\
\hline C & -3.73975200 & -1.09323200 & -0.49147600 \\
\hline C & -4.51997900 & -2.21156300 & -0.82307800 \\
\hline C & -4.40250700 & -0.01969300 & 0.14397200 \\
\hline C & -5.88545300 & -2.28244900 & -0.53578300 \\
\hline H & -4.04510100 & -3.05418800 & -1.32098500 \\
\hline C & -5.75652700 & -0.07285300 & 0.43721800 \\
\hline H & -3.84391600 & 0.87236200 & 0.40975000 \\
\hline C & -6.51276200 & -1.20754500 & 0.10240300 \\
\hline H & -6.44066600 & -3.17132700 & -0.81374000 \\
\hline H & -6.26135800 & 0.75804600 & 0.92132400 \\
\hline O & -7.83865800 & -1.15769700 & 0.43765300 \\
\hline C & -8.65030600 & -2.27053500 & 0.10684700 \\
\hline H & -9.65660000 & -2.02426100 & 0.45256300 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & -8.67392100 & -2.44829600 & -0.97761300 \\
\hline H & -8.30953500 & -3.18655200 & 0.61015300 \\
\hline C & 0.25062300 & -1.10137500 & 1.94414400 \\
\hline C & -0.48815300 & -0.07298100 & 2.63343100 \\
\hline C & 0.15497900 & 0.94275700 & 3.38612900 \\
\hline C & -1.90626200 & -0.04586000 & 2.59081300 \\
\hline C & -0.57573500 & 1.93430300 & 4.03365400 \\
\hline H & 1.23818400 & 0.95268800 & 3.45754000 \\
\hline C & -2.63176500 & 0.95239800 & 3.23201700 \\
\hline H & -2.43019400 & -0.81768600 & 2.03871900 \\
\hline C & -1.97378100 & 1.95617300 & 3.95281200 \\
\hline H & -0.05393100 & 2.69536700 & 4.60985100 \\
\hline H & -3.71666000 & 0.94223600 & 3.16853300 \\
\hline H & -2.54078600 & 2.73429100 & 4.45635000 \\
\hline C & 1.64870400 & -1.44437500 & 2.37497900 \\
\hline H & 2.33135000 & -0.58990400 & 2.31643900 \\
\hline H & 1.65008100 & -1.77365600 & 3.42690400 \\
\hline H & 2.06438800 & -2.24862800 & 1.77109900 \\
\hline H & -0.33284800 & -1.90584700 & 1.50794100 \\
\hline Br & 0.34383600 & -1.00613000 & -2.91029500 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{TS2-R-cf3} \\
\hline C & -0.39683000 & 4.14318800 & 2.26550300 \\
\hline C & -0.78091500 & 2.98313200 & 1.33267000 \\
\hline C & -1.71213200 & 4.18486200 & 1.57599000 \\
\hline H & -0.37001900 & 3.90835100 & 3.32371900 \\
\hline H & 0.39652400 & 4.78695900 & 1.90093500 \\
\hline H & -1.84023600 & 4.85211400 & 0.73126000 \\
\hline H & -2.60572100 & 3.97051800 & 2.15238200 \\
\hline C & -0.06979300 & 2.91798100 & 0.03741100 \\
\hline C & 0.72092400 & 3.83054300 & -1.87658400 \\
\hline C & 1.08255800 & 2.32239800 & -1.77055100 \\
\hline H & -0.05688700 & 4.05837400 & -2.60804300 \\
\hline H & 0.72242700 & 1.72320100 & -2.61079100 \\
\hline C & -1.20771800 & 1.70897200 & 1.94754900 \\
\hline C & -1.94680000 & 0.44661200 & 3.68114700 \\
\hline C & -1.92642300 & -0.35010400 & 2.35224100 \\
\hline H & -1.15470600 & 0.18505300 & 4.38782500 \\
\hline H & -1.37581400 & -1.29114200 & 2.40546000 \\
\hline 0 & 0.14560200 & 4.11264600 & -0.55909400 \\
\hline \(\bigcirc\) & -1.66286300 & 1.80683200 & 3.22125300 \\
\hline N & 0.37392000 & 1.87387700 & -0.55354200 \\
\hline N & -1.25088200 & 0.54944100 & 1.40261200 \\
\hline C & 2.02633400 & 4.61495000 & -2.07226800 \\
\hline C & -3.36398400 & 0.34121900 & 4.26341600 \\
\hline C & 2.58838100 & 2.32243000 & -1.59858000 \\
\hline C & 3.41813800 & 1.24057300 & -1.30754100 \\
\hline C & 3.10887900 & 3.61463600 & -1.72804000 \\
\hline C & 4.78584600 & 1.46994300 & -1.13632900 \\
\hline H & 3.00192600 & 0.24690900 & -1.18621500 \\
\hline C & 4.47508500 & 3.84216000 & -1.56360300 \\
\hline C & 5.31033300 & 2.76208200 & -1.26363600 \\
\hline H & 5.43779400 & 0.63758500 & -0.88729400 \\
\hline H & 4.88494200 & 4.84470800 & -1.66146700 \\
\hline H & 6.37564500 & 2.92789200 & -1.12534000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 2.10817300 & 4.94971300 & -3.11479700 \\
\hline H & 2.04003200 & 5.51354100 & -1.44548200 \\
\hline C & -3.39414100 & -0.51543300 & 2.01621600 \\
\hline C & -3.94736900 & -0.91427200 & 0.80213700 \\
\hline C & -4.20042800 & -0.12575000 & 3.09053600 \\
\hline C & -5.33854000 & -0.97345200 & 0.69201500 \\
\hline H & -3.31722900 & -1.12128700 & -0.05427100 \\
\hline C & -5.58899100 & -0.18211800 & 2.97824000 \\
\hline C & -6.15236600 & -0.61952800 & 1.77481200 \\
\hline H & -5.78214200 & -1.28426800 & -0.24948500 \\
\hline H & -6.22550800 & 0.12017500 & 3.80637800 \\
\hline H & -7.23365100 & -0.66534100 & 1.67431600 \\
\hline H & -3.37125800 & -0.38521800 & 5.08709800 \\
\hline H & -3.69007000 & 1.30093500 & 4.67919700 \\
\hline Ni & -0.44571300 & -0.10150200 & -0.41657600 \\
\hline C & 1.21958500 & -0.85395800 & 0.35949800 \\
\hline C & 2.03015900 & -1.88034100 & 0.03954700 \\
\hline H & 1.61439900 & -0.14369500 & 1.09862100 \\
\hline H & 1.68696600 & -2.63337300 & -0.67641600 \\
\hline C & 3.40269300 & -2.13623400 & 0.52196100 \\
\hline C & 4.01924000 & -3.36837900 & 0.25904100 \\
\hline C & 4.16664800 & -1.17382200 & 1.21587700 \\
\hline C & 5.32262200 & -3.65500100 & 0.67278500 \\
\hline H & 3.46362600 & -4.13049600 & -0.28387700 \\
\hline C & 5.46302800 & -1.43894200 & 1.63152000 \\
\hline H & 3.74111200 & -0.19401600 & 1.40941500 \\
\hline C & 6.05386700 & -2.68489500 & 1.36657700 \\
\hline H & 5.75084300 & -4.62507400 & 0.44659600 \\
\hline H & 6.04914600 & -0.69223700 & 2.15908400 \\
\hline 0 & 7.33613900 & -2.84170900 & 1.81705600 \\
\hline C & 7.98386900 & -4.07644700 & 1.56556200 \\
\hline H & 8.98147100 & -3.98858200 & 2.00114400 \\
\hline H & 7.45569100 & -4.91635600 & 2.03865300 \\
\hline H & 8.07588000 & -4.27519300 & 0.48838300 \\
\hline C & -1.13227000 & -2.76119200 & -0.84380000 \\
\hline C & -2.23205400 & -2.94461900 & -1.74655400 \\
\hline C & -3.48212800 & -3.46899200 & -1.32767600 \\
\hline C & -2.08275100 & -2.62492000 & -3.12075800 \\
\hline C & -4.51933600 & -3.65802100 & -2.23376100 \\
\hline H & -3.63573900 & -3.72489100 & -0.28471400 \\
\hline C & -3.11796900 & -2.82456000 & -4.02248100 \\
\hline H & -1.14425100 & -2.19575100 & -3.45639800 \\
\hline C & -4.34500100 & -3.33862600 & -3.58558100 \\
\hline H & -5.46735400 & -4.06297300 & -1.88849400 \\
\hline H & -2.97806300 & -2.56559100 & -5.06832300 \\
\hline H & -5.15789000 & -3.48742900 & -4.29119600 \\
\hline C & -1.13460900 & -3.33844800 & 0.54209000 \\
\hline H & -0.23945100 & -3.03099600 & 1.08454000 \\
\hline H & -2.01838100 & -3.03171800 & 1.11378700 \\
\hline H & -1.15755900 & -4.43991500 & 0.50251600 \\
\hline H & -0.16642400 & -2.59456400 & -1.30825900 \\
\hline Br & -2.03898400 & 0.56242800 & -2.14637500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS3-S}

Chapter 2 - Mechanistic Investigation of Ni-Catalyzed Reductive Cross-Coupling of Alkenyl 196 and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline C & 2.87608200 & 2.25666700 & -0.17715000 \\
\hline C & 3.92036200 & 2.94410700 & 0.72701600 \\
\hline H & 4.43656200 & 3.27539700 & -1.40339000 \\
\hline H & 3.13306400 & 4.39676300 & -0.75072200 \\
\hline H & 3.51486200 & 3.48957400 & 1.57189700 \\
\hline H & 4.82198000 & 2.37165600 & 0.91641400 \\
\hline C & 1.45774900 & 2.49811700 & 0.16155300 \\
\hline C & -0.19782200 & 3.78491000 & 1.02321800 \\
\hline C & -0.73611800 & 2.42898700 & 0.49739800 \\
\hline H & -0.19403500 & 3.87388400 & 2.11195800 \\
\hline H & -1.26959600 & 1.86585300 & 1.26365500 \\
\hline C & 3.25586800 & 0.94044400 & -0.73613700 \\
\hline C & 4.78422300 & -0.52787400 & -1.51229000 \\
\hline C & 3.35974000 & -1.15431800 & -1.50721500 \\
\hline H & 5.25528700 & -0.49973600 & -2.49548600 \\
\hline H & 2.93117000 & -1.36118900 & -2.49015000 \\
\hline 0 & 1.20101500 & 3.75145500 & 0.60763900 \\
\hline 0 & 4.55551700 & 0.85508800 & -1.12218100 \\
\hline N & 0.47562100 & 1.67761900 & 0.10248900 \\
\hline N & 2.52177600 & -0.09744700 & -0.88128300 \\
\hline C & -0.96701000 & 4.90318800 & 0.29980900 \\
\hline C & 5.62889000 & -1.28380400 & -0.45721800 \\
\hline C & -1.58860300 & 2.79807900 & -0.69582600 \\
\hline C & -2.17483900 & 1.93858700 & -1.62485000 \\
\hline C & -1.69215000 & 4.18723200 & -0.82118900 \\
\hline C & -2.89000200 & 2.49917900 & -2.68584600 \\
\hline H & -2.05641000 & 0.86300500 & -1.53653500 \\
\hline C & -2.40870600 & 4.74273800 & -1.88065000 \\
\hline C & -3.00873900 & 3.88890200 & -2.81085000 \\
\hline H & -3.34940800 & 1.84773300 & -3.42369900 \\
\hline H & -2.49507500 & 5.82149100 & -1.98718600 \\
\hline H & -3.56639400 & 4.30904500 & -3.64383700 \\
\hline H & -1.66980100 & 5.38357500 & 0.99325700 \\
\hline H & -0.28108100 & 5.68259900 & -0.05073300 \\
\hline C & 3.49787000 & -2.39400700 & -0.65732800 \\
\hline C & 2.55069200 & -3.39721400 & -0.45393200 \\
\hline C & 4.75389000 & -2.44848200 & -0.04481900 \\
\hline C & 2.87091500 & -4.45234700 & 0.40420000 \\
\hline H & 1.58905000 & -3.33620300 & -0.95520500 \\
\hline C & 5.07262500 & -3.50450000 & 0.80862100 \\
\hline C & 4.11978800 & -4.50232000 & 1.03538700 \\
\hline H & 2.14435800 & -5.24050700 & 0.58090700 \\
\hline H & 6.04766700 & -3.55660900 & 1.28717600 \\
\hline H & 4.35576300 & -5.32973300 & 1.69947500 \\
\hline H & 6.58988200 & -1.61358800 & -0.86897500 \\
\hline H & 5.85648300 & -0.61339800 & 0.38120700 \\
\hline Ni & 0.42576000 & -0.37968900 & -0.47077600 \\
\hline C & -1.27355900 & -0.77182900 & 0.38256000 \\
\hline C & -2.17501400 & -1.65809200 & -0.08327500 \\
\hline H & -1.60953400 & 0.00650800 & 1.06209400 \\
\hline H & -1.83287500 & -2.44363500 & -0.75318900 \\
\hline C & -3.61979700 & -1.62129300 & 0.16580100 \\
\hline C & -4.47489600 & -2.40903400 & -0.62223700 \\
\hline C & -4.22055200 & -0.82454700 & 1.16598300 \\
\hline C & -5.85975900 & -2.40649900 & -0.44667700 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
H & -4.04381200 & -3.03327800 & -1.40127700 \\
C & -5.59317900 & -0.81021300 & 1.35276100 \\
H & -3.59706800 & -0.21535500 & 1.81475200 \\
C & -6.42851900 & -1.60004600 & 0.54549700 \\
H & -6.47622200 & -3.03032000 & -1.08396400 \\
H & -6.05153000 & -0.20036000 & 2.12546600 \\
O & -7.76582900 & -1.51305500 & 0.81439500 \\
C & -8.65554000 & -2.29021100 & 0.03105200 \\
H & -9.65749100 & -2.07125700 & 0.40607000 \\
H & -8.60039900 & -2.02080800 & -1.03297500 \\
H & -8.45639400 & -3.36582400 & 0.13753800 \\
C & 0.48889000 & -1.39203200 & 1.45009400 \\
H & 1.49064700 & -1.55089700 & 1.04096500 \\
C & 0.55803400 & -0.36160700 & 2.52330000 \\
C & 1.71927700 & 0.42047300 & 2.66771800 \\
C & -0.51852800 & -0.09739600 & 3.39023400 \\
C & 1.79408700 & 1.44464200 & 3.60801800 \\
H & 2.56106300 & 0.22613600 & 2.00850700 \\
C & -0.44964600 & 0.93221800 & 4.33132400 \\
H & -1.41946500 & -0.69993100 & 3.32367900 \\
C & 0.70198600 & 1.71548200 & 4.43995900 \\
H & 2.70509100 & 2.03203200 & 3.69510200 \\
H & -1.29822800 & 1.11971600 & 4.98452600 \\
H & 0.75581600 & 2.51402900 & 5.17517200 \\
C & -0.06050700 & -2.76299600 & 1.82618000 \\
H & -0.15124900 & -3.38671100 & 0.93307800 \\
H & 0.63863300 & -3.25577600 & 2.51691300 \\
H & -1.04422100 & -2.71641400 & 2.29845600 \\
Br & 0.13717800 & -1.58531800 & -2.63128400
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS3-S-cf2}
C
C
C
H
H
H
H
C
C
C
H
H
C
C
C
H
H
O
O
N
N
C
-2.89739700
-2.20981200
-3.01969300
-3.75603200
-2.23774500
-2.44138700
-3.95751800
-0.73637200
1.26192000
1.43185600
1.50400100
2.05028600
-2.83676200
-4.57168800
-3.38913200
-4.80127100
-2.92078600
-0.17719200
-4.07600200
0.05050300
-2.36549600
2.04043500
-5.78754600
2.01914000
\begin{tabular}{lr}
4.22721900 & -1.47020700 \\
2.89088400 & -1.17188100 \\
3.13035500 & -2.46483400 \\
4.46049800 & -0.85300000 \\
5.05614600 & -1.69585300 \\
3.18603400 & -3.38205900 \\
2.58843100 & -2.53598900 \\
2.84988600 & -1.30260700 \\
3.72151800 & -1.92966900 \\
2.41222500 & -1.11350900 \\
3.63716300 & -2.99240400 \\
1.66450800 & -1.61186900 \\
2.01614700 & -0.14575000 \\
1.46317700 & 1.19924400 \\
0.45827300 & 1.35751200 \\
2.03092800 & 2.10261800 \\
0.43383100 & 2.34357500 \\
3.95804500 & -1.84554200 \\
2.42357600 & 0.22572800 \\
1.90012700 & -0.95414500 \\
0.95718400 & 0.39599000 \\
4.82875800 & -1.20017900 \\
0.69136000 & 0.63905400 \\
2.87164800 & 0.20406900
\end{tabular}
2.20669900
2.11728600
1.36143200
2.33076000
2.72611000
1.92341600
2.85435300
3.05067500
2.86575900
3.09963600
3.45177000
2.96516700
1.45531400
-3.98161700
-3.35917300
-5.29123500
-4.04421300
-2. 35711900
-5.98279900
\(-5.34510100\)
-3.55175200
-7.00225900
-5.86951800
\(-6.63931400\)
-6.11392400
-0. 39367400
1.23964400
2.10209600
1.61113000
1.74414200
3.54944300
4.39357000
4.15998300
5.78067200
3.95231400
5.53593200
3.54105600
6.36143200
6.38984200
6.00330900
7.70231200
8.58241800
9.58896600
8.51282300
8.38584400
\(-0.54069500\)
0.16019300
\(-0.71253300\)
-1.06919800
-0. 53320500
-1.26274000
-1. 19420000
\(-0.72308000\)
\(-0.26751600\)
-1. 09312100
-1. 54013700
\(-0.58048200\)
\begin{tabular}{ll}
4.23430600 & 0.16189700 \\
2.75671400 & 2.48948100
\end{tabular}
\(2.75671400 \quad 2.48948100\)
\(1.07061500 \quad 1.39790500\)
\(4.86746100 \quad 1.28843400\)
\(4.11836800 \quad 2.45250100\)
\(2.18950100 \quad 3.40513900\)
\(5.92660400 \quad 1.26624000\)
\(4.60100900 \quad 3.33997900\)
\(5.05622400-1.74704500\)
\(5.75426900-1.16105100\)
\(-0.87068500 \quad 0.95341200\)
\(-2.11501200 \quad 0.98328800\)
\(-0.72904600 \quad 0.48457600\)
\(-3.22299400 \quad 0.48016000\)
\(-2.19945600 \quad 1.38214400\)
\(-1.83702400-0.00469700\)
\(-3.08201000-0.01707800\)
\(-4.19064100 \quad 0.46314000\)
\(-1.73736800-0.37019100\)
\(-3.94989500-0.40870700\)
\(0.74698500 \quad 1.32831700\)
\(1.14289800-0.30552100\)
\(-0.02339300 \quad 0.03594900\)
\(-0.77853200-0.68959600\)
\(-1.52012700 \quad 0.03201000\)
\(-0.24898900-1.56455900\)
\(-2.03257200 \quad 0.91882800\)
\(-1.59267500-0.20006500\)
\(-1.98885700 \quad 0.84988500\)
\(-1.26863600-1.43088200\)
-2.04325100 0.70550400
\(-2.24984500 \quad 1.80882000\)
\(-1.31693900-1.59048100\)
\(-0.99708400-2.28179300\)
\(-1.70071300-0.52114000\)
\(-2.35068700 \quad 1.54787100\)
\(-1.07590600-2.54048400\)
\(-1.71595200-0.78462600\)
\(-2.10871800 \quad 0.25504200\)
\(-2.05174700-0.16453500\)
\(-1.43605800 \quad 1.12131900\)
\(-3.13819700 \quad 0.58559900\)
\(-1.50446700-1.57300400\)
\(-1.46196700-2.40846700\)
\(-2.95930700-1.18811500\)
\(-3.86676800-2.20141000\)
\(-3.46093000 \quad 0.10543300\)
\(-5.22031100-1.92736400\)
\(-3.50970000-3.22146700\)
\(-4.81660600 \quad 0.38462900\)
\(-2.78159600 \quad 0.90624500\)
\(-5.70319300 \quad-0.62721700\)
\(-5.89822700-2.73088600\)
\(-5.17384400 \quad 1.40138100\) and Benzyl Electrophiles
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
H & -1.23969600 & -6.75807800 & -0.40981400 \\
C & -1.84614600 & -0.86747500 & -2.10495600 \\
H & -1.69563000 & 0.18052300 & -2.38450900 \\
H & -2.15452900 & -1.40839700 & -3.01217300 \\
H & -2.66378200 & -0.93059600 & -1.38780500 \\
Br & -0.25568000 & -0.60870500 & 2.48313100
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS3-S-cf3}

\begin{tabular}{rrr}
1.60857000 & -2.54903300 & 1.37114900 \\
0.45608400 & -1.58616000 & 1.73603300 \\
0.92419800 & -2.69686000 & 2.68052600 \\
1.39308400 & -3.25793300 & 0.57879500 \\
2.59555800 & -2.10101300 & 1.32391400 \\
1.43953300 & -2.36367100 & 3.57377200 \\
0.23480600 & -3.52211700 & 2.81399800 \\
0.84843900 & -0.19497600 & 2.06413500 \\
2.11495300 & 1.34816100 & 3.11904800 \\
1.11042400 & 2.02252300 & 2.12996200 \\
1.98589300 & 1.64637100 & 4.16034700 \\
0.34693000 & 2.65230700 & 2.59502400 \\
-0.82874700 & -1.78209800 & 1.02153600 \\
-2.52079900 & -3.06716500 & 0.23160000 \\
-2.74840700 & -1.56535900 & -0.08143500 \\
-2.24566200 & -3.67713000 & -0.63334700 \\
-2.93456300 & -1.36100900 & -1.13283400 \\
1.77557800 & -0.06607900 & 3.04881300 \\
-1.34984600 & -3.03018200 & 1.10846800 \\
0.43043400 & 0.87276600 & 1.50354000 \\
-1.48158100 & -0.92305900 & 0.32670500 \\
3.54341800 & 1.60966400 & 2.58521400 \\
-3.75393200 & -3.57872100 & 0.99076500 \\
1.98903100 & 2.78958000 & 1.16722000 \\
1.58452900 & 3.61896800 & 0.12119500 \\
3.34263300 & 2.54398700 & 1.41295700 \\
2.56416500 & 4.18922100 & -0.69684300 \\
0.52693200 & 3.79343900 & -0.05257900 \\
4.31917300 & 3.12546900 & 0.60331000 \\
3.92182100 & 3.94288300 & -0.45941900 \\
2.26699300 & 4.83181600 & -1.52110000 \\
5.37480500 & 2.94305600 & 0.79101600 \\
4.67360100 & 4.39446300 & -1.10119500 \\
4.19200100 & 2.04169700 & 3.35642100 \\
3.99745800 & 0.66011800 & 2.27506300 \\
-3.91607700 & -1.18392000 & 0.80300000 \\
-4.42212200 & 0.09220300 & 1.04322400 \\
-4.46931500 & -2.31331400 & 1.41466300 \\
-5.51027700 & 0.22010400 & 1.91019400 \\
-3.95305900 & 0.96497900 & 0.59953100 \\
-5.55747400 & -2.18243000 & 2.27697100 \\
-6.07604400 & -0.90719200 & 2.51919900 \\
-5.91424300 & 1.20699600 & 2.11895100 \\
-5.99297200 & -3.05529100 & 2.75774700 \\
-6.92140500 & -0.78960800 & 3.19241000 \\
-4.37570300 & -4.18823500 & 0.32151500 \\
-3.45979700 & -4.22051300 & 1.82873700 \\
\hline 100
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
Ni & -0.60763200 & 0.90738200 & -0.43140800 \\
C & 0.75665700 & -0.11212200 & -1.37031700 \\
C & 2.06214200 & 0.20656700 & -1.29386200 \\
H & 0.44153900 & -1.13633400 & -1.57876300 \\
H & 2.34412900 & 1.23946600 & -1.09828800 \\
C & 3.16677200 & -0.76356400 & -1.28685200 \\
C & 4.39369300 & -0.41232100 & -0.70032000 \\
C & 3.04760000 & -2.07930400 & -1.78528500 \\
C & 5.44663700 & -1.32336400 & -0.57772500 \\
H & 4.52334400 & 0.59894300 & -0.32468400 \\
C & 4.08317200 & -2.99422800 & -1.67229700 \\
H & 2.12750400 & -2.38372400 & -2.27664000 \\
C & 5.29290500 & -2.62833500 & -1.05910500 \\
H & 6.37268100 & -1.00322500 & -0.11319200 \\
H & 3.98869600 & -4.00361800 & -2.06136000 \\
O & 6.24436800 & -3.60754400 & -0.99311000 \\
C & 7.49245400 & -3.28591300 & -0.40344500 \\
H & 8.09480800 & -4.19502200 & -0.45700900 \\
H & 8.00349800 & -2.48041900 & -0.94922300 \\
H & 7.37968800 & -2.98848100 & 0.64878200 \\
C & -0.62444500 & 0.98065600 & -2.69355300 \\
H & 0.10413900 & 0.45654400 & -3.30561700 \\
C & -1.95964500 & 0.36373000 & -2.91852400 \\
C & -3.17126100 & 0.98607900 & -2.55725900 \\
C & -2.02547400 & -0.90869900 & -3.52157900 \\
C & -4.39181900 & 0.35262100 & -2.78310100 \\
H & -3.14412200 & 1.94508400 & -2.05254700 \\
C & -3.24829100 & -1.54142700 & -3.74780300 \\
H & -1.10168700 & -1.40160000 & -3.81762000 \\
C & -4.44050900 & -0.91355400 & -3.37624900 \\
H & -5.31137900 & 0.84635700 & -2.48081600 \\
H & -3.27017400 & -2.52141200 & -4.21842600 \\
H & -5.39543100 & -1.40328900 & -3.54651500 \\
C & -0.43061000 & 2.47816000 & -2.88724500 \\
H & -0.54848000 & 2.72445500 & -3.95315500 \\
H & -1.13123600 & 3.07842300 & -2.30603900 \\
H & 0.58436600 & 2.76127400 & -2.58680700 \\
Br & & 2.85861500 & 2.8530100 \\
& 0.30308500
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS3-R}

C
C
C
H
H
H
H
H
C
C
C
H
H
C
C
4.83539800
3.42062200
3.75071000
5.55674300
5.19929100
3.34909600
3.70560600
2.67159200
2.23540200
1.33770700
1.71828600
0.26757200
3.15207300
3.67326500
2.31015400
\begin{tabular}{rr}
-0.06231100 & 1.96008100 \\
-0.08523600 & 1.37450400 \\
-0.69697900 & 2.75256000 \\
-0.70154300 & 1.46516500 \\
0.90961500 & 2.27162000 \\
-0.16807600 & 3.61103100 \\
-1.78036200 & 2.80809000 \\
1.19678900 & 1.36864300 \\
3.28681300 & 2.13504700 \\
2.91643100 & 0.92095300 \\
3.32121600 & 3.09753200 \\
3.03479000 & 1.10777000 \\
-1.03188000 & 0.25989400 \\
-2.73899900 & -1.11892100 \\
-2.10070400 & -1.51119800
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 4.42201000 & -2.71347200 & -1.91123300 \\
\hline H & 2.30482700 & -1.53486900 & -2.44683000 \\
\hline 0 & 3.15787800 & 2.15196700 & 2.19867600 \\
\hline 0 & 4.17084000 & -1.87158100 & -0.05615000 \\
\hline N & 1.63145900 & 1.49130500 & 0.68058500 \\
\hline N & 2.07608300 & -1.12379000 & -0.42435600 \\
\hline C & 2.98431100 & 4.58125700 & 1.78256900 \\
\hline C & 3.37588700 & -4.17382700 & -0.61909600 \\
\hline C & 1.84463500 & 3.80671900 & -0.19337700 \\
\hline C & 1.50398700 & 3.75275300 & -1.54395000 \\
\hline C & 2.78391500 & 4.72375400 & 0.28857100 \\
\hline C & 2.11891200 & 4.65616100 & -2.41459700 \\
\hline H & 0.81493100 & 2.99840700 & -1.91409600 \\
\hline C & 3.39328100 & 5.62488200 & -0.58380800 \\
\hline C & 3.05170600 & 5.58635800 & -1.93876500 \\
\hline H & 1.87555300 & 4.62703900 & -3.47293900 \\
\hline H & 4.12551400 & 6.34156400 & -0.21963900 \\
\hline H & 3.52170100 & 6.28040000 & -2.63076500 \\
\hline H & 2.54727000 & 5.42570300 & 2.33192400 \\
\hline H & 4.03649500 & 4.51565100 & 2.08097900 \\
\hline C & 1.34258000 & -3.25512200 & -1.53441900 \\
\hline C & 0.02288300 & -3.24892800 & -1.98335500 \\
\hline C & 1.94343600 & -4.42089800 & -1.04824900 \\
\hline C & -0.69617400 & -4.44592200 & -1.94327900 \\
\hline H & -0.41584200 & -2.32820200 & -2.35803600 \\
\hline C & 1.22501000 & -5.61596300 & -1.01695200 \\
\hline C & -0.09861200 & -5.61983900 & -1.46965400 \\
\hline H & -1.72661100 & -4.46586400 & -2.28643700 \\
\hline H & 1.68529400 & -6.53197000 & -0.65404200 \\
\hline H & -0.66901900 & -6.54487100 & -1.45143900 \\
\hline H & 4.07610500 & -4.90638800 & -1.03596200 \\
\hline H & 3.48846100 & -4.21130600 & 0.47244300 \\
\hline Ni & 0.27450100 & 0.06457800 & -0.23961900 \\
\hline C & -1.44634600 & 0.67227100 & 0.38217800 \\
\hline C & -2.60835800 & 0.09474800 & 0.02235800 \\
\hline H & -1.42958000 & 1.69473600 & 0.76332200 \\
\hline H & -2.58824200 & -0.96102300 & -0.24730300 \\
\hline C & -3.93541600 & 0.71335300 & -0.02553400 \\
\hline C & -5.06961300 & -0.10004700 & -0.17888300 \\
\hline C & -4.15126000 & 2.10372300 & 0.09109500 \\
\hline C & -6.36336600 & 0.42506500 & -0.19913300 \\
\hline H & -4.93631300 & -1.17541800 & -0.27374000 \\
\hline C & -5.42839500 & 2.64037200 & 0.07433300 \\
\hline H & -3.29954700 & 2.77241200 & 0.17871700 \\
\hline C & -6.54911400 & 1.80561900 & -0.06917400 \\
\hline H & -7.20685000 & -0.24591100 & -0.31677700 \\
\hline H & -5.59156700 & 3.71060000 & 0.15804300 \\
\hline 0 & -7.76190200 & 2.43807700 & -0.07502700 \\
\hline C & -8.92472300 & 1.64683800 & -0.24479900 \\
\hline H & -9.76752000 & 2.34118300 & -0.22947700 \\
\hline H & -8.91469200 & 1.11099600 & -1.20438800 \\
\hline H & -9.04279700 & 0.91751700 & 0.56925500 \\
\hline C & -0.36751400 & -0.53696300 & 1.84984500 \\
\hline C & -1.07281300 & -1.84490000 & 1.90449200 \\
\hline C & -2.40893200 & -1.96567600 & 2.32882900 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lr} 
C & -0.38572400 \\
C & -3.02676300 \\
H & -2.97272700 \\
C & -0.99859400 \\
H & 0.63881900 \\
C & -2.32485600 \\
H & -4.06043500 \\
H & -0.44158800 \\
H & -2.80726100 \\
C & -0.67607200 \\
H & -1.72929200 \\
H & -0.41951600 \\
H & -0.08188800 \\
H & 0.70992300 \\
Br & 0.14901400
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{rr}
-3.01883400 & 1.55088900 \\
-3.21361400 & 2.40229900 \\
-1.07641100 & 2.58928200 \\
-4.26762900 & 1.62994000 \\
-2.94402700 & 1.19798100 \\
-4.37093300 & 2.05573200 \\
-3.28093000 & 2.73237000 \\
-5.15413900 & 1.34514300 \\
-5.34311200 & 2.11546500 \\
0.45426800 & 2.96469400 \\
0.74528500 & 2.99840900 \\
0.00946400 & 3.93688500 \\
1.36572800 & 2.84493600 \\
-0.72205600 & 1.85322900 \\
0.43718100 & -2.69357000
\end{array}
\]

\section*{TS3-R-cf2}

4.43857400
3.37114100
4.39798100
5.22419700
4.06877600
3.99643800
5.15359400
1.98151900
0.45378300
-0.22378000
0.32593200
-0.95454400
3.58335600
4.90160400
3.39437500
5.46244200
3.03499900
1.87414000
4.88385800
0.89232200
2.70070200
-0.01827700
5.49587400
-0.81316000
-1.37774000
-0.67271800
-1.82140800
-1.43314300
-1.12128200
-1.69949400
-2.25124600
4.37162700
\[
\begin{array}{rr}
2.96426800 & 0.15677300 \\
1.87788600 & 0.37296000 \\
2.25552700 & 1.46056500 \\
2.70916400 & -0.54490900 \\
3.98177200 & 0.10838100 \\
2.77779200 & 2.32268300 \\
1.50567300 & 1.66898100 \\
2.34334300 & 0.58561100 \\
3.87631500 & 1.27157900 \\
2.63294600 & 0.63725400 \\
3.96163300 & 2.35378200 \\
2.16115700 & 1.29651000 \\
0.59080000 & -0.33179500 \\
-1.01478300 & -1.22279300 \\
-1.35255500 & -1.41956400 \\
-0.91419200 & -2.15274600 \\
-1.34154300 & -2.45103100 \\
3.61629900 & 1.04045800 \\
0.30712100 & -0.60824300 \\
1.69276300 & 0.40055900 \\
-0.25342500 & -0.70497900 \\
5.11301100 & 0.48944900 \\
-2.07893900 & -0.26797100 \\
3.14800400 & -0.65805900 \\
2.40497500 & -1.69484100 \\
4.53675400 & -0.74895000 \\
3.08646500 & -2.83073900 \\
1.32191400 & -1.64570000 \\
5.21335100 & -1.88244100 \\
4.47828800 & -2.92166900 \\
2.52367700 & -3.65408800 \\
6.29276100 & -1.96232200 \\
4.99237300 & -3.81383200 \\
5.68726800 & 1.09499000 \\
5.77892400 & 0.27055200 \\
-2.69084300 & -0.74625400 \\
-3.47431000 & -0.71191400 \\
-3.07312500 & -0.06483000
\end{array}
\]
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline C & 2.07528100 & -4.64952800 & 0.04323500 \\
\hline H & 1.17616000 & -3.15399200 & -1.25877900 \\
\hline C & 4.38658100 & -4.24965200 & 0.68465000 \\
\hline C & 3.22874000 & -5.03134800 & 0.74024000 \\
\hline H & 1.18679300 & -5.27371700 & 0.08705100 \\
\hline H & 5.28264600 & -4.55637100 & 1.21888600 \\
\hline H & 3.22721700 & -5.94806900 & 1.32415200 \\
\hline H & 6.38846400 & -2.54904900 & -0.69767700 \\
\hline H & 5.80813800 & -1.60196000 & 0.66924900 \\
\hline Ni & 0.58434700 & -0.27805000 & -0.35984400 \\
\hline C & -1.22083300 & -0.54730800 & 0.30921300 \\
\hline C & -2.05372500 & -1.50483300 & -0.15440100 \\
\hline H & -1.64671600 & 0.34776600 & 0.75671500 \\
\hline H & -1.61869500 & -2.39843100 & -0.59889400 \\
\hline C & -3.51224000 & -1.41175600 & -0.19900200 \\
\hline C & -4.23830400 & -2.22655900 & -1.08450900 \\
\hline C & -4.25212700 & -0.53771200 & 0.62974800 \\
\hline C & -5.62974800 & -2.17208800 & -1.16842400 \\
\hline H & -3.69614600 & -2.90803100 & -1.73567000 \\
\hline C & -5.63479900 & -0.47371500 & 0.55693700 \\
\hline H & -3.73349400 & 0.07645400 & 1.35943300 \\
\hline C & -6.33791000 & -1.28702800 & -0.34605000 \\
\hline H & -6.14411800 & -2.81579500 & -1.87299900 \\
\hline H & -6.20238600 & 0.19288700 & 1.19928500 \\
\hline 0 & -7.69812500 & -1.14604100 & -0.33597200 \\
\hline C & -8.45757000 & -1.93852400 & -1.23225900 \\
\hline H & -9.50191300 & -1.66633800 & -1.06516100 \\
\hline H & -8.19335400 & -1.73375700 & -2.27921000 \\
\hline H & -8.32803100 & -3.01218000 & -1.03546200 \\
\hline C & 0.13812400 & -1.23442500 & 1.72532600 \\
\hline C & -0.72379000 & -0.65805200 & 2.80860800 \\
\hline C & -0.39373300 & 0.55573100 & 3.43688500 \\
\hline C & -1.90375100 & -1.30589700 & 3.21323800 \\
\hline C & -1.21511800 & 1.10391600 & 4.42351000 \\
\hline H & 0.51069500 & 1.08013000 & 3.14419700 \\
\hline C & -2.72040500 & -0.76641200 & 4.20545000 \\
\hline H & -2.19276300 & -2.22792900 & 2.71704600 \\
\hline C & -2.38343200 & 0.44612700 & 4.81395400 \\
\hline H & -0.93838100 & 2.04574600 & 4.89181200 \\
\hline H & -3.62812300 & -1.28885100 & 4.49559900 \\
\hline H & -3.02322700 & 0.87177700 & 5.58214700 \\
\hline C & 1.63385500 & -1.14848500 & 2.08596600 \\
\hline H & 2.02259100 & -0.12789500 & 2.08838500 \\
\hline H & 1.76349500 & -1.55237000 & 3.10179500 \\
\hline H & 2.24334800 & -1.74146100 & 1.40717900 \\
\hline H & -0.11552600 & -2.27493700 & 1.52977100 \\
\hline Br & 0.21479500 & -0.98657100 & -2.75061600 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{TS3-R-cf3}

C
C
C
H
H
H
\[
\begin{array}{r}
0.67802800 \\
-0.45266800 \\
-0.28022500 \\
0.58820200 \\
1.68177000 \\
0.05309900
\end{array}
\]
\begin{tabular}{rr}
-3.36424500 & 0.30548600 \\
-2.44665000 & 0.82329600 \\
-3.88784100 & 1.31137200 \\
-3.68251700 & -0.72756200 \\
-3.08418800 & 0.60791300 \\
-3.99525300 & 2.33692400
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & -1.03961500 & -4.58939500 & 0.98678000 \\
\hline C & -0.04226100 & -1.35572100 & 1.73933700 \\
\hline C & 1.02847400 & -0.53305200 & 3.55100400 \\
\hline C & 0.37018200 & 0.61113300 & 2.71458000 \\
\hline H & 0.64544300 & -0.62168900 & 4.56864700 \\
\hline H & -0.42654900 & 1.16349300 & 3.22017500 \\
\hline C & -1.56734800 & -2.16201100 & -0.11069900 \\
\hline C & -3.14829800 & -2.78624800 & -1.61148100 \\
\hline C & -3.20170800 & -1.26275000 & -1.31468400 \\
\hline H & -2.74762600 & -3.05158200 & -2.59403800 \\
\hline H & -3.16281400 & -0.63874800 & -2.20995400 \\
\hline O & 0.62679300 & -1.74807600 & 2.85318600 \\
\hline \(\bigcirc\) & -2.18194600 & -3.25740900 & -0.62231500 \\
\hline N & -0.23005400 & -0.10467700 & 1.57204500 \\
\hline N & -2.00061000 & -1.01531700 & -0.49296500 \\
\hline C & 2.56125100 & -0.33587200 & 3.49262000 \\
\hline C & -4.54210900 & -3.36556500 & -1.32927700 \\
\hline C & 1.52733800 & 1.49408700 & 2.30757500 \\
\hline C & 1.47383200 & 2.68096500 & 1.57749900 \\
\hline C & 2.74736500 & 0.95062500 & 2.71883800 \\
\hline C & 2.67362900 & 3.31445800 & 1.24351600 \\
\hline H & 0.51724300 & 3.08583500 & 1.26131200 \\
\hline C & 3.94394700 & 1.59181000 & 2.39635300 \\
\hline C & 3.89923600 & 2.77237100 & 1.64797600 \\
\hline H & 2.64783800 & 4.22358900 & 0.65334000 \\
\hline H & 4.89784300 & 1.17837300 & 2.71630200 \\
\hline H & 4.82517300 & 3.27460900 & 1.38012500 \\
\hline H & 2.99745000 & -0.28182000 & 4.49739100 \\
\hline H & 3.02281100 & -1.19288600 & 2.98656300 \\
\hline C & -4.48964900 & -1.09266500 & -0.53500600 \\
\hline C & -4.92903100 & 0.04111500 & 0.14630000 \\
\hline C & -5.22943300 & -2.27971900 & -0.52928100 \\
\hline C & -6.14570200 & -0.02967500 & 0.82973400 \\
\hline H & -4.31798400 & 0.93876500 & 0.18069300 \\
\hline C & -6.44384600 & -2.34548700 & 0.15267900 \\
\hline C & -6.89878700 & -1.21047700 & 0.82987800 \\
\hline H & -6.50346600 & 0.83967200 & 1.37440600 \\
\hline H & -7.02456400 & -3.26476500 & 0.16447400 \\
\hline H & -7.84180800 & -1.24860700 & 1.36910300 \\
\hline H & -5.06245600 & -3.56163400 & -2.27635500 \\
\hline H & -4.46769200 & -4.32198200 & -0.80012400 \\
\hline Ni & -0.81363800 & 0.82244300 & -0.30445500 \\
\hline C & 0.56866000 & 0.01088100 & -1.38804700 \\
\hline C & 1.85613000 & 0.08275200 & -1.00429600 \\
\hline H & 0.20906700 & -0.82334800 & -1.99268100 \\
\hline H & 2.18302500 & 0.94165200 & -0.42129000 \\
\hline C & 2.84390000 & -0.99192900 & -1.16986300 \\
\hline C & 3.92364500 & -1.08142500 & -0.27610400 \\
\hline C & 2.73617300 & -1.99967600 & -2.15249200 \\
\hline C & 4.83854100 & -2.13691400 & -0.32308100 \\
\hline H & 4.04147700 & -0.31102100 & 0.48120200 \\
\hline C & 3.63748900 & -3.05185700 & -2.21316100 \\
\hline H & 1.93536900 & -1.94774900 & -2.88530300 \\
\hline C & 4.69488100 & -3.13646300 & -1.29241500 \\
\hline H & 5.65269400 & -2.16403600 & 0.39265800 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline H & 3.55520500 & -3.82221100 & -2.97405300 \\
\hline 0 & 5.52063100 & -4.21652700 & -1.43532100 \\
\hline C & 6.61865300 & -4.33860800 & -0.54741100 \\
\hline H & 7.14038100 & -5.25313900 & -0.83661100 \\
\hline H & 7.30710700 & -3.48633100 & -0.63385600 \\
\hline H & 6.28826100 & -4.42597000 & 0.49737500 \\
\hline C & -0.35258600 & 1.75059200 & -2.31844200 \\
\hline H & 0.09851600 & 1.17612400 & -3.12570100 \\
\hline Br & -2.20814600 & 2.51441200 & 0.88022800 \\
\hline C & 0.48380800 & 2.96056000 & -2.06102500 \\
\hline C & 1.82004400 & 2.98102000 & -2.50439500 \\
\hline C & -0.02564300 & 4.11865900 & -1.44668100 \\
\hline C & 2.61316600 & 4.11747800 & -2.35805400 \\
\hline H & 2.23401800 & 2.09220500 & -2.97248300 \\
\hline C & 0.76755200 & 5.25729100 & -1.30279500 \\
\hline H & -1.03684900 & 4.11690200 & -1.05824400 \\
\hline C & 2.08738500 & 5.26735700 & -1.76273300 \\
\hline H & 3.63936600 & 4.10771400 & -2.71676500 \\
\hline H & 0.34833100 & 6.14163400 & -0.82967000 \\
\hline H & 2.69947800 & 6.15949600 & -1.65627200 \\
\hline C & -1.82012300 & 1.98835600 & -2.69192200 \\
\hline H & -1.85601300 & 2.60690100 & -3.60203600 \\
\hline H & -2.31254600 & 1.03876300 & -2.92192700 \\
\hline H & -2.39475400 & 2.48641500 & -1.90980800 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{TS4-S} \\
\hline C & 3.23208300 & 3.56651500 & -0.17821100 \\
\hline C & 2.55391200 & 2.20444100 & 0.07091700 \\
\hline C & 3.51707700 & 2.84573900 & 1.08674200 \\
\hline H & 3.98959300 & 3.57442900 & -0.95313900 \\
\hline H & 2.57258900 & 4.42613900 & -0.14592700 \\
\hline H & 3.05250600 & 3.19710200 & 2.00103200 \\
\hline H & 4.47586200 & 2.35053700 & 1.19817400 \\
\hline C & 1.11377100 & 2.24595700 & 0.38011200 \\
\hline C & -0.71817100 & 3.20386400 & 1.30393600 \\
\hline C & -1.09123600 & 2.00074700 & 0.40711500 \\
\hline H & -0.79969400 & 3.01482900 & 2.37595600 \\
\hline H & -1.72930900 & 1.27068400 & 0.90054000 \\
\hline C & 3.06518200 & 1.04870000 & -0.69427900 \\
\hline C & 4.66968200 & 0.02202600 & -1.91729100 \\
\hline C & 3.43259300 & -0.90272600 & -1.72229800 \\
\hline H & 4.80580900 & 0.38580700 & -2.93836800 \\
\hline H & 2.95499100 & -1.23593900 & -2.64382500 \\
\hline 0 & 0.70893600 & 3.36358700 & 1.01776000 \\
\hline 0 & 4.34442400 & 1.18830900 & -1.10469400 \\
\hline N & 0.21487000 & 1.38084500 & 0.07243100 \\
\hline N & 2.45476800 & -0.04007100 & -0.99375300 \\
\hline C & -1.50207400 & 4.42061900 & 0.79630200 \\
\hline C & 5.90451400 & -0.69422700 & -1.34678500 \\
\hline C & -1.73461600 & 2.64154600 & -0.80555100 \\
\hline C & -2.06259100 & 2.04116500 & -2.02019700 \\
\hline C & -1.93972200 & 4.00923100 & -0.59366300 \\
\hline C & -2.61770200 & 2.83633400 & -3.02612600 \\
\hline H & -1.88337400 & 0.98193500 & -2.16772200 \\
\hline C & -2.49513500 & 4.80004800 & -1.59856200 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline C & -2.83416300 & 4.20392400 & -2.81673100 \\
\hline H & -2.88079500 & 2.38837800 & -3.98043500 \\
\hline H & -2.65699100 & 5.86382100 & -1.44165900 \\
\hline H & -3.26490800 & 4.80923400 & -3.61008000 \\
\hline H & -2.36368000 & 4.60448100 & 1.45203600 \\
\hline H & -0.88417400 & 5.32515700 & 0.81655300 \\
\hline C & 3.96863200 & -2.05511900 & -0.89514600 \\
\hline C & 3.27947800 & -3.17638300 & -0.43267900 \\
\hline C & 5.33501800 & -1.90043800 & -0.63560600 \\
\hline C & 3.96494500 & -4.11490500 & 0.34199500 \\
\hline H & 2.23407200 & -3.30441600 & -0.68591600 \\
\hline C & 6.01952100 & -2.83882000 & 0.13664600 \\
\hline C & 5.32294400 & -3.94264200 & 0.63529800 \\
\hline H & 3.43697400 & -4.98767000 & 0.71637200 \\
\hline H & 7.08098500 & -2.71918800 & 0.34027800 \\
\hline H & 5.84331300 & -4.67958600 & 1.24143400 \\
\hline H & 6.57823700 & -0.99754700 & -2.15839000 \\
\hline H & 6.47274900 & -0.02046900 & -0.69533900 \\
\hline Ni & 0.44027400 & -0.49214000 & -0.69145900 \\
\hline C & -1.35322000 & -0.91633000 & -0.21843700 \\
\hline C & -2.36855400 & -1.37681600 & -0.96268000 \\
\hline H & -1.53956800 & -0.68850300 & 0.83398800 \\
\hline H & -2.17617100 & -1.63860200 & -2.00184000 \\
\hline C & -3.75998400 & -1.57751300 & -0.51671800 \\
\hline C & -4.70841100 & -2.07799800 & -1.42084900 \\
\hline C & -4.21420700 & -1.28694300 & 0.78805400 \\
\hline C & -6.04305900 & -2.28862400 & -1.06413100 \\
\hline H & -4.39343300 & -2.31452300 & -2.43475900 \\
\hline C & -5.53379000 & -1.49004800 & 1.16024100 \\
\hline H & -3.51774400 & -0.89510200 & 1.52468700 \\
\hline C & -6.46359500 & -1.99364800 & 0.23626400 \\
\hline H & -6.73418700 & -2.67951800 & -1.80249400 \\
\hline H & -5.87762200 & -1.26608900 & 2.16581500 \\
\hline 0 & -7.73934400 & -2.15483200 & 0.70589600 \\
\hline C & -8.71530600 & -2.66469300 & -0.18503700 \\
\hline H & -9.64665700 & -2.71538600 & 0.38321800 \\
\hline H & -8.85725500 & -2.00568100 & -1.05341100 \\
\hline H & -8.45420500 & -3.67118200 & -0.54160500 \\
\hline C & 0.94402300 & -1.73548000 & 1.55048900 \\
\hline H & 1.96024300 & -1.73528800 & 1.16805400 \\
\hline C & 0.65416500 & -0.73047400 & 2.52700400 \\
\hline C & 1.62530000 & 0.26729900 & 2.82041600 \\
\hline C & -0.58353200 & -0.64627100 & 3.22144200 \\
\hline C & 1.37209600 & 1.28469500 & 3.72823600 \\
\hline H & 2.58407700 & 0.22008600 & 2.30974400 \\
\hline C & -0.83628000 & 0.38463000 & 4.12167600 \\
\hline H & -1.34324300 & -1.40238500 & 3.05368600 \\
\hline C & 0.13319500 & 1.36042500 & 4.38374000 \\
\hline H & 2.14142800 & 2.02310300 & 3.94065400 \\
\hline H & -1.79422700 & 0.42232600 & 4.63471300 \\
\hline H & -0.06293000 & 2.15391200 & 5.09962500 \\
\hline C & 0.19776500 & -3.02887900 & 1.40754300 \\
\hline H & 0.26571900 & -3.39825400 & 0.38110300 \\
\hline H & 0.62499300 & -3.79140100 & 2.07995300 \\
\hline H & -0.86582200 & -2.93708900 & 1.63995500 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Cl & 0.51419300 & -2.14139600 & \(-2.26255300\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{TS4-R} \\
\hline C & 4.04933100 & 3.12538100 & 1.27529700 \\
\hline C & 3.06849300 & 1.95975600 & 1.05542800 \\
\hline C & 3.97254100 & 2.05562000 & 2.30067500 \\
\hline H & 4.90526300 & 3.14363200 & 0.61092700 \\
\hline H & 3.59313500 & 4.08443400 & 1.49116600 \\
\hline H & 3.45822500 & 2.26281100 & 3.23331400 \\
\hline H & 4.77414900 & 1.32648000 & 2.35327700 \\
\hline C & 1.63589200 & 2.26096300 & 1.23724400 \\
\hline C & -0.09550500 & 3.43748400 & 2.11060000 \\
\hline C & -0.56063800 & 2.47560500 & 0.98961000 \\
\hline H & -0.36883700 & 3.13619200 & 3.12532900 \\
\hline H & -1.39677900 & 1.83097400 & 1.25987200 \\
\hline C & 3.43702200 & 0.95398700 & 0.03153900 \\
\hline C & 4.96489000 & -0.18572300 & -1.18220900 \\
\hline C & 3.51832000 & -0.64131300 & -1.54156700 \\
\hline H & 5.51435200 & 0.24808700 & -2.01883700 \\
\hline H & 3.19334400 & -0.40563900 & -2.55624800 \\
\hline 0 & 1.36428600 & 3.33015600 & 2.01956100 \\
\hline 0 & 4.76455400 & 0.88863400 & -0.22054900 \\
\hline N & 0.63672900 & 1.64993500 & 0.71247500 \\
\hline N & 2.66546100 & 0.16088800 & -0.61677700 \\
\hline C & -0.55236100 & 4.85081400 & 1.72618900 \\
\hline C & 5.69422100 & -1.38366300 & -0.53319400 \\
\hline C & -0.87090700 & 3.40320600 & -0.16906400 \\
\hline C & -1.09958600 & 3.06073800 & -1.50152400 \\
\hline C & -0.84146300 & 4.73937600 & 0.24413500 \\
\hline C & -1.32123900 & 4.09021200 & -2.41995000 \\
\hline H & -1.08471000 & 2.02173600 & -1.81241500 \\
\hline C & -1.06626900 & 5.76351900 & -0.67460900 \\
\hline C & -1.30963800 & 5.42919700 & -2.01002200 \\
\hline H & -1.49680600 & 3.84593100 & -3.46385900 \\
\hline H & -1.04448400 & 6.80466500 & -0.36168600 \\
\hline H & -1.48199800 & 6.21740000 & -2.73830500 \\
\hline H & -1.45324100 & 5.11441200 & 2.29648000 \\
\hline H & 0.21393300 & 5.59368500 & 1.97354600 \\
\hline C & 3.51911700 & -2.12893400 & -1.26498700 \\
\hline C & 2.51451300 & -3.05627700 & -1.54783100 \\
\hline C & 4.71719900 & -2.53038000 & -0.66546600 \\
\hline C & 2.71136200 & -4.38952800 & -1.18068000 \\
\hline H & 1.60006200 & -2.72638700 & -2.02986000 \\
\hline C & 4.91290200 & -3.86289200 & -0.30211300 \\
\hline C & 3.89776200 & -4.78929900 & -0.55413900 \\
\hline H & 1.93387800 & -5.12120000 & -1.38194200 \\
\hline H & 5.84309400 & -4.17875400 & 0.16412800 \\
\hline H & 4.03604600 & -5.82981300 & -0.27249400 \\
\hline H & 6.64414600 & -1.59541000 & -1.03818100 \\
\hline H & 5.93559900 & -1.14898300 & 0.51092800 \\
\hline Ni & 0.59428100 & 0.04388500 & -0.53437800 \\
\hline C & -1.26358700 & -0.23003600 & -0.19873100 \\
\hline C & -2.29302900 & -0.35155700 & -1.04972600 \\
\hline H & -1.46475600 & -0.28733800 & 0.87669600 \\
\hline H & -2.09740600 & -0.28710800 & -2.11858700 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{lr} 
C & -3.70465300 \\
C & -4.71294500 \\
C & -4.10903900 \\
C & -6.06662800 \\
H & -4.43367900 \\
C & -5.44685200 \\
H & -3.35794600 \\
C & -6.44032300 \\
H & -6.80802900 \\
H & -5.75278600 \\
O & -7.72973700 \\
C & -8.76762800 \\
H & -9.69914800 \\
H & -8.80115200 \\
H & -8.66495500 \\
C & 0.94623400 \\
C & -0.26221600 \\
C & -1.00842000 \\
C & -0.76345600 \\
C & -2.17499000 \\
H & -0.65990800 \\
C & -1.93124400 \\
H & -0.23051600 \\
C & -2.64477200 \\
H & -2.72503400 \\
H & -2.30183900 \\
H & -3.56383100 \\
C & 1.59031600 \\
H & 0.93761200 \\
H & 1.83337500 \\
H & 2.51915000 \\
H & 1.59073000 \\
Cl & 0.49161100
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{rr}
-0.57052200 & -0.68387800 \\
-0.35053100 & -1.63338300 \\
-1.01772500 & 0.59157700 \\
-0.53847800 & -1.33953300 \\
-0.01853300 & -2.63107900 \\
-1.21152200 & 0.89924100 \\
-1.24590300 & 1.34009600 \\
-0.96925300 & -0.06258300 \\
-0.35066600 & -2.10823800 \\
-1.56810500 & 1.87856600 \\
-1.19360800 & 0.34456300 \\
-0.98349400 & -0.59481100 \\
-1.21976100 & -0.07542700 \\
0.06026800 & -0.93886200 \\
-1.64160300 & -1.46953200 \\
-1.79843300 & 1.32873700 \\
-2.54276400 & 1.53836500 \\
-2.46014100 & 2.74020600 \\
-3.38671700 & 0.51319200 \\
-3.20207200 & 2.91403700 \\
-1.82136000 & 3.54644700 \\
-4.11295300 & 0.68728900 \\
-3.42573400 & -0.43181400 \\
-4.03174500 & 1.89213400 \\
-3.12787100 & 3.84904000 \\
-4.73818800 & -0.12044700 \\
-4.59574000 & 2.02280000 \\
-1.01557900 & 2.43498700 \\
-0.21684900 & 2.81001100 \\
-1.66079800 & 3.29448100 \\
-0.55403200 & 2.09481700 \\
-2.14468000 & 0.53059100 \\
-0.53365900 & -2.76197000
\end{array}
\]

\section*{\(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\) (ORCA)}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
C & -2.08035480745116 \\
C & -3.23769074609703 \\
C & -0.92301885233540 \\
F & -4.34757496386184 \\
F & 0.18686535087026 \\
C & -3.23769072197718 \\
C & -0.92301888078694 \\
F & -4.34757492081340 \\
F & 0.18686527613664 \\
C & -2.08035478998591 \\
F & -2.08035478968096 \\
F & -2.08035483801706
\end{tabular}

C \(\quad-2.08035480745116\)
C \(\quad-3.23769074609703\)
C \(\quad-0.92301885233540\)
F \(\quad-4.34757496386184\)
F \(\quad 0.18686535087026\)
C \(\quad-3.23769072197718\)
C -0.92301888078694
-4.34757492081340
-2 08035478998591

F 2.08035478968096

209
C \(\quad-0.60660232044200\)
H \(\quad-1.60460746635295\)
C 0.45328983433487
H \(\quad 1.49371646233862\)
C \(\quad-0.57195750470224\)
C 0.61998802181281
\[
\begin{array}{r}
-0.00000002082751 \\
-0.35506623649578 \\
0.35506620501065 \\
-0.69560642286598 \\
0.69560647574205 \\
-0.35506626792560 \\
0.35506626628939 \\
-0.69560645694073 \\
0.69560653123027 \\
-0.00000002292387 \\
-0.00000002759632 \\
-0.00000002269656
\end{array}
\]
\(-1.58571637452826\) -0.88678634286898 -0.88678633289870 -1. 55705193271356 \(-1.55705190979329\)
\[
0.51107006734975
\]
0.51107007660397
1.18133567640156 1.18133569163507
1.21000011999390
2.55054875632649 \(-2.92626500750795\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
-0.64433995736758 \\
-0.65333316008541 \\
-0.63003599455311 \\
-0.61917515448373 \\
-0.64861128117865 \\
-0.64566072383544
\end{gathered}
\]
\(-3.38005900922667\) -2.93305121239365 \(-2.55907618308245\) -2. 87727047533960 -4.84562063603251 \(-5.60004674907194\)
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\begin{tabular}{ll}
C & -1.79395229994265 \\
C & 0.59517064787864 \\
C & -1.83877360137507 \\
C & -0.63805521806712 \\
H & 1.58733125793119 \\
H & -2.72959761049744 \\
H & 1.51428622431806 \\
H & -2.78463544871623 \\
F & -0.66382938969596 \\
Br & 0.28753780217748
\end{tabular}

211
C -4.11532733969400
H \(\quad-5.16322602983630\)
C \(\quad-3.16762685914312\)
H \(\quad-2.10787415739093\)
C \(\quad-3.91045792977807\)
C \(\quad-2.63517196350950\)
C \(\quad-5.03578889837609\)
C \(\quad-2.48924585320593\)
C \(\quad-4.90926778262523\)
C \(\quad-3.63208872736911\)
H \(\quad-1.73841991553155\)
H \(\quad-6.03294651870383\)
H \(\quad-1.50595499406426\)
H \(\quad-5.78036122167198\)
F \(\quad-3.49132406175592\)
C \(\quad-2.51469059029440\)
H \(\quad-1.46687926140760\)
C \(\quad-3.46240715910281\)
H \(\quad-4.52215243116646\)
C \(\quad-2.71942537499200\)
C \(\quad-3.99440254918885\)
C \(\quad-1.59432007195093\)
C -4.14025890510305
C \(\quad-1.72077805437147\)
C \(\quad-2.99765036725211\)
H \(\quad-4.89091017520987\)
H \(\quad-0.59740181833295\)
H \(\quad-5.12328860004276\)
H \(\quad-0.84986377820378\)
F \(\quad-3.13833900772507\)

\section*{212(4-F) low spin (ORCA)}

Ni -0.00448447947817
Br 1.48051895103094
O \(\quad-2.14618384754168\)
\(0 \quad 2.37980000208120\)
N \(\quad-1.22320307906186\)
N \(\quad 1.38187625645077\)
C \(\quad-2.50473685992759\)
H \(\quad-3.02703521838075\)
C \(\quad-2.31414275829491\)
C \(\quad-1.51232164190342\)
H \(\quad-0.91049815291267\)

> -0.65623905033384 -0.64949435993566
> -0.66018199574130
> -0.65660166165618 -0.64084111737458
> -0.65893299398530
> -0.64739411187043
> -0.66600376119840
> -0.66046915172425
> -0.62612448467614
-1.12491356946914
-1.18831310673920
\(-1.13905534301137\)
-1.07707981623321
\(-1.03391764636984\)
\(-0.94763086729187\)
\(-1.03059708961062\)
\(-0.86218979261019\)
\(-0.94565654158294\)
\(-0.86244512329972\)
\(-0.94745158212351\)
\(-1.09641924344777\)
\(-0.79571102427353\)
\(-0.94331164978294\)
\(-0.77912663157127\)
\(-1.24576756800706\)
-1.18133021087182
\(-1.23201887654516\)
\(-1.29415602968902\)
\(-1.33692986135368\)
\(-1.42969757739758\)
\(-1.33379279785311\)
\(-1.51467685159697\)
\(-1.41813833281390\)
\(-1.50753157476434\)
\(-1.43587163754732\)
-1.26311777973175
\(-1.58630054772655\)
-1.41537981423140
\(-1.59044516645319\)
-5.54712355152329 -6.99133310043017
-6.94122267777344
\(-7.64189706791389\) -5.09619226931526
-4.98438732683538
\(-7.57720370736237\)
\(-7.48253959334636\)
\(-8.99889893159037\)
-0.66915781976260
-6.01429941298077
\(-5.69956900909472\)
\(-5.03808195186337\)
\(-5.30788545720844\)
-7.45326825019406
\(-8.05638453755352\)
\(-8.30621104514578\)
-9.43718523379085
-9.69165106403804 -10.23619868915133
\(-7.43570092957264\)
\(-7.86583450438134\)
-9.90305274209395
\(-10.34674289253264\)
-11.58447816915054
\(-2.66099915450661\)
\(-2.97581356345228\)
\(-3.63721103848032\)
\(-3.36740962017595\)
\(-1.22203428823827\)
\(-0.61920347627904\)
-0.36880889762441
0.76162695209982
1.01667612550167
1.56095297035080
-1. 24020875430780
\(-0.80897429389443\)
1. 22728282564892
1.67200496308725
2.90926760902267
\[
\begin{gathered}
0.00164020935805 \\
-1.06498553032033 \\
2.70992481822853 \\
1.45487800242610 \\
1.24516125844987 \\
0.45142569725855 \\
1.69215636182839 \\
0.81954243180769 \\
2.79291707793566 \\
2.78354092305962 \\
1.90705015537969
\end{gathered}
\]
0.00239302745841 \(-1.42227277162176\)
2.28296153762120
3.14553552778769
0.82001397365091 1.37268370607038
0.20028167496512
-0.21284803429169
-0.82891167485076
\(-1.97151518676158\)
-2.21296422085385
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline C & -1.48667183784918 \\
\hline H & -0.86400414733098 \\
\hline C & -2.24859325449193 \\
\hline H & -2.21699304159929 \\
\hline C & -3.04370247594705 \\
\hline H & -3.62841865175398 \\
\hline C & -3.07032191595432 \\
\hline C & -3.84960356218091 \\
\hline H & -4.92295813349767 \\
\hline H & -3.77594304049303 \\
\hline C & -3.24782198837848 \\
\hline H & -3.96181548987140 \\
\hline C & -1.09373624482642 \\
\hline C & 0.08827487863875 \\
\hline C & 0.30730255664132 \\
\hline H & 1.34653079630200 \\
\hline H & -0.41234425523186 \\
\hline C & -0.14793530388374 \\
\hline H & -1.18964241399308 \\
\hline H & 0.56860777104095 \\
\hline C & 1.28394818055181 \\
\hline C & 3.48191174327627 \\
\hline H & 4.12422097702651 \\
\hline C & 4.20274200542984 \\
\hline H & 5.27190389476995 \\
\hline H & 4.15016485558222 \\
\hline C & 3.51466753766513 \\
\hline C & 3.63740994066102 \\
\hline H & 4.27231145295736 \\
\hline C & 2.93467878923394 \\
\hline H & 3.02093633812608 \\
\hline C & 2.12461490652130 \\
\hline H & 1.58689261393112 \\
\hline C & 1.99959201633266 \\
\hline H & 1.38061955905140 \\
\hline C & 2.69685644850178 \\
\hline C & 2.72663367802005 \\
\hline H & 3.16825451112758 \\
\hline C & -1.40149009875006 \\
\hline H & -2.03510631596574 \\
\hline C & -1.75652521743068 \\
\hline H & -1.10501207355006 \\
\hline C & -2.95112365620622 \\
\hline C & -3.85728499891261 \\
\hline C & -3.22151252707195 \\
\hline C & -4.97922286924958 \\
\hline C & -4.33992211595134 \\
\hline C & -5.20574311712741 \\
\hline H & -3.67377801332535 \\
\hline H & -2.53258188490982 \\
\hline H & -5.67387381635059 \\
\hline H & -4.54200225250226 \\
\hline & -6.30308490686389 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
C \(\quad-1.48667183784918\)
-0.86400414733098
C \(\quad-2.24859325449193\)
H \(\quad-2.21699304159929\)
C \(\quad-3.04370247594705\)
H \(\quad-3.62841865175398\)
C \(\quad-3.07032191595432\)
C \(\quad-3.84960356218091\)
H \(\quad-4.92295813349767\)
H \(\quad-3.77594304049303\)
C \(\quad-3.24782198837848\)
H \(\quad-3.96181548987140\)
C \(\quad-1.09373624482642\)
C \(\quad 0.08827487863875\)
C 0.30730255664132
H \(\quad 1.34653079630200\)
H -0.41234425523186
C \(\quad-0.14793530388374\)
H \(\quad-1.18964241399308\)
H 0.56860777104095
C \(\quad 1.28394818055181\)
C 3.48191174327627
H 4.12422097702651
C 4.20274200542984
H 5.27190389476995
H 4.15016485558222
C 3.51466753766513
C \(\quad 3.63740994066102\)
H 4.27231145295736
C 2.93467878923394
3.02093633812608
C 2.12461490652130
H \(\quad 1.58689261393112\)
C 1.99959201633266
H 1.38061955905140
C \(\quad 2.69685644850178\)
C 2.72663367802005
H 3.16825451112758
C \(\quad-1.40149009875006\)
H \(\quad-2.03510631596574\)
C \(\quad-1.75652521743068\)
\(-1.10501207355006\)
C \(\quad-2.95112365620622\)
C \(\quad-3.85728499891261\)
C -3.22151252707195
-4.97922286924958
C \(\quad-4.33992211595134\)
C \(\quad-5.20574311712741\)
-3.67377801332535
H 5.67387381635059
H \(\quad-4.54200225250226\)
F \(\quad-6.30308490686389\)
3.92329934054902
3.93421369639543
5.05089471093451
5.93275922013676
5.05993212985855
5.94527500807122
3.92462134312011
3.69579574776801
3.54333522451468
4.52241849465255
2.40494676146387
1.77984856842228
1.93610966048983
2.02707353287255
3.36135515193982
3.67037733750601
4.14546701019410
2.18122249430214
2.13532039477542
1.66629142186091
1.27319317310105
0.72368410573533
1.48580470131008
\(-0.17332887910662\)
\(-0.23974757835717\)
0.24321584348415
-1.51073413328666
-2. 64517637862000
-2.63258666009796
-3. 80286202606502
-4.69635418451876
-3.82420395829027
-4.73596305778894
\(-2.68990406879442\)
-2.70181397824566
\(-1.53271201153393\)
\(-0.18761704582790\)
-0. 25449746077197
\(-0.78861801427904\)
\(-1.28764677439133\)
\(-0.86523505167258\)
-0.40857308973478
\(-1.51914280490975\)
\(-2.28306114369508\)
-1.39017338112351
\(-2.87842821603045\)
\(-1.97850977092046\)
\(-2.71388056534712\)
\(-2.42693252758972\)
-0.81230109787859
\(-3.47346317041941\)
-1.87474016712144
\(-3.29527128245169\)
\(-2.78164286180547\)
\(-3.67748163198082\)
-2. 45132495367893
\(-3.09340087627570\)
\(-1.30037856197006\)
-1.04169202149398
\(-0.48855181182245\)
0.78758163630582
0.58491826850845
1.50957617890282
1.34996429789153
1.90421276940742
1.91190877407963
2.78263295351118
3.52746537385254
3.61840043281037
3.30285053411278
4.30349516773825
4.61554073715783
4.94026945293758
2.36563742651106
2.48920495801151
2.02662190639825
3.49859326451102
3.23630663075593
4.51544988063502
3.34409244178004
4.14876463050819
5.03739448769345
3.79970833654877
4.42049587820722
2.65754694487539
2.39252422867949
1.84907993232279
0.95098959516874
2.20372943294103
1.49388927054575
0.49010899285342
\(-0.96238725294244\)
-0. 20524543892123
-2.25838195017227
-3.01166561912331
\(-2.81650139221344\)
-2.04982337266299
-4.19468295364675
-2. 62231397369321
-4.78764052083420
-3.98709027461802
\(-0.98369370994579\)
\(-4.81459548781304\)
\(-2.02849829659437\)
-5.85400827132554
\(-4.55036414280337\)
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\section*{Chapter 3}

\section*{Nickel-Catalyzed Reductive Alkylation of Heteroaryl Imines \({ }^{\dagger}\)}

\subsection*{3.1 INTRODUCTION}

The preparation of heterobenzylic amines by a Ni-catalyzed reductive cross-coupling between heteroaryl imines and \(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)\) electrophiles is reported. This umpolung-type alkylation proceeds under mild conditions, avoids the pre-generation of organometallic reagents, and exhibits good functional group tolerance. Mechanistic studies are consistent with the imine substrate acting as a redox-active ligand upon coordination to a low-valent Ni center. The resulting bis(2-imino)heterocycle \(\cdot \mathrm{Ni}\) complexes can engage in alkylation reactions with a variety of \(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)\) electrophiles, giving heterobenzylic amine products in good yields.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{\dagger}\) Portions of this chapter have been reproduced from a published manuscript. \({ }^{1}\) Fellowship support was provided by the NIH (R35GM118191-01). M.B. was supported by a fellowship from the Swiss National Science Foundation.
}

\subsection*{3.2 Development of a Reductive Alkylation of Heteroaryl Imines}

\subsection*{3.2.1 Background and Motivation}

Benzylic amines are common substructures in a variety of natural products, agrochemicals, and pharmaceuticals. \({ }^{2}\) In particular, heterobenzylic amines serve as important nitrogen-containing scaffolds in medicinal chemistry. Two representative examples are Gilead's Phase II/III HIV capsid inhibitor Lenacapavir \({ }^{3}\) and Pfizer's commercial anticancer agent Glasdegib \({ }^{4}\) (Figure 3.1). Due to broad interest in this structural motif, a variety of synthetic approaches to prepare benzylic amines have been developed.

Figure 3.1. Pharmaceutical drugs that contain heterobenzylic amines.
 HIV capsid inhibitor


Glasdegib (Pfizer) anticancer


BMS-986299 (BMS) anticancer


Benthiavalicarb (Kumiai Chemical) fungicide

Of these methods, the 1,2-addition of organometallic reagents to imines is one of the most well-established; \({ }^{5}\) however, pre-generation of sensitive and reactive organometallic reagents \(\mathbf{2 5 0}\) and use of activated imine derivatives is typically required. When simple N alkylimines are employed, stoichiometric Lewis acid additives can be necessary to enhance the reactivity (251). Moreover, \(\alpha\)-deprotonation of the imine substrate by the basic nucleophiles can be problematic as it isomerizes the imine and quenches the nucleophile (Scheme 3.1).

Scheme 3.1. Organometallic addition into imine-derivatives.
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In order to improve access to benzylic amines, chemists have explored complimentary single electron reactions of imines, including the 1,2-addition of organic radicals to imines \({ }^{6,7,8}\) and the reductive alkylation of imines via \(\alpha\)-amino radicals. \({ }^{9}\) These reactions often exhibit improved functional group tolerance by avoiding the use of organometallic reagents; however, they typically require particularly activated substrates. This challenge with radical addition to unactivated \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N} \pi^{*}\) systems can be attributed to the poor electrophilicity of imines, additionally the resulting \(N\)-centered radical in the product is typically less stable than the corresponding \(C\)-centered radical. This problem is resolved when using activated imine derivatives which contain groups that can stabilize the resulting N -centered radicals or lower the LUMO to accelerate radical addition. (Figure 3.2a). Due to these stabilizing effects, the vast majority of methods employ imine derivatives such as glyoxime esters 255, \({ }^{10}\) glyoxal sulfoxides 254, \({ }^{11}\) sulfonimines \(\mathbf{2 5 3},{ }^{12}\) or hydrazones \(\mathbf{2 5 2} .{ }^{13}\) Unfortunately, in most cases, \({ }^{6}\) harsh conditions are required for radical generation reducing the generality and functional group tolerance of these methods (Figure 3.2b).

Figure 3.2. Radical addition into activated imines


An alternative strategy that circumvents a high-energy \(N\)-centered radical intermediate, is photoredox-mediated reduction of imines to provide a more stable \(N\)-centered anion (256). The adjacent C-centered radical can then undergo radical-radical coupling reactions with other organic radicals (257) in solution. While this strategy has recently gained attention and appears to have broader functional group tolerance, the reducing power required to reduce imines ( \(\mathbf{2 6 1},-2.43 \mathrm{~V}\) vs. SCE ) is not feasible from most photoredox catalysts. This means for photoredox systems, like the aforementioned thermal reactions, stabilizing groups are required to lower the reduction potential like aromatics \(\mathbf{( 2 6 0},-1.91\) V vs. SCE), sulfonimides ( \(\mathbf{2 5 9},-1.45 \mathrm{~V}\) vs. SCE ), or hydrogen-bond donors \(\mathbf{2 5 8}\) (Figure
3.3a). \({ }^{14}\) Despite these limitations, there are many methods for photoredox-mediated imine alkylation reactions to give functionalized anilines or sulfonamide products (Figure 3.3b). \({ }^{15}\)

Figure 3.3. Radical reactions with imines the proceed through an \(\alpha\)-amino radical.


As part of our efforts to broaden the scope of electrophiles for cross-electrophile coupling, we became interested in a mechanistically distinct transition metal-catalyzed reductive alkylation of heterocyclic imines \({ }^{16,17}\) that leverages the redox non-innocence of 2-iminoheterocycles 262 as ligands on first-row transition metals. This strategy allows for the mild activation of imines for single-electron alkylation and provides direct access to N alkyl heterobenzylic amines 264 by the equivalent of a \(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)\) coupling reaction (Scheme 3.2). In this report, we describe the development of this method, which provides access to a variety of heterobenzylic N -alkylamines \(\mathbf{2 6 4}\) in good yields.

Scheme 3.2. Proposed reductive imine alkylation reaction.


\subsection*{3.2.2 Reaction Design and Redox-Active Iminopyridines}

Figure 3.4. \(\alpha\)-aminopyridine as redox-active ligands and catalytic reaction design.


Conjugated nitrogen ligands such as diiminopyridines, \(\alpha\)-diimines, and bi- and terpyridines can be electronically non-innocent: their \(\pi\)-systems are able to accept one or two electrons when bound to first-row transition metals. \({ }^{18}\) For example, spectroscopic,
electrochemical, and computational investigations conducted by Wieghardt and coworkers demonstrated that low-valent \(\mathrm{Cr}, \mathrm{Mn}, \mathrm{Fe}, \mathrm{Co}, \mathrm{Ni}\), and Zn bis(2-imino)pyridine complexes (265) possess ligand-centered radicals (266, Figure 3.4a). \({ }^{19}\) Although the alkylation of ligand backbones has been observed previously, \({ }^{20}\) this reactivity has not been leveraged for a catalytic cross-coupling.

We hypothesized that these redox-active complexes could be considered persistent \(\alpha\) amino radicals, which might react with alkyl radicals (257) to give metal-coordinated imine alkylation products ( \(\mathbf{2 6 7}\) to \(\mathbf{2 6 8}\) ). This process could be rendered catalytic if 1) the alkylated product-metal complex 268 could activate a \(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)\) electrophile to generate an alkyl radical ( \(\mathbf{2 6 8}\) to \(\mathbf{2 6 9}\) ), 2) the product could be liberated from complex \(\mathbf{2 6 9}\) by exchange with imine 262, and 3) the bis(2-iminoheterocycle) \(\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{II}} \mathrm{X}_{2}\) complex 270 could be reduced by a terminal reductant to regenerate the low-valent complex 267 . We envisioned that turnover might be facilitated by a Brönsted acid (H-X) or electrophilic reagent \((\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{X})\) able to sequester the anionic nitrogen of \(\mathbf{2 6 9}\) (Figure 3.4b).

\subsection*{3.2.3 Optimization of Alkylation Reaction}

Table 3.1. Identifying the optimal transition metal for the imine alkylation reaction.


Our investigations commenced with the coupling between \((E)\) - \(N\)-isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (271) and benzyl bromide (272) in the presence of \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) as a stoichiometric reductant, \(N\)-methylpyrrolidone (NMP) as the solvent, and trimethylsilyl chloride (TMSCl) as an additive. Product 273 was formed in varying yields for a series of metal dihalide salts (entries 1-6, Table 3.1). Of the metals evaluated, \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{dme}\) was found to be optimal providing 273 in \(87 \%\) yield (entry 1, Table 3.1). Interestingly, when TMSCl is used, the reaction proceeds in the absence of exogenous catalyst (entry 7, Table 3.1). It is likely that the combination of \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) and TMSCl generates \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}\), which was previously shown by Wieghardt \({ }^{12}\) to form a redox-active complex with a similar heteroaryl imine. Use of \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}\) gives no improvement over just \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) and provides 273 in lower yield than \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot\) dme (entry 6 , Table 3.1 ). \({ }^{13,21,22}\) When TMSCl was omitted from the reaction, 273 was formed in only \(19 \%\) yield (entry 8, Table 3.1).

Table 3.2. Optimizing the Ni-catalyzed imine alkylation.


Protic additives such as hexafluoroisopropanol (HFIP) (entry 2, Table 3.2) and AcOH (entry 3, Table 3.2 ) were also beneficial, but inferior to \(\mathrm{TMSCl}{ }^{23}\) Alternative reductants such as \(\mathrm{Zn}^{0}\) and tetrakis( \(N, N\) - dimethylamino)ethylene (TDAE) did not perform as well as \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) (entries 4 and 5, Table 3.2). The catalyst loading could be dropped to \(1 \mathrm{~mol} \%\) with only a small decrease in yield (entry 6 , Table 3.2 ); however, lowering the catalyst loading to \(0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \%\) significantly reduced the yield and showed no improvement over the background Mn-mediated reaction ((entry 7, Table 3.2 vs. entry 7, Table 3.1). To investigate the reaction in the absence of \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\), a constant current electrolysis protocol was explored for both Ni and Mn salts. The Ni-catalyzed electrolysis provided 273 in good yield (entry 1, Table 3.3) while the Mn-catalyzed reaction provided drastically lower yield of \(\mathbf{2 7 3}\) (entry 2, Table 3.3). Although the reaction could be performed with just \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\), the addition of \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot d m e\) resulted in higher yields of the imine alkylation product. As a result, the conditions from entry 1 (Table 3.2) were used to evaluate the scope of the reaction using \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) as the terminal reductant.

Table 3.3. Comparing the Ni and Mn-catalyzed reactions in the absence of \(\mathrm{Mn}^{\circ}\).


\subsection*{3.2.4 Scope of Alkylation Reaction with Mn Reductant}

The scope of the heteroaryl imine coupling partner was investigated using benzyl bromide as the electrophile (Figure 3.5). Sterically diverse \(N\)-substitution on the imine was well tolerated, affording the products containing \({ }^{n} \mathrm{Bu},{ }^{i} \mathrm{Pr}\), and \({ }^{t} \mathrm{Bu}\) groups in high yields (273-275). Imines bearing cyclopropyl and cyclobutyl groups, two increasingly popular fragments in drug development, \({ }^{24}\) provided the coupled products in \(67 \%\) yield (276) and \(70 \%\) yield (277), respectively. Use of the chiral imine derived from ( \(R\) )-1phenylethylamine gave product 278 in good yield, albeit with poor diastereoselectivity. The use of a ketimine substrate did result in product formation (279); however, the yield was low, likely due to the increased steric hindrance at the site of \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}\) bond formation.

Figure 3.5. Scope of \(\alpha\)-iminopyridines.
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Electron-donating substituents at the 4 - and 5-position of the pyridine were tolerated, furnishing the desired products in generally good yields (281-283). Substitution at the 6position afforded the products in lower yields (280 and 285), possibly because the substituent hinders coordination of the imine to the Ni-catalyst. In general, substrates bearing electron withdrawing groups at the 5-position gave lower yields of the product
(Figure 3.13). In addition to 2-iminopyridines, several other heterocyclic imines can be employed, including the corresponding benzimidazole (284), thiazole (288), pyrimidine (289), and quinoline (290) (Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.6. Scope of benzyl halide electrophiles.


A range of substituted benzylic bromides could be coupled with imine 271. Orthosubstituted benzylic bromides coupled smoothly, affording products 295-298 and in good yield. In addition, the reaction exhibits chemoselectivity for the benzylic halide in the presence of aryl iodides and bromides (297 and 298); these functionalities are frequently incompatible with standard organometallic reagents. Benzylic chlorides perform
comparably under standard reaction conditions (301-303). A secondary benzylic chloride also underwent the alkylation, although in reduced yield and with poor diastereoselectivity (303) (Figure 3.6).

Figure 3.7. Scope of alkyl electrophiles.




\(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R}^{1}={ }^{n} \mathrm{Bu}(\mathbf{3 0 8}), 30 \%\) yield


Non-benzylic alkyl halides were also investigated (Scheme 1), which revealed that the reaction yield is influenced by the identity of both the imine and the alkyl electrophile. \(N\) \({ }^{n} \mathrm{Bu}\) imine 291 could be coupled with cyclohexyl iodide and cyclohexyl bromide to furnish 304 in \(57 \%\) yield and \(32 \%\) yield, respectively. Coupling of the \(N-{ }^{i} \operatorname{Pr}\) imine (271) with cyclohexyl iodide gave 305 in \(45 \%\) yield; however, it was accompanied by \(50 \%\) yield of the imine homocoupling product 311. \({ }^{2526}\) In contrast, use of the corresponding \(N\) hydroxyphthalimide (NHP) ester \({ }^{27}\) gave \(\mathbf{3 0 5}\) in \(41 \%\) yield but with minimal formation of 311. Reaction of \(\mathbf{2 7 1}\) or \(\mathbf{2 9 1}\) with pyranyl and piperdinyl electrophiles furnished products 306-309 in modest to good yields. Taken together, these scope studies demonstrate a
generally high tolerance for nitrile, ketone, ester, and halide functional groups, which are often incompatible with organomagnesium and organolithium reagents (Figure 3.7)

\subsection*{3.2.5 Optimization and Scope of Electroreductive Alkylation}

Figure 3.8. Electroreductive imine alkylation scope.
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Given that deleterious imine homodimerization was observed in some reactions when \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) was used as a reductant (Figure 3.14), we sought to drive the reaction electrochemically to eliminate the need for \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\). Moreover, an electroreductive system removes the mechanistic ambiguity about the identity of the active catalyst (Ni vs. Mn). Under constant current electrolysis using reticulated vitreous carbon (RVC) foam as the cathode and \(\mathrm{Zn}^{0}\) metal as a sacrificial anode, alkylation of \(\mathbf{2 7 1}\) with \(\mathbf{2 7 2}\) proceeded smoothly. We were pleased to find that several substrates that gave low yields under the \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) conditions performed better under the electroreductive conditions. For example, when 271 was coupled with iodocyclohexane under standard conditions, product \(\mathbf{3 0 5}\) was formed in \(45 \%\) yield and was accompanied by \(50 \%\) yield (see Figure S3.14) of imine dimer \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\)
(Figure 3.7). Under the electroreductive conditions, \(\mathbf{3 0 5}\) was produced in \(59 \%\) yield on a 1.2 mmol scale; no \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\) was observed. Alkylation products from primary (312, 315, and 316) and tertiary (314) iodides, could also be formed in good yield under the electroreductive conditions (Figure 3.8). Both reactions proceeded in \(<20 \%\) yield when \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) was used as a reductant.

\subsection*{3.3 Mechanistic Studies}

\subsection*{3.3.1 Investigating the Redox-Active Substrate-Catalyst Complex}

Since the electroreductive coupling (Figure 3.8) demonstrates that Ni salts can catalyze the alkylation of 2-iminopyridines, we carried out a series of mechanistic experiments studying the Ni system. Initial mechanistic investigations focused on the substrate-catalyst complexes (like 270, Figure 3.4) proposed to be key catalytic intermediates. Non-chelating substrates like benzaldehyde-derived imine \(\mathbf{3 1 7}\) and isomeric pyridyl imine \(\mathbf{3 1 8}\) failed to couple under standard conditions, demonstrating the importance of forming a bidentate substrate-metal complex (Scheme 3.3a). Bis(2-iminopyridine) \(\cdot\) Ni complex 321 was prepared by the addition of imine 271 ( 2.0 equiv) to \(\mathrm{Ni}(\operatorname{cod})_{2}\) ( 1.0 equiv); \({ }^{12}\) subsequent addition of benzyl bromide provided 273 in \(53 \%\) yield, providing support for reduced Ni complex 321 as a competent species in the catalytic cycle (Scheme 3.3b).

Scheme 3.3. Investigating the importance of the substrate acting as a ligand.


In agreement with Wieghardt and coworkers, \({ }^{12}\) computational studies suggest that the electronic structure of the formally \(\mathrm{Ni}^{0}\) complex \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) is best described as a \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}\) center with antiferromagnetically coupled ligand-based radicals. DFT calculations of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) at the B3LYP/def2-TZVP level of theory show the broken symmetry solution \(\mathrm{BS}(2,2)\) being lower in energy than the closed-shell or high spin solutions (Figure 3.9a). \({ }^{28,29}\) A qualitative molecular orbital diagram of the magnetic orbitals reveals seven orbitals with significant d contribution (Figure 3.40, section 3.5.17). Upon closer examination of the electronic structure, there are two ligand-based singly-occupied molecular orbitals (SOMOs) as the imine \(\pi^{*}\) orbitals (Scheme 3.9b). Using the Yamaguchi equation, the spin-spin coupling constant \((J)\) between the metal-based SOMOs and the ligand-based SOMOs was calculated to be \(J=-777 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} .{ }^{30}\) These data support our hypothesis that the ligand non-innocence of reduced catalyst-substrate complexes such as \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) allows for facile access to persistent \(\alpha\) amino radical intermediates (Figure 3.4b).

Figure 3.9. Theoretical investigation of electronic structure of 321.


\subsection*{3.3.2 Redox Properties of Catalyst-Substrate Complex}

We sought to investigate the redox properties of \((\mathbf{2 7 1})_{2} \mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \mathbf{( 3 2 2 )}\) to confirm that reduction to the low-valent complex \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) is possible under the reaction conditions. Using cyclic voltammetry \((\mathrm{CV})\), the reduction potential of free 271 was compared to the reduction potentials of corresponding in situ generated complexes (271) \()_{2} \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}\) (322, purple) and \((\mathbf{2 7 1}){ }_{2} \mathrm{MnCl}_{2}\left(\mathbf{3 2 3}\right.\), green) (Figure 3.10). Complex \(323\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-1.82 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs} .\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\right.\)in NMP) is more challenging to reduce than Ni complex \(322\left(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}=-1.43 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs} .\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\right.\)in NMP \()\). The free imine 271 has a reduction potential \(\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p} / 2}\right)\) of \(-2.65 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs} . \mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\)in NMP, which is significantly more negative than that of either complex \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) or \(\mathbf{3 2 3}\). Complexation of \(\mathbf{2 7 1}\)
with a non-redox-active Lewis acid such as \(\mathrm{MgBr}_{2}\) does not significantly change the potential of imine reduction \(\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p} / 2}=-2.55 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs} . \mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\right.\)in NMP) (Figure 3.10). The significant anodic shift of the reduction potentials and the increased reversibility of the redox events demonstrate that imine coordination to Ni and Mn facilitates reduction and stabilizes the ligand-centered radicals. We note that reduction of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) is 420 mV more anodic than \(\mathbf{3 2 3}\) indicating the formation of proposed intermediate \(\mathbf{2 6 7}\) (or \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) when \(\mathrm{M}=\) Ni ) (Figure 3.4b) is more thermodynamically favorable, which may correlate with the improved product yields when catalytic Ni is included.

Figure 3.10. Cyclic voltammetry of 271 and its catalytically relevant metal complexes.


It was unclear from the CV alone whether the observed reduction of \((\mathbf{2 7 1})_{2} \mathrm{NiCl}_{2}(\mathbf{3 2 2})\) corresponded to a one-electron or a two-electron process. \({ }^{31}\) To investigate the identity of the species generated upon reduction, UV/Vis spectroelectrochemical analysis of \(\mathbf{3 2 3}\) was performed at varying potentials (Figure 3.35 , section 3.5 .14 ). At \(-1.4 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{vs} .\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\), a
species develops with a UV/Vis spectrum that is consistent with that of an independently prepared sample of \((\mathbf{2 7 1})_{2} \mathrm{Ni} \mathbf{( 3 2 1 )}\). Alternatively, mixing 1 equiv each of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) and \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) results in comproportionation to the \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}\) complex (324); this species has a different spectroscopic profile, and consistent with Wieghardt's prior studies, \({ }^{12}\) computational and EPR studies suggest that this complex does have not significant radical character on the ligand backbone (Section 3.5.16). These experiments suggest that at potentials accessible under the catalytic reaction conditions, complex \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) undergoes two electron reduction to generate 321 (Figure 3.11). \({ }^{32,33}\)

Figure 3.11. UV/vis comparison of electrochemically reduced 322 with independently prepared Ni complexes.


\subsection*{3.3.3 Electroanalytical Experiments}

Figure 3.12. Investigating the role of reaction components with CV.


To probe whether reductively generated \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) can react with alkyl electrophiles, CVs of complex 322 in the presence of benzyl chloride were acquired. Scanning in the negative direction, the CV of a mixture of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) (1 equiv) and benzyl chloride (100 equiv) shows a cathodic shift and increase in peak current relative to complex \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) alone (Figure 3.12). The cathodic shift indicates that, upon reduction, complex \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) does not react with benzyl chloride through a simple EC mechanism, but instead through a mechanism that likely involves intermediate chemicals steps such as loss of chloride ligands. Kinetic analysis of the reaction with benzyl chloride reveals a second order rate constant \(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{obs}}=1.8 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-}\) \({ }^{1}\) (Figures 3.26-30, section 3.5.12). \({ }^{34}\) Addition of AcOH (150 equiv) and additional 271 (50 equiv) results in a catalytic wave (Figure 3.12) that is not observed in the absence of BnCl
or excess 271 (Figure 3.25). AcOH was used for these studies because it was found to give reasonable alkylation yields (Table 3.2, entry 3) and had greater stability than TMSCl in the electrochemical cell.

\subsection*{3.4 Conclusion and Future Directions}

In conclusion, the Ni-catalyzed reductive cross-coupling of (2-imino)heterocycles with \(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)\) alkyl electrophiles has been reported. The reaction occurs under mild conditions and is tolerant of a variety of functional groups, including \(N\) - and \(S\)-heterocyclic imine coupling partners. Mechanistic studies support the formation of low-valent bis(2-imino)pyridine \(\cdot \mathrm{Ni}\) complexes as persistent ligand-centered radical species that can react with alkyl electrophiles and be leveraged for catalytic \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}\) bond formation.

Future studies should be focused on extending this methodology to other functional groups that form redox-active complexes upon coordination to low-valent transitions metals. This would not only broaden the scope of this reactivity but also enable challenging radical additions into carbonyls, a functionality more challenging than imines. Additionally, an enantioselective variant would be powerful given the value of enantioenriched amines. Initial attempts at enantioinduction with chiral ligands have been unsuccessful, likely due to the fact that substrate coordination is essential for reactivity (Scheme 3.5).

\subsection*{3.5 EXPERIMENTAL SECTION}

\subsection*{3.5.1 Materials and Methods}

Unless otherwise stated, reactions were performed under a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) atmosphere using freshly dried solvents. All reagents were purchased from commercial suppliers (Sigma Aldrich, Combi- Blocks, TCI, Enamine, Strem) and used without further purification unless mentioned otherwise. Tetrahydrofuran (THF) and methylene chloride \(\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)\) were dried by passing through activated alumina columns. Anhydrous N -methylpyrrolidinone (NMP) was purchased from Aldrich and stored in a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox. \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot\) dme was purchased from Strem and stored in the glovebox. Manganese powder ( \(\sim 325\) mesh, \(99.3 \%\) ) was purchased from Alfa Aesar. Zinc dust (97.5\%) was purchased from Strem. Reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography using EMD/Merck silica gel 60 F254 pre-coated plates ( 0.25 mm ) and were visualized by UV, p-Anisaldehyde, Ninhydrin, or \(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\) staining. Flash column chromatography was performed as described by Still et al. using silica gel (230-400 mesh, Silicycle). \({ }^{35}\) Purified compounds were dried on a high vacuum line ( 0.2 torr) to remove trace solvent. \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) and \({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\) NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker Avance III HD with Prodigy cryoprobe (at 400 MHz and 101 MHz , respectively), a Varian 400 MR (at 400 MHz and 101 MHz , respectively), or a Varian Inova 500 (at 500 MHz and 126 MHz , respectively). \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) and \({ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}\) NMR spectra were also recorded on a Varian Inova 300 (at 300 MHz and 282 MHz , respectively). NMR data is reported relative to internal \(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, \delta=7.26\right)\) and \(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \delta=77.0\right) . \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\) for NMR spectra on aminecontaining compounds was passed through basic alumina. Data for \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( \(\delta \mathrm{ppm}\) ) (multiplicity, coupling constant ( Hz ),
integration). Multiplicity and qualifier abbreviations are as follows: \(\mathrm{s}=\) singlet, \(\mathrm{d}=\) doublet, \(\mathrm{t}=\) triplet, \(\mathrm{q}=\) quartet, \(\mathrm{m}=\) multiplet, \(\mathrm{br}=\) broad. IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin Elmer Paragon 1000 spectrometer and are reported in frequency of absorption \(\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)\). HRMS were acquired from the Caltech Mass Spectral Facility using fast-atom bombardment (FAB), electrospray ionization (ESI-TOF), Field Desorption (FD), or electron impact (EI). Elemental analysis (EA) with ICP-MS on a commercial manganese sample (mentioned above) was performed at the Resnick Sustainability Institute's Water and Environment Lab at the California Institute of Technology. X-ray diffraction was performed at the Caltech X-ray Crystal Facility. The computations presented here were conducted on the Resnick High Performance Cluster, a facility supported by the Resnick Sustainability Institute at the California Institute of Technology. Electroanalytical and spectroelectrochemical experiments were conducted in the Beckman Resource Laser Resource Center at the California Institute of Technology.

\subsection*{3.5.2 Optimization Experiments}

General Procedure 3.1: To a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar (1.2 cm) was added 2imino pyridine 271 ( 0.3 mmol ), benzyl bromide 272 ( \(0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv), and reductant \(\left(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0\right.\) equiv; \(\mathrm{Zn}^{0}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0\) equiv; TDAE, \(0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) on the benchtop (or in the glovebox in the case of TDAE following the solvent addition). The vial was brought into a nitrogen-filled glovebox and a stock solution of metal catalyst in NMP \((0.75 \mathrm{ml}, 0.02 \mathrm{M}, 0.05\) equiv [M]) and additive (TMSCl, \(0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0\) equiv; \(\mathrm{AcOH}, 0.3\) mmol, 1 equiv; HFIP, 1.5 mmol , 5 equiv) was added. The vial was sealed with a Teflon cap, removed from the glovebox, and stirred at ambient temperature for 14 hours at 600
rpm. The resulting suspension was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with 1 N \(\mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\) (s) until gas evolution ceased. The resulting aqueous solution was extracted \(3 x\) with EtOAc and the combined EtOAc layers were concentrated under reduced pressure then further concentrated at \(30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) until most of the NMP was removed and analyzed by \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR with \(1,1,2,2\) tetrachloroethane as an internal standard to obtain a quantitative NMR yield.

\section*{Impact of Stir Rate:}

Scheme 3.4. Control study showing minimal impact on alkylation yield across several stir rates. Yields determined by \({ }^{1} H N M R\) with an internal standard.


\section*{Mediator or Electron Shuttle Additives:}

The possibility that the role of the nickel catalyst is to act as an electron mediator that accelerates the Mn-mediated reaction was investigated through the addition of exogenous ligands and through the addition of known electron mediatiors (Scheme 3.5). Exogenous ligands we examed were bidentate nitrogen ligands (dtbbpy), tridentate nitrogen ligands (terpy), and bidentate phosphine ligands (dppe). All ligands or electron shuttles seemed to inhibit the reaction or shut down productive reactivity.

Scheme 3.5. Using additional ligands and electron shuttles.


\subsection*{3.5.3 Substrate Synthesis}

\section*{Synthesis of Heteroaryl Imines}

\section*{General Procedure 3.2: Heteroaryl Imine Synthesis using Volatile Amines}


A 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{MeOH}(0.7 \mathrm{M})\), heteroaryl aldehyde ( 1.0 equiv), and primary amine \(\mathrm{RNH}_{2}\) (1.1-1.5 equiv). The resulting solution was stirred at room temperature for 2 hours, followed by concentration in vacuo. The resulting 2-imino-heteroarene was obtained in pure form and used without further purification.

\section*{b. General Procedure 3.3: Heteroaryl Imine Synthesis using Non-volatile Amines}

A 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.7 \mathrm{M})\), heteroaryl aldehyde ( 1.05 equiv), \(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\) (1.5 equiv) and primary amine \(\mathrm{RNH}_{2}\) (1.0 equiv). The resulting solution was stirred at room temperature for 18 hours. The resulting suspension was filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting 2 -imino-heteroaryl was obtained in pure form and used without further purification.
(E)- N -isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (271)
 obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ) : \(\delta 8.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.39(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.73(\mathrm{td}, J=7.9,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69-3.60(\mathrm{~m}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 1.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.5,155.0,149.6,136.7,124.8,121.6,61.7,24.2\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3056, 2968, 2929, 2865, 1647, 1588, 1568, 1466, 1437, \(1362,1316,1139,993,973,945,775,744,615\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}-\mathrm{H}_{2}\) : 147.0922; found 147.0922.
(E)-N-butyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (291)


Prepared from 2-pyridine carboxaldehyde ( \(1.07 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and \(n\)-butylamine ( \(878 \mathrm{mg}, 12.0 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(291(1.30 \mathrm{~g}, 8.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ) : \(\delta 8.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.73(\mathrm{td}, J=7.7,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(1.71(\mathrm{p}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~h}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 161.9,154.8,149.6,136.8,124.8,121.4,61.5,33.0,20.6\), 14.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3053, 3009, 2958, 2938, 2872, 1649, 1587, 1567, 1468, \(1436,1377,1332,1292,1227,1145,1117,1066,1044,992,978,939,898,864,775,743\), 654, 617.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 163.1235\); found 163.1256 .

\section*{(E)-N-tert-butyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (325)}


Prepared from 2-pyridine carboxaldehyde ( \(225 \mathrm{mg}, 2.10 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and tertbutlyamine ( \(185 \mathrm{mg}, 2.52 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(325(326 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl 3 ) : \(\delta 8.66-8.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.01(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.9,1.1\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.76-7.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.28(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.9,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 156.6,155.7,149.5,136.7,124.6,121.2,58.0,29.8\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3056, 2969, 2931, 1646, 1588, 1568, 1467, 1436, 1228, \(1209,1044,994,972,908,860,775,744,616\).

HRMS (ESI-TOF, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 163.1235; found 163.1210.
(E)-N-cyclopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (357)


Prepared from 2-pyridine carboxaldehyde ( \(225 \mathrm{mg}, 2.10 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and cyclopropylamine ( \(144 \mathrm{mg}, 2.52 \mathrm{mmol}\) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, 357 ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.54(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.71(\mathrm{td}, J=7.7,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.13\) (hept, \(J=6.8,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(1.09-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.03-0.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.3,154.8,149.6,136.6,124.4,121.3,42.2,9.5\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3420, 3055, 3010, 2962, 2878, 1635, 1583, 1568, 1470, 1436, 1381, 1320, 1174, 1146, 1090, 1042, 956, 887, 812, 773, 743, 612.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 147.0922; found 147.0922.

\section*{(E)-N-cyclobutyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (326)}


Prepared from 2-pyridine carboxaldehyde ( \(225 \mathrm{mg}, 2.10 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and cyclobutylamine ( \(179 \mathrm{mg}, 2.52 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, 326 ( \(243 \mathrm{mg}, 1.51 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.3(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.0(\mathrm{~d}, J\) \(=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.7(\mathrm{td}, J=7.7,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.3(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.4,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.3-4.2(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(2.4-2.3(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.3-2.1(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.9-1.8(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.4,154.9,149.6,136.7,124.8,121.4,62.9,30.5,15.8\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3055, 2980, 2939, 2868, 1642, 1589, 1567, 1469, 1436, 1374, 1319, 1228, 1140, 1080, 1042, 992, 972, 861, 773, 743.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 161.1079; found 161.1086.

\section*{(R,E)-N-(1-phenylethyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine (327)}


Prepared from 2-pyridine carboxaldehyde ( \(176 \mathrm{mg}, 1.65 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and ( \(R\) )-\((+)-1\)-phenethylamine ( \(190 \mathrm{mg}, 1.57 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.3. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 2 7}(82.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(25 \%\) ) was obtained as tan solid.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.64(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.9,1.7,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.10(\mathrm{dt}\), \(J=7.9,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.78-7.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.46-7.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.38-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30\) \((\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.28-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.65(\mathrm{q}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) 6.7 Hz, 3H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 160.6,155.0,149.5,144.8,136.7,128.7,127.2,126.9\), 124.9, 121.7, 69.8, 24.8.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3059, 3027, 2972, 2927, 2861, 1646, 1586, 1568, 1491, \(1466,1456,1436,1373,1338,1304,1080,993,973,908,763,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 211.1235\); found 211.1217 .
(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethan-1-imine (328)


Prepared from 2-acetylpyridine (162 mg, 1.34 mmol\()\) and isopropylamine ( \(95.2 \mathrm{mg}, 1.61 \mathrm{mmol}\) following General Procedure 3.2 modified with the addition of \(3 \AA\) molecular sieves \((350 \mathrm{mg}, 2.2\) mass equiv) to allow the reaction to run for 48 hours. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 2 8}(126 \mathrm{mg}\), \(0.78 \mathrm{mmol}, 58 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{C l}_{\mathbf{2}}\) ): \(\delta 8.46(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=8.0,1.1\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=8.0,7.4,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,4.8,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83\) (hept, \(\mathrm{J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 0 1} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{C l}_{2}\) ): \(\delta 163.19,158.28,148.07,135.98,123.76,120.63,51.46\), 23.20, 12.98 .

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3050, 2967, 2929, 2869, 1638, 1585, 1565, 1464, 1433, 1368, 1297, 1134, 1098, 1043, 991, 783, 743.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 163.1235\); found: 163.1231.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(6-methylpyridin-2-yl)methanimine (329)}


Prepared from 6-methylpicolinaldehyde ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.65 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(117 \mathrm{mg}, 1.98 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 2 9}\) ( \(174 \mathrm{mg}, 1.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.61(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{hept}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.9,158.2,154.5,137.0,124.4,118.5,61.6,24.6,24.2\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3061, 2968, 2927, 2863, 1646, 1591, 1574, 1455, 1378, \(1361,1308,1250,1224,1141,1086,990,967,948,9191,863,792,762,738,636\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 163.1235; found 163.1236.
(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(4-methylpyridin-2-yl)methanimine (330)


Prepared from 6-methylpicolinaldehyde ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.65 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(117 \mathrm{mg}, 1.98 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(330(224 \mathrm{mg}, 1.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.37(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.82(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.12\) (d, \(J=3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63\) (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.8,154.7,149.4,148.0,125.8,122.1,61.7,24.2,21.2\). FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2968, 2925, 2864, 1647, 1602, 1558, 1466, 1380, 1362, \(1315,1155,994,945,850,826,768,650\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 163.1235; found 163.1257.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(5-methoxypyridin-2-yl)methanimine (331)}


Prepared from 5-methoxypicolinaldehyde ( \(250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.82 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(129 \mathrm{mg}, 2.19 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2 After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 3 1}(195 \mathrm{mg}, 1.09\) \(\mathrm{mmol}, 60 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.34(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.7,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.60\) (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) 6.3 Hz, 6H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 158.8,156.7,147.9,137.2,122.4,120.9,61.6,55.9,24.3\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2967, 2867, 1644, 1588, 1571, 1491, 1379, 1363, 1302, 1278, 1251, 1217, 1142, 1030, 1142, 1030, 972, 886, 838.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 179.1184\); found 179.1187 .
(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(4-methoxypyridin-2-yl)methanimine (332)


Prepared from 4-methoxypicolinaldehyde ( \(250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.82 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(129 \mathrm{mg}, 2.19 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, 332 ( \(310 \mathrm{mg}, 1.73 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.33(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.49(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.81\) (d, \(J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.62\) (hept, \(J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 166.4,159.4,156.9,150.6,112.1,106.1,61.5,55.5,24.1\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2968, 2866, 1648, 1592, 1560, 1477, 1364, 1303, 1252, 1142, 1037, 993, 969, 944, 850, 767.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 179.1184; found 179.1181 .

\section*{(E)-1-(4-chloropyridin-2-yl)-N-isopropylmethanimine (333)}


Prepared from 4-chloropicolinaldehyde ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.41 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(100.0 \mathrm{mg}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure
3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 3 3}\) ( \(224 \mathrm{mg}, 1.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 87 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.02(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.30\) (d, \(J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65\) (hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 158.3,156.5,150.4,145.1,125.0,121.7,61.6,24.1\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2969, 2924, 2864, 1648, 1575, 1553, 1458, 1398, 1362, 1313, 1264, 1230, 1145, 1090, 945, 827, 709.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 183.0689; found 183.0662.

\section*{(E)-1-(6-fluoropyridin-2-yl)-N-isopropylmethanimine (334)}


Prepared from 6-fluoropicolinaldehyde ( \(177 \mathrm{mg}, 1.41 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(100.0 \mathrm{mg}, 1.70 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure
3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(334(202 \mathrm{mg}, 1.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.85-7.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(6.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63\) (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, CDCl \({ }_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.4(\mathrm{~d}, J=240.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 158.0,153.7(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz})\), \(141.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 118.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 110.7(\mathrm{~d}, J=36.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 61.6,24.1\).
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(282 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ) \(\delta\)-67.84.
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2970, 2930, 2868, 1650, 1598, 1578, 1455, 1380, 1362, \(1309,1262,1228,1139,1071,994,974,937,865,804,771,731,630\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 167.0985 ; found 167.0963 .
(E)-1-(5-fluoropyridin-2-yl)- \(N\)-isopropylmethanimine (335)
 obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{N a}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.46(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.02(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), 7.43 (t, \(J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62\) (hept, \(J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27\) (d, \(J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 160.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=259.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 158.0,151.5(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz})\),
\(137.8(\mathrm{~d}, J=24.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 123.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=18.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.8(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 61.6,24.2\).
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(\mathbf{2 8 2} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ) \(\delta\)-124.70.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2970, 2933, 2865, 1647, 1593, 1579, 1478, 1380, 1363, \(1312,1253,1232,1143,1281,1232,1143,1019,961,886,841\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{FN}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 167.0985 ; found 167.0980 .

\section*{( E)-N-isopropyl-1-(1-methyl-1H-benzo[d]imidazol-2-yl)methanimine (336)}


Prepared from 1-methyl-1H-benzo[d]imidazole-2-carbaldehyde ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(88.5 \mathrm{mg}, 1.50 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, 336 ( \(227 \mathrm{mg}, 1.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.53(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.65-3.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.30\) (d, \(J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}\) ).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 151.6,147.8,142.6,137.0,124.2,122.7,120.6,109.8\), 62.4, 31.9, 24.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2968, 2861, 1471, 1405, 1359, 1336, 1143, 931, 882, 748.
HRMS (ESI-TOF, \(\mathbf{m} / \mathbf{z}\) ): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 202.1344\); found 202.1315.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(thiazol-2-yl)methanimine (337)}
 Prepared from thiazole-2-carbaldehyde ( \(200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.77 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(115 \mathrm{mg}, 1.94 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(337(251 \mathrm{mg}, 1.63 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.46(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65\) (hept, \(J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 167.7,152.6,144.0,121.4,61.4,23.9\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3080, 2969, 2966, 1636, 1507, 1490, 1458, 1418, 1362, \(1294,1235,1132,1058,945,853,775,733,691,629\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 155.0643; found 155.0652.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(pyrimidin-2-yl)methanimine (338)}


Prepared from pyrimidine-2-carbaldehyde ( \(120 \mathrm{mg}, 1.11 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(72.2 \mathrm{mg}, 1.22 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(338(75.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.50 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{N M R}\left(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.43(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{t}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\), 2 H ), 3.72 (hept, \(J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33\) (d, \(J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.3,158.3,157.8,121.2,62.0,24.0\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3041, 2969, 3938, 3867, 1651, 1561, 1423, 1382, 1365, \(1319,1246,1144,994,964,944,898,818,793,634\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 150.1031 ; found 150.1043 .

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(quinolin-2-yl)methanimine (339)}
 was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{N M R}\left(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.56(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.17(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.83\) \((\mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.73(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.57(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.73\) (hept, \(J=6.2\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 160.1,155.3,148.0,136.7,130.0,129.7,128.9,127.9\), 127.5, 118.7, 61.7, 24.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3061, 2968, 2929, 2865, 1716, 1939, 1596, 1559, 1540, \(1505,1457,1363,1338,1302,1142,966,893,833,752,620\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 199.1235; found 199.1210.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-phenylmethanimine (317)}


Prepared from benzaldehyde \((157 \mathrm{mg}, 1.48 \mathrm{mmol})\) and isopropylamine (105 mg, 1.77 mmol ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 1 7}(215 \mathrm{mg}, 1.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 99 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.31(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.77-7.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{t}, J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\), 3.55 (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 158.5,136.7,130.6,128.7,128.2,61.9,24.4\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3061, 3026, 2967, 2931, 2836, 1647, 1581, 1450, 1382, 1306, 1159, 1141, 967, 881, 755, 693.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 148.1126; found 148.1125

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(pyridin-3-yl)methanimine (318)}


Prepared from nicotinaldehyde (151 mg, 1.41 mmol\()\) and isopropylamine ( \(91.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.55 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 1 8}(199 \mathrm{mg}, 1.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 95 \%)\) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\left.500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.33(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.11\) \((\mathrm{d}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.36-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.57(\) hept \(, J=12.6,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4\) Hz, 6H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 155.6,151.5,150.4,134.6,132.2,123.8,62.0,24.2\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2969, 2931, 2864, 1646, 1591, 1575, 1558, 1419, 1385, 1315, 1188, 1142, 1026, 975, 944, 882, 806, 708.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 149.1079; found 149.1086.
((E)-N-isopropyl-1-(6-methoxypyridin-2-yl)methanimine (340)
 mmol, \(76 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{H}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.28(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64-7.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.75(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.0,3.0\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{p}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, CDCl 3 ): \(\delta 164.0,159.7,152.7,139.1,114.1,112.0,61.6,53.6,24.2\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2968, 2862, 1648, 1592, 1574, 1469, 1434, 1414, 1362,
\(1324,1305,1266,1139,1073,1034,988,966,866,805,765,734,631\).
HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 179.1184; found 179.1155 .

Methyl (E)-6-((isopropylimino)methyl)nicotinate (341)
 mmol, \(99 \%\) ) was obtained as a brown solid.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{H}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 9.22(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.43(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.32(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.08\) (d, \(J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.68\) (hept, \(J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 165.8,158.7\), 158.2, \(150.8,137.8,126.6,121.1,61.9\), 52.7, 24.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2968, 2863, 1721, 1596, 1456, 1388, 1360, 1287, 1194, 1112, 1021, 965, 862, 776.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 207.1134; found 207.1131.
(E)-1-(5-bromopyridin-2-yl)- \(N\)-isopropylmethanimine (342)
 was obtained as a colorless oil.
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{N a}_{3}\) : \(\delta 8.69(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.2,0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.33(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.94-7.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=6.3,0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 158.34,153.43,150.59,139.34,122.61,122.08,61.60\), 24.05.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3046, 2969, 2926, 2867, 1645, 1570, 1553, 1462, 1380, 1363, 1314, 1141, 1087, 1006, 963, 945, 881, 837, 630.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}:\)227.0184; found 227.0201.

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(isoquinolin-3-yl)methanimine (343)}


Prepared from isoquinoline-2-carbaldehyde ( \(300 \mathrm{mg}, 1.91 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and isopropylamine ( \(135 \mathrm{mg}, 2.29 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 4 3}\) ( \(370 \mathrm{mg}, 1.87 \mathrm{mmol}, 98 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\left.500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 9.28(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.26(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.70(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.63(\mathrm{t}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69\) (hept, \(J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.5,152.8,148.5,136.2,130.9,129.3,128.3,127.8\), 127.7, 119.5, 61.9, 24.3.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2967, 2924, 2864, 1646, 1624, 1508, 1490, 1379, 1362, \(1309,1272,1148,970,945,894,751\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 199.1235; found 199.1245 .

\section*{(E)-N-isopropyl-1-(1-methyl-1H-indazol-3-yl)methanimine (344)}


Prepared from 1-methyl-1H-indazole-3-carbaldehyde (200 mg, \(1.25 \mathrm{mmol})\) and isopropylamine ( \(88.6 \mathrm{mg}, 1.50 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following

General Procedure 3.2. After concentration in vacuo, 344 ( 208 mg , \(1.03 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%\) ) was obtained as a yellow oil.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{N a}_{3}\) : \(\delta 8.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.39(\mathrm{dt}, J=8.1,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.47-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.28-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) 6.3 Hz, 6H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 152.4,142.1,141.2,126.8,123.2,122.3,121.9,108.8\), 62.1, 35.8, 24.4.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3056, 2966, 2936, 2852, 1644, 1618, 1576, 1487, 1456, \(1401,1377,1360,1346,1294,1247,1142,1062,1004,961,944,864,795,768,746,660\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 202.1344; found 202.1320.
(E)-1-(1H-imidazol-2-yl)-N-isopropylmethanimine (345)
 After concentration in vacuo, \(\mathbf{3 4 5}(1.87 \mathrm{~g}, 13.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 91 \%)\) was obtained as a brown solid.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.06-\) \(6.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{pd}, J=6.3,0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 149.15,145.18,130.58,117.59,60.88,24.00\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2963, 1646, 1558, 1446, 1387, 1108, 998, 755, 683.
HRMS (ESI, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 138.1026; found 138.026.

\section*{Synthesis of \(\boldsymbol{N}\)-hydroxyphthalimide (NHP) Ester Substrates}

NHP esters 346-349 were prepared according to procedure reported and referenced by Reisman and coworkers. \({ }^{36}\) The NMR spectra of \(\mathbf{3 4 6}{ }^{37}, \mathbf{3 4 7}^{\mathbf{3 8}}, \mathbf{3 4 8}{ }^{39}\), and \(\mathbf{3 4 9}{ }^{39}\) matched those reported in the literature.
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\subsection*{3.5.4 Nickel-Catalyzed Alkylation of Heteroaryl Imines}


\section*{General procedure 3.4: Reaction on \(\mathbf{0 . 3} \mathbf{~ m m o l}\) scale}

On the bench-top, an oven-dried 1 dram vial, equipped with a stir bar, was charged with heteroarylimine ( \(0.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0\) equiv), alkyl halide (if non-volatile, \(0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv),
and \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) ( \(16.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0\) equiv). The vial was brought into a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox and a stock-solution of \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot\) dme in \(\operatorname{NMP}(0.75 \mathrm{ml}, 0.02 \mathrm{M}, 0.05\) equiv [ Ni\(\left.]\right), \mathrm{TMSCl}(76\) \(\mu \mathrm{l}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0\) equiv) and alkyl halide (if volatile, \(0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) was added consecutively. The vial was sealed with a Teflon cap and taken out of the glove box. The vial was sealed with electrical tape and stirred at room temperature for 14 hours at 600 rpm. The resulting suspension was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with 1 N \(\mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\) (s) until gas evolution ceased. The resulting aqueous solution was extracted \(3 x\) with EtOAc and the combined organic phases were concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude material was purified by column chromatography to afford the desired product.

Substrates here are not featured in the main text and undergo alkylation under the optimized conditions in poor yields. Products \(\mathbf{3 5 0 - 3 5 6}\) were prepared from imines \(\mathbf{3 4 0 - 3 4 5}\) reacted under General Procedure 3.2 with 1.2 equivalents of benzyl bromide. Product \(\mathbf{3 5 3}\) was prepared from reacting \(\mathbf{2 9 1}\) under standard reaction conditions with 1.2 equivalents of 4-iodo-1-tosylpiperidine. Yields are reported as the average of 2 runs based on isolated product on 0.3 mmol scale.

Figure 3.13. Unsuccessful or challenging substrates under the optimized conditions.


\section*{Product Distribution for Reactions with 271 and \(\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{0}}\) Alkyl Halides}

General Details: All reaction were carried out according to General Procedure 3.4 on a 0.3 mmol scale. Yields determined from quantitative \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR measurements against 1,3,5trimeoxybenzene or 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane. Yields of \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\) are reported out of 0.15 mmol theoretical yield of \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\).

Figure 3.14. Distribution of desired alkylation versus homocoupling across several alkyl electrophiles. Yields of \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\) are based on a 0.15 mmol theoretical yield.



\subsection*{3.5.5 Characterization of Reaction Products:}

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (273)}


Prepared from imine \(271(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(273(56.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 78 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(54.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%-76 \%\) average yield.

Reaction was also performed on 1.0 mmol scale to afford \(273(184 \mathrm{mg}, 0.77 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \%)\).
Yield for duplicate run: \(168 \mathrm{mg}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%-74 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.27\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.51(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.20(\mathrm{t}\), \(J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.06(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57\) (hept, \(J=6.3\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.5,149.6,139.0,136.2,129.4,128.4,126.4,122.8\), 122.1, 63.2, 46.2, 43.9, 24.2, 22.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): \(3328,3062,3038,3005,2964,2928,2868,1682,1590\), \(1572,1556,1494,1470,1454,1434,1379,1368,1337,1295,1266,1175,1148,1126\), 1083, 1049, 1030, 996, 775, 748, 701.

HRMS (ESI-TOF, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 241.1705\); found 241.1693.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)butan-1-amine (274)}


Prepared from imine 291 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8
\(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(274(56.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(57.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%-74 \%\) average yield.

Also prepared from imine \(291(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl chloride ( \(41.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36\) mmol, 1.2 equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)\) afforded \(274(54.6 \mathrm{mg}\), \(0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(53.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%\) \(72 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.30\left(\right.\) silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \(\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.56(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.22(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.45-2.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(1.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.81(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.3,149.5,139.0,136.4,129.5,128.5,126.5,122.4\), \(122.2,66.1,47.8,43.7,32.4,20.5,14.1\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3062, 3027, 2956, 2927, 2859, 1589, 1570, 1495, 1456, 1433, 1120, 996, 774, 748, 700, 668.

HRMS (ESI-TOF, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 255.1861\); found 255.1859.

\section*{2-methyl-N-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (275)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 2 5}(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(275(60.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(55.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \%-76 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.42\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\left.{ }_{3}\right): \delta 8.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.58(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), 7.39 (d, \(J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.25-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(2 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.3,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.13(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.9,5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.06(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,5.7\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 166.6,149.0,139.2,136.2,129.6,128.5,126.5,122.3\), 121.7, 60.6, 51.3, 45.6, 29.6.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3063, 3027, 2961, 2928, 1590, 1570, 1495, 1472, 1456, \(1434,1388,1364,1229,1108,1030,995,774,746,700\).

HRMS (ESI-TOF, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 255.1861\); found 255.1848.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)cyclopropanamine (276)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 5 7}(43.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(276(50.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(46.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 64 \%-67 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.27\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, CDCl \(\left.{ }_{3}\right): \delta 8.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\),
\(7.19(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.06-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(3.10-2.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.35-0.25(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.25-0.19\) (m, 1H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.2,149.6,139.0,136.1,129.5,128.4,126.3,123.1\), 122.2, 66.1, 43.2, 29.3, 7.1, 6.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3325, 2084, 3006, 2928, 1684, 1590, 1570, 1496, 1472, \(1455,1434,1369,1338,1216,1148,1088,1015,773,747,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 239.1548\); found 239.1555 .

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)cyclobutanamine (277)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 2 6}(48.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(277(54.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(52.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%-70 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.21\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.55(\mathrm{td}, J=7.7,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.23(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{dt}, J=1627.0\), \(7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.12-3.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.93(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02\) (s, 1H), \(1.91-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.3,149.4,138.9,129.4,128.5,126.5,122.4,122.2\), 63.8, 52.6, 43.6, 31.6, 31.6, 14.8.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3321, 3061, 3026, 2968, 2932, 2853, 1590, 1570, 1495, \(1472,1455,1434,1340,1237,1161,1119,1076,1049,996,774,747,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 253.1705; found 253.1691.

2-phenyl- N -((S)-1-phenylethyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethan-1-amine (278)


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 2 7}\) ( \(63.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc}\) \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)\) afforded a 1.8:1 mixture of diastereomers of \(278(55.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(61 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(43.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 47 \%-54 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.39\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3}\) N, UV).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), 8.59 ( \(\mathrm{d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), 7.57 (td, \(J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(7.46(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), 7.28 \(7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 17 \mathrm{H}), 7.11(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.6,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 7.01(\mathrm{q}, J=9.9,8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5 \mathrm{H}\), major), \(6.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), \(4.03(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 3.77(\mathrm{q}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), 3.71 (dd, \(J=8.2,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), 3.46 ( \(\mathrm{q}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), 3.15 (dd, \(J\) \(=13.2,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 3.08(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 3.03(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4,6.4\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), 2.94 (dd, \(J=13.4,8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(1.98(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\), 6 H, major \(), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}\), minor \()\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.4\) (minor), 163.0 (major), 149.8 (minor), 149.4 (major), 145.9 (major), 145.5 (minor), 138.99 (major), 138.96 (minor), 136.2 (minor), 136.1 (major), 129.54 (minor), 129.50 (major), 128.49 (minor), 128.45 (major), 128.35 (major), 128.32 (minor), 126.93 (minor), 126.91 (major), 126.8, 126.32 (minor), 126.29 (major), 122.9 (minor), 122.8 (major), 122.1 (minor), 122.0 (major), 63.4 (major), 62.6 (minor), 55.7, 43.9 (minor), 42.9 (major), 25.4 (minor), 23.2 (major).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3060, 3026, 3963, 2922, 2860, 1589, 1570, 1493, 1472, \(1455,1435,1369,1207,1127,748,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 303.1861; found 303.1848.

\section*{\(N\)-isopropyl-1-phenyl-2-(pyridin-2-yl)propan-2-amine (279)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 2 8}(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(279(28.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(28.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%-37 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.48(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.15-\)
\(7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.06(\mathrm{dt}, J=14.6,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.7\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\) hept, \(J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.50(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 165.8,148.8,137.9,135.7,130.6,127.7,126.2,121.9\), 121.6, 62.1, 50.6, 44.4, 26.3, 25.3, 22.4.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3337, 3061, 3028, 2960, 2866, 1698, 1587, 1570, 1496, 1456, 1431, 1376, 1339, 1168, 1093, 993, 794, 749, 703, 633.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 255.1861\); found 255.1843.

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(6-methylpyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (280)}


Prepared from imine 329 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide
( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(280(39.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(38.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%\) - \(50 \%\) average yield. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.13\) \((\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.08-7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{t}, J\) \(=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.06(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.6,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.63-2.57\) \((\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.2,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.9,158.1,139.1,136.3,129.5,128.4,126.3,121.6\), \(119.5,63.1,46.2,43.8,24.8,24.2,22.3\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3325, 3061, 3026, 2961, 2927, 2866, 1592, 1576, 1559, 1456, 1377, 1339, 1170, 1085, 1031, 996, 792, 746, 700.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 255.1861 ; found 255.1865 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(4-methylpyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (281)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 0}\) ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{2 8 1}(57.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(55.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \%-74 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.16\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.20(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.0,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.15(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.91(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(4.02(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(2.57(\mathrm{p}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.2,149.2,147.3,139.1,129.4,128.4,126.3,123.5\), 123.1, 63.1, 46.2, 43.8, 24.2, 22.2, 21.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3307, 3059, 3026, 2962, 2924, 2865, 1604, 1559, 1455, \(1378,1339,1174,1084,1030,998,823,743,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 255.1861 ; found 255.1859 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(5-methoxypyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (282)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 1}\) ( \(53.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et 3 N) afforded \(282(54.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 67 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(51.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.019 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \%-65 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.16\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.11\) \((\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.07-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~s}\), \(3 \mathrm{H}), 3.05-2.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.55\) (hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.2,2.6\) Hz, 6H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 155.3,154.6,139.1,137.1,129.4,128.4,126.3,122.9\), 120.6, 62.4, 55.8, 46.1, 43.9, 24.2, 22.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3026, 2961, 2837, 1574, 1491, 1475, 1396, 1339, 1266, \(1176,1125,1078,1032,831,749,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 271.1810\); found 271.1804 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(4-methoxypyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (283)}


Prepared from imine 332 ( \(53.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8
\(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification
of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(283(60.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(56.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%-72 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.13\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.41-8.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.12(\mathrm{~m}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.68-6.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})\), \(3.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57\) (hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(1.92(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 166.0,165.5,150.6,139.0,129.4,128.4,126.4,108.6\), 108.2, 63.3, 55.2, 46.3, 43.7, 24.2, 22.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): \(\delta 3025,2963,1596,1569,1479,1457,1367,1302,1166\), 1039, 994, 820, 742, 700.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}:\)271.1810; found 271.1796.
\(N\)-(1-(4-chloropyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (284)


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 3}(54.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(284(35.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 42 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(34.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 41 \%-42 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.32\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.14(\mathrm{dd}, J\) \(=5.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.09-7.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.09-4.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4,7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.55\) (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{dd}, J\) \(=10.9,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 165.9,150.3,144.4,138.5,129.4,128.6,126.6,122.8\), 122.5, 63.1, 46.5, 43.7, 24.2, 22.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3027, 2963, 2928, 2865, 1697, 1574, 1557, 1457, 1389, 1367, 1339, 1174, 1127, 1096, 826, 745, 700.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 275.1315; found 275.1330.

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(6-fluoropyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (285)}


Prepared from imine 334 ( \(49.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 285 ( \(35.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(34.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 44 \%-44 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.35\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 7.59(\mathrm{q}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=\)
\(6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.92(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.3,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.75(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.0,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2\)
\(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.00(\mathrm{qd}, J=13.3,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\) hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97\) (dd, \(J=11.7,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.8(\mathrm{~d}, J=216.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 162.8(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 141.1(\mathrm{~d}\), \(J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 138.6,129.4,128.5,126.5,120.0(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 107.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=37.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 62.5\), 46.2, 43.4, 24.2, 22.1.
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(282 \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta-67.71\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, cm-1): 3322, 3063, 3028, 2964, 2926, 2866, 1603, 1575, 1494, \(1445,1380,1368,1338,1269,1222,1174,1147,1070,995,943,916,894,845,802,744\), 701.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 259.1611\); found 259.1598 .
\(N\)-(1-(5-fluoropyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (286)


Prepared from imine 335 ( \(49.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide
( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4.

Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ \(\left.1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)\) afforded \(286(48.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(43.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%-59 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.29\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.43(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.7,4.5\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.08(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.03-2.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.55\) (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13}\) C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl \({ }_{3}\) ): \(\delta 159.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 158.5(\mathrm{~d}, J=254 \mathrm{~Hz}), 157.5\), 138.7, \(137.6(\mathrm{~d}, J=23.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 129.4,128.5,126.5,123.4(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.9(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.8\) Hz), 62.6, 46.3, 43.9, 24.2, 22.2.
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(\mathbf{2 8 2} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta-130.02\).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3062, 3027, 2963, 3928, 2867, 1683, 1584, 1480, 1455, \(1388,1368,1340,1225,1171,1112,1020,956,909,838,750,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 259.1611\); found 259.1610 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(1-methyl-1H-benzo[d]imidazol-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (287)}


Prepared from imine 336 ( \(60.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(287(67.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(64.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%-74 \%\) average yield. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.09\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.1,5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{dd}, J=12.9,5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})\), \(3.19-3.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.72\) (hept, \(J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.3,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\), 6 H ).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 156.8,142.6,138.1,135.7,129.4,128.6,126.8,122.3\), \(122.1,119.5,109.4,55.5,46.2,43.2,29.3,23.9,22.2\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3322, 3028, 2963, 1670, 1472, 1406, 1338, 1281, 1239, \(1175,1084,1007,852,745,702,681\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 294.1970\); found 294.1973.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(thiazol-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (288)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 7}\) ( \(61.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(288(40.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(37.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%-52 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.41\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.35-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.28-7.23\) (m, 2H), \(7.23-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.0,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.28(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.6,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.6,9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71(\mathrm{hept}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) 6.4 Hz, 3H), \(0.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 178.1,142.7,137.8,129.4,128.8,127.0,118.9,59.8\), 47.3, 44.3, 24.1, 22.2.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3064, 3028, 2961, 2925, 2864, 1698, 1497, 1473, 1456, \(1381,1368,1319,1177,1124,1056,773,726,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 247.1269\); found 247.1244 .

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyrimidin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (289)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 8}(44.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8
\(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification
of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(289(36.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(34.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 47 \%-48 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.10\left(\right.\) silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.07(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.27(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.06(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4\),
\(7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58(\) hept, \(J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, J\) \(=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 172.8,157.0,138.4,129.3,128.4,126.3,119.2,63.8\), 46.5, 42.9, 24.0, 22.4.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3420, 3029, 2965, 2866, 1561, 1541, 1496, 1455, 1437, \(1418,1380,1339,1174,1085,1030,995,805,751,700\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 242.1657; found 242.1662.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(quinolin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (290)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 3 9}\) ( \(59.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ \(1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(290(44.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(43.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%-50 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.31\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.79(\mathrm{~d}\), \(J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.70(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.51(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.25-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.00(\mathrm{dd}, J=\) \(13.5,8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.61(\mathrm{hept}, J=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.4,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\). \({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 164.8,148.0,138.8,136.2,129.5,129.4,129.3,128.5\), \(127.8,127.7,126.5,126.1,120.6,64.0,46.8,43.9,24.3,22.4\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3028, 2961, 2928, 1618, 1600, 1558, 1540, 1506, 1473, 1456, 1379, 1169, 826, 750, 700.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 291.1861\); found 291.1876 .

\section*{N-(2-(4-chlorophenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (292)}
 Prepared from imine \(271(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and 1-(bromomethyl)-4-chlorobenzene ( \(74.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 292
( \(64.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 78 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(53.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(65 \%-72 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.24\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): 8.50(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.11-7.01(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.89-6.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.93(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}\) \(=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.2,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.88\) (dd, J = 6.2, 1.3 Hz, 6H).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.83,149.46,137.30,136.03,131.91,130.57,128.28\), 122.64, 122.00, 62.81, 45.94, 42.90, 23.99, 22.04.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3309, 3005, 2962, 2925, 2865, 1589, 1570, 1490, 1469, \(1433,1379,1367,1338,1174,1092,1015,812,776,748\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 275.1315 ; found: 275.1328 .

\section*{Methyl 4-(2-(isopropylamino)-2-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)benzoate (293)}


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and methyl 4(bromomethyl)benzoate \((82.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol})\) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 293 ( 68.1 mg , \(0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \%)\) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(55.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%\) 69\% average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.21\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{C l}_{3}\) : \(8.48(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.88-7.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.39(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.09-6.93(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.89(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}\)
\(=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(0.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): 162.22, 149.64, 144.73, 136.12, 131.91, 130.04, 122.62, \(122.20,119.02,109.97,62.46,45.84,43.61,23.96,22.05\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3311, 2960, 2867, 1721, 1609, 1589, 1570, 1469, 1434, 1414, 1309, 1280, 1178, 1111, 765, 749, 706.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 299.1760\); found: 299.1767.

\section*{4-(2-(isopropylamino)-2-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)benzonitrile (294)}


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 4(bromomethyl)benzonitrile ( \(70.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(294(55.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21\) \(\mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%)\) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(51.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%-67 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.15\) (silica, EtOAc, UV).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.67-8.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.49-\) \(7.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.14(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.6,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.15-2.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{hept}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~d}\), \(J=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.22,149.64,144.73,136.12,131.91,130.04,122.62\), \(122.20,119.02,109.97,62.46,45.84,43.61,23.96,22.05\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3316, 3049, 2962, 2929, 2866, 2226, 1606, 1589, 1570, \(1505,1470,1433,1379,1337,1175,1147,996,823,780,751\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 266.1657\); found: 266.1677.
\(N\)-(1-(pyridin-2-yl)-2-(o-tolyl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (295)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 1-(bromomethyl)-2-methylbenzene ( \(66.6 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.36 \mathrm{mmol})\) following General

Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(295(60.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%\) ) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(56.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%-76 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.18\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.47(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.8,1.9,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.35(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.02-6.92(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.92-6.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.83(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.81-\) \(6.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.93(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.0,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04-2.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46(\mathrm{p}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(2.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96-0.79(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.33,149.40,137.07,136.54,135.83,130.15,129.95\), \(126.21,125.62,122.74,121.89,61.89,46.03,40.99,24.04,22.12,19.42\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3317, 3061, 3009, 2961, 2928, 2864, 1681, 1589, 1569, \(1468,1432,1378,1365,1339,1169,1147,1125,1049,995,841,781,741\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 255.1861; found: 255.1864 .

\section*{\(N\)-(2-(2,6-dimethylphenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (296)}


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 2-(bromomethyl)-1,3-dimethylbenzene ( \(71.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General

Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(296(58.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%)\) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(55.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 68 \%-70 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.16\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.69(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.7,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.2,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10(\mathrm{dd}, J=\) \(13.4,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.53\) (hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})\), 1.95 (brs, 4H), 0.99 (dd, \(J=11.6,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.06,149.42,137.13,135.74,128.04,125.97,123.07\), 121.97, 60.95, 45.97, 37.92, 24.10, 22.07, 20.02.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3308, 3065, 3007, 2961, 2867, 1687, 1588, 1569, 1468, \(1432,1378,1366,1171,1146,1096,995,769,749\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 269.2018\); found: 269.2020 .
\(N\)-(2-(2-iodophenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (297)


Prepared from imine \(271(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and 1-(bromomethyl)-2-iodobenzene ( \(107 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 297 ( \(77.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(70 \%\) ) as a pale yellow oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.22\) (silica, \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1, \mathrm{UV}\) w/ \(1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ). Yield for duplicate run: \(69.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19\) mmol, \(63 \%-67 \%\) average yield.
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.62(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.79(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,1.3\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.47(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.13(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.07(\mathrm{td}, J=\) \(7.4,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.7,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.83(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.78(\mathrm{dd}, J=\) \(7.6,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.25(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.2,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.12-3.06\) (m, 1H), 2.64 (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.1,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.60,149.55,141.71,139.39,135.81,130.95,127.91\), \(127.78,123.05,121.99,100.90,60.83,48.04,46.02,24.00,22.40\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3051, 2960, 1693, 1588, 1568, 1466, 1433, 1366, 1170, 1010, 748.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{I}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 367.0671\); found: 367.0677 .
\(N\)-(2-(2-bromo-5-methoxyphenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (298)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 1-bromo-2-(bromomethyl)-4-methoxybenzene ( \(101 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(298(77.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(74 \%\) ) as an off-white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(68.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%-70 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.53(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.41(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.5,4.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.7,1.1\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.50(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.8,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.10(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\),
\(1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.1,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.1,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{p}\), \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70(\mathrm{brs}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{t}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.75,158.41,149.49,139.30,135.93,133.09,123.08\), \(121.99,116.62,115.22,114.22,60.65,55.30,46.01,43.87,23.88,22.38\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3069, 3003, 2960, 1589, 1570,1471, 1433, 1378, 1292, \(1278,1241,1164,1129,1056,1015,996,801,749\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): HRMS (ESI-TOF, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OBr}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 349.0915; found: 349.0917 .

4-(2-(butylamino)-2-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)benzonitrile (299)


Prepared from imine 291 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 4(bromomethyl)benzonitrile \((70.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol})\) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(299(61.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22\) \(\mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%\) ) as a yellow-orange solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(59.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%\) \(-72 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.22\left(\right.\) silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ \(\left.1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.60-8.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.53(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.49-\) \(7.42(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.13(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.7,4.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.90(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}\) \(=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43-\) \(1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.27-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.80(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 161.83,149.36,144.45,136.00,131.74,129.82,122.21\), 122.04, 118.78, 109.81, 65.16, 47.21, 43.18, 32.03, 20.10, 13.67.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2955, 2926, 2869, 2226, 1606, 1589, 1570, 1504, 1469, 1433, 1121, 995, 824, 779, 750.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 280.1814\); found: 280.1822 .
4-(2-(butylamino)-2-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)benzonitrileN-(2-(2-bromo-5-
methoxyphenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)butan-1-amine (300)


Prepared from imine 291 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 1-bromo-2-(bromomethyl)-4-methoxybenzene ( \(101 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 0 0}(51.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(47 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(49.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%-46 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.60(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.37(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.13(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.7,1.1\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.58(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.8,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.45(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(3.62(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.21(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.3,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.03(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.3,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.33\) \((\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, CDC1 3 ): \(\delta 163.08,158.95,149.92,139.69,136.52,133.62,123.27\), \(122.51,117.08,115.74,114.70,64.10,55.77,47.96,44.04,32.73,20.81,14.39\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3004, 2955, 2927, 2857, 1589, 1570, 1471, 1433, 1291, \(1240,1163,1112,1048,1015,995,782,749\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OBr}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 363.1072\); found: 363.1083.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-(4-fluorophenyl)-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (302)}


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 1-(chloromethyl)-4-fluorobenzene ( \(52.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following

General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(302(61.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%\) ) as a pale yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(57.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%-76 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.13\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, J=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.50(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.10(\mathrm{ddd}, J=7.6,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.00(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.96-6.91(\mathrm{~m}\), \(2 \mathrm{H}), 6.89-6.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.99(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.02-2.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{hept}, J=6.2\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.2,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, CDCl 3 ): \(\delta 163.00,160.24,149.44,136.02,134.47,130.64,122.65\), 121.97, 115.07, 114.86, 63.02, 45.98, 42.76, 24.02, 22.03.
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(\mathbf{2 8 2} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta-117.15\)
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3046, 3005, 2962, 2927, 2865, 1684, 1589, 1570, 1508, \(1469,1433,1379,1367,1338,1221,1168,1157,1094,830,748\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 259.1611\); found 259.1622.
\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)propyl)butan-1-amine (303)


Prepared from imine \(291(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and (1chloroethyl)benzene ( \(50.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 0 3}(36.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}\),
\(46 \%\) ) as a 1.4:1 mixture of diastereomers as a brown oil. Yield for duplicate run: 34.4 mg , \(0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \%-44 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.39\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), \(8.51-8.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.6\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 7.61(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 7.41(\mathrm{td}, J=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \()\), \(7.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 7.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), major), \(7.24(\mathrm{~m}, J=4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major), \(7.21(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 7.15(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 7.10-7.04(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(7.01(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.5,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(6.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(3.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 3.79-3.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 3.17(\mathrm{p}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), minor), \(3.01(\mathrm{p}, J\) \(=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 2.37-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 2.27-2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 1.64(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}\), \(2 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 1.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}\), major+minor), \(1.04(\mathrm{dt}, J=14.9,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), major \(), 0.79\) \((\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), minor \(), 0.70(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\), major \()\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.22\) (major), 162.71 (minor), 149.15 (minor), 149.02 (major), 144.65 (major), 144.52 (minor), 136.35 (major), 135.54 (minor), 128.71 (major), 128.11 (minor), 127.94 (minor), 127.83 (major), 126.74 (major), 126.15 (minor), 123.13 (minor), 122.64 (major), 122.19 (major), 121.62 (minor), 70.68 (major), 70.09 (minor), 47.88 (minor), 47.71 (major), 46.51 (major), 45.47 (minor), 32.34 (minor), 31.91 (major), 20.41 (minor), 20.21 (major), 19.34 (major), 16.63 (minor), 14.04 (minor), 13.91 (major). FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3026, 2957, 2926, 2871, 1589, 1569, 1453, 1432, 1376, 1125, 994, 763,748, 700.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 269.2018; found: 269.2028 .

\section*{\(N\)-(cyclohexyl(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)butan-1-amine (304)}


Prepared from imine 291 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and iodocyclohexane ( \(75.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 0 4}(42.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 58 \%)\) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: 41.3 mg , \(0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 56 \%-57 \%\) average yield.

Also prepared from imine \(291(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and bromocyclohexane \((58.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36\) mmol) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et N ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 0 4}(25.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(35 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(21.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.087 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%-32 \%\) average yield.

Also prepared from imine \(291(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and \(346(98.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol})\) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 304 ( \(32.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 44 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(21.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%-41 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.26\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathbf{M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.54(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.59(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.11(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.42(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.91(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=12.3,4.0,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 1.74-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.01-0.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.83(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.28,148.87,135.50,122.68,121.37,69.50,47.67\), 43.50, 32.22, 29.80, 29.72, 26.36, 26.15, 26.11, 20.24, 13.78.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3311,3068, 2923, 2851, 1588, 1569, 1467, 1431, 1375, 1342, 1117, 994, 838, 777, 747.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 247.2174\); found: 247.2186 .

\section*{\(N\)-(cyclohexyl(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)propan-2-amine (305)}


Prepared from imine \(271(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and \(\mathbf{3 4 6}(98.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36\) mmol) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 305 ( \(34.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(28.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(40 \%-44 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.26\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.70(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.73(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.35(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.25(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{hept}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{dtt}, \mathrm{J}=12.1,3.6,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.82(\mathrm{~m}\), \(3 \mathrm{H}), 1.75\) (dddd, J = 13.4, 11.5, 6.7, 3.3 Hz, 3H), \(1.54-1.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.37-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(1.17-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.81,149.09,135.61,123.04,121.50,66.70,46.26\), 43.80, 30.08, 29.96, 26.59, 26.37, 26.32, 24.27, 22.18.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2920, 2851, 1693, 1588, 1432, 1364, 1174, 749.
HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 233.2018\); found: 233.2027.

\section*{tert-butyl 4-((butylamino)(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)piperidine-1-carboxylate (308)}
 iodopiperidine-1-carboxylate ( \(112 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(308(33.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10\) \(\mathrm{mmol}, 32 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(28.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.083 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%-30 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.18\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\left.\mathbf{H}_{3}\right): \delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=38.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.39(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.59(\mathrm{dt}\), \(\mathrm{J}=25.7,11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=19.0,11.3\), \(3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.41(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.39-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 0 1 ~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.96,155.23,149.89,136.31,123.55,122.33,79.60\), 69.17, 48.14, 42.46, 32.80, 28.86, 20.80, 14.37.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2954, 2929, 2853, 1732, 1692, 1651, 1588, 1424, 1365, 1276, 1247, 1171, 872, 750.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 348.2651\); found: 348.2646.
tert-butyl 4-((isopropylamino)(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)piperidine-1-carboxylate (309)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 1-(tert-butyl) 4-(1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl) piperidine-1,4-dicarboxylate (135 \(\mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) )
afforded \(\mathbf{3 0 9}\) ( \(55.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}, 56 \%\) ) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: 47.7 \(\mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 48 \%-52 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{H}_{3}\) ): \(\delta \delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.59(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6\),
\(1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=37.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.46(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71\)
\(-2.49(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.44(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02-1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{tdt}, \mathrm{J}=11.3,7.4,3.7\)
\(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.22-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=18.2,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 0 1} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.98,154.92,149.61,135.91,123.29,121.94,79.27\), \(65.89,46.21,42.26,29.23,28.56,24.38,22.23\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2964, 1861, 2724, 1772, 1735, 1689, 1589, 1569, 1469, \(1424,1365,1278,1250,1168,1119,1050,871,750,718\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 334.2495\); found: 334.2469 .

\section*{N -(pyridin-2-yl(tetrahydro-2H-pyran-4-yl)methyl)butan-1-amine (306)}


Prepared from imine 291 ( \(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and 4-iodotetrahydro-2H-pyran ( \(76.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ \(1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(306(63.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \%)\) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(54.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%-80 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\left.\mathbf{H}_{3}\right): \delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.9\)
\(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.90(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}\)
\(=47.4,11.5,4.5,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.29(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=33.0,11.9,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(2 H), 2.43-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.48-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=13.2\), 4.3, 2.3 Hz, 1H), \(0.82(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.96,149.89,136.27,123.58,122.30,69.52,68.59\), 68.31, 48.10, 41.39, 32.82, 30.74, 30.42, 20.81, 14.37.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3317, 3067, 3004, 2928, 2839, 2755, 1588, 1569, 1468, \(1432,1385,1264,1237,1122,1093,1015,994,983,876,782,749\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 249.1967\); found: 249.1973 .

\section*{\(N\)-(pyridin-2-yl(tetrahydro-2H-pyran-4-yl)methyl)propan-2-amine (307)}


Prepared from imine \(271(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl tetrahydro-2H-pyran-4-carboxylate \((99.1 \mathrm{mg}\), 0.36 mmol ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(307(36.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}\), \(51 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(36.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \%-51 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.23\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ \(1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{N M R}\left(\mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.58(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=4.7,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.04-3.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.30(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=25.5\), \(11.8,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.98-1.75(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.15\) \(-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15.9,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 163.30,149.95,136.22,123.68,122.26,68.67,68.34\), 66.57, 46.53, 41.54, 30.93, 30.48, 24.73, 22.59.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3315, 2957, 2929, 2841, 1588,1569, 1469, 1433, \(1366,1262,1236,1176,1127,1093,877,750\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 235.1810\); found: 235.1805 .

\section*{4-((isopropylamino)(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)cyclohexan-1-one (310)}


Prepared from imine \(291(44.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and 1,3-dioxoisoindolin-2-yl 4-oxocyclohexane-1-carboxylate (103 mg, 0.36 mmol ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(310(49.0 \mathrm{mg}, ~ 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 66 \%)\) as a yellow oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(38.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16\) mmol, \(52 \%-59 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.20\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl \(\mathbf{H}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.57(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.9\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22-7.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.55(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.45(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.18\) ( \(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}\) ), 2.06 (dddd, \(\mathrm{J}=14.6,11.5,6.6,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=12.4,6.4\), \(3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=18.3,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 0 1} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{C l}_{\mathbf{2}}\) ): \(\delta 212.10,149.99,136.30,123.59,122.38,65.34,46.77\), 42.53, 41.29, 30.12, 24.56, 22.42.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3314, 2960, 2866, 1714, 1589, 1469, 1432, 1378, 1337, 1168, 753.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 247.1810\); found: 247.1805 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(6-methoxypyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (350)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 4 0}\) ( \(53.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide
( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 350 ( \(14.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.051 \mathrm{mmol}, 17 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(12.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.044 \mathrm{mmol}, 15 \%-16 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.29\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \(\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (500 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.35(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=\) \(7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95-3.86(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.02\) (t, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.58(\mathrm{hept}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 164.1,160.5,139.3,138.5,129.5,128.2,126.2,115.8\), 108.7, 62.5, 45.9, 43.5, 24.3, 22.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3063, 3026, 2962, 2857, 1599, 1578, 1466, 1436, 1416, 1310, 1288, 1173, 1147, 1073, 1032, 988, 803, 770, 743, 699.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 271.1810; found 271.1806.

\section*{Methyl 6-(1-(isopropylamino)-2-phenylethyl)nicotinate (351)}


Prepared from imine 34161.9 mg , 0.3 mmol ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography ( \(\mathrm{Hex} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(351(26.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.087\) \(\mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(26.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.087 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%-29 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.23\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 9.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.12(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.23-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.13(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.04\) \((\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58-2.49(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{~s}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 168.5,166.1,157.1,150.9,138.4,137.3,129.4,128.5\), \(126.6,124.5,122.3,63.3,52.5,46.5,43.7,24.2,22.2\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3063, 3027, 2960, 2866, 1729, 1597, 1586, 1456, 1436, 1381, 1339, 1289, 1194, 1176, 1118, 1024, 960, 777, 738, 701.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 299.1760; found 299.1755.

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(5-bromopyridin-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (352)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 4 2}\) ( \(68.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 352 ( \(22.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.069 \mathrm{mmol}, 23 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(22.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.069 \mathrm{mmol}, 23 \%-23 \%\) average yield. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.35\left(\right.\) silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.63(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4,0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.07-6.94(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.05-2.90(\mathrm{~m}\), 2H), 2.54 (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.07\) (s, 1H), 0.95 (dd, \(J=6.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.2,150.6,138.8,138.5,129.4,128.6,126.6,124.0\), 118.8, 62.8, 46.5, 43.7, 24.1, 22.1.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3083, 3027, 2925, 1863, 1710, 1602, 1572, 1494, 1463, \(1367,1173,1091,1006,839,744,628\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 319.0810\); found 319.0825 .

\section*{\(N\)-(1-(isoquinolin-3-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (354)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 4 3}\) ( \(59.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 354 ( 30.5 mg , 0.11 mmol , \(35 \%)\) as a colorless oil. Yield for duplicate run: \(27.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.093 \mathrm{mmol}, 31 \%-33 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 9.27(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{ddd}, J=8.2,6.7,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.55(\mathrm{ddd}, J=8.1,6.7,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.20-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3\), \(7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.08(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.3,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58(\) hept, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.99\) (d, \(J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}\) ).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (126 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 156.0,152.7,139.2,136.2,130.5,129.4,128.4,128.0\), \(127.7,126.9,126.7,126.3,118.8,63.0,46.1,43.6,24.3,22.1\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3308, 3057, 3026, 2963, 2927, 2862, 1684, 1647, 1628, \(1582,1558,1490,1456,1379,1339,1271,1174,1127,1080,945,883,750,689,668\).

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 291.1861; found 291.1858 .

\section*{N-(1-(1-methyl-1H-indazol-3-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (355)}


Prepared from imine 344 ( \(60.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( \(42.8 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 355 (6.0 \(\mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}, 7 \%)\) as a colorless oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.19\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.38-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.11\) (m, 5H), \(7.11-7.03(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.53(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.1,2.7\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\) ), 2.68 (hept, \(J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71\) (s, 1H), 0.96 (dd, \(J=10.7,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 141.0,138.8,129.3,128.2,126.2,126.1,121.1,119.7\), 108.9, 55.7, 46.1, 43.3, 35.3, 23.9, 22.0.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3444, 3025, 2956, 2928, 2864, 1684, 1615, 1506, 1456, 1369, 1294, 1236, 1171, 768, 746, 702.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\): 294.1970; found 294.1961.

\section*{\(N\)-(pyridin-2-yl(1-tosylpiperidin-4-yl)methyl)butan-1-amine (353)}


Prepared from imine \(291(48.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})\) and tertbutyl 4-iodo-1-tosylpiperidine ( \(131 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(353(36.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.090 \mathrm{mmol}, 30 \%)\) as a white solid. Yield for duplicate run: \(31.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.077\) mmol, \(26 \%-28 \%\) average yield.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.22\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV w/ 1\% Et 3 N ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.54(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(2 H), 7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.37(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.4\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.42(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.18(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=11.9,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=\) \(11.3,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.5,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.18(\mathrm{~m}\), \(8 \mathrm{H}), 0.84(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 2 6} \mathbf{~ M H z}\), CDCl \(_{3}\) ): \(\delta 149.63,143.35,135.94,133.00,129.52,127.72,123.25\), \(122.05,68.21,47.64,46.63,46.40,41.08,32.32,28.65,28.40,21.52,20.36,13.94\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3323, 2952, 2921, 2856, 2361, 1588, 1467, 1351, 1338, 1163, 1093, 929, 752, 728.

HRMS (FAB, \(\mathbf{m} / \mathbf{z}\) ): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 402.2215\); found: 402.2218.

\section*{N -(1-(1H-imidazol-2-yl)-2-phenylethyl)propan-2-amine (356)}


Prepared from imine \(\mathbf{3 4 5}\) ( \(41.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}\) ) and benzyl bromide ( 42.8 \(\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.2\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.4. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(356(3.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.014 \mathrm{mmol}, 5 \%)\) as a yellow oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.21\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 7.26-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=\) \(1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.53(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.69(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=\) \(29.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (100 MHz, CDCl 3 ): \(\delta 135.71,129.47,129.16,128.63,128.08,127.25,121.25\), 53.65, 30.25, 28.6017 .80.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3355, 2953, 2914, 1733, 1716, 1558, 1506, 1456, 1167, 910

HRMS (ESI, \(\mathbf{m} / \mathbf{z}\) ): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}:\)230.1652; found: 230.1648 .

\subsection*{3.5.6 Investigation into Imine Homocoupling}

\section*{N1,N2-diisopropyl-1,2-di(pyridin-2-yl)ethane-1,2-diamine (311)}


Independent synthesis of 311: On the bench-top, to a 1 dram vial, equipped with a stir bar, was charged with ( \(E\) )- N -isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)methanimine 271 ( 44.5 mg 0.3 mmol , 1.0 equiv) and \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\left(16.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0\right.\) equiv). The vial was brought into a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox and a stock-solution of \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot\) dme in NMP \((0.75 \mathrm{ml}, 0.02 \mathrm{M}, 0.05\) equiv [ Ni\(\left.]\right)\) and \(\mathrm{TMSCl}(76 \mu \mathrm{l}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0\) equiv) was added consecutively. The vial was sealed with a Teflon cap and electrical tape and stirred at room temperature for 18 hours at 600 rpm. The resulting suspension was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with 1 N \(\mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\) (s) until gas evolution ceased. The resulting aqueous solution was extracted \(3 x\) with EtOAc and the combined organic phases were concentrated under reduced pressure at \(40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) until most of the NMP was removed. The crude material was purified by column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc \(\left.1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)\) to afford \(\mathbf{3 1 1}(11.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.038 \mathrm{mmol}, 25 \%)\) as a colorless crystalline solid.

\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.26\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1, UV).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.44\) (dddd, \(\mathrm{J}=5.0,3.3,1.8,0.9\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.46(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.33(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(2 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.01-6.93(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\), \(2 \mathrm{H}), 4.16(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.93(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.52(\mathrm{dh}, \mathrm{J}=25.0,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(0.94-0.82(\mathrm{~m}, 18 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, CDCl \({ }_{3}\) ): \(\delta 206.96,162.16,161.91,149.03,148.74,135.59,135.39\), \(123.32,123.10,121.64,121.54,67.00,65.85,65.09,46.91,46.13,30.93,24.28,23.86\), 22.45, 22.41 .

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, cm \({ }^{-1}\) ): 3298, 3051, 2960, 2926, 2866, 1693, 1589, 1568, 1469, 1433, 1379, 1337, 1173, 1146, 995, 748.

HRMS (FAB, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 348.2651\); found: 348.2646 .

\section*{Investigating Conditions that Result in Imine Homocoupling}

Table 3.4. Investigating 271 homocoupling under various conditions.


\subsection*{3.5.7 Probing the Intermediacy of an Organomanganese Intermediate:}


Benzyl organomanganese reagent \(\mathbf{6}\) was prepared according to a procedure from Knochel and coworkers. \({ }^{40}\)

Preparation of \(\mathbf{M n C l}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{\bullet} \mathbf{2 L i C l}\) : To an oven-dried 10 mL Schlenk flask charged with a stir bar and cooled under an atmosphere of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) was added \(\mathrm{LiCl}(424 \mathrm{mg}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol})\). The flask was then placed under vacuum \((\sim 0.2 \mathrm{mmHg})\) and heated to \(150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) in an oil bath for 3 hours. The flask was then backfilled with \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) and removed from the oil bath. After cooling to room temperature, \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}(629 \mathrm{mg}, 5.0 \mathrm{mmol})\) was added. The flask was then resealed and the mixture of solids was reheated under vacuum at \(130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) for 3 hours. The flask was then refilled with \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) and cooled to room temperature followed by the addition of 5 mL of THF was added to the flask. The solution was then stirred for 24 hours at \(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) to give a transparent, light-yellow solution of \(1.0 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{MnCl}_{2} \cdot 2 \mathrm{LiCl}\) in THF.

Preparation of Benzylmanganese chloride: A 50 mL round-bottom flask charged with a stir bar was flame-dried under vacuum and allow to cool to \(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) under an atmosphere of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) then charged with activated \(\mathrm{Mg}^{0}\) turnings ( \(117 \mathrm{mg}, 4.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.4\) equiv). The flask was then evacuated and backfilled with \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) three times before 0.67 mL of THF was added to the flask followed by 2.5 mL of the \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2} \bullet 2 \mathrm{LiCl}\) solution ( 1.0 M in \(\mathrm{THF}, 2.50 \mathrm{mmol}\) ). The mixture was then cooled to \(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) in an ice bath and stirred. Once cooled, benzyl chloride \((253 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol})\) was added neat to the reaction and the solution was allowed to stir at
\(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) for 1.5 hours. The solution was then transferred to a flame-dried Schlenk flask with a filter cannula. The resulting solution was then titrated with \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) in triplicate to give an average concentration of 0.22 M of \(\mathbf{6}\) in THF ( \(35 \%\) yield).


1,2-addition with Organomanganese Reagent: To an oven-dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was added \(271(14.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})\). The vial was then pumped into a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox where (if applicable) \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot d\) me ( \(1.1 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%\) ) was added and dissolved in \(750 \mu \mathrm{~L}\) of NMP. This solution was allowed to stir for 15 min at \(27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) causing it to turn green (in the presence of Ni ). To the solution was then added \(545 \mu \mathrm{~L} 0.22 \mathrm{M}\) solution of organomanganese reagent via syringe. The vial was then sealed with a teflonlined cap and isolation tape then removed from the glovebox and stirred on the bench at 600 rpm for 16 hours. The resulting suspension was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with \(1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(\mathrm{~s})\) until gas evolution ceased. The resulting aqueous solution was extracted 3 x with EtOAc and the combined organic phases were concentrated under reduced pressure and analyzed by \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR to obtain the reaction yield. In the case of \(0 \%\) Nickel catalyst only starting material was recovered with no product formed. Likewise with \(5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \bullet \mathrm{dme} \mathrm{no}^{\text {no }}\) product \(\mathbf{2 7 3}\) was formed but a significant amount of \(\mathbf{3 1 1}\) ( \(57 \%\) yield) was recovered.

\subsection*{3.5.8 Stoichiometric Ni \(^{0}\) Alkylation:}


An oven-dried 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar was charged with 2-imino pyridine 271 \((29.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol})\) in a nitrogen-filled glovebox. To the vial was then added \(\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}\) \((27.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})\) which immediately turned dark violet as it made contact with the 271 in the vial. The residue was then dissolved in NMP \((250 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.4 \mathrm{M})\) to give an opaque, royal purple solution. This was then stirred for 30 minutes to ensure complete complexation followed by addition of benzyl bromide ( \(20.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}\) ). The vial was then sealed with a Teflon cap, removed from the glovebox, and stirred for 18 hours at 600 rpm . The resulting suspension was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.5 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with \(1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(0.5\) \(\mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(\mathrm{~s})\) until gas evolution ceased. The resulting aqueous solution was extracted 3 x with EtOAc and the combined organic phases were concentrated under reduced pressure and analyzed by \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR to obtain the reaction yield. Average yield of \(\mathbf{2 7 3}\) over 2 runs: \(53 \%\) yield ( 0.053 mmol ).

\subsection*{3.5.9 Synthesis of (271) \({ }_{2} \mathrm{MCl}_{2}\) Complexes 322 and 323:}


Synthesis of 322: Procedure adapted from method described by Andrade-Lopez and coworkers \({ }^{41}\). In a nitrogen-filled glovebox an oven-dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{dme}\) ( \(110 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and suspended in 2 mL MeCN then sealed with a septa cap. To a separate 1 dram vial was added 0.5 mL DCM and imine 271 ( \(148 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 2\) equiv) then sealed with a septa cap. The vials were then removed from the glovebox and placed under a flow of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\). The stirring acetonitrile solution was then heated to \(70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) where the DCM solution of 271 was added causing the mixture to become a homogenous green solution. After 5 hours a green precipitate started to form. After 24 hours the solution was cooled to room temperature and filtered. The green powder was washed with cold MeCN two times then dried under high vacuum to give 322 (173 \(\mathrm{mg}, 0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 81 \%\) yield) as a green powder. The crude powder could be recrystallized from a minimal amount of \(4: 1 \mathrm{MeCN}: \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\) and cooled to \(-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) to give green rhombic crystals.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2969, 1976, 1596, 1442, 1390, 1331, 1300, 1167, 1018, 780, 729, 509.



Synthesis of 323: Procedure adapted from method described by Andrade-Lopez and coworkers. \({ }^{41}\) In a nitrogen-filled glovebox an oven-dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was
charged with \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}(62.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and suspended in 2 mL MeCN then sealed with a septa cap. To a separate 1 dram vial was added 0.5 mL DCM and imine 271 ( \(148 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 2\) equiv) then sealed with a septa cap. The vials were then removed from the glovebox and placed under a flow of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\). The stirring acetonitrile solution was then heated to \(70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) where the DCM solution of 271 was added causing the mixture to become a cloudy orange solution. After 1 hour an orange precipitate started to form. After 24 hours the solution was cooled to room temperature and filtered. The orange powder was washed with cold MeCN two times then dried under high vacuum to give \(\mathbf{3 2 3}\) ( 194 mg , \(0.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 92 \%\) yield) as an orange solid. The crude powder could be recrystallized from a minimal amount of \(4: 1 \mathrm{MeCN}: \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\) and was lightly capped so the solvent can slowly evaporate and allowed to sit for to give orange rhombic crystals.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2966, 2929, 1645, 1593, 1461, 1440, 1394, 1363, 1305, 1166, 1012, 874, 784, 749, 637, 506.

\subsection*{3.5.10 Preparation of (271) \({ }_{2} \mathrm{Ni}^{\prime}\) complex 324 :}


UV/VIS sample Preparation: In a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox, an oven-dried 20 mL scintillation vial with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}(2.2 \mathrm{mg}, 8 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.8\) equiv \()\) and 2.5 mL of NMP. To the stirring suspension was added 271 ( \(2.4 \mathrm{mg}, 16 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.6\) equiv) causing the solution to turn a deep royal purple and was allowed to stir for 15 minutes to form \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\). Concurrently, an oven-dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathbf{3 2 2}(4.3 \mathrm{mg}, 10\) \(\mu\) mol, 1 equiv). To the vial was added 2.5 mL of NMP to give a green solution. After 15 minutes the NMP solution of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) was transferred to the solution of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) in NMP causing the solution to turn black. The solution was stirred for 2 hours then transferred to a quartz cuvette ( 1 cm pathlength) for UV/VIS analysis.


EPR sample Preparation: In a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox, an oven-dried 20 mL scintillation vial with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}(13.7 \mathrm{mg}, 50 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1\) equiv) and 1 mL of NMP. To the stirring suspension was added \(271(14.8 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2\) equiv) causing the solution to turn a deep royal purple and was allowed to stir for 15 minutes to form 321. Concurrently, an oven-dried 1 dram vial with a stir bar was charged with \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \bullet \mathrm{dme}(11.0\) \(\mathrm{mg}, 50 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1\) equiv). To the vial was added 1 mL of NMP to give a blue solution followed by 271 ( \(14.8 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2\) equiv) causing the solution to turn light green to form \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\)

After 15 minutes the NMP solution of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) was transferred to the solution of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) in NMP. The 1 dram vial was then rinsed with 3 mL of NMP (final concentration 10 mM ) to ensure quantitative transfer. This solution was then stirred for 15 minutes and turned from dark purple to black. An aliquot of this solution was then transferred to an EPR tube which was then rapidly frozen at 77 K in a liquid \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) dewar and was analyzed by EPR.

General EPR Details: X-Band EPR spectra (9.4 Hz, continuous wave) using a Bruker EMX spectrometer with Bruker Win-EPR software. Samples were collected at 77 K using a vacuum-insulated quartz liquid \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) dewar. For maximum sensitivity, several microwave frequencies were scanned between 20 mW to \(20 \mu \mathrm{~W}\) where 2 mW was found to be optimal. EPR data was simulated in MATLAB with Easyspin. Key parameters: Temperature \(=77\) K , solvent \(=\) NMP, microwave frequency \(=9.36 \mathrm{GHz}\), power \(=2.181 \mathrm{~mW}\), modulation amplitude \(=1200.00 \mathrm{G} .:\) EPR was simulated as two \(\mathrm{S}=1 / 2 \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}\) isomeric species (based on optimal fitting parameters and related work from Wieghardt. \({ }^{45}\) Fitting parameters for species 1 (plum): \(g_{1}=2.25, g_{2}=2.16, g_{3}=2.03\), linewidth \(=4.4 \mathrm{mT}, \Gamma_{1}=70, \Gamma_{2}=47, \Gamma_{3}\) \(=85 \mathrm{MHz}\), weighting factor \(=1.0\). Fitting parameters for species \(2(\) teal \(): \mathrm{g}_{1}=2.30, \mathrm{~g}_{2}=\) \(2.20, \mathrm{~g}_{3}=2.07\), linewidth \(=3.5 \mathrm{mT}, \Gamma_{1}=106, \Gamma_{2}=2, \Gamma_{3}=123 \mathrm{MHz}\), weighting factor \(=\) 0.56 .

\section*{EPR Data of 324:}

Figure 3.15. Experimental and simulated EPR spectrum of comproportionation reaction.


Figure 3.16. EPR of each simulated species shown separately.


\subsection*{3.5.11 Alternative Radical Generation Approaches for Alkylation}

Lewis and Brønsted acids were evaluated as alternative catalysts to facilitate radical addition into heteroaryl imines. Using Lewis acids under otherwise optimized conditions in place of \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{dme}\) did not provide the same yield boost or improve the yield beyond the Mn-mediated background reaction. Yields determined by \({ }^{1} \mathrm{HNMR}\) with an internal standard. (Table S3.5).

Table 3.5. Alkylation reaction with alternative, non redox-active, metal catalysts.


Radical generation under thermal \(\mathrm{AIBN} /{ }^{n} \mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}\) conditions in the absense of \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) did not result in product formation whereas the optimized conditions performed at \(80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) gave alkylated product in \(42 \%\) yield (Scheme 3.6).

Scheme 3.6. Thermal radical generation conditions for a redox-neutral imine alkylation (top) and control experiment of the optimized reaction conditions run at \(80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) (bottom).


Genration of benzylic radicals through the reduction of NHP esters in the presence of TMSCl and TDAE as a reductant. Across several metal catalysts we observe significant levels of benzyl homocoupled product indicating radical formation and trace levels of alkated products (Scheme 3.7).

Scheme 3.7. Radical generation under mild reductive conditions employing NHP esters as radical precursors and several metal catalysts


\subsection*{3.5.12 Electroanalytical Experiments}

General Details: Cyclic voltammograms were obtained in a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox using a standard three electrode cell consisting of a freshly polished ( \(0.3 \mu \mathrm{~m}\) then \(0.05 \mu \mathrm{~m}\) alumina) glassy carbon working electrode, platinum counter electrode, and a silver wire non aqueous reference electrode in \(10 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{AgNO}_{3}(\mathrm{MeCN})\). Data were collected using a Biologic SP300 potentiostat and analyzed in EC-Lab. All cyclic voltammograms were measured in NMP with 0.1 M TBAPF 6 supporting electrolyte and then referenced to freshly sublimed ferrocene (Fc). All voltammagrams were background corrected against blank solvent/electrolyte unless specified. Peak currents were calculated from linear baselinecorrected "peak analysis" feature in EC-Lab. The reduction potentials are reported versus the reduction potential of the \(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\)peak. Ohmic drop compensation was done with all samples before each scan using positive-feedback iR-compensation at \(85 \%\) of uncompensated resistance \(\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{u}}\right)\) measured from potentio electrochemical impedence spectroscopy (PEIS). All CVs shown are first scan in \(0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}\) electrolyte in NMP at \(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, v=100 \mathrm{mv} / \mathrm{s}\) unless otherwise specified.

\section*{Cyclic Voltammetry of Heteroaryl Imines and Metal Complexes:}

Figure 3.17. CV of 271 ( 1 mM ).


Figure 3.18. CV of 322 ( 1 mM ) that was independently synthesized.


Figure 3.19. CV of 322 ( 1 mM ) prepared in situ from \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot d m e\). The second reduction peak is likely small amounts of the Ni complex with three 271 ligands. \({ }^{42}\)


Figure 3.20. CV of 321 (1 mM) prepared in situ from \(\mathrm{Ni}(C O D)_{2}\).


Figure 3.21. CV of \(323(2 \mathrm{mM})\) prepared in situ from \(\mathrm{MnCl}_{2}\).


Figure 3.22. CV of \(\mathbf{2 7 1}-\mathrm{MgBr}_{2}\) prepared in situ from \(\mathrm{MgBr}_{2}\).


\subsection*{3.5.13 Effect of Reaction Components on 322}

Figure 3.23. Cyclic voltammograms of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) ( 1 mM , purple) followed by the addition of 10 mM BnCl (green) and 90 mM BnCl ( 100 mM total, blue).


Figure 3.24. Cyclic voltammograms of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) ( 1 mM , purple) followed by the addition of 100 mM BnCl (green). Addition of 40 mM 271 to allow for turnover for additive studies (blue). Addition of 50 mM AcOH additive (teal) followed by an additional 100 mM AcOH to the same cell ( 150 mM total, orange).


Figure 3.25. Control experiment for Figure 3.24 showing voltammetry for different order of addition of reaction components. Cyclic voltammograms of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) (1 mM, purple) with 20mM excess 271. Reaction component addition order: 2 mM AcOH (green), addition of 98 mM AcOH (blue), then 100 mM BnCl to the cell.


\section*{Kinetics of Reaction of Reduced 322 ( \(\left.322^{\text {red }}\right)\) and Benzyl Chloride:}


To calculate the reaction rate constant between reduced \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\left(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\right)\) with benzyl chloride) a procedure described by Sigman and Minteer was used. \({ }^{43}\) This reaction could be studied by mixing 322 with a large excess of benzyl chloride and measuring the cathodic and
anodic peak currents ( \(i_{\mathrm{pc}}\) and \(i_{\mathrm{pa}}\) ) of the \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) redox wave at varying scan rates (v) from \(2 \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{s}\) to \(3 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}\). Varying the scan rate changes the time it takes to go from \(E_{\mathrm{pc}}\), where \(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\) is generated, to the \(E_{\mathrm{pa}}\), where any remaining \(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\) is reoxidized to \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\), enabling us to calculate the amount of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}{ }^{\text {red }}\) remaining after it reacts with benzyl chloride at various time points. In the case of a CV potential window \(E_{\mathrm{i}} \rightarrow E_{\mathrm{r}}\left( \pm 0.25 \mathrm{~V}\right.\) to \(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}\) here) then the reaction time \((t)\) can be calcualted as:
\[
t=\frac{\left|E_{r}-E_{p c}\right|+\left|E_{r}-E_{p a}\right|}{v}
\]
where \(E_{\mathrm{pc}}\) is the potential of the peak cathodic current and \(E_{\mathrm{pa}}\) is the potential of the peak anodic current. From the Randles-Sevcik equation, the amount of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\) remaining at time \(t\) can be detemined from the baseline-corrected peak height ratios \(\left(i_{\mathrm{pa}} / i_{\mathrm{pc}}\right)\) :
\[
\frac{i_{p a}}{i_{p c}}=\frac{\left[322^{\text {red }}\right]_{t} \sqrt{D_{322 \text { red }}}}{\left[322^{\text {red }}\right]_{0} \sqrt{D_{322}}}
\]

We can simplify this by assuming that the difussion coefficents for the reduced species \(322^{\text {red }}\) and \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) ( \(D_{322}{ }^{\text {red }}\) and \(D_{322}\) respectively) are approximately the same:
\[
\frac{i_{p a}}{i_{p c}}=\frac{\left[322^{\text {red }}\right]_{t}}{\left[322^{\text {red }}\right]_{0}}
\]

Multiplying the fraction by the known initial concetration of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}(1 \mathrm{mM})\) will give us the concentration of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}{ }^{\text {red }}\) at \(t\) allowing us to extract a time course. This time course can then be treated as a pseudo-1 \(1^{\text {st }}\) order reaction due to large excess of benzyl chloride ( 100 mM ) or be simulated as a second order reaction and analyzed in the COPASI \({ }^{44}\) kinetics simulation software.

Figure 3.26. Voltammograms of the reaction of 322 ( 1 mM ) with \(\mathrm{BnCl}(100 \mathrm{mM})\) with scan rates 3-80 mV/s.


Figure 3.27. Voltammograms of the reaction of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) ( 1 mM ) with \(\mathrm{BnCl}(100 \mathrm{mM})\) with scan rates \(100-2000 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}\).


Figure 3.28. Time course of calculated 322 \({ }^{\text {red }}\) remaining over time after reacting with BnCl .


Kinetic Analysis: The net reaction between \(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\) and benzyl chloride follows the second order rate equation:
\[
\text { rate }=k_{o a}[\mathrm{BnCl}]\left[322^{\text {red }}\right]
\]

Given the large excess of BnCl added, the reaction can be treated as a pseudo- \(1^{\text {st }}\) order reaction with the rate law:
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { rate }=k_{\text {app }}\left[322^{\text {red }}\right] \\
k_{\text {app }}=k_{\text {oa }}[\mathrm{BnCl}]
\end{gathered}
\]

For the pseudo- \(1^{\text {st }}\) order treatment the rate constant \(k_{\text {app }}\) can be determined from the slope of a plot of \(\ln \left(\left[\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\right]\right)\) vs. time (Figure 3.29 ) which can then be used to determine \(k_{\text {oa }}\) with the known amount of benzyl chloride added \(\left([\mathrm{BnCl}]_{0}\right)\). From the measured \(k_{\text {app }}=0.018 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\) we determine the corresponding \(2^{\text {nd }}\) order rate constant \(k_{\mathrm{oa}}=0.18 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\).

Figure 3.29. First order treatment of time course data from reaction of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}^{\text {red }}\) and benzyl chloride.


A complementary approach utilizing kinetic modeling software was also done with the time course data. The reaction was modeled as a second order process and gave a \(k_{\mathrm{oa}}=0.17\) \(\mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\) (Figure 3.30).

Figure 3.30. Experimental time course and simulated reaction fit. Fit was used for first entire time course measured.


\subsection*{3.5.14 UV/Vis and Spectroelectrochemistry}

General Details of UV/Vis studies: All UV/Vis measurements were performed on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer with Cary WinUV software. Samples were prepared in a nitrogen filled glovebox and sealed in a 1 cm quartz cuvette for analysis. Background correction was done against an NMP blank and samples were scanned from 1100 nm to \(300 \mathrm{~nm} . \varepsilon\) values were calculated from the prepared concentration in the case of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) and \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) and in the case of the \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}\) the reaction (section 3.5.10) to make the \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}\) sample was assumed to be quantitative. This assumption appears to be valid based on the lack of spectral features resembling 321 in the sample and similarities in the known \(\varepsilon\) values for the analogous \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}\) and formally \(\mathrm{Ni}^{0}\) complexes studied by Wieghardt and Coworkers. \({ }^{45}\)

\section*{UV/Vis of Independently Prepared Complexes}

Figure 3.31. UV/Vis spectrum of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) (1mM) in NMP. Inset: Close up of 400-1100 \(n m\) region to show transitions.


Figure 3.32. UV/Vis spectrum of 321 ( 0.26 mM ) prepared from 271 ( 0.52 mM ) and \(\mathrm{Ni}(C O D)_{2}\).


Figure 3.33. UV/Vis spectrum of (271) \({ }_{2} \mathrm{Ni}^{\prime}(0.32 \mathrm{mM})\) prepared from reacting 321 and 322 after 2 hours to ensure complete disproportionation.


\section*{Spectroelectrochemistry of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\)}

General Details: Spectroelectrochemistry studies were conducted in a nitrogen-filled glovebox. Spectroelectrochemistry kit from Pine Research (AKSTCKIT3) was used with measurements done in a quartz spectroelectrochemical cell with 0.17 cm path length. A three electrode setup composed of a honeycomb electrode containing Pt working and Pt counter electrodes was used along with a silver wire, \(\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{AgNO}_{3}(10 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MeCN})\), nonaqueous reference electrode. The cell was placed in a Ocean Optics CUV-UV cuvette holder connected to the light source and spectrophotometer with \(600 \mu \mathrm{~m}\) core optical fibers. UV/Vis measurements were done with an Hamamatsu L1179 deuterium light source coupled to an Ocean Optics USB4000-UV-Vis-ES detector.

Spectroelectrochemistry Measurement Procedure: An initial cyclic voltammagram was taken of the 1 mM solution of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) ( \(0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}\) in NMP to identify redox peaks. For spectroelectrochemistry measurements the cell was held at a constant voltage for 3 minutes where after 2.5 minutes of elecrolysis the spectrum was saved to ensure that the majority of electroactive species were reduced at the electrode despite most of the current passing within the first 5 seconds once sufficiently reducing potentials were reached (Figure 3.34). Starting at -1.04 V vs. \(\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\)the potential was then decreased stepwise by 0.1 V increments until significant current started to pass at which point the step sizes decreased to 0.05 V . This was done until the spectrum remained unchanged indicating reduction was complete \(\left(-1.94 \mathrm{~V}\right.\) vs. \(\left.\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\right)\). After this the procedure was repeated in the oxidative direction to ensure the reversibility of the process. All spectra were basline corrected at 860 nm and plotted as the 5-point moving average.

Calculating \(\varepsilon\) in Figure 3.11: The UV/Vis spectra remained largely unchanged in intensity and absorbance features at \(-1.74 \mathrm{~V}\left(\mathrm{vs} . \mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}\right)\)suggesting all of \(\mathbf{3 2 2}\) at the electrode had been reduced. Assuming this is true the \(\varepsilon\) was calculated from an assumed concentration of 1 mM of reduced species at each measured wavelength. From these values, the concentration of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\) can be calculated at lower potentials containing \(<1 \mathrm{mM}\) of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\). The concentration was calculated by averaging the concentration calculated for each wavelength by \(\mathrm{A} /\left(\varepsilon^{*} 0.17 \mathrm{~cm}\right)\) between 320 nm and 630 nm . The average concentration calculated at the \(\mathrm{E}_{1 / 2}(-1.44 \mathrm{~V})\) was \(0.54 \pm 0.04 \mathrm{mM}\).

Figure 3.34. Representative current of electrochemical cell over time under constant potential electrolysis ( -1.54 V vs \(F C / F C^{+}\)here). By the time the UV/Vis spectrum was recorded most of the current had passed to generate the reduced species.


Figure 3.35. UV/Vis spectroelectrochemical absorbance spectra during stepwise potential scan. Potentials listed are relative to Fc/Fc \({ }^{+}\). Shown spectra are taken after 2.5 minutes of electrolysis. * Indicates signal saturation inherent to light source and detector used for experiment.


\subsection*{3.5.15 Optimization of Electrocatalytic Imine Alkylation}

General Details: All reactions were performed according to General Procedure 3.5 (vide infra) on a 1.2 mmol scale unless specified otherwise. Reaction yields were determined by \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR using 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethylene as an internal standard added after workup.

Table 3.6. Optimization table and control experiments for electroreductive alkylation. * indicates voltage overload due to the high resistance of the divided cell ( \(94 \%\) yield based on amount of current passed).


Divided Cell Experiment: Divided cell electrolysis was performed on an H-Cell type electrochemical cell on a 2.0 mmol scale. Due to the high resistance of the divided cell setup, the reaction reached its safety voltage limit after 3.75 h corresponding limiting the reaction to a \(39 \%\) theoretical yield based on the amount of electrons passed. Each cell was analyzed individually to ensure there was not significant substrate diffusion over the course
of the reaction which was confirmed by finding the anodic cell had \(<5 \%\) of 271 and no 305 could be detected.

\section*{General Procedure 4: Electrolysis on \(\mathbf{1 . 2} \mathbf{~ m m o l}\) Scale:}

In a \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-filled glovebox, to an oven-dried standard 5 mL ElectraSyn vial charged with a stir bar was added \(\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot\) dme ( \(26.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.1\) equiv) and \(\mathrm{TBAPF}_{6}(456 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2\) mmol, 1 equiv). The solids were then dissolved in 3 mL of NMP \((0.4 \mathrm{M})\) and stirred for 10 minutes. To the blue solution was then added heteroaryl imine ( \(1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) causing the solution to turn light green followed by alkyl halide ( 1.5 equiv, 1.8 mmol ). The threading of the vial was then lined with teflon tape and the vial cap fitted with \(\mathrm{Zn}^{0}\) anode (counter electrode) and RVC cathode (working electrode) was attached. The cell was then removed from the glovebox and attached to the Electrasyn 2.0 where the following setup was employed: New exp. -> Constant current -> -20 mA -> no ref. electrode -> no alternating polarity -> start. The reaction was stirred at room temperature for 6 hours. The resulting dark solution was diluted with \(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{ml})\) and extracted 3 x with 1 N HCl \((30 \mathrm{ml})\). To the combined aqueous phases was added \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(\mathrm{~s})\) until gas evolution ceased and the \(\mathrm{pH} \sim 9\). The resulting aqueous solution was extracted 3 x with EtOAc \((50 \mathrm{~mL})\) and the combined organic phases were dried with \(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\), filtered through celite and then concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude material was purified by column chromatography to afford the desired products.

\section*{\(N\)-(2-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethyl)propan-2-amine (273)}


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(178 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and benzyl bromide ( \(214 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) and following General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 273 ( \(210 \mathrm{mg}, 0.88 \mathrm{mmol}, 73 \%\) ) as a colorless oil. \(N\)-(cyclohexyl(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)propan-2-amine (305)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(178 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and cyclohexyliodide ( \(233 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 305 ( \(165 \mathrm{mg}, 0.71 \mathrm{mmol}, 59 \%\) ) as a yellow oil.
\(N\)-isopropyl-4-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)butan-1-amine (312)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(178 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and 1 -iodo-3-phenylpropane ( \(290 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 312 ( \(164 \mathrm{mg}, 0.61 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.32\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.25-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{t}\), \(\mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.52(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.67-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.51-\) \(1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\left.\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 164.66,149.94,142.87,136.53,128.85,128.68,126.10\), \(122.71,122.21,61.69,46.24,37.51,36.40,28.71,24.59,22.64\).

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2960, 2858, 1588, 1432, 1367, 747, 698

HRMS (FD, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 268.19340\); found: 268.19358.

\section*{tert-butyl 4-((isopropylamino)(pyridin-2-yl)methyl)piperidine-1-carboxylate (309)}
 residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 309 \((173 \mathrm{mg}, 0.52 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \%)\) as a white solid.
\(N\)-isopropyl-4-phenyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)butan-1-amine (313)


Prepared from imine \(337(185 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and cyclohexyliodide ( \(233 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 4:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 1 3}(172 \mathrm{mg}, 0.72 \mathrm{mmol}, 60 \%)\) as a yellow oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.67\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 1:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 7.70(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~d}\), \(\mathrm{J}=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.67(\mathrm{hept}, \mathrm{J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.57(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.29\) \(-1.06(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 178.12,142.63,118.76,63.95,47.68,45.04,30.29,29.76\), 26.86, 26.68, 24.54, 22.75.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2958, 2924, 2851, 1497, 1448, 1379, 1365, 1316, 1176, \(1121,1052,776,720\).

HRMS (FD, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}\): 238.14982; found: 238.15067 .
\(N\)-isopropyl-2,2-dimethyl-1-(thiazol-2-yl)propan-1-amine (314)


Prepared from imine 337 ( \(185 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and 2-iodo-2methylpropane ( \(215 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) following General

Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 4:1 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded 314 ( \(136 \mathrm{mg}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}, 53 \%\) ) as a yellow oil. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.56\left(\right.\) silica, \(\left.\mathrm{Hex} / E t O A c 1: 1 \mathrm{w} / 1 \% \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\right)\).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR (400 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~s}\), 1H), 2.57 (hept, \(\mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 176.43,142.29,118.77,67.79,47.62,35.23,27.41,24.61\), 22.46.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2960, 2866, 1495, 1475, 1367, 1175, 1120, 1089, 1053, 854, 722.

HRMS (FD, m/z): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 212.13417\); found: 212.13459.
3-(1,3-dioxolan-2-yl)- N -isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)propan-1-amine (315)


Prepared from imine 271 ( \(178 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 1\) equiv) and 2-(2-iodoethyl)-1,3-dioxolane ( \(410 \mathrm{mg}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5\) equiv) following General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% Et 3 N ) afforded 315 (158.7 \(\mathrm{mg}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}, 53 \%)\) as a yellow oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.24\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{UV}\) ).
\({ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\) NMR ( \(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 8.56(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.9,1.8,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.65-7.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})\), \(7.25-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.97-3.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})\), \(3.86(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=12.1,4.6,0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81-3.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(h e p t, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.90\)
\(-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.73-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}\), \(\mathrm{J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13}\) C NMR (101 MHz, \(\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 164.05,149.61,136.25,122.41,121.94,104.58,65.01\), 64.98, 61.12, 45.97, 31.50, 30.76, 24.17, 22.44.

FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 2960, 2929, 1589, 1569, 1464, 1432, 1365, 1137, 1036, 747.

HRMS (ESI, \(\mathbf{m} / \mathbf{z}\) ): calc' \({ }^{\prime}\) for \(\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]\) : 251.1754; found: 251.1857.

\section*{4,4,4-trifluoro- N -isopropyl-1-(pyridin-2-yl)butan-1-amine (316)}


General Procedure 3.5. Purification of the crude residue by silica gel column chromatography (Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% Et \({ }_{3} \mathrm{~N}\) ) afforded \(\mathbf{3 1 6}(145 \mathrm{mg}, 0.59 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \%)\) as a yellow oil.
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=0.53\) (silica, Hex/EtOAc 3:2 w/ 1\% \(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\), UV).
\({ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\right): \delta 8.58(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,1.8,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.6,1.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.21(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.17(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,4.8,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.8\) \(\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54\) (hept, \(\mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.84\) \((\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})\).
\({ }^{13} \mathbf{C}\) NMR ( \(\mathbf{1 0 1} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): \(\delta 162.97,149.91,136.52,127.73(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=277.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.35\), 122.28, 59.88, 45.84, \(30.86(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=28.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 29.46(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 24.18,22.34\).
\({ }^{19}\) F NMR ( \(\mathbf{2 8 2} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathbf{C D C l}_{3}\) ): -66.2 ( \(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\) ).
FTIR (NaCl, thin film, \(\mathbf{c m}^{-1}\) ): 3309, 2996, 2964, 1590, 1571, 1471, 1452, 1434, 1382, 1337, 1289, 1251, 1134, 1091, 1023, 787, 749

HRMS (ESI, \(\mathbf{m} / \mathbf{z}\) ): calc'd for \(\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]\) : 247.1417; found: 247.1851

\subsection*{3.5.16 DFT Calculations of Substrate-Catalyst Complex}

General Computational Details: All density functional theory (DFT) calculations were carried out using the ORCA 4.2 software package. \({ }^{46}\) Geometry optimizations and numerical frequency calculations were carried out using the B3LYP hybrid functional. \({ }^{47}\) All atoms were described with the def2-TZVP basis set. \({ }^{\text {Error! Bookmark not defined. For all }}\) calculations, the resolution of identity (RI) approximation was used to calculate the coulomb integrals and the chain-of-spheres \({ }^{48}\) approximation was used for the exchange integrals (RIJCOSX). Weigend's coulomb fitting auxiliary basis set \({ }^{49}\) (Def2/J) was also employed for all calculations. Calculations were converged to tight SCF criteria ( \(\Delta \mathrm{E}<=\) \(1 * 10^{-8} \mathrm{Eh}\) ). All stationary points were confirmed as local minima by the absence of imaginary vibrational modes. Fine integration grids were used with the GRID7 and NOFINALGRID keywords. Broken symmetry calculations were performed using the method described by Ginsberg \({ }^{50}\) and Noodleman et al \({ }^{51}\). The broken symmetry notation \((m, n)^{52}\) is employed where the \(\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{n})\) is the number of spin up (or spin-down) electrons on each fragment. All graphical representations shown were rendered with the program CYLview \({ }^{53}\) and orbital/density surfaces with the program ChemCraft. \({ }^{54}\)

\section*{DFT Input Files and Coordinates}

\section*{Input File - (271)2Ni BS(0,0) (Low Spin)}
! UKS B3LYP def2-TZVP def2/J RIJCOSX Grid7 TightSCF NoFinalGrid LargePrint
! Opt NumFreq
\% pal nprocs 16 \# num of processors
end
\%maxcore 9000
\%method
Z_solver DIIS
end
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
*xyz 01 & & \\
C & -0.08651 & -3.70002 & 2.07639 \\
N & 0.69789 & -2.47950 & 1.83316 \\
C & 0.45604 & -1.41247 & 2.58729 \\
C & 1.15663 & -0.22934 & 2.24501 \\
N & 2.09886 & -0.42527 & 1.24915 \\
Ni & 2.04979 & -2.19969 & 0.50253 \\
N & 2.45194 & -1.83399 & -1.34168 \\
C & 3.13733 & -2.86225 & -1.96491 \\
C & 3.33308 & -3.98983 & -1.12655 \\
N & 2.93217 & -3.86804 & 0.13320 \\
C & 3.19296 & -4.96161 & 1.07941 \\
C & 3.57466 & -2.73898 & -3.30672 \\
C & 3.30958 & -1.58023 & -4.01101 \\
C & 2.59063 & -0.54055 & -3.36863 \\
C & 2.19485 & -0.71236 & -2.05385 \\
C & 2.81676 & 0.64458 & 0.83213 \\
C & 2.64151 & 1.92122 & 1.33545 \\
C & 1.66315 & 2.13562 & 2.34167 \\
C & 0.93376 & 1.05530 & 2.79805 \\
H & -0.27266 & -1.41630 & 3.40535 \\
H & 3.81281 & -4.89507 & -1.51148 \\
H & 4.12399 & -3.56650 & -3.76334 \\
H & 3.64903 & -1.46440 & -5.04343 \\
H & 2.32663 & 0.37753 & -3.89757 \\
H & 1.63104 & 0.06630 & -1.53457 \\
H & 3.57044 & 0.44479 & 0.06589 \\
H & 3.26672 & 2.73740 & 0.96648 \\
H & 1.48984 & 3.13524 & 2.74925 \\
H & 0.16921 & 1.17461 & 3.57027 \\
C & -0.03364 & -4.19572 & 3.53004
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
H & 1.00544 & -4.33915 & 3.86696 \\
H & -0.56364 & -5.15742 & 3.62494 \\
H & -0.51769 & -3.48699 & 4.22121 \\
C & -1.53722 & -3.50164 & 1.60390 \\
H & 0.36420 & -4.47372 & 1.43644 \\
H & -2.05826 & -2.75609 & 2.22660 \\
H & -2.10053 & -4.44694 & 1.66624 \\
H & -1.56038 & -3.14500 & 0.56234 \\
C & 4.60357 & -4.81493 & 1.67543 \\
H & 5.37225 & -5.00132 & 0.90649 \\
H & 4.75967 & -5.53717 & 2.49305 \\
H & 4.75317 & -3.80003 & 2.07403 \\
C & 2.97945 & -6.37338 & 0.51074 \\
H & 2.47651 & -4.81532 & 1.90217 \\
H & 3.74189 & -6.64022 & -0.23805 \\
H & 1.98994 & -6.47302 & 0.03599 \\
H & 3.05516 & -7.11503 & 1.32198 \\
* & & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Optimized coordinates - (271)2Ni (321) (Low Spin)}
\begin{tabular}{lllc}
C & -0.07139688048135 & -3.68994745690584 & 2.12487431847914 \\
N & 0.69457607470368 & -2.46847311460371 & 1.82154805145691 \\
C & 0.46230487368270 & -1.40579204444689 & 2.56862153431397 \\
C & 1.14434009100596 & -0.22144322634441 & 2.22294863299765 \\
N & 2.08908020452348 & -0.39907719496350 & 1.23289295160638 \\
N & 2.05405208904355 & -2.18531967202371 & 0.47923647332427 \\
N & 2.49643854225418 & -1.81468121815090 & -1.36865285410353 \\
C & 3.16446186466836 & -2.85339073012088 & -1.97920690295865 \\
C & 3.31760272384933 & -3.98920040401533 & -1.15196806361930 \\
N & 2.91187147934083 & -3.87930406652301 & 0.09674659500334 \\
C & 3.11663739078330 & -5.01105774748437 & 1.01483205871569 \\
C & 3.63666674260574 & -2.74228514674203 & -3.29998010570616 \\
C & 3.42987520482683 & -1.58194872471534 & -4.00569252858579 \\
C & 2.73521978741020 & -0.52733337208899 & -3.38020051761558 \\
C & 2.30198321662912 & -0.68703717184991 & -2.08427020650156 \\
C & 2.75926602868113 & 0.69616869616506 & 0.80989558621606 \\
C & 2.53408645796020 & 1.96185256089880 & 1.29845706195641 \\
C & 1.55641364281730 & 2.14840111450956 & 2.29977193544369 \\
C & 0.87764936094192 & 1.04924644715982 & 2.76459391405816 \\
H & -0.24436539587200 & -1.41220981699462 & 3.39183929255147 \\
H & 3.76267991173966 & -4.89465032843539 & -1.54733269752619 \\
H & 4.16585461087004 & -3.57878731768715 & -3.73981093627253 \\
H & 3.79354917566678 & -1.47697113063354 & -5.01976970038894
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllc} 
H & 2.51804955554337 & 0.39203256272523 & -3.90693723882010 \\
H & 1.75340643056829 & 0.10123739387726 & -1.58632148319338 \\
H & 3.51580560597679 & 0.52604040965820 & 0.05503786662332 \\
H & 3.11988717088641 & 2.79058844620730 & 0.92377829313703 \\
H & 1.34556487197089 & 3.13471108498792 & 2.69286025990739 \\
H & 0.11585794297099 & 1.14176537769507 & 3.52896357533661 \\
C & 0.11074053819156 & -4.19024906155441 & 3.56442148756822 \\
H & 1.16673948233884 & -4.32106394706288 & 3.80795291978854 \\
H & -0.39364895576934 & -5.15035231697145 & 3.69451235474330 \\
H & -0.31777214323576 & -3.49409255492280 & 4.28805617503585 \\
C & -1.55674571487992 & -3.48493452800464 & 1.79467332974312 \\
H & 0.31030707160697 & -4.45376368456651 & 1.44663185168743 \\
H & -2.01062574174205 & -2.74917438642245 & 2.46167437112740 \\
H & -2.10423254973763 & -4.42282511073171 & 1.91061235597269 \\
H & -1.67776764610482 & -3.13044557318379 & 0.76984802654670 \\
C & 4.47205228314121 & -4.86997104291255 & 1.72112741662872 \\
H & 5.29010903289212 & -5.05281554296529 & 1.01952885957022 \\
H & 4.55529007731697 & -5.59451606866376 & 2.53456036697896 \\
H & 4.58876080603594 & -3.86839722947529 & 2.13538087580025 \\
C & 2.97595111228601 & -6.40027658488880 & 0.38279121384763 \\
H & 2.34359858105154 & -4.91169080470743 & 1.77668397354347 \\
H & 3.79366684408679 & -6.62646057336273 & -0.30412720758781 \\
H & 2.03542278018867 & -6.50090537390851 & -0.16244896055192 \\
H & 3.00275536676520 & -7.15809982484962 & 1.16880542372144
\end{tabular}

Final Single point energy \(=-2427.4312451\) Eh

\section*{Input File - (271)2Ni BS(0,0) (321) (High Spin)}
! UKS B3LYP def2-TZVP def2/J RIJCOSX Grid7 TightSCF NoFinalGrid Slowconv ! Opt
\%scf
maxiter 1000
end
\%output
Print[P_basis] 2
Print[P_MOs] 1
Print[P_ReducedOrbPop_L] 1
Print[P_BondOrder_L] 1
```

Print[P_FragBondOrder_L] 1
Print[P_OrbPopMO_L] 1
Print[P_ReducedOrbPopMO_L] 1
end
% pal nprocs 16 \# num of processors
end

```
\%maxcore 9000
\%method
Z_solver DIIS
end
*xyz 05
C \(\quad-0.951965-2.779945 \quad 0.804853\)
\(\mathrm{N} \quad 0.259699 \quad-2.102834 \quad 1.291891\)
C \(\quad 0.163355-1.290541 \quad 2.329373\)
C \(\quad 1.350443-0.685445 \quad 2.793235\)
\(\mathrm{N} \quad 2.463620 \quad-0.955323 \quad 2.021895\)
\(\mathrm{Ni} \quad 2.053936\)-2.206995 \(\quad 0.539021\)
\(\mathrm{N} \quad 1.742323 \quad-2.523282 \quad-1.369608\)
C \(\quad 2.678467\)-3.365674 -1.930862
C \(\quad 3.726973-3.721126-1.055626\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & 3.657444 & -3.292665 & 0.193550\end{array}\)
C \(\quad 4.729961 \quad-3.669707 \quad 1.127692\)
C \(\quad 2.550432-3.801319 \quad-3.265637\)
C \(\quad 1.486983-3.378194 \quad-4.023452\)
C \(\quad 0.544277-2.500162 \quad-3.446775\)
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & 0.714281 & -2.114017 & -2.137559
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & 3.636564 & -0.413382 & 2.404333
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & 3.780399 & 0.382584 & 3.518903
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & 2.647019 & 0.657126 & 4.313447
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & 1.438701 & 0.124188 & 3.943490
\end{tabular}
H \(\quad-0.780918 \quad-1.086001 \quad 2.824841\)
H \(\quad 4.551035\)-4.324971 -1.419412
H \(\quad 3.297312\)-4.471572 -3.673059
H \(\quad 1.371032\)-3.710044 \begin{tabular}{llll}
-5.047326
\end{tabular}
H \(\quad-0.291167\)-2.118372 -4.016995
H \(\quad 0.018994 \quad-1.432443-1.667480\)
H \(\quad 4.484679-0.624744 \quad 1.764898\)
\begin{tabular}{llll}
H & 4.747774 & 0.798084 & 3.765959
\end{tabular}
H \(\quad 2.730258 \quad 1.277822 \quad 5.196037\)
H \(\quad 0.541774 \quad 0.312628 \quad 4.521249\)
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
C & -1.455537 & -3.820099 & 1.814489
\end{tabular}
H \(\quad-0.645229 \quad-4.482391 \quad 2.122697\)
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
H & -2.245541 & -4.426493 & 1.365088 \\
H & -1.863838 & -3.341612 & 2.707932 \\
C & -2.071478 & -1.810464 & 0.402491 \\
H & -0.643524 & -3.321370 & -0.090273 \\
H & -2.502866 & -1.304444 & 1.269126 \\
H & -2.876169 & -2.354760 & -0.097181 \\
H & -1.703037 & -1.044378 & -0.280688 \\
C & 6.144799 & -3.487931 & 0.559935 \\
H & 6.361578 & -4.207074 & -0.232116 \\
H & 6.881618 & -3.649528 & 1.350048 \\
H & 6.285166 & -2.484870 & 0.151832 \\
C & 4.534816 & -5.105218 & 1.637839 \\
H & 4.625304 & -3.001741 & 1.984372 \\
H & 4.717330 & -5.829427 & 0.840031 \\
H & 3.520480 & -5.251628 & 2.011436 \\
H & 5.234461 & -5.317148 & 2.449504
\end{tabular}

\section*{Optimized coordinates - (271)2Ni (321) (High Spin)}
\begin{tabular}{lllc}
C & -0.67546185593229 & -3.01194225132354 & 0.92708152761451 \\
N & 0.42185027785309 & -2.14512275088691 & 1.35709043685846 \\
C & 0.27564528000301 & -1.31235792858595 & 2.38383064783419 \\
C & 1.37589458224275 & -0.53820945874821 & 2.80674309984266 \\
N & 2.55366162706074 & -0.72430748576660 & 2.09817672072619 \\
Ni & 2.20468422617664 & -1.90443895458006 & 0.47692934150778 \\
N & 1.77952259766498 & -2.29063061590460 & -1.46521155960331 \\
C & 2.55888972003137 & -3.32553819770884 & -1.94712921159489 \\
C & 3.48133275460832 & -3.86633290826890 & -1.02959788003236 \\
N & 3.54603526470520 & -3.37824541431330 & 0.21011174374495 \\
C & 4.54799023363377 & -3.91417448488668 & 1.13750299156853 \\
C & 2.40078613021566 & -3.75701305275399 & -3.28640821131654 \\
C & 1.47988829073571 & -3.14798893768625 & -4.09894613837900 \\
C & 0.70545783110605 & -2.07659559763725 & -3.59339277021777 \\
C & 0.89995869127111 & -1.69731482795463 & -2.28356029587924 \\
C & 3.64682896609949 & -0.03975167619023 & 2.47042703095854 \\
C & 3.67040603206030 & 0.84501486773517 & 3.52626249042815 \\
C & 2.47001490049755 & 1.06401314045836 & 4.24394358441745 \\
C & 1.33796771803904 & 0.38380815391404 & 3.88069174346983 \\
H & -0.67015343136389 & -1.21172307967440 & 2.90927433326902 \\
H & 4.14020678172387 & -4.66434306401669 & -1.35901269956403 \\
H & 3.01434682121694 & -4.57186533811043 & -3.65097000188068 \\
H & 1.34312538238766 & -3.48308378167296 & -5.11962790927482 \\
H & -0.02429527181179 & -1.56689936367529 & -4.20587410603150 \\
H & 0.32460334196373 & -0.88574080162952 & -1.85233421673640
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
H & 4.54182071776966 & -0.22705303128079 & 1.88674700027297 \\
H & 4.58570328144591 & 1.35471913858034 & 3.79146892748243 \\
H & 2.44695341891206 & 1.76388857215933 & 5.06956499811675 \\
H & 0.40280869534655 & 0.53895332715564 & 4.40535018097080 \\
C & -1.12386070295983 & -3.98233590569120 & 2.02889670659211 \\
H & -0.26918651137828 & -4.51420948783956 & 2.45026931425936 \\
H & -1.81982242832530 & -4.71758085398521 & 1.61803551282206 \\
H & -1.63264918222916 & -3.45852403537860 & 2.84184804464185 \\
C & -1.86926459359883 & -2.22494633961223 & 0.36735387872994 \\
H & -0.26656389676660 & -3.61097962558761 & 0.11018584818412 \\
H & -2.35533346271860 & -1.63177861865786 & 1.14602425214132 \\
H & -2.61364803209557 & -2.90751673609144 & -0.04911651188103 \\
H & -1.55088880888699 & -1.54730414961070 & -0.42498168358554 \\
C & 5.98047210835223 & -3.76814126952864 & 0.60074281549449 \\
H & 6.14772409012766 & -4.40647269955022 & -0.26939446276233 \\
H & 6.70291629159882 & -4.06158047195875 & 1.36583302140057 \\
H & 6.18667568751465 & -2.73789488205202 & 0.30389133657664 \\
C & 4.26691101614032 & -5.37147314218721 & 1.53487640008259 \\
H & 4.46763781644977 & -3.30527628775653 & 2.04108670449169 \\
H & 4.40728607395273 & -6.04573261803369 & 0.68651383314665 \\
H & 3.24560313840414 & -5.48761539513916 & 1.90098397237021 \\
H & 4.95153639075551 & -5.68726367808600 & 2.32525721872257
\end{tabular}

Final Single point energy \(=-2427.425281762070\) Eh

\section*{Input File - (271)2Ni (321) BS(2,2)}
! UKS B3LYP def2-TZVP def2/J RIJCOSX Grid7 TightSCF NoFinalGrid Slowconv ! Opt NumFreq
\%scf
maxiter 500
brokensym 2,2
end
\%output
Print[P_basis] 2
Print[P_MOs] 1
Print[P_ReducedOrbPop_L] 1
Print[P_BondOrder_L] 1
Print[P_FragBondOrder_L] 1
Print[P_OrbPopMO_L] 1
Print[P_ReducedOrbPopMO_L] 1
end
\% pal nprocs 16 \# num of processors
end
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\%maxcore 9000} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\%method} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Z_solver DIIS} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{end} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{*xyz 01} \\
\hline C (2) -0.67546185593229 & -3.01194225132354 & 0.92708152761451 \\
\hline N (2) 0.42185027785309 & -2.14512275088691 & 1.35709043685846 \\
\hline C (2) 0.27564528000301 & -1.31235792858595 & 2.38383064783419 \\
\hline C (2) 1.37589458224275 & -0.53820945874821 & 2.80674309984266 \\
\hline N (2) 2.55366162706074 & -0.72430748576660 & 2.09817672072619 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Ni}(1) 2.20468422617664\) & -1.90443895458006 & 0.47692934150778 \\
\hline N (2) 1.77952259766498 & -2.29063061590460 & -1.46521155960331 \\
\hline C (2) 2.55888972003137 & -3.32553819770884 & -1.94712921159489 \\
\hline C (2) 3.48133275460832 & -3.86633290826890 & -1.02959788003236 \\
\hline N (2) 3.54603526470520 & -3.37824541431330 & 0.21011174374495 \\
\hline C (2) 4.54799023363377 & -3.91417448488668 & 1.13750299156853 \\
\hline C (2) 2.40078613021566 & -3.75701305275399 & -3.28640821131654 \\
\hline C (2) 1.47988829073571 & -3.14798893768625 & -4.09894613837900 \\
\hline C (2) 0.70545783110605 & -2.07659559763725 & -3.59339277021777 \\
\hline C (2) 0.89995869127111 & -1.69731482795463 & -2.28356029587924 \\
\hline C (2) 3.64682896609949 & -0.03975167619023 & 2.47042703095854 \\
\hline C (2) 3.67040603206030 & 0.84501486773517 & 3.52626249042815 \\
\hline C (2) 2.47001490049755 & 1.06401314045836 & 4.24394358441745 \\
\hline C (2) 1.33796771803904 & 0.38380815391404 & 3.88069174346983 \\
\hline H (2) -0.67015343136389 & -1.21172307967440 & 2.90927433326902 \\
\hline H (2) 4.14020678172387 & -4.66434306401669 & -1.35901269956403 \\
\hline H (2) 3.01434682121694 & -4.57186533811043 & -3.65097000188068 \\
\hline H (2) 1.34312538238766 & -3.48308378167296 & -5.11962790927482 \\
\hline H (2) -0.02429527181179 & -1.56689936367529 & -4.20587410603150 \\
\hline H (2) 0.32460334196373 & -0.88574080162952 & -1.85233421673640 \\
\hline H (2) 4.54182071776966 & -0.22705303128079 & 1.88674700027297 \\
\hline H (2) 4.58570328144591 & 1.35471913858034 & 3.79146892748243 \\
\hline H (2) 2.44695341891206 & 1.76388857215933 & 5.06956499811675 \\
\hline H (2) 0.40280869534655 & 0.53895332715564 & 4.40535018097080 \\
\hline C (2) -1.12386070295983 & -3.98233590569120 & 2.02889670659211 \\
\hline H (2) -0.26918651137828 & -4.51420948783956 & 2.45026931425936 \\
\hline H (2) -1.81982242832530 & -4.71758085398521 & 1.61803551282206 \\
\hline H (2) -1.63264918222916 & -3.45852403537860 & 2.84184804464185 \\
\hline C (2) -1.86926459359883 & -2.22494633961223 & 0.36735387872994 \\
\hline H (2) -0.26656389676660 & -3.61097962558761 & 0.11018584818412 \\
\hline H (2) -2.35533346271860 & -1.63177861865786 & 1.14602425214132 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llc} 
H (2) -2.61364803209557 & -2.90751673609144 & -0.04911651188103 \\
H (2) -1.55088880888699 & -1.54730414961070 & -0.42498168358554 \\
C (2) 5.98047210835223 & -3.76814126952864 & 0.60074281549449 \\
H (2) 6.14772409012766 & -4.40647269955022 & -0.26939446276233 \\
H (2) 6.70291629159882 & -4.06158047195875 & 1.36583302140057 \\
H (2) 6.18667568751465 & -2.73789488205202 & 0.30389133657664 \\
C (2) 4.26691101614032 & -5.37147314218721 & 1.53487640008259 \\
H (2) 4.46763781644977 & -3.30527628775653 & 2.04108670449169 \\
H (2) 4.40728607395273 & -6.04573261803369 & 0.68651383314665 \\
H (2) 3.24560313840414 & -5.48761539513916 & 1.90098397237021 \\
H (2) 4.95153639075551 & -5.68726367808600 & 2.32525721872257
\end{tabular}

\section*{*Optimized coordinates - (271)2Ni BS(2,2)}
\begin{tabular}{lllc}
C & -0.82966725295907 & -2.97306713556467 & 0.98391231232957 \\
N & 0.31564234965178 & -2.15527474656864 & 1.40782141871046 \\
C & 0.18661233428015 & -1.33365819506513 & 2.42525572669296 \\
C & 1.32336723113946 & -0.57496948947910 & 2.81296607198333 \\
N & 2.45429284502804 & -0.80784045035236 & 2.06392406346494 \\
Ni & 2.11753418788747 & -2.18194211647260 & 0.59157108406639 \\
N & 1.80730737748709 & -2.38982914395920 & -1.40140706855030 \\
C & 2.66651854234869 & -3.30142609460453 & -1.96359592895860 \\
C & 3.63871133700863 & -3.82578467504436 & -1.07114459864131 \\
N & 3.63406068386660 & -3.40203483160523 & 0.17808972585921 \\
C & 4.65664348682686 & -3.93044270469426 & 1.09807499949608 \\
C & 2.56123406887550 & -3.65040384601567 & -3.32424709364504 \\
C & 1.59405290476536 & -3.06390578955357 & -4.10564791322658 \\
C & 0.73247912049560 & -2.11135073207650 & -3.52593502716818 \\
C & 0.88201265069838 & -1.81674660505081 & -2.18780151942203 \\
C & 3.56414020275364 & -0.11371601738159 & 2.37404419350835 \\
C & 3.62863002751118 & 0.80548319982150 & 3.40042012551173 \\
C & 2.47421252842772 & 1.04528959947848 & 4.17137853294205 \\
C & 1.32541467023087 & 0.35382753235277 & 3.87111665751198 \\
H & -0.74588001742733 & -1.21556780975476 & 2.97154102682376 \\
H & 4.36121280100347 & -4.54818633399696 & -1.43956806609851 \\
H & 3.24853369356283 & -4.37906660171230 & -3.73659968489463 \\
H & 1.49340461786156 & -3.32930051696091 & -5.15051795826389 \\
H & -0.03220987487715 & -1.61562434895246 & -4.10767980364031 \\
H & 0.23844146902882 & -1.09163645342390 & -1.70488962134146 \\
H & 4.43422482929762 & -0.32033657840444 & 1.76167551809855 \\
H & 4.55448653054053 & 1.32556247694397 & 3.60510426880362 \\
H & 2.49152854072316 & 1.76261765538979 & 4.98170850251515 \\
H & 0.41282833897479 & 0.5153339994681 & 4.43254171105362 \\
C & -1.29663195204607 & -3.94015376684175 & 2.07947861570671 \\
H & -0.45555934592671 & -4.50803479167501 & 2.48105002423090 \\
H & -2.02357114475044 & -4.64470896680287 & 1.66867936084098
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllc} 
H & -1.77506831063915 & -3.40942228204270 & 2.90613888016039 \\
C & -1.99346728089541 & -2.12185590998760 & 0.46081942566359 \\
H & -0.46036283971450 & -3.57423842264255 & 0.15078687748887 \\
H & -2.46073753745544 & -1.54583541991035 & 1.26324088180872 \\
H & -2.75926448757613 & -2.76183013597538 & 0.01663442695652 \\
H & -1.65056205108871 & -1.42191592936799 & -0.30126124978734 \\
C & 6.08382252180126 & -3.78607083923497 & 0.55105479119808 \\
H & 6.26233964219568 & -4.45088125340704 & -0.29636774561966 \\
H & 6.80716089441652 & -4.04808921722188 & 1.32656496589356 \\
H & 6.27933532732471 & -2.76314241839612 & 0.22368482975174 \\
C & 4.37677434030353 & -5.38454233057516 & 1.50308869809208 \\
H & 4.58176804085155 & -3.31690715271850 & 1.99841875882622 \\
H & 4.51608674562748 & -6.06140174982159 & 0.65663405032687 \\
H & 3.35657157902320 & -5.49943129834275 & 1.87275900108364 \\
H & 5.06361363353594 & -5.69444336179592 & 2.29392175185709
\end{tabular}

Final Single point energy \(=-2427.44810734845\) Eh

\section*{Input File - (271)2Ni \({ }^{\text {I }}\) cation 324}
! UKS B3LYP def2-TZVP def2/J RIJCOSX Grid7 TightSCF NoFinalGrid ! Opt NumFreq
\%scf
maxiter 5000
end
\% pal nprocs 16 \# num of processors
end
\%maxcore 9000
\%method
Z_solver DIIS
end
*xyz 12
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
Ni & 0.51596 & 2.09723 & -0.02143 \\
N & 1.81002 & 1.51809 & 1.33417 \\
C & 2.35675 & 2.17322 & 2.41468 \\
C & 3.32582 & 1.54135 & 3.24432 \\
C & 3.72963 & 0.22863 & 2.98842 \\
C & 3.21863 & -0.41494 & 1.87415
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
C & 2.31312 & 0.27836 & 1.04395 \\
C & 1.94083 & -0.21588 & -0.09597 \\
N & 1.18628 & 0.67240 & -0.89632 \\
C & 0.38934 & 0.16841 & -1.99026 \\
N & -0.16644 & 3.48433 & 0.94890 \\
C & -0.65038 & 3.32205 & 2.30746 \\
C & -0.74338 & 4.51006 & 0.15069 \\
C & -0.44499 & 4.48045 & -1.09272 \\
N & 0.30543 & 3.41515 & -1.45021 \\
C & 0.81731 & 3.41399 & -2.71424 \\
C & 0.48725 & 4.41011 & -3.65458 \\
C & -0.38946 & 5.43407 & -3.30178 \\
C & -0.85928 & 5.48487 & -1.99617 \\
H & 2.10844 & 3.19485 & 2.62629 \\
H & 3.77585 & 2.05881 & 4.08381 \\
H & 4.46582 & -0.27545 & 3.61731 \\
H & 3.57251 & -1.41803 & 1.63193 \\
H & 0.91009 & 4.37908 & -4.65095 \\
H & -0.66834 & 6.19923 & -4.02091 \\
H & -1.50924 & 6.30673 & -1.69242 \\
H & 1.50976 & 2.68711 & -2.99876 \\
H & -1.38555 & 5.28894 & 0.52767 \\
H & 2.24614 & -1.20527 & -0.42055 \\
C & -0.50344 & 4.64554 & 2.99402 \\
H & 0.55043 & 4.91314 & 2.78345 \\
H & -0.69834 & 4.60717 & 4.07343 \\
H & -1.21392 & 5.37289 & 2.56605 \\
C & -2.11500 & 2.87816 & 2.13570 \\
H & -0.18599 & 2.54663 & 2.95985 \\
H & -2.63824 & 3.42984 & 1.31716 \\
H & -2.70846 & 3.05330 & 3.04734 \\
H & -2.09435 & 1.80994 & 1.81735 \\
C & -0.34142 & -1.12207 & -1.60208 \\
H & 0.38288 & -1.90666 & -1.30508 \\
H & -0.88086 & -1.52782 & -2.48417 \\
H & -1.03995 & -0.91156 & -0.76664 \\
C & 1.27951 & -0.13300 & -3.12592 \\
H & -0.39797 & 0.90573 & -2.27466 \\
H & 2.03737 & -0.85363 & -2.76667 \\
H & 1.77314 & 0.78459 & -3.40276 \\
H & 0.66321 & -0.51383 & -3.95883 \\
* & & & \\
& & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Optimized coordinates - (271)2 \(\mathbf{N i}^{\text {i }}\) cation 274}

Ni 0.86668948178079
N 2.19137284337807
C 2.73636546055795
C 3.70981418252361
C 4.14110400547722
C 3.59418559913333
C 2.63206477682334
C 2.02287804079151
N 1.16464547689342
C 0.44534573642135
N - 0.34710864531494
C -0.81863848907384
C -0.77156901744477
C -0.29453440050272
N 0.54509764315184
C 1.07737241822241
C 0.79561596144076
C -0.08209378272296
C -0.63154644312627
H 2.38092178248726
H 4.11996351047010
H 4.89436037435653
H 3.90802086243901
H 1.26172165641352
H -0.32695624593520
H - 1.31266810036221
H 1.76028207075683
H -1.46265590081787
H 2.29123696370020
C - 1.59775625724950
H -1.03237729909225
H -1.80238209158107
H -2.56984009927747
C -1.61599590885385
H 0.10109967383892
H -2.55357768718930
H -1.86464865340668
H -1.03626526994738
C -1.04971244662453
H - 1.22734897611980
H -1.62661523941233
H -1.41911531029175
C 0.97711686293287
H 0.56370383748324
\(2.34373126908244-0.05349092107067\)
\(1.66568639702621 \quad 1.25013265054364\)
\(2.28845641823813 \quad 2.31284464235365\)
\(1.69773435388661 \quad 3.11749493212786\)
\(0.40050451215240 \quad 2.82417205572819\)
\(-0.25193996855542 \quad 1.72045203604887\)
\(0.40489374023037 \quad 0.94691274963695\)
\(-0.15826991062898-0.24321813339487\)
\(0.58344628819015 \quad-0.87713438438844\)
\(0.07829861155353-2.06798486041708\)
3.549822241502990 .91648319139516
\(3.33436847276040 \quad 2.30267671266730\)
4.553172757434650 .20827184668137
\(4.64722568698935-1.15872117188268\)
\(3.62827973444604-1.52263035764586\)
\(3.65738327343779-2.75958614819228\)
\(4.66630212769202-3.67977989965004\)
\(5.69277984011979-3.31808996661902\)
\(5.68177039813570 \quad-2.03708517801509\)
\(3.30012744195258 \quad 2.51337458727689\)
\(2.25292018284593 \quad 3.96051766864292\)
\(-0.08901222539984 \quad 3.44129931407601\)
-1.26031327171365 1.44807310081955
\(4.64164633662294-4.66429719523258\)
\(6.48949490496955-4.02033994762582\)
\(6.46749026369357-1.70810377509851\)
\(2.84435534872303-3.00987365934374\)
\(5.30749391544666 \quad 0.59539527448741\)
\(-1.16863531605443-0.56504844719297\)
\(4.49488118365771 \quad 2.92071254262963\)
\(5.43736899512491 \quad 2.89109457639443\)
\(4.26522569150410 \quad 3.97477770736791\)
\(4.64871576059044 \quad 2.42901203183016\)
\(2.02187428869902 \quad 2.34264378489570\)
\(3.18031017374853 \quad 2.89233398380984\)
\(2.12318831011814 \quad 1.77727536048871\)
1.765847334295593 .38123641876040
\(1.19545976522246 \quad 1.90974124195912\)
\(-0.01154535184039-1.72582957612469\)
\(-0.79864017700929-0.97893119511815\)
\(-0.25449936899212-2.62815940684242\)
\(0.94087900573238-1.32224721834388\)
\(-1.23001016700869-2.65214290136927\)
\(0.87104699392680 \quad-2.82610713623952\)
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
H & 0.81218759623364 & -2.08207531289966 & -1.97600226461422 \\
H & 2.04800665374394 & -1.17200576049644 & -2.89434691053008 \\
H & 0.43875279289497 & -1.44892518915429 & -3.58375775566983
\end{tabular}

Final Single Point Energy \(=-2427.283556656272\)

\section*{EPR g-tensor values}
\[
\mathrm{g}(\text { tot })=2.04989142 .11148452 .2104202 \text { iso }=2.1239320
\]

\section*{Input File - (271)2 \(\mathbf{N i}^{\mathbf{l}} \mathbf{C l}\) - Structure 323-Cl (not shown in text)}
```

! UKS B3LYP def2-SVP def2/J RIJCOSX Grid7 TightSCF NoFinalGrid
! Opt NumFreq
% pal nprocs 16 \# num of processors
end
%maxcore 9000
%method
Z_solver DIIS
end

* xyz 0 2

| 28 | 1.820504000 | 2.710304000 | -0.462278000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 1.422289000 | 1.090697000 | 0.764874000 |
| 6 | 0.401372000 | 0.921321000 | 1.621705000 |
| 6 | 0.058226000 | -0.297284000 | 2.189291000 |
| 6 | 0.821599000 | -1.436538000 | 1.831022000 |
| 6 | 1.869925000 | -1.289572000 | 0.943384000 |
| 6 | 2.175578000 | -0.010785000 | 0.400603000 |
| 6 | 3.241551000 | 0.241976000 | -0.535267000 |
| 7 | 3.314755000 | 1.482274000 | -1.009712000 |
| 6 | 4.399285000 | 1.933652000 | -1.871706000 |
| 7 | 0.466660000 | 4.144535000 | 0.430781000 |
| 6 | 0.969791000 | 5.074446000 | 1.436590000 |
| 6 | -0.587175594 | 4.338434098 | -0.251245236 |
| 6 | -0.871256000 | 3.368339000 | -1.353266000 |
| 7 | 0.128340000 | 2.503397000 | -1.621594000 |
| 6 | 0.003177000 | 1.612616000 | -2.606858000 |
| 6 | -1.145336000 | 1.530870000 | -3.398371000 |

```
\begin{tabular}{lcrc}
6 & -2.189476000 & 2.420140000 & -3.141325000 \\
6 & -2.051919000 & 3.353557000 & -2.110629000 \\
1 & -0.169211000 & 1.822996000 & 1.867731000 \\
1 & -0.775611000 & -0.366476000 & 2.890336000 \\
1 & 0.578813000 & -2.417735000 & 2.248399000 \\
1 & 2.465272000 & -2.155223000 & 0.648204000 \\
1 & -1.209968000 & 0.792107000 & -4.199662000 \\
1 & -3.104976000 & 2.389510000 & -3.737219000 \\
1 & -2.856508000 & 4.058659000 & -1.900939000 \\
1 & 0.858411000 & 0.949393000 & -2.766945000 \\
6 & 0.684235000 & 4.619732000 & 2.868991000 \\
1 & -0.395971000 & 4.617329000 & 3.091718000 \\
1 & 1.171787000 & 5.307345000 & 3.577609000 \\
1 & 1.079913000 & 3.609316000 & 3.054810000 \\
6 & 5.538328000 & 2.563691000 & -1.062708000 \\
1 & 6.004233000 & 1.836413000 & -0.376084000 \\
1 & 6.319969000 & 2.956801000 & -1.734309000 \\
1 & 5.134877000 & 3.404343000 & -0.479095000 \\
1 & 0.580898000 & 6.094449000 & 1.281388000 \\
1 & 2.053707000 & 5.129474000 & 1.255847000 \\
1 & 4.789275000 & 1.122418000 & -2.513043000 \\
1 & 3.985874000 & 2.712384000 & -2.528071000 \\
17 & 2.720062000 & 4.694190000 & -1.397898000 \\
1 & -1.163679128 & 5.232292730 & -0.003459350 \\
1 & 3.872757602 & -0.666009171 & -0.718639988 \\
\(*\) & & &
\end{tabular}

Optimized coordinates - (271)2 \(\mathbf{N i}^{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{C l} 324-\mathrm{Cl}\)
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
Ni & 1.773684 & 2.748519 & -0.441386 \\
N & 1.337728 & 1.115032 & 0.794175 \\
C & 0.313973 & 0.926189 & 1.644589 \\
C & -0.017682 & -0.304618 & 2.192577 \\
C & 0.752012 & -1.436281 & 1.819386 \\
C & 1.802422 & -1.269308 & 0.937534 \\
C & 2.098978 & 0.021781 & 0.428770 \\
C & 3.166806 & 0.304448 & -0.476342 \\
N & 3.287567 & 1.533500 & -0.941481 \\
C & 4.443347 & 1.888833 & -1.750263 \\
N & 0.375015 & 4.147715 & 0.439693 \\
C & 0.758428 & 5.139418 & 1.431384 \\
C & -0.676130 & 4.285697 & -0.270952 \\
C & -0.911218 & 3.352378 & -1.388620 \\
N & 0.100366 & 2.495808 & -1.647986 \\
C & -0.012489 & 1.622576 & -2.650317 \\
C & -1.152679 & 1.555742 & -3.457084 \\
C & -2.202748 & 2.443014 & -3.206670
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
C & -2.080135 & 3.360202 & -2.159500 \\
H & -0.264999 & 1.819488 & 1.902259 \\
H & -0.850959 & -0.390422 & 2.892710 \\
H & 0.510469 & -2.423155 & 2.223599 \\
H & 2.415849 & -2.115864 & 0.616208 \\
H & -1.206201 & 0.826591 & -4.268152 \\
H & -3.106373 & 2.419559 & -3.820645 \\
H & -2.876379 & 4.073949 & -1.934926 \\
H & 0.842679 & 0.959411 & -2.812783 \\
C & 1.211784 & 4.512194 & 2.748120 \\
H & 0.386885 & 3.996644 & 3.265927 \\
H & 1.602040 & 5.292785 & 3.419879 \\
H & 2.016377 & 3.781942 & 2.571738 \\
C & 5.518788 & 2.581909 & -0.908155 \\
H & 5.898840 & 1.914360 & -0.116697 \\
H & 6.368541 & 2.889934 & -1.540079 \\
H & 5.085824 & 3.481742 & -0.446254 \\
H & -0.054651 & 5.873087 & 1.594287 \\
H & 1.607365 & 5.669665 & 0.963652 \\
H & 4.865271 & 0.990035 & -2.244192 \\
H & 4.109586 & 2.591413 & -2.528759 \\
Cl & 2.691700 & 4.703564 & -1.375914 \\
H & -1.394397 & 5.109548 & -0.117481 \\
H & 3.875094 & -0.489246 & -0.758889
\end{tabular}

\section*{EPR g-tensor values}
\[
\mathrm{g}(\text { tot })=2.18996382 .23666712 .2529868 \text { iso }=2.2262059
\]

\section*{Calculated Geometries of 321 and 324}

Figure 3.36. BS \((0,0)\) low spin optimized geometry of 321.


Figure 3.37. BS(0,0) high spin optimized geometry of 321.


Figure 3.38. \(B S(2,2)\) optimized geometry of \(\mathbf{3 2 1}\).


Figure 3.39. Optimized geometry of cationic 324.


\subsection*{3.5.17 Qualitative MO Diagram of 321 BS(2,2)}

Figure 3.40. Qualitative MO diagram of \(B S(2,2) 321\) with spatial overlap values for S<0.999. Assignments of M (metal-based) or L (ligand-based) are made based on Ni d character or the corresponding orbital.


\subsection*{3.5.18 X-Ray Crystallography}

General Details: Low-temperature diffraction data ( \(\varphi\) - and \(\omega\)-scans) were collected on a Bruker AXS D8 VENTURE KAPPA diffractometer coupled to a PHOTON II CPAD detector with \(\mathrm{Cu} K_{\alpha}\) radiation ( \(\lambda=1.54178 \AA\) ) from a \(\mathrm{I} \mu \mathrm{S}\) HB micro-focus sealed X-ray tube. All diffractometer manipulations, including data collection, integration, and scaling were carried out using the Bruker APEXII software. \({ }^{55}\) Absorption corrections were applied using SADABS. The structure was solved by intrinsic phasing using SHELXT \({ }^{56}\) and refined against F2 on all data by full-matrix least squares with SHELXL-2017 \({ }^{57}\) using established refinement techniques. \({ }^{58}\) All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically. Unless otherwise noted, all hydrogen atoms were included into the model at geometrically calculated positions and refined using a riding model. The isotropic displacement parameters of all hydrogen atoms were fixed to 1.2 times the U value of the atoms they are linked to (1.5 times for methyl groups). Crystallographic data for 311, 322, and \(\mathbf{3 2 3}\) can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre (CCDC) via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif under CCDC deposition numbers CCDC 2079525. Graphical representation of the structures with \(50 \%\) probability thermal ellipsoids was generated using Mercury visualization software. \({ }^{59}\)

Table 3.7. Crystal and Refinement data for 311.



Table 3.8. Crystal and Refinement data for 322.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline CCDC Number & 2117478 \\
\hline Formula & \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{Ni}\) \\
\hline Formula Weight & 426.02 \\
\hline Crystal System & monoclinic \\
\hline Space Group & \(\mathrm{P} 21 / \mathrm{c}\) \\
\hline a, \(\AA\) & 14.142(5) \\
\hline b, \(\AA\) & 25.845(7) \\
\hline c, \(\AA\) A & 11.136(4) \\
\hline \(\alpha,{ }^{\circ}\) & 90 \\
\hline \(\beta\), \({ }^{\circ}\) & 91.374(17) \\
\hline \(\gamma,{ }^{\circ}\) & 90 \\
\hline Volume, \(\AA\) & 4069(2) \\
\hline T (K) & 100 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{d}_{\text {calc, }} \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}\) & 1.391 \\
\hline Z & 8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{1},{ }^{\mathrm{a}}\) w \(\mathrm{R}_{2},{ }^{\mathrm{b}}[\mathrm{I}>2 \sigma(\mathrm{I})]\) & 0.0549, 0.1487 \\
\hline GOF & 1.033 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Table 3.9. Crystal and Refinement data for 323.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline CCDC Number & 2117477 \\
\hline Formula & \(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{Mn}\) \\
\hline Formula Weight & 422.261 \\
\hline Crystal System & Orthorhombic \\
\hline Space Group & \(\mathrm{P} 212{ }_{1}{ }_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{a}, \AA\) & 11.185(6) \\
\hline b, \(\AA\) & 13.024(7) \\
\hline c, \(\AA\) A & 13.725(11) \\
\hline \(\alpha,{ }^{\circ}\) & 90 \\
\hline \(\beta\), \({ }^{\circ}\) & 90 \\
\hline \(\gamma,{ }^{\circ}\) & 90 \\
\hline Volume, Å & 1999(2) \\
\hline T (K) & 100 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{d}_{\text {calc }}, \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}\) & 1.403 \\
\hline Z & 4 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{1},{ }^{\mathrm{a}} w \mathrm{R}_{2},{ }^{\text {b }}\) [ \(\left.\mathrm{I}>2 \sigma(\mathrm{I})\right]\) & 0.0486, 0.0819 \\
\hline GOF & 1.010 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\subsection*{3.5.19 Elemental Analysis of Commercial Mn \({ }^{0}\)}

Samples were measured on an Agilent 8800 ICP-MS instrument. ICP-MS was used to quantify trace Ni impurities in the commercial \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) metal powder sample that was used throughout this publication. Three samples were prepared where sample \(A\) is the commercial metal, sample B is a procedural digestion blank to establish a background response, and sample C which is the commercial sample that was spiked with a transition metal analytical standard containing 500 ppb Ni. Sample data was quantified against a calibration curve (Figure S34) and amount of trace Ni in sample A was corrected for matrix/digestion effects determined by samples B and C.

Figure 3.41. Ni calibration curve of measured counts/s against concentration in ppb.


Sample preparation: To a 50 mL PTFE digestion tube was added \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) metal powder ( 108.2 mg ) followed by 2 mL of conc. \(\mathrm{HNO}_{3}\) (sample A). To the procedural blank tube (sample B ) was also added 2 mL of conc. \(\mathrm{HNO}_{3}\), then all samples were refluxed under a watch glass for 2 h at \(80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\). The homogenous solutions were then diluted to 50 mL with conc. \(\mathrm{HNO}_{3}\). These solutions were then diluted again by diluting 1 mL to 50 mL in conc.
\(\mathrm{HNO}_{3}\) to make the instrument ready samples. Another Mn-containing sample (sample C) was prepared the same as sample A except 1 mL of a transition metal standard containing 500 ppb Ni was added. The standard adds a net 10 ppb Ni to the sample C over the unspiked sample A in the instrument ready samples.

Table 3.10. Average concentration of Ni measured in each sample with relative standard deviation (RSD).
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{ Sample Name } & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Avg Conc. \\
\((\mathrm{ppb})\)
\end{tabular}}
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c}
\multicolumn{1}{c|}{\begin{tabular}{c} 
Conc. RSD \\
\((\%)\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Sample A
\end{tabular}\(\quad 2.3 \quad 18.6\)

\section*{Calculation of Trace Ni in Mn sample:}
\[
\frac{[N i]_{C}-[N i]_{A}}{[N i]_{S t d}} \times 100 \%=\frac{9.6 p p b-2.3 p p b}{10 p p b} \times 100 \%=73 \%
\]

From the digestion recovery and procedural blank (sample B) the measured concentration of Ni can be corrected by taking the difference of the concentration in sample A ( 2.3 ppb ) and the background from sample B ( 0.6 ppb ) giving 1.7 ppb Ni . This value is then further corrected by dividing by the recovery, \(73 \%\) (equation above) to give a final corrected concentration of 2.3 ppb Ni . A 2.3 ppb concentration from the 108.2 mg sample corresponds to a final concentration of \(\mathbf{5 4 . 1} \mathbf{~ p p m}\). This corresponds to \(54.1 \mu \mathrm{~g}\) of total Ni per gram of Mn metal added. As a consequence, each reaction on a 0.3 mmol scale described by general procedure 3.4 has \(\sim 900 \mathrm{ng}\) of nickel species ( \(0.005 \mathrm{~mol} \%\) ) added through the addition of our \(\mathrm{Mn}^{0}\) reductant.
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\section*{Appendix 1}

Spectra Relevant to Chapter 3:
Nickel-Catalyzed Reductive Alkylation of Heteroaryl Imines
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