## Chapter 4

Application of Highly Active Chiral Ruthenium Catalysts to Asymmetric Cross and
Ring-Opening Cross Metathesis

In this chapter is described the use of highly active chiral ruthenium catalysts for asymmetric ring-opening cross metathesis (AROCM) and the first example of an asymmetric cross metathesis (ACM) reaction. Chiral molybdenum catalysts have been developed for asymmetric ring-closing metathesis (ARCM) and AROCM. ${ }^{1,2,3}$ These catalysts lack extensive functional group tolerance and require rigorous exclusion of air and moisture. The greater functional group tolerance and stability of enantioselective ruthenium metathesis catalysts will dramatically expand the scope and utility of these transformations as has been the case in other areas of olefin metathesis. Described in Chapter 2 was the preparation of a series of highly active chiral ruthenium catalysts (Figure 4.1, Catalysts 2a,b-6a,b). As described in Chapter 3, catalysts 2a,b-3a,b and 5a,b-6a,b, bearing monodentate chiral NHCs, proved to be much more active and selective for ARCM than catalyst 7 that possesses a bidentate chiral NHC and is stereogenic directly at the metal center. In this chapter is described the application of the highly active catalysts to asymmetric ring-opening cross metathesis and asymmetric cross metathesis.
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Figure 4.1. Ruthenium olefin metathesis catalysts ( $\mathbf{a}: \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathbf{b}: \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{I}$ ).

Encouraged by the results for ARCM using 2a,b-6a,b, the use of these catalysts for asymmetric ring-opening cross metathesis (AROCM) was investigated. Catalyst 7 and related catalysts have been successfully employed in AROCM for a number of norbornenes and related strained bicycles. ${ }^{4}$ In an initial study, anhydride $\mathbf{8}$ was treated with one mole percent of catalysts $\mathbf{2 a}, \mathbf{3 a}, \mathbf{5 a}$, and $\mathbf{6 a}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in the presence of 10 equivalents of styrene (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. AROCM with chiral ruthenium catalysts

|  | $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ 2a-6a $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, RT, 1h च Ph (10 equiv) >95\% conv, 1:1 E/Z |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catalyst | Product | $\boldsymbol{e} \boldsymbol{e}$ |
| 2a | ent-9 | 47\% |
| 3a | ent-9 | 29\% |
| 5a | 9 | 62\% |
| 6 a | 9 | 76\% |

Catalyst 6a was the most selective of the dichloride catalysts, and no change in enantioselectivity was observed when the solvent $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}, \mathrm{THF}, \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$, benzene, toluene, neat) or equivalents of cross partner (1, 3, 5 and 10) were varied. In ARCM reactions, the diiodide catalysts $\mathbf{2 b} \mathbf{-} \mathbf{6 b}$ were found to be dramatically more enantioselective than the dichloride catalysts $\mathbf{2 a - 6 a}$. In the current system, the use of $\mathbf{6 b}$ instead of $\mathbf{6 a}$ improved the $e e$ slightly to $80 \%$ and cooling the reaction to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gave $\mathbf{9}$ in $82 \% e e$. The diiodide catalysts are generally less reactive than the dichloride catalysts; therefore, the loading of $\mathbf{6 b}$ was increased to three mole percent in order to achieve activity similar to $\mathbf{6 a}$. Since catalysts $\mathbf{6 a}, \mathbf{b}$ gave the highest $e e$ for substrate $\mathbf{8}$, they were employed to explore the substrate scope (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. AROCM using 6a and 6b


| Substrate | Catalyst ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | ee $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Z})$ | Yield (E/Z) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bar{\square}$ | 6a | 76\% (4\%) | 95\% (1:1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{O}=\mathrm{B} \\ \mathbf{8} \times=\mathrm{O} \end{gathered}$ | 6b | 80\% (n.d.) | 96\% (1:1) |
| $10 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{N}-t \mathrm{Bu}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 a \\ & 6 b \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% ~(33 \%) \\ & 75 \% ~(50 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \%(1.4: 1) \\ & 99 \%(1.2: 1) \end{aligned}$ |
|  <br> 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 a \\ & 6 b \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68 \%(15 \%) \\ & 68 \%(10 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \%(1.2: 1) \\ & 99 \%(1.2: 1) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6 a | 33\% (29\%) | 30\% (1.1:1) |
| (SO-OH | 6 a | 81\% (20\%) | 10\% (ND) |
|  | $6 a$ $6 b$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \%(10 \%) \\ & 72 \%(40 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \%(1.4: 1) \\ & 78 \%(1.4: 1) \end{aligned}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Conditions for 6a: $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, RT, 10 equiv styrene, 1 h .
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Conditions for $\mathbf{6 b}: 3 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{6 a}, 1$ equiv $\mathrm{NaI}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{RT}$, 10 equiv styrene, 1 h .
The $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ ratio was close to one to one for all of the substrates examined, but we initially focused our attention on discovering trends within the trans series of products because in
all cases the $e e$ 's of the cis products were lower than the $e e$ 's of the trans products. Replacement of the anhydride oxygen with a tert-butylamine (10) reduced the enantioselectivity to $57 \%$ for $\mathbf{6 a}$ and $75 \%$ for $\mathbf{6 b}$ and both catalysts gave quantitative yields. Introducing heteroatoms into the norbornene skeleton (11) slightly reduced the $e e$ to $68 \%$ and surprisingly catalysts $\mathbf{6 a}$ and $\mathbf{6 b}$ afforded product in the same $e e$. When unprotected diols $\mathbf{1 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 3}$ were examined the yields were dramatically reduced to $30 \%$ and $10 \%$ respectively. In these cases, substrate coordination to the catalyst may inhibit the reaction. In addition, the stereochemistry of the norbornene diols affected the $e e$ as the endo-diol $\mathbf{1 3}$ gave $81 \%$ while the exo-diol 12 gave only $33 \%$. To prevent coordination to the catalyst, diol $\mathbf{1 3}$ was protected as a bisacetate (14) which resulted in a decrease in $e e$ to $60 \%$ accompanied by a large increase in yield to $99 \%$; the use of catalyst $\mathbf{6 b}$ improved the $e e$ to $72 \%$ and slightly reduced the yield to $78 \%$. The cis series of products exhibited different selectivity trends than the trans series. The cis ee both increased when the trans $e e$ decreased ( $\mathbf{8}$ vs. 10 with $\mathbf{6 a}$ ) and decreased when the trans $e e$ increased ( $\mathbf{1 0}$ vs. $\mathbf{1 1}$ with $\mathbf{6 a}$ ). In addition, when catalysts $\mathbf{2 a , b} \mathbf{- 5 a , b}$ were examined with these substrates, catalysts $\mathbf{6 a , b}$ always gave the trans product in the highest $e e$. However, catalysts $\mathbf{5 a}, \mathbf{b}$ often gave the cis product in the highest $e e$.

Careful evaluation of the data obtained thus far elucidates some aspects of the mechanism for AROCM and allows for a proposal as to the origin of enantioselectivity. Upon monitoring the reactions of $\mathbf{8}$ and $\mathbf{1 0}$ over 3 hours, no change in the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ ratio or $e e$ was observed. Moreover, the reactive terminal olefin in the products is never observed to undergo further cross metathesis reactions at RT. These findings indicate that the products are unreactive towards secondary metathesis and therefore that the $e e$ 's and $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$
ratios observed are the direct result of singular reactions with the catalysts. Of primary importance to the development of a mechanism for AROCM is to distinguish between the two possible ruthenium alkylidene propagating species (Figure 4.2).

Pathway 1: Propagating Methylidene



Figure 4.2. Comparison of propagating species.
In pathway 1 , the norbornene reacts with a ruthenium methylidene intermediate and this ring-opening step determines the $e e$ of the products. Then in the cross metathesis step the products are released, determining the olefin geometry of the products and regenerating the ruthenium methylidene. This pathway requires that the $e e$ of both the E and Z products be identical. In pathway 2 , the norbornene reacts with a ruthenium benzylidene intermediate and both the $e e$ and olefin geometry of the products are determined concurrently in this ring-opening step. The products are then released in the cross metathesis step that regenerates the ruthenium benzylidene. The $e e$ 's of the E and Z products are independent in this reaction pathway. Since the observed $e e$ 's of the E and Z products are significantly different, we propose that it is likely that the ruthenium benzylidene is the propagating species in this system.

There has been a long standing debate regarding the site of olefin coordination to the ruthenium catalyst that leads to metallocyclobutane formation. There is experimental
evidence that supports olefin binding either cis or trans to the NHC. ${ }^{5}$ In the most recent report on this issue,,${ }^{5 \mathrm{c}}$ Romero and Piers provide compelling evidence for the observation of a 14-electron ruthenium species in which the metallocycle lies trans to the NHC. Computational studies also support olefin binding trans to the $\mathrm{NHC},{ }^{6}$ in fact, a recent computational study of $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{b}$ in ARCM calculated olefin coordination trans to the NHC as the lower energy pathway. ${ }^{6 a}$

In our system, catalyst 3a yields ent-9 and catalyst $\mathbf{6 a}$ yields $\mathbf{9}$ as the major trans product. ${ }^{7}$ Moreover, the propagating species is believed to be a benzylidene and norbornenes are well known to react preferentially on the exo face of the olefin. ${ }^{8}$ With these caveats in mind, a cis coordination pathway would require that the norbornene approach catalyst 3a from the face that is shielded by the ortho-isopropyl group and catalyst 6a from the face that possesses the meta-tert-butyl group (Figure 4.3).
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Figure 4.3. Olefin approaches for $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{6 a}$ that afford the major trans enantiomer.
It is most likely that introducing a tert-butyl group in the meta position increases the steric bulk of that side of the ring. Therefore, at this time, the cis coordination pathway seems unlikely as it requires the norbornene to approach both catalyst $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{6 a}$ from the more hindered side.

It is proposed that a trans coordination pathway is more consistent with the observed data. A trans coordination pathway would require that the benzylidene of catalyst 3a sit under the unsubstituted side of the aryl ring, and the benzylidene of
catalyst 6a sit under the side bearing an ortho-isopropyl group. Thus increasing the steric bulk of the tert-butyl side of the ring causes the benzylidene to move to the opposite side of the ring, explaining the observed reversal of enantioselectivity between these two catalysts. Continued work on asymmetric metathesis will allow for further development of this mechanistic insight.

Catalyst 1a has been used extensively in cross metathesis ${ }^{9}$ and a chiral variant of this transformation would provide a powerful new synthetic tool for the construction of stereochemically complex targets. However, ACM is also the most challenging of the asymmetric metathesis transformations, as only in this transformation must all three factors - the propagating species, its orientation, and enantiotopic olefin selection - be controlled. ACM work was carried out in collaboration with Dr. Steven Goldberg. In ARCM, there is only one possible propagating species that leads to productive metathesis, so only the orientation of that species and the selection of an enantiotopic olefin must be controlled. AROCM requires control of the propagating species and its orientation, but facial selectivity of the enantiotopic olefin is easily controlled in the norbornene substrate. To address the enantiotopic olefin selection in ACM, we focused on meso diene substrates that had distinct small $(\mathrm{H})$, medium (vinyl) and large (OP) substituents at the allylic carbon. To address the nature of the propagating species, we employed TBS protected 1,4-pentadiene-3-ol (15a) and cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene (16) as substrates (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3. ACM using catalysts 2a-6a


It was expected that use of an excess of 16, which is more metathesis active than 15a, would afford predominantly a ruthenium acetoxyethylidene as the propagating species. This was supported by the fact that the initial benzylidene of $\mathbf{2 a}$ was observed to react exclusively with $\mathbf{1 6}$ to give cinnamyl acetate. Having controlled the propagating species, we achieved the first asymmetric olefin cross metathesis reaction, although these results are certainly unoptimized. The yields and $e e$ 's were lower than expected. One systemic problem for the yield is that the terminal olefin present in the product is similar in reactivity to the starting material, resulting in consumption of the desired product and formation of a significant amount of symmetrical bis-cross product. Catalysts 2a and 5a emerged as the most enantioselective catalysts for this reaction. For catalysts $\mathbf{3 a} \mathbf{- 6 a}$, as the meta substitution increased in size from a proton to a methyl group to an isopropyl group the enantioselectivity increased, but a tert-butyl group proved to be too large and eroded the enantioselectivity. However, moving the isopropyl group to the opposite meta position (2a) proved to be equally effective as 5a. Since 5a gave slightly better yield
than $\mathbf{2 a}$, we explored the use of $\mathbf{5 a}$ with a number of other prochiral diene substrates (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4. ACM with cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene using 5a
Substrate
${ }^{\text {a }} 5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{5 a}, 5$ equiv of $\mathbf{1 5 b}$ relative to $\mathbf{1 6}$, neat, $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 6 \mathrm{~h}$.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{5a}, 5$ equiv of $\mathbf{1 6}$, neat, $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 6 \mathrm{~h}$.
${ }^{c} 5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{5 a}, 5$ equiv of $\mathbf{1 6}, 0.25 \mathrm{M}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 6 \mathrm{~h}$.
Increasing the size of the protecting group by using TIPS protected 1,4-pentadiene-3-ol (15b, Table 2) resulted in a modest increase in $e e$ from $44 \%$ to $52 \%$. We also examined protected 1,2-diol 18 and protected 1,3-diol $\mathbf{2 0}$ that afforded $e e$ 's similar to those obtained with 15a. Attempting to improve the $e e$ of ACM, we further reduced the
reactivity of the diene substrate by preparing both 1,1- and 1,2- disubstituted olefins. Unfortunately, diene $\mathbf{2 2}$ proved to be unreactive under these conditions and diene $\mathbf{2 3}$ gave only $4 \% e e$. The poor result for $\mathbf{2 3}$ could result from the medium and large groups $\left(\mathrm{CHCHCH}_{3}\right.$ and OTBS, respectively) becoming too similar in size. This initial report of ACM sets the stage for future catalyst and substrate design in order to make this transformation synthetically useful.

This chapter described an expansion in scope for asymmetric metathesis using highly active ruthenium catalysts with chiral monodentate NHCs. These catalysts showed excellent activity in ring-opening cross metathesis reactions and enantioselectivities ranged from $68 \%$ to $82 \%$. These investigations allowed for the development of a working model for the mechanism of AROCM. In addition, the catalysts were used for the first asymmetric cross metathesis reactions and produced $e e$ 's ranging from $37 \%$ to $52 \%$. These reactions represent an important proof of principle and work is ongoing to improve the yields and enantioselectivities for ACM.

## Experimental

General Information. NMR spectra were recorded on an Oxford 300 MHz NMR spectrometer running Varian VNMR software. Chemical shifts are reported in parts per million (ppm) downfield from tetramethylsilane with reference to internal solvent for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra. Chemical shifts are reported in parts per million (ppm) downfield from $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ for ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR spectra. Multiplicities are abbreviated as follows: singlet (s), doublet (d), triplet ( t ), quartet ( q ), quintet (quint), septet (sept), multiplet (m), and broad (br). Optical rotations were taken on a Jasco P-1010 polarimeter with a
wavelength of 589 nm . The concentration "c" has units of $\mathrm{g} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ (or $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) unless otherwise noted. Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed using silica gel 60 F254 precoated plates ( 0.25 mm thickness) with a fluorescent indicator. Visualization was performed with standard potassium permanganate stains, anisaldehyde or UV light. Flash column chromatography of organic compounds was performed using silica gel 60 (230-400 mesh), and flash column chromatography of ruthenium compounds was performed using silica gel 60 (230-400 mesh) from TSI Scientific (Cambridge, MA). All enantiomeric purities were determined by chiral GC (Chiraldex G-TA, $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ or CP Chirasil-Dex-CB, $25 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) or chiral HPLC (Chiracel AD, OD-H, AS) and were compared to racemic samples. All glassware was either oven dried or flame dried, and reactions were done under an atmosphere of argon unless otherwise noted. All organic solvents were dried by passage through solvent purification columns containing activated alumina. All commercial chemicals were used as obtained, and $\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Ru}(=\mathrm{CHPh}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ was a gift from Materia, Inc. Compounds $\mathbf{1 1}^{\mathbf{1 0}}, \mathbf{1 4}^{\mathbf{1 1}}, \mathbf{1 5 a} \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{1 2}}$, and $\mathbf{2 2}^{\mathbf{1 3}}$ are known compounds and were prepared as previously reported. Compounds $\mathbf{8}, \mathbf{1 2}$, and $\mathbf{1 3}, \mathbf{1 6}$ were purchased from Aldrich and used as received.

## Preparation of norbornene substrates



Imide 10. To a solution of anhydride $\mathbf{8}(71 \mathrm{~g}, 430 \mathrm{mmol})$ in xylenes $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added tert-butyl amine ( $50 \mathrm{~mL}, 480 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). A Dean-Stark trap was attached and the reaction was stirred at reflux for 10 hours. At that point, 8 mL of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ had collected in the trap, so 350 mL of xylenes were distilled away. The reaction was cooled to RT and then placed in a $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ freezer but this did not induce crystallization. Instead, an excess of petroleum ether was added and the reaction was refluxed for 30 min . A minimal amount of MeOH was added and the reaction was refluxed for an additional 15 min . The flask was cooled to RT and then $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Imide $\mathbf{1 0}$ was obtained as white crystals ( $13.5 \mathrm{~g}, 14 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 6.10(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.35-3.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.08-3.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66$ $(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.45(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 179.3$, 134.6, 58.3, 52.0, 45.6, 45.5, 28.7; HRMS (FAB+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$, 219.1259. Found 219.1263.

## General Procedure A: asymmetric ring-opening cross metathesis reactions with $\mathbf{6 a}$.

To the norbornene ( 0.2 mmol ) and styrene $(230 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added the dichloride catalyst $\mathbf{6 a}(2.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.002 \mathrm{mmol})$ and the reaction stirred at RT for 1h. The solvent was evaporated, and the remaining residue was purified by flash chromatography to yield the desired functionalized cyclopentane.

## General Procedure B: asymmetric ring-opening cross metathesis reactions with $\mathbf{6 b}$.

A solution of $\mathrm{NaI}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and dichloride catalyst $\mathbf{6 a}(7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.006 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at RT for 1 h . A solution of norbornene ( 0.2 mmol ) and styrene ( $230 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the solution stirred at RT for 1 h . The solvent was evaporated, and the remaining residue was purified by flash chromatography to yield the desired functionalized cyclopentane.


Anhydride 9. Using 33 mg of anhydride 8, procedure A yielded 25 mg (47\%) of anyhydride 9. Procedure B at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ yielded 26 mg ( $48 \%$ ) of anhydride 9 . Column eluent was $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel AS, 8\% IPA/Hex, $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 40.4 [major], 47.2 [minor]). Anhydride 9 is a known compound. ${ }^{4 \mathrm{~d}}$


Imide S4. Using 44 mg of imide $\mathbf{1 0}$, procedure A yielded 37 mg (57\%) of imide $\mathbf{S 4}$ and $27 \mathrm{mg}(42 \%)$ of cis-S4. Procedure B yielded 34 mg (52\%) of S4 and 2 mg (3\%) of cisS4. Column eluent was $30 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / H e x a n e s$. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, $3 \%$ IPA/Hex, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, trans ret. times: 36.0 [major], 44.8 [minor]; cis
ret. times: 12.0 [minor], 13.6 [major]). Characterization of $\mathbf{S 4}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.39-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.48-6.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.07-5.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16-5.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.16-2.91$ $(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 177.6,137.5,137.0$, 130.7, 129.0, 128.8, 127.5, 126.6, 115.8, 58.6, 49.3, 48.9, 46.7, 45.9, 35.6, 28.7; HRMS (FAB+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2}, 323.1885$. Found 323.1895. Characterization of cis-S4 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.37-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.02-5.90(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.64(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.7,11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.12-5.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.37-3.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10-3.01$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.90-2.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94-1.86(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$.


Heterocycle S5. Using 48 mg of heterocycle 11, procedure A yielded 37 mg (54\%) of $\mathbf{S 5}$ and 32 mg (46\%) of cis-S5. Procedure B yielded 37 mg (54\%) of $\mathbf{S 5}$ and $31 \mathrm{mg}(45 \%)$ of cis-S5. Column eluent was $70 \%-100 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes. The ee for $\mathbf{S 5}$ was determined by supercritical $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD-H, 5-25\% MeOH over 10 min then $25 \%$ $\mathbf{M e O H}, 1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 11.8 [major], 14.0 [minor]). The ee for cis-S5 was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel AD, 8\% IPA/Hexanes, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 21.3 [minor], 33.0 [major]). Characterization of $\mathbf{S 5}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) 8 7.58-7.26 (m, $10 \mathrm{H}), 6.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.25(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15.6,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.03-5.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.50$ $(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=18,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.34(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.63$ $(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=7.2,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91-2.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $136.0,135.1,133.6,129.3,128.9$ 128.6, 127.0, 126.1, 125.6, 118.7, 59.7, 59.4, 41.9;

HRMS (FAB+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}, 346.1556$. Found 346.1532. Characterization of cisS5 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.53-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 6.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.97$ (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=16.8,10.2,6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.83(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.7,9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.50(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.36(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=8.1,8.1,0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.55(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 134.8,133.4,129.3,129.0$, 128.8, 128.7, 128.2, 127.9, 125.6, 118.8, 59.4, 55.4, 42.5; HRMS (FAB+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}, 346.1556$. Found 346.1570.


Diol S6. Using 31 mg of diol 12, procedure A yielded $8.5 \mathrm{mg}(16 \%)$ of $\mathbf{S 6}$ and 7.5 mg (14\%) of cis-S6. Column eluent was $80 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, 5\% IPA/Hex, 1mL/min, cis-S6 ret. times: 11.7 [minor], 13.0 [major], S6 ret. times: 18.8 [minor], 21.3 [major]). Diol S6 is a known compound. ${ }^{4 \mathrm{c}}$


Diol S7. Using 31 mg of diol 13, procedure A yielded 5 mg ( $10 \%$ ) of an inseparable mixture of $\mathbf{S 7}$ and cis-S7. Column eluent was $85 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, 5\% IPA/Hex, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, cis-S7 ret. times: 15.4 [minor], 16.7 [major], $\mathbf{S 7}$ ret. times: 22.3 [major], 27.2 [minor]). Diol $\mathbf{S 7}$ is a known compound. ${ }^{4 \mathrm{c}}$


Acetate protected diol S8. Using 49 mg of acetate protected diol 14, procedure A yielded 62 mg ( $91 \%$ ) of an inseparable mixture of $\mathbf{S 8}$ and cis-S8. Procedure B yielded 53 $\mathrm{mg}(78 \%)$ of an inseparable mixture of $\mathbf{S 8}$ and cis-S8. Column eluent was $30 \%$ $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel AD, 2\% IPA/Hex, 1 $\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}$, cis-S8 ret. times: 10.3 [minor], 11.9 [major], $\mathbf{S 8}$ ret. times: 16.0 [major], 18.6 [minor]). Characterization of a mixture of $\mathbf{S 8}$ and cis-S8 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta$ $7.37-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}$, cis and trans $), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, cis $), 6.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.6,1 \mathrm{H}$, trans $), 6.22-6.14(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, cis or trans $), 5.89-5.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, cis and trans $), 5.60(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $11.1,11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, cis or trans), 5.10-5.00 (m, 2H, cis and trans), 4.25-4.04(m, 4H, cis and trans), 3.42-3.30 (m, 1H, cis or trans), 3.03-2.73(m, 2H, cis and trans), 2.63$2.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, cis and trans, 1 H , cis or trans $), 2.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, cis and trans $), 2.00(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, cis or trans), $1.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, cis or trans $) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.1,171.1,139.3,139.0$, $137.5,133.4,131.2,131.1,131.0,130.3,128.8,128.5,127.5,127.1,126.3,116.0,63.0$, 62.9, 44.9, 44.8, 44.5, 44.4, 38.8, 36.7, 29.9, 21.3, 21.2; HRMS (FAB+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{4}, 342.1831$. Found 342.1839.

## Absolute Stereochemistry Determination
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recryst. to $97 \%$ ee S9

Using procedure B at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on a larger scale ( $607 \mathrm{mg}, 3.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ of norbornene starting material) yielded $258 \mathrm{mg}(26 \%)$ of 9 in $82 \%$ ee. To this was added 4-bromoaniline (182 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ and xylenes $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was stirred at $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , cooled
to RT and purified by flash column chromatography ( $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Pentane) to yield $\mathbf{S 9}$ (300 $\mathrm{mg}, 75 \%$ ). Imide $\mathbf{S 9}$ was recrystallized by slow diffusion of pentane into a solution of $\mathbf{S 9}$ in benzene. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel AD, $8 \%$ IPA/Hex, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 31 [minor], 41 [major]). X-ray crystal analysis of three separate crystal samples revealed that the absolute stereochemistry was that which is depicted in the above scheme (all down).

In a separate experiment 9 ( $330 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was treated with LAH $(93 \mathrm{mg}, 2.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 14 mL ) to give $\mathbf{S 7}$ ( $146 \mathrm{mg}, 47 \%$ ). HPLC analysis confirmed that this sample had the same absolute stereochemistry as $\mathbf{S 7}$ prepared from $\mathbf{1 3}$ using catalyst $\mathbf{6 a}$.

## X-ray crystal analysis of S9



CCDC 234164

## Cross Metathesis Substrate Preparation



TIPS protected 1,4-pentadiene-3-ol (15b). TIPSCl ( $2.42 \mathrm{~mL}, 11.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a solution of 1,4-pentadiene-3-ol ( $1 \mathrm{~mL}, 10.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and imidazole ( $770 \mathrm{mg}, 11.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in DMF ( 20 mL ). The reaction was stirred overnight and then quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added and the organic layer was removed. The aqueous layer was extracted 3 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic fractions were washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and saturated aqueous NaCl . The organic layer was then dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, concentrated and purified by column chromatography (5\%

EtOAc/Hexanes) to yield $1.7 \mathrm{~g}(68 \%)$ of $\mathbf{1 5 b} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.82$ (ddd, J $=17.1,10.2,5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.23(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.07(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,1.5$, $1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.72-4.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.07-1.06(\mathrm{~m}, 21 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 140.9$, 113.9, 75.1, 18.3, 12.5; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{OSi}$ 240.1910. Found 240.1910.


TMS protected 1,5-hexadiene-3,4-diol 18. Carbonyl diimidazole (7.46 g, 46 mmol ) was added to 1,5 -hexadiene-3,4-diol ( $5 \mathrm{~g}, 43.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, mixture of meso and rac ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was stirred for 12 h and quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The aqueous layer was removed and the solution was concentrated. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and Hexanes were added and the aqueous layer was added. The solution was washed 3 x with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column
chromatography $\left(40 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hex}\right.$, desired spot is the lower spot) to yield $620 \mathrm{mg}(10 \%)$ of carbonate protected meso-1,4-pentadiene-3-ol. To $550 \mathrm{mg}(6.07 \mathrm{mmol})$ of this compound was added $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1.5 \mathrm{~g}, 18.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and methanol $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was stirred for 18 h and then worked up to yield $690 \mathrm{mg}(99 \%)$ of meso-1,5-hexadiene-3,4-diol (S10). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{2} \mathrm{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.94-5.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.39-5.26(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.22-4.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.19(\mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{br}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 136.1,117.8,75.6$; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{2}, 114.0681$. Found 114.0683.

To $\mathbf{S 1 0}$ ( $110 \mathrm{mg}, 0.96 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added imidazole ( $328 \mathrm{mg}, 4.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMF ( 3 mL ). The reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{TMSCl}(306 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The reaction was stirred for 12 h , during which time it warmed to RT , and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. The reaction was washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, and saturated aqueous NaCl . The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 8}$ ( $137 \mathrm{mg}, 55 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 5.95-5.84(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.21(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=18.3,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.13(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,1.2$, $1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.96-3.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.10(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 138.6,115.7,76.8$, 0.5; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Si}_{2}, 257.1393$. Found 257.1400.


Protected 1,3-diol 20. Following literature procedure, ${ }^{14}$ 1,6-heptadiene-3,5-diol was prepared as a mixture of meso and rac isomers. To this diol mixture $(815 \mathrm{mg}, 6.36$ mmol) in pyridine ( 20 mL ) was added di-tert-butylsilylbis(trifluoromethanesulfonate)
$(2.55 \mathrm{ml}, 6.99 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was stirred at rt for 3 hours and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. The reaction was washed 3 x with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, concentrated and purified by flash column chromatography ( $3 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ ) to yield $633 \mathrm{mg}(37 \%)$ of 20. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 5.84$ (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=6.0,12.0,18.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $5.33(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=2.0,2.0,24 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.08(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=2.0,2.0,9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.64-4.57(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.8-1.7(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.6-1.5(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.1(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.0(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$.


TBS protected alcohol 23. A modified literature procedure was used. ${ }^{15}$ To a solution of 1-propynlmagnesiumbromide in THF ( $100 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.5 \mathrm{M}, 50 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added crotonaldehyde ( $3.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 42.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and allowed to warm to RT during this time. Saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added and the reaction was extracted 3 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic layers were washed with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography (20\% EtOAc/Hexanes) to yield 4.18 g ( $88 \%$ ) of the propargyl alcohol. This propargyl alcohol (4.18 g, 37.3 mmol ) in THF ( 80 mL ) was added to LAH ( $2.83 \mathrm{~g}, 74.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 250 mL ) at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was warmed to rt and then stirred at reflux for 18 hours. The reaction was quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $15 \%$ aqueous solution of NaOH , filtered through celite and purified by flash column chromatography ( $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ ) to yield 1.16 $g(27 \%)$ of the symmetrical alcohol. A number of mixed fractions were recolumned in $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ Hexanes to yield an additional $0.815 \mathrm{~g}(19 \%)$ of the symmetrical alcohol. To this alcohol ( $.815 \mathrm{~g}, 7.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added DMF ( 15 mL ), imidazole ( $483 \mathrm{mg}, 7.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and TBSCl ( $1.07 \mathrm{~g}, 7.1 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and saturated
aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was added. The mixture was extracted 3 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ ) to yield 1.184 g (74\%) of 23. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.64-5.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.43(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=1.2,5.7$, $15.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.53-4.49(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.68(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=1.2,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz} .6 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}$, $6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 134.1,125.0,74.2,26.2,18.6,17.9,-4.3$; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{OSi}, 226.1753$, found 226.1755.

## Asymmetric Cross Metathesis Reactions



Diene 28. Benzoate protected 1,4-pentadiene-3-ol ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene ( $134 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.85 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(570 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $\mathbf{5 a}(9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0085 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight (12h). The reaction was concentrated and purified by column chromatography in $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ to yield ( $17 \mathrm{mg}, 38 \%$ ) of the desired product. When a TLC plate is stained with anisaldehyde, the product is purple, the starting material is black and cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2butene is brown. The enantiomeric excess was determined by chiral HPLC analysis (Chiralcel AD, $1 \% \mathrm{IPA} / \mathrm{Hex}, 1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 13.8 [major], 15.5 [minor]). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.57(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$,

2H), 5.99-5.89 (m, 4H), $5.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.29(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.60(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.07(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.9,165.6,135.0,133.3,131.0$, $130.4,129.9,128.6,127.6,118.1,74.6,64.1,21.1 ;$ HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{4}$, 260.1049. Found 260.1057.


Diene 17a. Substrate $15 \mathrm{a}(37 \mathrm{mg}, 0.186 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene ( $147 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.93 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(570 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $5 \mathbf{a}(9.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0093 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight (12h). The reaction was purified by column chromatography in $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes to yield ( $14 \mathrm{mg}, 28 \%$ ) of the desired product. To determine the enantiomeric excess, 17a was converted to 28. $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}-3 \mathrm{HF}$ ( 50 $\mu \mathrm{L})$ was added to $\mathbf{1 7 a}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$; the reaction was stirred for 12 h . Then, $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ( $200 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and benzoyl chloride ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) were added and the reaction was stirred for 2 h . Workup and analysis was the same as for 28. Characterization of 17a ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 5.84-5.73(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.22(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $10.2,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.64-4.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.56(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3.9,0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.06(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.0,139.9,136.6,123.6,114.4,73.7$, 64.6, 26.1, 21.1, 18.6, -4.5, -4.5; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}, 269.1573$. Found 269.1561.


Diene 17b. Substrate 15b ( $44.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.186 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2butene ( $147 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.93 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $\mathbf{5 a}(9.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0093 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight (12h). The reaction was purified by column chromatography in $20 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes to yield ( $5 \mathrm{mg}, 8 \%$ ) of the desired product. To determine the enantiomeric excess, $\mathbf{1 7 b}$ was converted to $\mathbf{2 8}$. $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}-3 \mathrm{HF}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added to $\mathbf{1 7 b}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$; the reaction was stirred for 12 h . Then, $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(200 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and benzoyl chloride ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) were added and the reaction was stirred for 2 h . Workup and analysis was the same as for 28. Characterization of $\mathbf{1 7 b}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta$ 5.85-5.74 (m, 3H), $5.23(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.08(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73-4.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.06-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 21 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ (75 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.0,140.4,137.2,123.5,114.2,73.9,64.6,21.2,18.2,12.5$; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}, 313.2199$. Found 313.2184.


Diene 19. Substrate 18 ( $27 \mathrm{mg}, 0.104 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene ( 82 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.52 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $\mathbf{5 a}$ ( 5.7 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.0052 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The reaction was purified by column chromatography in $40 \%$ $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ to yield ( $6 \mathrm{mg}, 17 \%$ ) of 19. For ee determination, 19 was converted into its triacetate analogue. TMS protected diol $19(6 \mathrm{mg})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was treated
with $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}-3 \mathrm{HF}$ (3 drops) and stirred for 0.5 hours. Triethyl amine ( $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) were added and the reaction was stirred for 14 hours. This crude sample was then directly analyzed by chiral GC $\left(\beta-\mathrm{DM}, 100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ for 5 min , then ramp $2^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$ to 200 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, ret. times: 30.7 [minor], 30.9 [major]). Characterization of $19{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta$ 5.93-5.71(m, 3H), $5.21(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=17.1,1.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15-5.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.56$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.99-3.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.09(18 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 138.5, 135.2, 125.2, 115.9, 77.4, 76.3, 64.6, 21.2, 0.5, 0.5; HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{Si}_{2}, 331.1761$. Found 331.1769.


Diene 21. Substrate 20 ( $33 \mathrm{mg}, 0.124 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene ( 59 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.37 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(570 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $5 \mathbf{a}(6.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0062 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The reaction was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hexanes}$ ) to yield ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 48 \%$ ) of 21. For ee analysis the diol was reprotected with benzoate groups. Silyl protected diol $21(20 \mathrm{mg})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 1 mL ) was treated with $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}-3 \mathrm{HF}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and stirred for 18 hours. Triethyl amine ( $300 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and $\mathrm{BzCl}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ were added and the reaction was stirred for 14 hours. The benzoate-protected diol was purified by flash column chromatography (40\%
$\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes $)$ and analyzed by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel AD, 5\% EtOH/Hexanes, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times: 16.2 [major], 19.4 [minor]). Characterization for $21{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.91-5.70(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.32(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=18 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.66-$
$4.56(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~s}$, 9H).


Diene 24. Substrate 23 ( $98 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to cis-1,4-diacetoxy-2-butene ( 79 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ open to air. The flask was then flushed with argon and catalyst $\mathbf{5 a}(6.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0062 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. A reflux condenser was attached and the reaction was stirred at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The reaction was purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ Hexanes) to yield ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 23 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{2 4}$. For ee analysis a three step sequence was carried out (see below). Characterization of $\mathbf{2 4}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.74-5.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.67-5.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.45-5.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.59-4.48(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.68(\mathrm{~d}, 6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.90(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.05(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $171.0,137.4,133.1,126.0,123.1,73.4,64.7,26.1,21.2,17.9,-4.3,-4.5 ;$ HRMS (EI+) calc for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Si}$, 283.1730. Found 283.1741.

$\mathrm{MeOH}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added to $24(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14)$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ were added. The $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was removed and the remaining mixture was extracted 3 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic extracts were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated to yield 26 mg ( $96 \%$ ) of the deprotected primary alcohol. To this compound ( $26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added THF ( 3 mL ) and $\mathrm{NaH}(85 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol})$ and the reaction was stirred for 20 minutes. Benzyl bromide was purified by passing it through neutral alumina and $38 \mu \mathrm{~L}(.33 \mathrm{mmol})$ was
added. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and then purified by flash column chromatography ( $10 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes) to yield $23 \mathrm{mg}(65 \%)$ of the protected diol. To this compound ( $23 \mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added TBAF ( $150 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, 1 M in THF). The reaction was stirred for 2 hours and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ were added. $\mathrm{The}_{\mathrm{Et}}^{2} \mathrm{O}$ was removed and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined ether layers were washed with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography ( $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes) to yield $10 \mathrm{mg}(64 \%)$ of the deprotected secondary alcohol. The ee was determined by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, $0.75 \%$ IPA/hexanes, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, ret. times:
94.6 [major], 116.4 [minor]).

## Cross Metathesis Stereoproofs

## Stereoproof for 17a,b.



To prepare a known sample: ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}$ )-Salen $(\mathrm{Co})(562 \mathrm{mg}, 0.93 \mathrm{mmol})$ was stirred with glacial acetic acid $(600 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ in toluene $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 30 minutes. Then the solution was concentrated to dryness and butadiene monoxide ( $5 \mathrm{~mL}, 62 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(782 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 43.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The reaction was stirred for 72 hours and during this period it was allowed to warm to rt. The epoxide was isolated by vacuum transfer to a receiving flask cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The epoxide was put through a plug of alumina to dry it and the epoxide ( $626 \mathrm{mg}, 29 \%$ ) was isolate enantioenriched $[\alpha]^{22}$ d -9.93 (c 3.17, $i \mathrm{PrOH}$ ) [Lit. value: -10.4 , c $\left.2.97, i \mathrm{PrOH}\right]$. In a second step, catalyst $\mathbf{1 a}(42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to the enantioenriched epoxide ( $322 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and cis-1,4-dibenzyloxy-2-butene ( $257 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, then cooled to rt , concentrated and purified by column chromatography ( $15 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes, the product is the middle spot) to give the desired product ( $121 \mathrm{mg}, 63 \%$ ). This product was added to a solution of $(\mathrm{Me})_{3} \mathrm{SI}(344 \mathrm{mg}, 1.68 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\operatorname{BuLi}(980 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.57 \mathrm{mmol})$ which was prestirred for 2.5 hours at $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours during which time it was allowed to warm to rt and then the reaction was quenched with a saturated aqueous
solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl} . \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added and the organic layer was removed, the aqueous layer was extracted 3 x with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and the combined organic fractions were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, concentrated and purified by column chromatography $\left(30 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hex}\right)$ to yield S11 ( $65 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ ). The material was analyzed by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, 206 nm , $2 \% \mathrm{IPA} / \mathrm{Hex}, 1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ ) to give a minor peak at 35.6 min and a major peak at 41.1 min with an ee of $44 \%$.

To prepare a sample by asymmetric cross metathesis: 17a was prepared as previously described. An excess of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(93 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{MeOH}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added to $17 \mathbf{a}(26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was stirred for 48 hours and then $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ were added. The ether was separated and the aqueous layer was extracted 3 x with ether. The organic fractions were combined and dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and concentrated to give the desired primary alcohol ( $23 \mathrm{mg}, 99 \%$ ). In a second step, $\operatorname{BnBr}(36 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to the primary alcohol ( $23 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{NaH}(6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ prestirred for 15 minutes in THF $(500 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The reaction was stirred for 48 hours and then purified by column chromatography ( $5 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hex}$ ) to give the TBS and Bn protected diol (25 $\mathrm{mg}, 78 \%$ ). To this substrate ( $25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.078 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added TBAF ( $200 \mu \Lambda, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in THF, 0.2 mmol$)$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and then quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. The reaction was extracted 3 times with diethyl ether. The combined organic fractions were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and purified by column chromatography ( $50 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{Hex}$ ) to give $\mathbf{S 1 1}(6 \mathrm{mg}, 38 \%)$. This sample was also analyzed by chiral HPLC (Chiralcel OD, $206 \mathrm{~nm}, 2 \%$ IPA/Hex, $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ ) to give a major peak at 36.2 min and a minor peak at 42.0 min with an ee of $44 \%$.

## Stereoproof of 19



Compound $\mathbf{S 1 2}$ was purchased enantiopure from Aldrich. $\operatorname{In} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(180 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathbf{S 1 2}$ (5.7 $\mathrm{g}, 36 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\operatorname{DIBAL}(41.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in Toluene, 41.1 mmol ) was added. The reaction was stirred for 3 hours and $\mathrm{MeOH}(12 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added along with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Na}_{2}$ Tartrate- $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{4}$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and the aqueous layer was removed; the organic layer was washed with 1 N HCl . The combined aqueous layers were extracted 3 x with EtOAc. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography ( $2 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{Hex}$ ) to yield 5 g (87\%) of S13.
$\mathrm{Ph}_{3} \mathrm{PCH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}(4.91 \mathrm{~g}, 13.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and LiHMDS (27.4
 canula in THF ( 15 mL ). The reaction was stirred for 14 hours. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added, the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was separated and
the aqueous layer was extracted 2 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography $\left(20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ to yield $1.98 \mathrm{~g}(99 \%)$ of S14.
$\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $(\mathrm{COCl})_{2}(276 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.16 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. DMSO ( $450 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 6.32 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added slowly and gas was evolved. The reaction was stirred 10 minutes and $\mathbf{S 1 4}(250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.58 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via canula. The reaction was stirred for 1 hour and triethylamine was added dropwise. The reaction was stirred for 30 minutes and warmed to rt . $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, hexanes and a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ were added, the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was removed and the aqueous layer was extracted 2 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ to yield S15. This product was taken on crude. To S15 ( 1.58 mmol estimated) was added flame dried $\mathrm{LiCl}(80.5 \mathrm{mg}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. To the solution was added $\mathbf{S 1 6}$ ( $377 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.90 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DBU ( $236 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.58 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction was stirred 30 minutes, worked up and purified by flash column chromatography (50\% EtOAc/Hexanes) to yield 64 mg (18\%) of $\mathbf{S 1 7}$.

To $\mathbf{S 1 7}(54 \mathrm{mg}, 0.284 \mathrm{mmol})$ in toluene $(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added DIBAL $(711 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ in toluene, 0.711 mmol ). The reaction was stirred for 2 hours and slowly warmed to RT, quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and stirred vigorously. The reaction was extracted 3 x with toluene, dried and purified by flash column chromatography ( $60 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes) to yield $33 \mathrm{mg}(75 \%)$ of $\mathbf{S 1 8}$.
$\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$, triethylamine $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ were added to $\mathbf{S 1 8}(33 \mathrm{mg})$ and the reaction was stirred for 2 hours. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, hexanes and a saturated solution of $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ were added, the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was removed and the aqueous layer was extracted 2 x with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and purified by flash column chromatography ( $30 \% \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes) to yield 36 mg (89\%) of $\mathbf{S 1 9}$.

To $\mathbf{S 1 9}(36 \mathrm{mg})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The reaction was stirred for 12 hours and then MeOH was added. The reaction was stirred 8 hours and then neutralized. The reaction was extracted $3 x$ with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. To this was added $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and triethylamine and DMAP. The reaction was worked up and purified by flash column chromatography (40\% $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} /$ hexanes) to yield $\mathbf{S 2 0}$.

Chiral GC analysis ( $\beta$-DM, $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , then ramp $2^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$ to $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, ret. time: 30.9) demonstrated that this was the same enantiomer as the major enantiomer produced by the asymmetric cross metathesis of $\mathbf{1 8}$.
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