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#### Abstract

This dissertation focused on the development of new methods to synthesize enantioenriched complex nitroalkanes using transition metal catalysis. Nitroalkanes are useful intermediates in several $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions and serve as precursors for several functional groups including amines and carbonyls. Despite this rich chemistry, the seemingly simple $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes with alkyl electrophiles (such as alkyl halides) has remained a highly challenging task due to competing $O$-alkylation. Using the advent of transition metal catalysis our group has addressed this century old problem.

In this regard, I was involved in four main projects during my graduate career. Chapter 1 describes the synthetic utility of nitroalkanes in organic synthesis and include a summary of base metals known to undergo $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions using simple alkyl electrophiles via a radical mechanism.

Chapter 2, describes the development of metal-free trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using commercially available reagent reagent 5(trifluoromethyl)dibenzothiophenium triflate (Umemoto's reagent). These conditions provide high yielding access to fully substituted $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes and I showed that these compounds can be easily converted into medicinally relevant $\alpha$ (trifluoromethyl)amines.

Chapter 3, describes the discovery and development of the first nickelcatalyzed conditions for the enantioselective synthesis of $\beta$-nitroamides using racemic $\alpha$-bromoamides as electrophiles. In this work, I showed the stereocenter alpha to the


nitro group could be controlled and I also showed that the enantioenriched $\beta$ nitroamides can be used as a handle for further $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions such as conjugate addition, trifluoromethylation and Tsuji-Trost allylation to set a fully substituted $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ stereocenters without erosion of enantiomeric excess and producing the product with excellent diastereoselectivity.

Chapter 3, also describes the development of a first, nickel-catalyzed $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated alkyl iodides. This method allowed the preparation of a diverse array of complex nitroalkanes using simple starting materials. Significantly, this system allows for the alkylation of primary, secondary, and tertiary alkyl iodides without the requirement of radical stabilizing groups.

Preliminary results in the copper and nickel catalyzed enantioselective $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes using additional radical stabilizing substrate classes such as benzyl bromide and $\alpha$-bromoketones will be discussed in detail in Appendix D and E.

## Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Nitroalkanes as Versatile Functional Group

Nitroalkanes are one of the most useful building block in organic synthesis. ${ }^{1}$ They take part in a variety of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions such as the Michael addition, ${ }^{2}$ Henry reaction, ${ }^{3}$ and aza-Henry reaction. ${ }^{4}$ They can also be converted easily to alkyl amines, carbonyls, amides, or alkanes. Nitroalkanes are also known to react in transition metal-catalyzed reactions to form $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds through arylation or allylation reactions. ${ }^{5,6}$ Recently, nitroarenes have been shown to react in palladium catalyzed reactions to form $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds using aryl boronic acids or $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}$ bonds using arylamines. ${ }^{7}$ Additionally, they serve as radical precursors and synthons for heterocycles in cycloaddition reactions. ${ }^{1}$ Despite the prolific use of nitroalkanes in organic synthesis, the carbon alkylation of nitroalkanes with simple alkyl halides remains undeveloped. For the first time, our group has developed a copper-catalyzed method for the C-alkylation of nitroalkanes using a wide variety of simple alkyl electrophiles (see chapter 2 section 2.1 for discussions). ${ }^{8}$

The following section of this chapter will introduce the utility of nitroalkanes in organic synthesis and include a summary of base metals known to undergo $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions using simple alkyl electrophiles via a radical mechanism.

### 1.1.1 Henry Reaction

In 1895 , L. Henry discovered that aldehydes and ketones were easily combined with nitroalkanes to afford $\beta$-nitroalcohols in the presence of a base. ${ }^{9}$ The aldol condensation between carbonyl compounds and nitroalkanes (nitro-aldol reaction) has become a significant tool in the formation of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds and referred to as the Henry reaction. The $\beta$-nitroalcohols are easily converted into useful synthetic intermediates (Figure 1.1). For example, reduction of the nitro group affords $\beta$-aminoalcohols (1.1), dehydration gives nitroalkenes (1.2), oxidation of secondary alcohol affords $\alpha$ nitroketones (1.3), and radical denitration gives secondary alcohols (1.4). ${ }^{1}$


Figure 1.1: Henry Reaction and its Synthetic Applications

Controlling absolute and relative stereochemistry in the Henry reaction was difficult due to the reversible nature of the reaction and the facile epimerization of the
carbon center $\alpha$ to the nitro substituent. Extensive research efforts have been directed towards the discovery and development of an asymmetric version of the Henry reaction. In 1992, Shibasaki and coworkers reported the first asymmetric version of the nitro-aldol reaction using a $\mathrm{La}(\mathrm{BINAP})_{3}$ complex (1.5) as catalyst to afford $\beta$ nitroalcohol (1.6) in good yield and excellent enantioselectivity (Figure 1.2, top). The heterobimetallic complex (1.5) possess both Lewis acidic and basic sites, which activates nitro compound and aldehyde substrate independently to forge the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond with excellent enantioselectivity. They also controlled the relative stereochemistry in the Henry reaction using prochiral nitroalkane and chiral catalyst (1.7), which possesses a triethylsilane (TES) group in the BINOL backbone. Using this modified mixed metal alkoxide complex (1.7), $\beta$-nitroalcohol (1.8) was produced in excellent diastereoselectivity and enantioselectivity (Figure 1.2, bottom). ${ }^{10}$ Later, Shibasaki successfully utilized asymmetric Henry reactions with chiral catalyst (1.5) in the synthesis of the effective $\beta$-blocker (-)-pindolol (1.9) (Figure 1.3). ${ }^{11}$


Figure 1.2: Pioneering Studies of Asymmetric Henry Reaction by Shibasaki and Coworkers


Figure 1.3: Shibasaki's Synthesis of (-)-pindolol using Asymmetric Henry Reaction

Considering the significance of asymmetric $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions in organic synthesis, Henry reactions are discussed extensively in research communications and review articles. ${ }^{3,12}$ These reviews cover syntheses of $\beta$ nitroalcohols and their applications in organic synthesis. A more recent review published in 2011 summarizes literature on the nitro-aldol reaction published up to 2011. ${ }^{13}$ Few recent examples of Henry reactions are discussed below.

In 2013, Gong and coworkers reported the mild, copper-catalyzed enantioselective Henry reaction of enals with nitromethane (Figure 1.4). Using a $\mathrm{C}_{1}-$ symmetric chiral diamine (1.10) and copper (II) catalytic system, a variety of cyclic and acyclic $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated aldehydes undergo the Henry reaction to afford $\beta$ nitroalcohol (1.11) with excellent yield and enantioselectivity. ${ }^{14}$ However, nitroalkanes other than nitromethane were not investigated.


Figure 1.4: Gong's Copper Catalyzed Enantioselective Nitro-Aldol Reaction of Enal

Furthermore, synthetic utility of this asymmetric protocol was demonstrated by its application in the synthesis of chiral azatricyclic hexahydrochromeno[4,3-b] pyrrole scaffold, which is a prevalent pharmocophore in medicinal chemistry (Figure 1.5). ${ }^{15}$ For example, the enal (1.12) was reacted with nitromethane under coppercatalyzed conditions to afford product (1.13) in $96 \%$ ee. The nitro alcohol was sequentially reduced to the amine and protected as the tolyl sulfonamide. The amino alcohol (1.14) underwent intramolecular iodolactamization to afford azatricyclic framework (1.15).


Figure 1.5: Gong's Synthesis of Azatricyclic Framework using Enantioselective Henry Reaction

### 1.1.2 The Nitro-Mannich Reaction or aza-Henry Reaction

The addition of nitronate anion to an imine electrophile to form a $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond is known as the nitro-Mannich (or aza-Henry) reaction. The first report of this transformation was published by L. Henry in $1896 .{ }^{16}$ This reaction allowed access to $\beta$-nitroamines, which are easily converted into useful synthetic intermediates (Figure
1.6). For example, reduction of the nitro group affords 1,2-diamines (1.16), hydrolysis gives $\alpha$-aminocarbonyls (1.17), and radical denitration gives monoamines (1.18). ${ }^{1}$



Figure 1.6: aza-Henry Reaction and its Synthetic Applications

The significant interest in nitro-Mannich began with the development of the first acyclic diastereoselective reactions reported by Anderson and his coworkers in 1998 (Figure 1.7). ${ }^{17}$ The author treated lithium nitronates with protected imines (1.19) in the presence of acetic acid to produce nitro-Mannich products (1.20) with excellent anti diastereoselectivity and yield. Due to the instability of (1.20), the group synthesized 1,2-diamines (1.21) by reduction of the nitro group and removal of the amine protecting group. The author also suggests that the addition of a nitronate anion to an imine is thermodynamically unfavored due to the difference in pKa values
between the nitronate anion $\left(\mathrm{pK}_{\mathrm{a}} 9\right)$ and the anion of the nitro-Mannich product (1.20) $\left(\mathrm{pK}_{\mathrm{a}} 35\right)$. Hence, acetic acid is crucial for the reaction to occur.


Figure 1.7: Anderson's First Diastereoselective aza-Henry Reaction

In 1999, Shibasaki and coworkers reported the first enantioselective version of the nitro-Mannich reaction between coordinating N-phosphinoyl imines (1.22) and nitromethane. Heterobimetallic (1.23) afforded $\beta$-nitroamine (1.24) in good yield and excellent enantioselectivity (Figuare 1.8, top). ${ }^{18}$ Interestingly, the complex prepared in a 1:1:2 ratio of $\mathrm{Yb}\left(\mathrm{O}^{i} \mathrm{Pr}\right)_{3}, \mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$, and ( R )-binapthol did not catalyze the reaction, however the same component mixed in 1:1:3 ratio afforded excellent results. The heterobimetallic complex (1.23) possesses Lewis acidic and Bronsted basic sites, which activates both the nitro compound and the imine substrate, hence no base is required for the reaction. Using LDI-TOF mass spectra studies, the authors reported that active catalyst was a complex formed by $[\mathrm{YbK} \text { (binaphthoxide) })_{2}$ ] and (R)binapthol. However, nitroalkanes other than nitromethane were not suitable coupling partners. This lack of scope was attributed to the smaller size of the binding pocket of
the catalyst which does not have sufficient space to accommodate both electrophilic and nucleophilic coupling partners.

The same group later showed that the catalyst derived from (R)-ALB $\operatorname{AlLi}[(\mathrm{R}) \text {-binaphthoxide }]_{2}(\mathbf{1 . 2 5})$ and $\mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ was an efficient catalyst for a variety of nitroalkanes. ${ }^{19}$ Using this BINOL-based catalyst system, $\beta$-nitroamines (1.26) were produced with good to excellent enantioselectivity (Figure 1.8 below).


1.23

(R)-ALB, 1.25

Figure 1.8: Pioneering Studies of Enantioselective aza Henry Reaction by Shibasaki and Coworkers

Selected aspects of the nitro-Mannich reactions have been appeared in reviews on related subjects. These include reviews on multimetallic multifunctional catalysts, ${ }^{20}$ asymmetric addition to $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{N}$ bonds, ${ }^{21}$ organocatalysis, ${ }^{22} \mathrm{~N}$-acylimines, ${ }^{23}$ and synthesis of $\alpha, \beta$-diamino acids. ${ }^{24}$ Considering the significance of aza-Henry reactions there are several reviews reported on the literature. ${ }^{25}$ More recent reviews summarize literature
on the nitro-Mannich reaction and its applications in organic synthesis published up to 2013. ${ }^{4}$ More recent examples of nitro Mannich are discussed below.

In 2017, Duan and coworkers reported the mild, bifunctional phase-transfer catalyst to catalyze the diastereo- and enantioselective aza-Henry reaction of $\beta, \gamma$ unsaturated nitroalkenes (1.27) with amidosulfones (1.28). Using a bifunctional phasetransfer catalyst (1.29) derived from cinchona alkaloids, a variety of substrates afford nitro-Mannich products (1.30) with excellent diastereo- and enantioselectivity (Figure 9). ${ }^{26}$


Figure 1.9: Duan's Bifunctional Phase-Transfer Catalyzed Enantioselective and Diastereoselective aza-Henry Reaction of Amidosulfones


Figure 1.10: Wang's Synthesis of anti-HIV drug DPC 083 Using nitro-Mannich Reaction with Thiourea Catalyst $\mathbf{1 . 3 1}$

In 2011 Wang and coworkers utilized thiourea (1.31) as a catalyst for the nitroMannich reaction of cyclic trifluorometthyl ketimines in the synthesis of the anti-HIV drug DPC 083 (1.32). ${ }^{27}$ The nitro-Mannich reaction between cyclic ketimine (1.33) and nitroalkane (1.34) afforded $\beta$-nitroamine (1.35) in $91 \%$ yield and $90 \%$ ee (major diastereomer) albeit in poor diastereoselectivity. Completion of the synthesis of DPC 083 (1.32) was accomplished in further four steps (Figure 1.10).

### 1.1.3 Michael Addition

Nitroalkanes are a convenient source of stabilized carbanions that react with electron deficient olefins giving the corresponding $\gamma$-nitro substituted 1,4 -adducts with high regioselectivity. The $\gamma$-nitro substituted products are useful synthetic intermediates which can be derivatized into useful functional groups such as amine, carbonyl, etc. (Figure 1.11). ${ }^{1}$


Figure 1.11: The Nitro-Michael Reaction and its Synthetic Applications

In 1916, Kohler and coworkers published the first example of nitroalkane reacting with chalcone (1.36). ${ }^{28}$ Sodium methoxide is the base in the reaction, which is generated by combining sodium and methanol. Nitromethane reacts with $\alpha, \beta$ unsaturated carbonyls to afford $\gamma$-nitroketone (1.37) in excellent yield (Figure 1.12). Even though only a few examples of primary and secondary nitroalkanes were studied, this was an important step in the development of conjugate addition reactions using nitroalkane nucleophiles.


Figure 1.12: Kohler's Early Study of Conjugate Addition Reaction Using Nitroalkane as Nucleophiles

Nitroalkanes in Michael additions have been extensively used in organic synthesis and have been reviewed. ${ }^{2}$ This review covers syntheses of $\gamma$-nitrocarbonyl products and their applications in organic synthesis. The asymmetric organocatalytic synthesis of $\gamma$-nitrocarbonyls through Michael reaction has been extensively reviewed more recently. ${ }^{29}$ A few recent examples of Michael addition using nitroalkanes as nucleophiles are discussed below.

In 2015, Watson and coworkers reported a highly diastereoselective Michael reaction using $\alpha$-substituted, $\beta$-nitrocarbonyls as nucleophiles to afford functional group rich stereodiads containing fully substituted nitrogen-bearing centers. ${ }^{30}$ Good to excellent diastereoselectivity was observed. For example, a mixture of diastereomers of Weinreb amide (1.38) reacts with methyl acrylate to afford fully substituted nitroalkane (1.39) with excellent yield and diastereoselectivity. This transformation tolerates various types of carbonyls on the nucleophile as well as a wide range of Michael acceptors (Figure 1.13).


Figure 1.13: Watson's Diastereoselective Michael Reaction Using $\beta$-nitrocarbonyls as Nucleophiles

The author proposes internal hydrogen bonding in the nitroalkane tautomer imparts the observed relative stereochemistry of the observed products. A rapid reversible deprotonation of the diastereomeric mixture of nitroalkane (1.38)
establishes a tautomer (1.40). Intramolecular hydrogen bonding to the adjacent carbonyl organizes compound (1.39). From this common intermediate, the Michael acceptor likely reacts away from the alkyl group (Figure 1.14). This model is consistent with the observed diastereoselectivity in these transformations.


Figure 1.14: Watson’s Proposed Model for Observed Diastereoselectivity

In 2017 Miaura and coworkers reported an enantioselective catalytic conjugate addition of nitroalkanes (1.41) to $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ketones (1.42) using a novel sulfonamide-thiourea organocatalyst (1.43). ${ }^{31}$ The author prepared a variety of enantioenriched $\gamma$-nitrocarbonyl products (1.44) using this protocol in excellent enantioselectivity (Figure 1.15). However, the scope with respect to nitroalkane is very limited. Nitroalkanes other than nitromethane, nitroethane, and 2-nitropropane were not investigated. Further, scope with respect to the Michael acceptor is limited to aromatic enones. A wide range of Michael acceptors were not studied under these catalytic conditions.


Figure 1.15: Miaura's Enantioselective Conjugate Addition Reaction Using Organocatalyst 1.43

### 1.1.4 Allylation of Nitroalkanes

In the early 1970's Tsuji and coworkers reported the palladium-catalyzed telomerization of butadiene using nitroalkanes as nucleophiles towards the synthesis of many natural products. ${ }^{32}$ Since then, palladium catalysis has served as a broad platform for the allylation of nitroalkanes using allylic electrophiles.

### 1.1.4.1 Allylation of Unactivated Nitroalkanes

In 1982, Aleksandrowicz and coworkers reported the first example of the allylation of nitroalkanes using allylic chlorides, acetates, phenyl ethers and alcohols in the presence of palladium catalysts (Figure 1.16, top). ${ }^{6}$ In the same year, Wade and coworkers published similar reactions of (phenylsulfonyl)nitromethane, primary nitroalkanes, phenyl nitromethane, and $\alpha$-nitro esters using cinnamyl acetates as electrophiles (Figure 1.16 , bottom). ${ }^{33}$ These reactions often yielded a mixture of regioisomers ( $\mathbf{1 . 4 5}$ and 1.46 ) resulting from attack of nitronate anion at both electrophilic sites of the $\pi$-allyl intermediate.


Figure 1.16: Aleksandrowicz and Wade's Pioneering Studies of Allylation of
Unactivated Nitroalkanes

In 1996, Helmchen and coworkers published the first example of enantioselective allylic alkylation reaction using nitromethane as a nucleophile. ${ }^{34}$ Using symmetrical 1,3-disubstituted allylic carbonates (1.47) as allylating agents in combination with 4,5-dihydrooxazoles (1.48) as ligands, excellent yields and enantioselectivities were obtained (Figure 1.17). Under these catalytic conditions, overalkylation competes with monoalkylation, depending on the stoichiometry of nitromethane employed. Even though only nitromethane was employed as a nucleophile, this was an important step in the asymmetric allylic alkylation of nitroalkanes.


Figure 1.17: Helmchen's Pioneering Studies of Asymmetric Allylic Alkylation of Nitroalkanes



Figure 1.18: Trost's Studies of Asymmetric Allylic Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

In 2000, Trost and coworkers expanded the scope of allylic electrophiles such as meso-diesters, cycloalkenyl carbonates and acetates. ${ }^{35}$ Utilizing ligand (1.49), nitromethane and 2-nitropropane were alkylated under different conditions providing highly enantioenriched nitroalkanes (1.50) (Figuare 1.18). Soon thereafter, the method was expanded to substituted nitroalkanes. In this case, symmetrical substituted 1,3dialkyl allylic carbonates were employed as allylating agents. ${ }^{36}$ Homoallylic nitroalkanes (1.51) were obtained with good diastereoselectivity and uniformly excellent enantioselectivity (Figure 1.18 bottom).

In 2006, Helmchen and coworkers showed that iridium catalysis can also promote C-allylation of nitroalkanes when using monosubstituted allylic carbonates (1.52). ${ }^{37}$ Utilizing phosphoramidite ligand (1.53), both unactivated nitroalkanes and activated ethyl nitroacetate were coupled with excellent efficiency. Because
nitromethane did not undergo efficient coupling, ethyl nitroacetate (1.54) was used as a nitromethane surrogate, as it could be easily decarboxylated to afford the nitromethylated product (1.55) in a two-step process. Couplings with ethyl nitroacetate were not diastereoselective, however this is inconsequential because of the subsequent removal of the ester group.


Figure 1.19: Helmchen's Studies of Asymmetric C-Allylation of Nitroalkanes Using Iridium Catalysis

### 1.1.4.2 Allylation of Activated Nitroalkanes

This section will cover methods for the allylation of "activated" nitroalkanes. This class include those nitroalkanes possessing highly acidic $\alpha$-protons such as $\alpha$ nitroesters, $\alpha$-nitroketones and $\alpha$-nitrosulfones $(\mathrm{pKa} \sim 5)$. As with the allylation of nitroalkanes, the Wade group was instrumental in early studies of $\alpha$-nitrosulfone
allylation. In 1981, they reported that the lithium salt of (phenylsulfonyl) nitromethane (1.56) was allylated using various monosubstituted allylic acetates (1.57) with excellent regioselectivity for the linear products. ${ }^{38}$

In 1984, Genet and coworkers pioneered the studies on the allylation of $\alpha$ nitroacetates (1.58). They were allylated using allylic acetates, phenyl ethers, and carbonates (1.59) (Figure 1.20). ${ }^{39}$ These methods were utilized in various efforts toward the synthesis of complex ergoline alkaloids. ${ }^{40}$


Figure 1.20: Wade and Genet's Pioneering Studies of Allylation of Activated Nitroalkanes

In 2008, White and coworkers reported alkylation of nitroacetates with allylbenzene derivatives. This was achieved through palladium-catalyzed $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation (Figure 1.21). ${ }^{41}$ This protocol is highly attractive because it precludes the necessity of pre-oxidized electrophiles like allylic acetates and carbonates. By utilizing 2,6-dimethylbenzoquinone (DMBQ) and DMSO as a $\pi$-acceptor ligand, nitroacetates were smoothly coupled with allylbenzene in good branched to linear ratios (1.60) without the need for prefunctionalized electrophiles.


Figure 1.21: White's Palladium Catalyzed Allylic C-H Alkylation of Activated Nitroalkanes


Figure 1.22: Ooi's Palladium Catalyzed Allylation of Nitroalkanes Using Chiral IonPaired Ligands

In 2012, Ooi and coworkers published the enantioselective allylation of nitroacetates with cinnamyl carbonates using novel chiral ion-paired ligands (1.61). ${ }^{42}$ While most chiral, non-racemic ligands used in asymmetric catalysis consist of a single chiral molecule bearing coordinating groups, the authors found that an achiral ammonium phosphine ionically bound to a chiral binaphtholate anion could impart excellent levels of stereocontrol. This new class of ligand was shown to promote the allylation of nitroacetates with cinnamyl carbonates in excellent yield and
enantioselectivity (1.62). The products from the reaction could be easily derivatized into $\alpha, \alpha$-disubstituted amino acid derivatives (Figure 1.22).

In 2011, Tunge and coworkers reported that $\alpha$-nitroketones can undergo three component unsymmetrical bisallylation under palladium catalysis (Figure 1.23 top). ${ }^{43}$ A variety of homoallylic nitroalkanes could be synthesized using this novel strategy with excellent yield. This reaction proceeds by initial allylation of the $\alpha$-nitroketones (1.63) to afford (1.64), followed by transfer of the acyl group to an exogenous alcohol (1.65), which is accompanied by nitronate anion formation. The resultant nitronate anion (1.66) undergoes a second Tsuji-Trost type allylation with the newly formed allylic acetate to provide unsymmetrical bisallylated nitroalkanes (1.67) (Figure 1.23 bottom).


Figure 1.23: Tunge's Deacylative Allylation of Nitroalkane Using Palladium Catalysis

### 1.1.4.3 Intramolecular Allylation of Nitroalkanes

In 1987, Tsuji and coworkers pioneered the studies on the intramolecular decarboxylative allylation of carbon nucleophiles. The author showed that $\alpha$-nitro allyl esters could undergo $C$-allylation under decarboxylative palladium catalysis. ${ }^{44}$ Only a single example was reported and a significant amount of $O$-allylation product was observed. Although the selectivity could be enhanced at low temperatures, $O$ allylation could not be avoided (Figure 1.24).


Figure 1.24: Tsuji's Initial Report on Intramoleculare Allylation of Nitroalkanes

In 2010, Tunge and coworkers reinvestigated the decarboxylative allylation of nitroalkanes, and showed that $O$-allylation could be suppressed and $C$-allylated products (1.68) could be formed in excellent yields under mild reaction conditions (Figure 1.25). ${ }^{45}$


Figure 1.25: Tunge's Decarboxylative Intramolecular Allylation of Nitroalkanes

Examination of the reaction mechanism revealed that $O$-allylation proceeds in certain cases, but the process is reversible via a bimolecular palladium $\pi$-allyl (1.69) reformation from the $O$-allylated nitronate intermediate (1.70). To suppress the $O$ allylated nitronate, which produces aldehyde (1.71) byproduct, increasing the reaction concentration allowed irreversible $C$-allylation to favor. Thus, the desired products (1.72) were formed with excellent yields and selectivity (Figure 1.26).


Figure 1.26: Tunge's Proposed Mechanism for the Decarboxylative Intramolecular Allylation of Nitroalkanes

In another example of an intramolecular allylation, Rajappa and coworkers have shown that allyl groups can be transferred from pendant allyl esters without undergoing decarboxylation. ${ }^{46}$ For example, $\alpha$-nitroamide (1.72) undergoes Michael addition to allyl acrylate, affording $\alpha$-nitrocarbonyl (1.73) bearing a pendant allyl ester. Under the palladium catalysis conditions, the allyl group is transferred to palladium, forming a $\pi$-allyl complex. The $\alpha$-nitro carbon is deprotonated by DBU, and combines with $\pi$-allyl fragment to afford (1.74) in good yield (Figure 1.27). The
products formed were used in the synthesis of N -hydroxypyroglutamylproline ester derivatives.


Figure 1.27: Rajappa's Intramolecular Allylation of Nitroalkanes under Palladium Catalysis

### 1.1.5 Arylation of Nitroalkanes

The chemistry of arylation of nitroalkanes has progressed more slowly when compared to allylation of nitroalkanes. Early examples of arylation of nitroalkanes include reactions of nitronate anions with aryllead acetates, ${ }^{47}$ iodonium salts, ${ }^{48}$ triarylbismuth reagents, ${ }^{49}$ and arenes in the presence of manganese salts. ${ }^{50}$ While these early studies provided proof of concept, an ideal method would avoid the need for stoichiometric arylmetal reagents. Palladium catalysis has proven to be the strategy for achieving this goal.


Figure 1.28: Muratake's Pioneering Studies on Palladium Catalyzed Intramolecular Arylation of Nitroalkanes

In 1998, Muratake and coworkers reported the first intramolecular arylation of nitroalkanes using palladium catalysis. ${ }^{51}$ The scope of the reaction was not studied thoroughly, but both primary and secondary nitroalkanes (1.76 and 1.77) were shown to undergo cyclization in synthetically useful yields, albeit with significant amount of byproducts (1.78 and 1.79), formed due to the competing elimination reaction (Figure 1.28).

In 2000, Buchwald and coworkers, explored to the more useful intermolecular arylation of nitroalkanes. By utilizing electron rich, sterically encumbered biaryl phosphine ligand (1.80), excellent yields of benzylic nitroalkanes (1.81) were produced using a variety of complex primary nitroalkanes with aryl bromides and aryl chlorides. ${ }^{5 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ Significantly, nitroalkanes bearing esters and terminal olefin functional groups were effectively arylated and no competing enolate arylation or Heck-type reaction was observed. Although this protocol showed broad generality of primary
nitroalkanes, secondary nitroalkanes and nitromethane were not suitable coupling partners reaction (Figure 1.29).


## Figure 1.29: Buchwald's Palladium Catalyzed Intermolecular Arylation of Nitroalkanes

Subsequently, Kozlowski and coworkers reported that the arylation of nitromethane with pseudohalides and aryl halides could be achieved though judicious choice of ligand. ${ }^{5 \mathrm{~d}}$ The authors utilized electron rich, slightly less sterically encumbered Xphos (1.83) compared to Buchwald's ligand (1.80). The generality of the nitromethylation reaction was broad, allowing access to a variety of benzyl nitroalkanes (1.82) in good yield (Figure 1.30). Although these studies required the use of nitromethane as solvent, subsequent modification used only 2-10 equivalents of nitromethane, minimizing the safety concerns that typically accompany reactions using large quantities of nitromethane. ${ }^{5 \mathrm{e}}$


Figure 1.30: Kozlowski's Palladium Catalyzed Intermolecular Arylation of Nitromethane


Figure 1.31: Kozlowski’s Palladium Catalyzed $\alpha$-arylation of arylnitromethane

In 2015, Kozlowski and coworkers developed palladium catalyzed conditions for the $\alpha$-arylation of arylnitromethane (Figure 1.31). Using high-throughput experimentation techniques, $t$-BuXPhos (1.84)was identified as the optimal ligand for this strategy. ${ }^{52}$ Some of the diaryl nitromethane products are unstable under the reaction condition, a one pot diarylation/Nef reaction sequence was developed to afford benzophenone in good yields. However, some diarylnitromethanes were observed to be stable and isolated in good yield. Finally, the authors also demonstrated that the orthogonal conditions for the mono- and diarylation can be done in a one-pot diarylation of nitromethane (Figure 1.32).


Figure 1.32: Kozlowski’s Palladium Catalyzed One-Pot Diarylation of nitromethane

### 1.1.6 Miscellaneous Reaction of Nitroalkanes

### 1.1.6.1 The Suzuki-Miyaura Reaction of Nitroarenes

Nitroarenes are highly versatile, cheap, common aromatic building blocks in organic synthesis. They can be easily prepared from nitration of the parent arenes. In 2011, Wu and coworkers showed a rhodium catalyzed $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}$ bond forming reaction using nitroarenes (Figure 1.33, top). ${ }^{53}$ Additionally, an analogous copper catalyzed CS cross coupling of nitroarenes was described by Shinde and coworkers in 2013 (Figure 1.33, bottom). ${ }^{54}$ Although these methods represent a good synthetic tool, they suffer from limited substrate scope and electron withdrawing groups are necessary for the excellent yields of the coupling products. However, these pioneering studies show that nitroarenes can undergo nucleophilic aromatic substitution in which the $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ group serves as a leaving group under rhodium and copper catalysis.

## Wu (2011)



Shinde (2013)


Figure 1.33: Wu and Shinde's Studies on Rhodium and Copper-Catalyzed Cross Coupling of Nitroarenes

In 2017, Sakaki and coworkers described a palladium-catalyzed $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reaction using nitroarene and aryl boronic acids. After extensive optimization, the authors discovered electron rich, sterically encumbered biarylphosphine Brettphos (1.84) as the optimal ligand for this transformation. ${ }^{7 b}$ In addition, $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in the presence of 18-crown-6 and a trace amount of water was found to be crucial for the success of the transformation. Under the optimized reaction condition, a wide array of nitroarenes underwent this Suzuki-Miyuara coupling affording biaryl compounds in excellent yields (1.85) (Figure 1.34). Several heterocyclic substrates were tolerated under this reaction conditions. Furthermore, electron-rich, electron-deficient, and sterically encumbered boronic acids are compatible with this protocol.


Figure 1.34: Sakaki’s Groundbreaking Studies on Palladium-Catalyzed SuzukiMiyuara Cross Coupling of Nitroarenes and Boronic Acids

### 1.1.6.2 The Buchwald-Hartwig Amination of Nitroarenes

In 2017, Nakao and coworkers described the first example of palladium catalyzed Buchwald Hartwig amination of nitroarenes. By utilizing biarylphosphine Brettphos (1.84) as the optimal ligand, a wide array of nitroarenes (1.85) with diverse electronic properties were found to be excellent substrates for this $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}$ bond forming reaction. In addition to secondary amines, primary amines (1.86) could also be converted into aniline derivaties in excellent yield (1.87) (Figure 1.35). ${ }^{7 \mathrm{a}}$


Figure 1.35: Nakao's First Example of Palladium Catalyzed Buchwald Hartwig Amination of Nitroarenes

To gain insight into the reaction mechanism, the authors performed stoichiometric studies. Treatment of $(\mathrm{COD})_{2} \mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{TMS}\right)_{2}(\mathbf{1 . 8 8})$, BrettPhos (1.84),
and nitroarene in THF at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ afforded the oxidative addition complex (1.89). X-ray structure clearly shows that the electron rich $\mathrm{Pd}^{0}$ oxidatively added into $\mathrm{Ar}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ bond (Figure 1.36).


Figure 1.36: Nakao's Stoichiometric Studies in Palladium Catalyzed Buchwald Hartwig Amination of Nitroarenes


Figure 1.37: Nakao's Proposed Mechanism Palladium Catalyzed Buchwald Hartwig Amination of Nitroarenes

The author proposes a mechanism for the Buchwald-Hartwig amination of nitroarenes which is described in figure (1.37). Nitroarene reacts with $\operatorname{Pd}(0)$ complex (1.90) to form $\eta^{2}$ arene palladium (0) complex (1.91), followed by oxidative addition of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ bond to afford (1.92). Subsequently, the amine reacts with (1.92) in the presence of base to afford aryl Pd amide (1.93), which undergoes reductive elimination to give aryl amine (1.94). The arene ligand can then exchange to regenerate the active catalyst (1.90).

### 1.1.7 Reduction of Nitroalkanes to Amines

The reduction of a nitro group represents a versatile and powerful way to access amino group in a molecule. ${ }^{1}$ There are a variety of methods developed to reduce aliphatic and aromatic nitro compounds to amines. ${ }^{55}$ The most frequently employed methods involve catalytic hydrogenation using palladium on carbon ( $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ ) or Raney nickel. Other common methods include $\mathrm{Zn} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ or $\mathrm{HCl}, \mathrm{NiCl}_{2} / \mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$, $\mathrm{CoCl}_{2} / \mathrm{NaBH}_{4}, \mathrm{HCOONH}_{4}$ in the presence of $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$.

In 2010, Pedro and coworkers reported the enantioselective synthesis of $(S)$ -$(+)$-sotalal, a member of the class III $\beta$-blockers, using catalytic enantioselective Henry reaction to afford $\beta$-nitroalcohol (1.95). Hydrogentation in the presence of palladium on carbon reduces (1.95) to amine (1.96) in near quantitative yield (Figure 1.38). ${ }^{56}$


Figure 1.38: Pedro's Synthesis of $(S)$ - (+)-Solatol using Nitroalkane Reduction

The reduction of nitroalkanes can be stereoretentive. Products from the nitroaldol reaction (section 1.1.1), aza-Henry reaction (section 1.1.2), Micheal addition (section 1.1.3) or allylation (section 1.1.4) can all be reduced and retain the stereochemistry at the nitro center; as a result, this transformation can be utilized in late stage total synthesis.

In 2011, Johnston and coworkers published the enantioselective synthesis of (-)-nutlin, using catalytic enantioselective aza-Henry reaction to $\beta$-nitroamine (1.97). ${ }^{57}$ The authors used the combination of sodium borohydride with cobalt chloride as a mild and efficient reducing agent of nitroalkanes through the in situ formation of cobalt hydride (Figure 1.39). The reduction of (1.97) affords diamine (1.98) with stereoretention and good yield. Further functional group transformation afforded (1.99) (-)-nutlin, a potent cis-imidazoline small molecule inhibitor of p53-MDM2 which is used as a probe in cell biology and drug development.


Figure 1.39: Johnston's Synthesis of (-)-nutlin using Sodium Borohydride Reduction of Nitroalkanes in the presence of Cobalt Chloride

In 2015, Orlandi and coworkers reported a mild, metal-free reduction of both aromatic and aliphatic nitro groups to amines using the combination of trichlorosilane and tertiary amine (Figure 1.40). The scope of the reaction was broad and highly functional group tolerant, providing product with excellent yield. ${ }^{58}$ This metal-free reduction was employed in the reduction of nitrolactone (1.100) in the total synthesis of aliskiren. ${ }^{59}$ Remarkably, the mild procedure afforded enantiopure aminolactone (1.101) in $99 \%$ yield without altering the stereochemical integrity of the four stereocenters of the molecule (1.101).


Figure 1.40: Orlandi's Metal-Free Reduction of Nitroalkane Using Trichlorosilane and Tertiary Amine

### 1.1.8 Hydrolysis of Nitroalkanes to Carbonyls (The Nef Reaction)

In $1893, \mathrm{M}$. Konovalov showed that the treatment of potassium salt of 1phenylnitroethane with dilute acid $\left(\mathrm{AcOH}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ afforded 1-phenylnitroethane and acetophenone. ${ }^{60}$ In 1894, J.U. Nef systematically studied the acidic hydrolysis of sodium salt of nitroalkane and demonstrated the generality of this transformation, the conversion of nitroalkanes into the corresponding carbonyl compounds is known as the Nef reaction. ${ }^{61}$ The harsh acidic reaction conditions developed by Nef made the reaction incompatible with sensitive functional groups, thus limiting the scope of the transformation. Furthermore, when the $\mathrm{pH}>1$, byproducts such as oximes and hydroxynitroso compound can be formed. To make the reaction more chemoselective and functional group tolerant, oxidative and reductive conditions have been developed for the Nef reaction (Figure 1.41). Nef reactions have been extensively studied in organic synthesis and reviewed, and they will not be discussed here in detail. ${ }^{62}$ Few recent examples of the Nef reaction are discussed below.


Figure 1.41: Oxidative and Reductive Conditions for the Nef Reaction

Reductive conditions for Nef reactions have been used in the total synthesis of several natural products. Among the reductive methods for accessing carbonyls from nitroalkanes, the McMurry method using $\mathrm{TiCl}_{3}$ is the most commonly used. The total synthesis of Spirotryprostatin B was accomplished by Fuji and coworkers using the McMurry method. ${ }^{63}$ The conversion of the nitroolefin (1.102) to the corresponding aldehyde (1.103) was carried out under reductive conditions using excess $\mathrm{TiCl}_{3}$ in aqueous solution. The initially formed aldehyde oxime was hydrolyzed in situ by the excess ammonium acetate.


Figure 1.42: Fuji's Synthesis of Spirotryprostatin B Using Reductive Nef Reaction

Oxidative Nef conditions use oxidizing agents, such as potassium permanganate $\left(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\right)$, $m$-choroperbenzoic acid ( $m$-CPBA), hydrogen peroxide $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right)$, or Oxone ${ }^{\circledR} .{ }^{64}$ The oxidative method allows conversion of primary nitroalkanes into aldehydes or carboxylic acids, while the secondary nitroalkanes are converted into ketones.

In 2017, Hayashi and coworkers reported an elegant example of oxidative Nef reaction in the enantioselective synthesis of Beraprost. ${ }^{65}$ Nitrolefin (1.104) is oxidized to $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ketone (1.105) using oxygen as the oxidant and 1,4 -diazabicyclo [2.2.0].


Figure 1.43: Hayashi's Synthesis of Beraprost Using Oxidative Nef Reaction

### 1.1.9 Denitration of Nitroalkanes

The replacement of a nitro functional group by hydrogen is a relatively novel transformation as compared with other traditional functional group transformations (See section 1.1 .7 and 1.1.8). The ease and functional group compatibility of denitration methods make this strategy a powerful one for natural product synthesis. In 1979, Kornblum and coworkers reported the first radical denitration to afford aliphatic chain (1.107). ${ }^{66}$ The tertiary nitroalkane (1.106) was treated with sodium salt of methyl mecaptan to cleave the carbon-nitrogen bond to afford denitrated product (1.107) via radical mechanism in excellent yields (Figure 1.44). However, the scope was limited to tertiary nitroalkanes; secondary nitroalkanes shows little reactivity and primary nitroalkanes were unreactive. Also, toxic HMPA was used as solvent, which negatively impacts the practicality of this approach.


Figure 1.44: Kornblum's First Radical Denitration of Nitroalkanes

In 1981, Ono and Tanner reported independently that tributyltin hydride $\left(\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}\right)$ is more versatile for denitration of nitroalkanes than sodium salt of methyl mecaptan. ${ }^{67}$ Tanner demonstrated that the excess $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ and catalytic benzoyl peroxide was efficient for the conversion of tertiary nitroalkanes (1.108) into denitrated product (1.109) in good yield. Tanner proposed a radical mechanism, as the
reaction was completely inhibited by the addition of strongly electron withdrawing mdinitrobenzene (Figure 1.45 top).



Figure 1.45: Ono and Tanner's Trialkyltin Reagents for Denitration of Nitroalkanes

In 1981 Ono and coworkers reported the first reduction of secondary nitroalkanes (1.110). The secondary nitroalkane (1.110) was treated with catalytic amount of radical initiator such as 2,2-azobisisobutyronitrile (AIBN) and stoichiometric $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ to cleave the carbon-nitrogen bond to afford denitrated product (1.111) via radical mechanism in good yields (Figure 1.45, bottom).

The synthetic utility of denitration with trialkyltin reagents is demonstrated in the synthesis of $(3 S, 4 R)$-paroxetine, a serotonin inhibitor used in the treatment of depression, by Dixon and coworkers. ${ }^{68}$ Denitration of nitroamide (1.112) affords product (1.113) in good yield and without erosion of ee (Figure 1.46). The Yamaguchi group reported complete stereoretention in the cleavage of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}$ bond of the stereochemically pure Michael addition compound (1.114) (Figure 1.47). ${ }^{69}$ With the
synthetically useful stereoselective methods developed for Henry reaction, aza-Henry reaction, and Michael addition, this method enhances the utility of the resultant products as chiral intermediates for further derivatization.


Figure 1.46: Dixon's Synthesis of Paroxetine Using Radical Denitration of Nitroalkanes


Figure 1.47: Yamaguchi’s Stereoretentive Denitration of Nitroalkanes

Even though the radical-mediated reduction of nitroalkanes to alkanes with stoichiometric $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ has been extensively used in the organic synthesis, due to stoichiometric and super stoichiometric amounts of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$, inherent toxicity of tributyl tin compounds, as well as purification issues associated with $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ reagent, methods have been developed that use catalytic quantities of trialkyltin in the presence of silicon hydride reductant. In 1998, Fu and coworkers reported an efficient method
using a catalytic amount of tributyl tin and phenyl silane as a reductant. ${ }^{70}$ This new catalytic method is effective for the reduction of tertiary nitroalkanes and activated secondary nitroalkanes and is compatible with several functional groups including acetals, esters, ketones, ethers nitriles and mesylates (Figure 1.48).


Figure 1.48: Fu's Trialkyltin Reagent Catalyzed Reduction of Nitroalkanes to Alkanes

The proposed mechanism involves the reaction of nitroalkane (1.115) with $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ produces alkane (1.116) and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnONO}$ (1.117). In the regeneration step of the catalytic cycle, phenyl silane (1.118) reduces $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnONO}$ to $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ to turn over the catalytic cycle (Figure 1.50). The evidence supporting the reduction step comes from ${ }^{119} \mathrm{Sn}$ NMR studies (Figure 1.49).

$$
\underset{\underset{\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnONO}}{{ }^{119} \mathrm{Sn} \text { NMR: } \delta 83 \mathrm{ppm}}+\mathrm{PhSiH}_{3} \xrightarrow[\substack{\mathrm{rt},<10 \mathrm{~min} \\ \text { quantitative }}]{\mathrm{d}_{8} \text {-toluene }}}{{ }^{119} \mathrm{Sn} \text { NMR: } \delta-89 \mathrm{ppm}}
$$

Figure 1.49: Fu's ${ }^{119}$ Sn NMR Studies


Figure 1.50: Fu's Proposed Mechanism for the $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ Catalyzed Reduction of Nitroalkane to alkane

### 1.2 Early Efforts Towards C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes Using Alkyl Electrophile

Although several reactions of nitroalkanes are known, such as the Henry reaction (section 1.1.1), conjugate additions to $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated carbonyls (section 1.1.2), and palladium-catalyzed allylation (section 1.1.4) and arylation reactions (section 1.1.5), the alkylation of nitroalkanes with alkyl halide electrophiles to form a new $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond remains a highly challenging task. This is because the nitronate anion undergoes alkylation at oxygen leading to unstable nitronic esters, which break down to give an oxime and carbonyl compound (Figure 1.51). Given the variety of the existing methods of forming new $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds with nitroalkanes, the ability to selectively C-alkylate nitroalkanes with alkyl electrophile would fill a significant gap in the existing scientific literature. Despite the apparent value and seeming simplicity of such a $C$-alkylation method for nitroalkanes with simple alkyl electrophiles, reports as early as 1908 have described failed attempts to perform such a general transformation.


Figure 1.51: Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 1.2.1 Early Reports of $\boldsymbol{O}$-alkylation over $\boldsymbol{C}$-alkylation

In 1949, when Hass and Bender first investigated the reaction between the sodium salt of 2-nitropropane and various benzylic halides, the O-alkylation products were predominantly observed. ${ }^{71}$ However, an exception occurred when the electron deficient $p$-nitrobenzyl chloride was employed, exclusively providing the C -alkylated product (1.119) (Figure 1.52).


Figure 1.52: Hass and Bender's Study of Nitroalkane Alkylation

### 1.2.2 Mechanistic Studies for $\boldsymbol{C}$-alkylation of Nitroalkanes

In 1975, Kornblum and coworkers proposed a radical anion mechanism to explain the initial report by Hass and Bender. ${ }^{72}$ The author observed a trend between the formation of C -alkylation product (1.119) and the leaving group on the starting
material (1.120). The better leaving groups favor O-alkylated product (1.121) via typical $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ mechanism, and the less effective leaving groups favor C -alkylation product (1.119) via a radical mechanism (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Action of Leaving Group on C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes


To gain insight into the radical nature of the $C$-alkylaiton of nitroalkanes, Kornblum and coworkers exposed the reaction to known radical inhibitor, pdinitrobenzene. ${ }^{73}$ Adding catalytic amount of $p$-dinitrobenzene affords $O$-alkylated product (1.121). The control experiment without $p$-dinitrobenzene affords the $C$ alkylated product (1.119) (Table 1.2). Based on this experiment, Kornblum proposed the mechanism as shown in Figure 1.53. In this mechanism, single electron transfer (SET) from the electron rich nitronate anion (1.123) to the electron deficient arene (1.122) afforded the radical anion intermediate (1.124). This radical intermediate decomposes to expel chloride and a benzylic radical (1.125). This benzylic radical then undergoes radical-anion coupling with the nitronate anion (1.123) to form the
radical anion of the product (1.126), which reduces another equivalent of the benzyl chloride, thus propagating the chain reaction and generating the $C$-alkylated product (1.119).

Table 1.2: Effect of Radical Inhibitor on C-Alkylation of Nitroalkane



Figure 1.53: Kornblum's Proposed Radical Chain Mechanism for $C$-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 1.2.3 Katritzky's Pyridinium Salts in the C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

To explore other methods to C-alkylate nitroalkanes, in 1981 Katritzky and coworkers showed that $N$-alkyl pyridinium salts or quinolium salts (1.127) alkylate a variety of nitronate anions (Figure 1.54 , top). ${ }^{74}$ Although this method is compatible with both primary and secondary nitroalkanes, the functional group tolerance was not studied. Furthermore, the multistep synthesized pyridinium salts used in this reaction are used stoichiometrically and they are not recoverable after the reaction.

Unlike Kornblum's radical chain mechanism for C-alkylation of nitroalkanes, this process is not a radical chain reaction. Instead, Katritzky suggests the intermediacy of a charge-transfer complex (1.129) between the nitronate anion and the pyridinium salt. This charge-transfer complex undergoes homolytic bond cleavage to afford triphenylpyridine (1.130), an alkyl radical, and an $\alpha$-nitro radical (1.131), which recombines to provide the C -alkylated product (1.132) (Figure 1.54, bottom). ${ }^{75}$ Interestingly, the addition of known radical scavengers such as $p$-dinitrobenzene does not the inhibit the reaction.



Figure 1.54: Katritzky's Alkylation of Nitronates with Pyridinium Salts and Proposed Mechanism

### 1.2.4 Alkyl Metal Complexes to C-Alkylate Nitroalkanes

Russell and coworkers showed that alkylmercury halides can be used to $C$ alkylate nitroalkanes. By utilizing photolytic conditions, tertiary alkyl mercury chloride or secondary alkyl mercury chloride ( $\mathbf{1 . 1 3 3}$ and $\mathbf{1 . 1 3 4}$ ) could be treated with secondary nitronate anions to afford $C$-alkylated product (Figure 1.55 ). ${ }^{76}$ The product (1.135 and 1.136), which possesses two fully substituted carbon centers, can be accessed in synthetically useful yields. However, the toxicity of the alkylmercury reagents impedes their use in synthesis. The author proposed a radical anion coupling mechanism. Under the visible light irradiation, alkylmercury halides (1.133) generates an alkylradical (1.137). Subsequently, this alkyl radical undergoes radical anion coupling with the nitronate anion to afford $C$-alkylated product (1.135) (Figure 1.55, bottom).


Figure 1.55: Russell's Alkylation of Nitroalkanes Using Alkylmercury Halides and Proposed Mechanism

Branchaud and coworkers have shown that alkylcobalt complex (1.138) can also be used to $C$-alkylate nitroalkanes. By utilizing photolytic conditions, primary alkylcobalt complex could be treated with primary nitronate anions to afford desired product (1.139) (Figure 1.56 top). ${ }^{77}$ Simple nitroalkanes such as nitromethane and 1nitropropane were shown to participate in the reaction, although functionalized nitroalkanes were not studied. Furthermore, the requirement to synthesize the alkylcobalt reagent and the photolytic conditions limits the scalability and impedes its use in the synthesis. Under visible light irradiation, the alkylcobalt complex decomposes to form alkyl radicals, which undergo coupling with nitronate anions to afford product (1.140) upon oxidation (Figure 1.56 bottom). This reaction, as well as above examples, (section 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3) displays the high propensity of alkyl radicals to combine with nitronate anions to form $C$-alkylated products.


Figure 1.56: Branchaud's Alkylation of Nitroalkanes Using Alkylcobalt Complex and Proposed Mechanism

### 1.3 Radical Cross-Coupling Reactions Using Base Metal Catalysis

Even though the methods described in section 1.2 to $C$-alkylate nitroalkanes suffered from harsh reaction conditions, utilized toxic reagents, and the starting materials required multistep synthesis, they are proposed to undergo radical-anion coupling as the key step in the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming event. A wide variety of useful and elegant chemistry has been developed over the past several decades using radical intermediates. ${ }^{78}$ A review of literature suggests that first-row transition metals such as nickel, ${ }^{79}$ iron, ${ }^{79 b, 80}$ cobalt, ${ }^{81}$ and copper ${ }^{78 a, 82}$ are known to generate transient radicals when exposed to alkyl halides. We hypothesized that such a radical based process might form the basis for a general, catalytic approach to successful C -alkylation of nitroalkanes.


Figure 1.57: Proposed Base Metal Catalyzed to C-Alkylate Nitroalkanes via Radical Anion Coupling

### 1.3.1 Nickel Catalyzed Cross Couplings of $\mathbf{s p}^{\mathbf{3}}$ Halides

Nickel is by far the most versatile metal for the cross coupling of simple alkyl halides and it has drawn a lot more attention in recent years than palladium. This is due to low cost, accessibility to various oxidation states such as Ni (0), (I), (II), (III) (which allows different modes of reactivity and radical based mechanisms), and a slower $\beta$-hydride elimination step. Specifically, the energy barrier to the $\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{C}$ bond rotation prior to $\beta$-hydride elimination is often significantly higher for nickel than for comparable palladium species. ${ }^{83}$

Nickel-catalyzed cross couplings of alkyl electrophiles in organic synthesis and the involvement of alkyl radical intermediates have been extensively reviewed. ${ }^{79 \mathrm{a}, 84}$ The seminal reports and recent advancements in the nickel catalyzed alkyl electrophile cross coupling will be discussed.

In 1992, Suzuki and coworkers published the first palladium catalyzed $C\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-$ $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)$ cross coupling reaction using primary alkyl iodide and alkyl boranes, but significant amounts of elimination and reduction products were also formed (elimination: reduction: desired product, 9:27:50) (Figure 1.58 top). ${ }^{85}$ Knochel then reported that nickel catalysts could be used to successfully couple primary alkyl iodides with alkylzinc reagents using a tethered alkene ${ }^{86}$ or exogenous electrondeficient alkene (Figure 1.58 bottom). ${ }^{87}$ Kambe reported an olefin-assisted Kumada coupling of primary alkyl halides and tosylates, proposed to proceed via a bis $\left(\eta^{3}\right.$-allyl) nickel catalyst formed by the coupling of two equivalents of butadiene (Figure 1.58 middle). ${ }^{88}$

## Suzuki (1992)



Knochel (1996)


## Kambe (2002)



Figure 1.58: Suzuki, Knochel and Kambe Studies on Cross-Coupling of Primary Alkyl Electrophile Using Pd or Ni Catalysis

In 2003, Fu and coworkers reported the nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling of secondary alkyl bromides with $\beta$-hydrogens (1.141) and alkylzinc reagents (1.142). The chelating tridentate PyBOX nitrogen ligand (1.143) was essential, perhaps by slowing the rate of $\beta$-hydride elimination, which requires an open coordination site. The transition from previously used primary alkyl halides to secondary alkyl halide is ground-breaking, because it opened the door way to asymmetric synthesis of tertiary stereocenters (Figure 1.59). ${ }^{89}$


Figure 1.59: Fu's Pioneering Studied on Nickel-Catalyzed Negishi Cross Coupling of Secondary Alkyl Electrophile Using Tridentate PyBOX Ligand

Following extensive mechanistic studies by Vicic, it is hypothesized that a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ species (1.144) undergoes transmetallation with alkylzinc reagent to form a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$-alkyl species (1.145). Single-electron transfer (SET) from (1.145) to the alkyl halide generates a solvent-caged $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$-alkyl intermediate and an alkyl radical (1.146). ${ }^{90}$ Upon recombination, a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}$ dialkyl species (1.147) is formed, which after reductive elimination, affords the cross coupled product (1.148) and the active $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ catalyst (1.144) (Figure 1.60). The proposed radical mechanism was supported by the inhibition of the product formation when radical scavengers were added to the reaction, fragmentation of cyclopropyl bearing substrates results in olefinic products,
and dimerization of alkyl radicals. The synthesis and isolation $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ (terpy) $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ mono methyl complex were performed and the complex was found to be active intermediates in this reaction. ${ }^{91}$

1.146
solvent-caged radical pair
Figure 1.60: Fu's Pioneering Studied on Nickel-Catalyzed Negishi Cross Coupling of Secondary Alkyl Electrophile Using Tridentate PyBOX Ligand

Recently, the Baran and Weix group have shown that redox-active esters (RAEs) are also potential alkylating agent in nickel-catalyzed cross coupling and reductive cross couplings, respectively. These methods take advantage of utilizing alkyl carboxylic acids, which are not only cheap, abundant feedstock chemicals, but are also present in many complex bioactive molecules, giving rise to opportunities for late-stage functionalization. In their seminal report, Baran and coworkers investigated the Negishi cross coupling of alkylzinc halides (1.149) with a variety of electronically and sterically diverse, secondary RAEs (1.150) (Figure 1.61). ${ }^{92}$ The enantioenriched redox-active ester (1.151) loses chiral integrity and a cyclopropyl acetic acid
derivative (1.152) ring-opens under the reaction conditions suggesting the intermediacy of alkyl radical during the catalytic cycle (Figure 1.62).


Figure 1.61: Baran's Nickel-Catalyzed Negishi Cross Coupling of Redox-Active Esters

Based on these studies, they proposed a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I} / I I I}$ catalytic cycle in which an active $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ species (1.153) undergoes a transmetallation with the alkylzinc halide to form alkyl-nickel species (1.154). This species can then undergo oxidative addition via single-electron transfer, thus generating an alkyl radical. This newly formed alkyl radical can then recombine with $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$ species (1.155) to form high-valent $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{III}}$ species (1.156). Upon reductive elimination, the desired product (1.157) is produced and the catalytically active, electron rich, low-valent $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}}$ valent specis (1.153) is regenerated (Figure 1.63). Since this seminal report, several other cross couplings using RAEs have also been demonstrated, including Negishi or Kumada alkylations and SuzukiMiyura arylations. ${ }^{93}$


Figure 1.62: Baran's Radical Probe Studies Negishi Cross Coupling of Redox-Active Esters


Figure 1.63: Baran's Proposed Mechanism on Negishi Cross Coupling of RedoxActive Esters

Alternatively, Weix has shown that RAEs can serve as alkyl electrophiles in a nickel-catalyzed reductive coupling with aryl iodides. The reaction exhibits broad scope in both the RAEs and aryl electrophile, affording the primary or secondary alkyl arenes (1.158) in excellent yields (Figure 1.64). ${ }^{94}$ Even though the authors have not
proposed a mechanism but suggested that a radical-chain bimetallic mechanism may be operative.


Figure 1.64: Weix's Nickel-Catalyzed Reductive Cross Coupling of RAEs and Aryl Iodides

### 1.3.2 Iron Catalyzed Cross Couplings of $\mathrm{sp}^{\mathbf{3}}$ Halides

Iron compounds offer many advantages over other transition metals catalysts such as nickel, palladium, rhodium, etc. as iron is extremely cheap, abundant, nontoxic and environmentally benign. Iron-catalyzed reactions have been utilized in organic synthesis and it has been extensively reviewed. ${ }^{80}$ As with nickel catalysis, a variety of different alkyl-alkyl cross coupling reactions using iron catalysis have also been developed. ${ }^{78 a, 79 b, 84 b, 95}$ The seminal reports and recent advancements in the ironcatalyzed alkyl electrophile cross coupling and the radical intermediate involvement will be discussed.

In 1971, Kochi and coworkers reported the first alkyl electrophile cross coupling using iron catalysis. For example, simple alkyl halides (1.159) were treated with Grignard reagents (1.160) in the presence of catalytic amounts of $\mathrm{FeCl}_{3}$ to form new $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds in modest yields (Figure 1.65). Several byproducts such as homocoupling of alkyl halide and hydrogen atom abstraction were observed; accordingly, Kochi proposed a radical based mechanism. ${ }^{96}$


Figure 1.65: Kochi's Early Study on Alkyl-Alkyl Cross Coupling Using Iron Catalysis

In 2007, the Chai group published the first synthetically useful alkyl-alkyl cross coupling of Grignard reagents with unactivated alkyl halides using Xantphos (1.161) as the optimal ligand for iron(II) acetate (Figure 1.66). ${ }^{97}$


Figure 1.66: Chai's Initial Studies on Iron-Catalyzed Kumada Reaction

To investigate the mechanism of the reaction, the authors performed radical probing experiments. For example, when the substrate (1.162), which bears a cyclopropyl ring, was treated with Grignard reagent (1.163), the ring-opened product (1.164) was formed in modest yield (Figure 1.67). The desired product (1.165) was formed in less than $5 \%$ yield. This experiment suggests the intermediacy of an alkyl radical generated under the reaction conditions.


Figure 1.67: Chai's Radical Probing Studies on Iron-Catalyzed Kumada Reaction

In 2015, Nakamura and coworkers reported the first iron-catalyzed enantioselective cross coupling reaction between Grignard reagents and $\alpha$ chloroesters. ${ }^{98}$ The author showed a variety of racemic $\alpha$-chloroesters (1.166) were coupled with aryl Grignard reagent in the presence of a catalytic amount of $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{acac})_{3}$ and a chiral bisphosphine ligand (1.167), affording the products (1.168) in high yield and good enantioselectivity (Figure 1.68).


Figure 1.68: Nakamura's First Example of Iron-Catalyzed Asymmetric Reaction between $\alpha$-chloroesters and Aryl Grignard Reagents

The authors proposed a bimetallic radical chain mechanism, the cycle begins with Fe (II) species (1.169), which is generated from the partial reduction of $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{acac})_{3}$ in the presence of ligand (1.167) (Figure 1.69). This species (1.169) abstracts a halogen atom from the substrate (1.166) to form alkyl radical intermediate (1.170) and iron species (1.171). The alkyl radical (1.170) reacts with another divalent iron species (1.169) to form high valent $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})$ species (1.172). Upon reductive elimination,
desired product (1.168) and a low valent $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{I})$ species (1.173) is produced. This $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{I})$ species (1.173) conproportionates with the Fe(III) species (1.171) to form catalytically active $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})$ species (1.169). The intermediacy of alkyl radical was supported by the observation of ring opened product from the substrate bearing cyclopropyl ring.


Figure 1.69: Nakamura's Proposed Mechanism on Iron-Catalyzed Asymmetric Reaction between $\alpha$-chloroesters and Aryl Grignard Reagents

In 2016, Baran and coworkers reported that redox-active esters (RAEs) serve as alkyl electrophiles in an iron-catalyzed reaction with alkylzinc and alkylmagnesium reagents. A variety of electronically and sterically diverse, secondary and tertiary RAEs (1.174) could be treated with alkylzinc or alkylmagnesium reagents to afford cross-coupled products (1.175) in good yields (Figure 1.70). ${ }^{99}$ Like alkyl halides, this transformation is catalyzed via in situ generated low-valent Fe-species. Based on the
preliminary mechanistic studies, the author proposed a radical mechanism that proceeds through a stepwise oxidative addition via single electron transfer.


Figure 1.70: Baran's Iron-Catalyzed Cross Coupling of Redox-Active Esters with Alkyl Zinc and Magnesium Reagents

### 1.3.3 Cobalt Catalyzed Cross Couplings of $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ Halides

Cobalt catalyzed reactions have been extensively utilized in organic synthesis and have been reviewed accordingly. ${ }^{81}$ As with nickel and iron catalysis, a variety of different alkyl-alkyl cross coupling reactions using cobalt catalysis have also been developed. ${ }^{78,84 \mathrm{~b}}$ The seminal reports and recent advancements in the cobalt-catalyzed alkyl electrophile cross coupling will be discussed.

In 2008, the Chai group published the seminal report on cobalt-catalyzed alkylalkyl cross coupling of alkylmagnesium reagents. ${ }^{100}$ By utilizing $\mathrm{CoCl}_{2}$. 2 LiI in the presence of excess tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA), the cross coupling between primary and secondary alkyl halides (1.176) and alkyl Grignard reagents (1.177) was achieved in good yields (Figure 1.71). However, tertiary alkyl halide was not a competent cross coupling partner, thus limiting the synthetic utility of the process. The authors hypothesized the reaction proceeds via a radical pathway.


## Figure 1.71: Chai's Initial Studies on Cobalt-Catalyzed Kumada Reaction Using Alkyl Halides

In 2013, Kambe and coworkers, advanced the alkyl-alkyl cross coupling reaction using Co catalysis by utilizing $2^{\circ}$ and $3^{\circ}$ alkyl Grignard reagents. ${ }^{101}$ A variety of products ( $\mathbf{1 . 1 7 8}$ and 1.179 ) bearing sterically congested quaternary carbon centers were synthesized in excellent yield using this process (Figure 1.72).


Figure 1.72: Kambe's Advancement in the Cobalt-Catalyzed Alkyl-Alkyl Cross Coupling Using $2^{\circ}$ and $3^{\circ}$ Alkyl Grignard Reagents

Kambe proposes a two-electron mechanism and rules out a radical mechanism for the transformation based on the radical probing experiments. When the substrate (1.180) was treated under reaction conditions, cyclized product (1.181) was not formed regardless of the nature of the Grignard reagent utilized (Figure 1.73 top).

Furthermore, by utilizing a cyclopropyl-bearing substrate (1.182), no ring opened product (1.183) was observed (Figure 1.73 bottom).


Figure 1.73: Kambe's Radical Probing Studies

In 2014, the Walsh and Bian group reported the first cobalt-catalyzed enantioselective cross coupling reaction between Grignard reagent and an $\alpha$ bromoester. ${ }^{102}$ The author showed a variety of racemic $\alpha$-bromoesters (1.185) were coupled with aryl Grignard reagent $(\mathbf{1 . 1 8 6})$ in the presence of catalytic amount of $\mathrm{CoI}_{2}$ and a chiral bisoxazoline ligand (1.187), affording the products (1.188) in high yield and good enantioselectivity (Figure 1.74).


Figure 1.74: Walsh and Bian's First Example of Cobalt-Catalyzed Asymmetric Kumada Cross Coupling between $\alpha$-bromoesters and Aryl Grignard Reagents

### 1.3.4 Copper Catalyzed Atom Transfer Radical Addition

Copper complexes were known to undergo a variety of radical based reactions and they have successfully been utilized in natural product synthesis along with other first row transition metals. ${ }^{103}$ Even though several radical reactions are known for copper catalysis, the most utilized and relevant transformation to the chemistry discussed in chapter 3 and to copper-catalyzed $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes developed in our group is atom transfer reactions. ${ }^{82,104}$

The Kharasch addition was first discovered in 1945 as a means of adding halogenated methanes to olefins by using light or radical initiators. ${ }^{105}$ Today, this process, commonly referred to as atom transfer radical addition (ATRA) and it goes via radical mechanism. Catalytic amount of diacetyl peroxide initiates a radical-chain mechanism by decomposition of methyl radical (1.189) and peroxide radical (1.190). These radical species abstract a hydrogen atom from (1.191), forming a stabilized radical (1.192). This radical species (1.192) adds across the olefin, forming a new C C bond (1.193). The product distribution is very poor because the product (1.193) can undergo a variety of additional reactions (Figure 1.75).


Figure 1.75: Kharasch Seminal Report on Atom Transfer Radical Addition

Intramolecular transition metal-catalyzed ATRA or atom transfer radical cyclisation (ATRC) reaction is an attractive tool because it enables the synthesis of functionalized ring systems that can be used as a precursor for complex molecule synthesis. In 1990, the Tsuji group reported the first successful example of copper mediated ATRC reaction in the synthesis of trichlorinated $\gamma$-lactones from readily available alkenyl trichloroacetates. ${ }^{106}$ The proposed mechanism involves abstraction of a chlorine atom (1.194) by $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ salt to generate stabilized alkyl radical (1.195) and $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ species. The radical (1.195) adds across the double bond to generate primary radical (1.196), which abstracts a chlorine atom from $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ species to regenerate active $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ species and product (1.197) (Figure 1.76).


Figure 1.76: Tsuji's Seminal Report on ATRC Reaction and The Proposed Mechanism

Recently, Nishikata and workers reported the copper-catalyzed radical alkenylation using activated tertiary alkyl halide (1.198) and styrene derivatives. This reaction provides an efficient synthesis of tertiary-alkylated products (Figure 1.77). ${ }^{107}$ The activated tertiary bromide substrate (1.198) is known to undergo atom transfer reactions when exposed to Cu salts and the author's proposed mechanism begins with atom transfer reaction between $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ salt and (1.198) to generate $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ and stabilized tertiary radical (1.199). Evidence of this step arises from the reaction in the presence of TEMPO which does not afford the desired product (1.200). Instead, tertiaryalkylated TEMPO adduct was obtained, which suggests the intermediacy of radical species (1.199). This radical (1.199) adds across the double bond to give a new radical intermediate (1.201), which abstracts a bromide atom from $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ to give intermediate (1.202) and regenerate the active $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ species to complete the catalytic cycle. The brominated intermediate (1.203) undergoes -HBr elimination with the amine to afford the desired product (1.200).



Figure 1.77: Nishikata's Copper Catalyzed Radical Alkenylation Reaction

Matyjaszewski pioneered the mechanistically similar atom transfer radical polymerization reaction, which affords polymers of different lengths from simple monomers using copper catalysis. This has been extensively reviewed and will not be discussed here. ${ }^{104 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, 108}$
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## Chapter 2

## TRIFLUOROMETHYLATION OF SECONDARY NITROALKANES

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Nitroalkanes are useful intermediates in several $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions and serve as precursors for several functional groups including amines and carbonyls. Despite this rich chemistry, the seemingly simple $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes with alkyl electrophiles (such as alkyl halides) has remained a highly challenging task. ${ }^{1}$ This is because the nitronate anion undergoes alkylation at oxygen rather than carbon. This process generates a nitronic ester (2.1) which decomposes rapidly in the presence of base to give aldehyde and oxime (Figure 2.1). ${ }^{2}$ As such, we sought to develop a mild catalytic protocol for the $C$-alkylation of nitronate anions with high selectivity over O-alkylation. My colleagues Dr. Peter Gildner and Dr. Amber Geitter Burch discovered the first catalytic conditions for the benzylation of nitroalkanes using the combination of a simple copper (I) salt and easily synthesized diketimine ligand (nacnac) (2.2). ${ }^{3}$ This method provides access to a variety of complex homobenzylic Nitroalkanes (2.3) which can be readily transformed into medicinally relevant phenethylamine derivatives.

Our preliminary mechanistic hypothesis involves a stabilized radical intermediate generated via atom transfer from electron-rich $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$-nacnac complex, followed by radical-anion coupling with nitronate anion to afford nitronate radical (2.4), and back transfer of an electron to the $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ center to regenerate the catalyst and desired product (2.3) (Figure 2.2).


Figure 2.1: Copper-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes with Benzyl bromide


Figure 2.2: Proposed Mechanism for $C$-Benzylation of Nitroalkanes

Our studies on the benzylation of nitroalkanes showed that the reaction proceeds through an intermediacy of alkyl radicals. This suggests that the other alkyl halides bearing stabilizing group might serve as potential alkylating agents for nitroalkanes. Toward this end, our group investigated the use of the $\alpha$-halocarbonyl scaffold (2.5), since these substrates have been shown to form alkyl radicals in transition-metal catalysis. This method can be utilized to access to a variety of $\beta$ -
nitrocarbonyls (2.6). ${ }^{4}$ The substrate scope is remarkably broad, tolerating various carbonyl groups including esters, amides, ketones and aldehydes in excellent yields. Additionally, the alkylation proceeds even in the presence of considerable steric congestion, forming products bearing contiguous quaternary centers in synthetically useful yields. The products can be easily derivatized into $\beta$-amino acids, compounds with considerable use in bioorganic chemistry, as the basis of peptoids. ${ }^{5}$


Figure 2.3: Copper-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes with $\alpha$-Halocarbonyl Compounds

Our group's interest in the synthesis of highly nitrogen-rich compounds led us to consider nitrogen-containing groups that could be used to support neighboring radicals. Toward this end, my colleague Dr. Kirk Shimkin discovered a mild coppercatalyzed condition for the $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes with $\alpha$-bromonitrile (2.7)electrophiles. ${ }^{6}$ This method provides access to a variety of $\beta$-cyanonitroalkanes (2.8), which are valuable synthetic building blocks due to their potential use as orthogonally masked 1,3-diamines. In addition, these products can also be derivatized into complex cyanoalkenes and 5-aminoisoxazoles in good yields.


Figure 2.4: Copper-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes with $\alpha$-Bromonitriles

Organofluorine compounds play an important role in pharmaceuticals, agrochemicals, liquid crystals, dyes, and polymers. ${ }^{7}$ Trifluoromethyl groups in particular have been shown to impart unique physiological properties, including modulation of binding affinities, lipophilicity, metabolic stability, and bioavailability when incorporated into organic compounds. ${ }^{8}$ Introduction of a trifluoromethyl group alpha to nitrogen results in favorable modulation of in vivo activity compared to their non-fluorinated analogs. ${ }^{9}$ A rapid entry into such $\alpha$-trifluoromethylamines can be achieved through the trifluoromethylation of nitroalkanes, followed by subsequent reduction of the nitro functional group. Based on our past studies, we envisioned that alkylation of a nitroalkanes with appropriate electrophilic trifluoromethylating agent would provide an elegant solution to this problem. Umemoto's reagent (2.9) was selected as an appropriate trifluoromethyl source because of its potential to form $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical under catalytic conditions. The fully substituted $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkanes (2.10) obtained from this transformation can be derived into a variety of complex nitrogen-containing, medicinally-relevant $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)amines $\mathbf{2 . 1 1}$ (Figure 2.5). This chapter will describe the development of trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using Umemoto's reagent as electrophile.


Figure 2.5: Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkanes using Umemoto's Reagent

### 2.2 Medicinal Importance of Trifluoromethyl Groups

Trifluoromethylated molecules are increasingly targeted in the field of medicinal chemistry for a myriad of reasons (see section 2.1). Remarkably, a subtle structural change from a methyl group to a trifluoromethyl group often imparts pronounced improvements in drug-like qualities of a molecule. The antidepressant Fluoxetine (Eli Lilly), marketed as the racemate and commonly known as Prozac ${ }^{\circledR}$, is a molecule containing an aryl trifluoromethyl group. Studies have shown that depression is linked to low levels of neuro-transmitter 5-hydroxytryptamine (5-HT), also known as serotonin. Fluoxetine acts by selectively inhibiting the reuptake of serotonin, allowing the neurotransmitter to activate its specific receptor. Structureactivity relationship studies showed that the presence of a trifluoromethyl group in the para position of the phenolic ring increases the potency for inhibiting 5-HT uptake by 6 -fold, compared to the non-fluorinated parent compound (Figure 2.6). ${ }^{10}$ It has been documented that the size of the trifluoromethyl group is almost double the size of the methyl group, and closer in size to an isopropyl group. ${ }^{8 a}$ Accordingly, it is hypothesized that the steric bulk of the trifluoromethyl group allows the aryl ring to adopt a conformation which favors binding to the 5-HT transporter. ${ }^{11}$

$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=102 \mathrm{nM}$

$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=95 \mathrm{nM}$

$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}=17 \mathrm{nM}$
Prozac ${ }^{\circledR}$

Figure 2.6: Comparison of $K_{i}$ Value of Prozac ${ }^{\circledR}$ and its Derivatives

Another case study of the trifluoromethyl group's medicinal properties can be seen in the development of trifluridine. Trifluridine is an antiviral drug used in the treatment of eye infections. It is a suicide inhibitor, causing irreversible inhibition of thymidylate synthase (TS). TS is an enzyme that mediates the methylation of deoxyuridine monophosphate forming thymidine monophosphate, a key step in DNA biosynthesis. Inhibition of this enzyme causes apoptic cell death, which affects rapidly dividing cancer cells or viruses.

The drug acts by irreversibly forming a covalent bond with thymidylate synthase. The proposed mechanism involves the Michael addition of the nucleophilic group at the active site, followed by fluoride elimination to give difluoromethylene intermediate. The nucleophilic amine group at the active site further reacts with the intermediate to form an amide bond after the fluoride elimination and subsequent hydrolysis. The mechanism of inhibition of thymidylate synthase by trifluridine (Figure 2.7). ${ }^{12}$







Figure 2.7: Mechanism of Inhibition of Thymidylate Synthase by Trifluridine

Suppressing the rate of oxidative metabolism by fluorine substitution is an important strategy in drug development. vitamin $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ is used in the treatment of hyperthyroidism. Falicalcitral, a fluorinated analogue of vitamin $D_{3}$ exhibits increased metabolic stability compared to native vitamin $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ (Figure 2.8). In this case, $\mathrm{C}-25$ hydroxyl oxidation is blocked by the presence of trifluoromethyl substituents. ${ }^{13}$



Figure 2.8: Structure Comparison of Vitamin $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ and Falicalcitral

Enhancing the oral bioavailability by incorporating trifluoromethyl groups is another important strategy in drug discovery. Structure-activity relationship studies of Sitagliptin, a DPP-4 inhibitor used in the treatment of type 2 diabetes, showed that only the trifluoromethylated derivative possessed good oral bioavailability (Table 2.1). ${ }^{14}$

Table 2.1: Comparison of the Oral Bioavailability of Sitagliptin and its NonFluorinated Analogs

 Sitagliptin

| Compound | R | DPP-4 $\mathrm{IC}_{50}(\mathrm{nM})$ | Oral Bioavailability F (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ | H | 68 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 3}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ | 37 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 4}$ | $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ | 18 | 76 |

### 2.3 Importance of $\alpha$-(Trifluoromethyl)amines

As previously discussed, $\alpha$-trifluoromethyl amines has been shown to favorably modulate the biological properties of numerous small molecules compared when to their non-fluorinated analogues. The following examples illustrate a pronounced effect on the potency of the drug candidates.

Replacement of amide bonds with suitable bioisosteres is an approach used in the medicinal chemistry. There are few examples of amide bond isosteres that preserve the geometry and basicity of the amide N-H bond; notably, trifluoromethylamines serve as competent bioisosteres for the amide group. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Cathepsin K is a cysteine protease that is highly expressed in osteoclasts; accordingly, it is an important target for the treatment of osteoporosis. ${ }^{15}$ Studies have shown that replacement of the amide carbonyl with a trifluoromethyl group enhances the potency of the Cathepsin K inhibitor (Table 2.2). Molecular modeling studies show that the non-basic nature of the $\alpha$-trifluoromethylamine maintains the excellent hydrogen bonding to Gly66. ${ }^{9 a}$ Furthermore, structure-activity relationship studies show that the fluorinated analog is 1000 times more potent than the non-fluorinated analogues (Table 2.3).

Table 2.2: $\alpha$-Trifluoromethylamines as Amide Isosteres in Cathepsin K Inhibitors


2.16

| Compound | Cathepsin K IC $_{50}(\mathrm{nM})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 5}$ | $\leq 0.0015$ |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}$ | 0.015 |

Table 2.3: Comparison of $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ Replacements in Cathepsin K inhibitors

cathepsin K inhibitor

| Compound | R | Cathepsin $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{IC}_{50}(\mathrm{nM})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ | H | 802 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 988 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ | $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ | 0.9 |

In 2011, researchers at Merck reported $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ as an inhibitor of Janus Kinase 2 (JAK2). ${ }^{16}$ JAK2 has been linked to myeloproliferative disorders (MPDs), which are a group of disorders that cause red blood cells, white blood cells, and platelets to grow abnormally in bone marrow. These abnormalities have been linked to several different diseases, such as primary myelofibrosis and chronic myelogenous leukemia. With respect to JAK2 inhibitors, the installation of a trifluoromethyl group on the parent scaffold increased the inhibitory concentration by 25 -fold, enhanced the enzymatic
selectivity, and improved the pharmacokinetic profile towards inhibition of JAK 2 (Table 2.4).

Table 2.4: Comparison of $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ Replacements in JAK2 Inhibitors


Taxol ${ }^{\circledR}$ is an anti-cancer drug used extensively in the treatment of breast and ovarian cancers. However, studies have shown that its use results in undesirable side effects. ${ }^{17}$ Ojima and coworkers showed a second-generation, fluorine-containing taxoid which exhibits fewer side effects and improved activity against drug-resistant tumors. ${ }^{18}$ Structure - activity relationship studies showed 2.22 to be 20 -fold more potent than the phenyl analogue (2.23) (Table 2.5). ${ }^{19}$ The new trifluoromethylated taxoid possesses excellent activity against several human cancer cell lines, A121 (ovarian carcinoma), A549 (non-small cell lung carcinoma), HT-29 (colon carcinoma), and MCF-7 (mammary carcinoma).

Table 2.5: Comparison of $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ Replacements in Taxoid


### 2.4 Previous Syntheses of $\alpha$-Perfluoronitroalkanes:

Two methods have been previously described to prepare $\alpha$ perfluoronitroalkanes. Both methods utilized a perfluoroalkylating agent for the perfluoroalkylation of nitroalkanes. In 1981, Umemoto and coworkers described the perfluoroalkylation of an alkyl sodium nitronate salt using the perfluorinated hypervalent iodine reagent (2.24) (FITS). ${ }^{20}$ Similarly, using the less reactive perfluoroalkylphenyliodonium sulfate (2.25) (FIS) was competent in the reaction, albeit in lower yield than (2.24). The high reactivity of (2.24) is attributed to the good leaving ability of the triflate group. Even though only two examples were studied using nitroalkanes as the nucleophiles, this was an important step in the development of perfluoroalkylation of nitroalkanes (Figure 2.9).


Figure 2.9: Umemoto's Synthesis of $\alpha$-Perfluoronitroalkanes

In 1983, Feiring described the perfluoroalkylation of 2-nitropropane using perfluoroalkyliodides (2.26) as the perfluoroalkylating agent. ${ }^{21}$ This method removes the need of FITS (2.24), which must be synthesized prior to use. The scope with perfluoroalkyliodides was limited, and only one nitroalkane was investigated. Several experiments suggest that the reaction proceeds via SRN1 mechanism. For example, the reaction gave low yield of the desired product when conducted in the dark and inhibited by radical scavengers. Second, electrochemical studies on 1-iodotridecafluorohexane revealed a reduction potential of -0.6 V vs SCE (in MeCN ), which lies in the range of electron transfer from the nitronate anion. Finally, when $2^{\circ}$ perfluoroalkyliodides are treated with nitronate anion, homodimers of perfluoroalkyl iodides were observed, suggesting the intermediacy of perfluoroalkyl radical species. ${ }^{21}$


Figure 2.10: Feiring's Synthesis of $\alpha$-perfluoronitroalkanes using Photolytic Condition

### 2.5 Previous Syntheses of $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes:

The method described in section 2.4 are effective to synthesize $\alpha$ perfluoronitroalkanes, but are ineffective in synthesizing $\alpha$ (trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes. In 1963, Kununyants developed the first method to prepare simple $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl) nitroalkanes (2.27) by treating hydrogen fluoride and nitric acid with 1,1-difluoroethylene. ${ }^{22}$ While this method established precedent for the synthesis of $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkanes, the harsh reaction conditions utilized limits the general applicability of this transformation.


Figure 2.11: Knunyant's Synthesis of $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes

In 2007, Togni and his coworkers reported the first example of a transition metal-catalyzed reaction for the formation of $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes. ${ }^{23}$ Using catalytic copper and Togni's reagent (2.28), activated $\alpha$-nitroesters could be trifluromethylated in good yield (Figure 2.12). Notably, one example with an activated $\alpha$-nitroamide was reported. Control experiments showed that no desired trifluoromethylated product was formed when copper (I) bromide dimethyl sulfide was omitted.


Figure 2.12: Scope of Togni's $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes of $\alpha$-Nitroesters

This procedure, however, has several serious limitations (Figure 2.12). First, nitroalkanes bearing other activating group such as ketones and carboxylic acids were not suitable coupling partners. Second, any substitution $\alpha$ to the nitro carbon is not accessible and nitroalkanes possessing $\beta$-branching are not accessible, suggesting a serious steric limitation. Third, no functional group tolerance with respect to nitroalkanes was displayed using these reaction conditions (Figure 2.13). Finally, only $\alpha$-nitrocarbonyls, which are a specialized class of activated nitroalkanes, were trifluoromethylated under the reaction conditions. $\alpha$-Trifluoromethylation of unactivated nitroalkanes were not explored using these reaction conditions. It was also reported that the isolation of the products can be difficult. As shown in Figure 2.12, substrate (2.30) has ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and isolated yield of $99 \%$ and $31 \%$ respectively, supporting the claim that the isolation was difficult. Togni attributed this discrepancy in yield to the high volatility of $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkane (2.30).


Figure 2.13: Limitations of Togni's Trifluoromethylation of $\alpha$-Nitrocarbonyls.

Togni's group also investigated the possibility of developing an diastereoselective trifluoromethylation of chiral $\alpha$-nitroesters (2.39). A doctoral thesis from Togni's group shows that formation of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CF} 3$ bond could proceed diastereoselectively via remote stereo control. Using a menthol-derived chiral auxillary, diastereoselectivities of up to 6:1 were observed (Figure 2.14). ${ }^{24}$


Figure 2.14: Togni's Diastereoselective Studies of Trifluoromethylation of $\alpha$ Nitroesters using Phenyl Menthol Chiral Auxillary

As shown in Figure 2.15, the Togni group could desymmetrize the trifluoromethylation of $\alpha$-nitroesters using a chiral $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{BOX}$ (2.40) complex. ${ }^{25}$ After
survey of a variety of ligand scaffolds, the best results were obtained using chiral copper complex (2.40). Nitroalkane (2.41) was obtained in $24 \%$ ee (yield not reported). More discouragingly, attempts to extend to additional substrates such as (2.42), (2.43) and (2.44) afforded little to no ee. The lack of generality with nitroalkanes, limited substitution pattern accessible, lack of stereocontrol underscore the necessity for improved method for the preparation of $\alpha$ (trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes.


Figure 2.15: Togni's Preliminary Enantioselective Studies of Trifluoromethylation of $\alpha$-Nitroesters using Cu-BOX Complex.

### 2.6 Copper Mediated Radical Trifluoromethylation Reaction using Electrophilic Trifluromethylating Reagent:

Trifluoromethylation reactions have been extensively studied in organic synthesis. Methods for their incorporation can be broadly classified as nucleophilic, electrophilic, free radical, or transition metal-catalyzed processes; they have been extensively reviewed and will not be discussed here in detail. ${ }^{23 b, 26}$ Electrophilic trifluoromethylating reagents such as Togni's reagent (2.28) and Umemoto reagent (2.9) are easy to handle, stable at ambient conditions, and can be easily prepared. ${ }^{27}$

They have been reported to react with a wide variety of nucleophiles including keto derivatives, sulfides, arenes, enol silyl ethers, dicyanoalkylidenes, and alkynes. ${ }^{28}$ Furthermore, they are known to generate $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radicals in the presence of copper salts. A few recent examples are covered in the following section.

In 2011, Xiao and coworkers reported a mild procedure for the trifluoromethylation of heteroaryl iodides in the presence of copper using (S)(trifluoromethyl)diphenylsulfonium triflate (2.45) (Figure 2.16). ${ }^{29}$ The electrophilic trifluoromethylating reagent can be reduced by copper via single electron transfer (SET). The intermediate (2.46) rapidly decomposes to give a $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical, which reacts with copper to generate $\mathrm{CuCF}_{3}$ (2.47). The formation of $\mathrm{CuCF}_{3}$ is corroborated by ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectroscopy and ESI-MS studies (Figure 2.17).


Figure 2.16: Xiao's Trifluoromethylation of Heteroaryl Iodides with (S)(Trifluoromethyl)diphenylsulfonium Triflate


Figure 2.17: Xiao's Proposed Mechanism for the Generation of $\mathrm{CuCF}_{3}$ Intermediate

In 2013, Buchwald and coworkers developed a mild method for the enantioselective oxytrifluoromethylation of alkenes using a Togni-type reagent (2.48) and chiral copper-based catalyst (2.49) system to afford lactones such as (2.50) in good yield and excellent enantioseletivity (Figure 2.18). ${ }^{30}$


Figure 2.18: Buchwald's Copper Catalyzed Enantioselective Oxytrifluoromethylation of Alkenes using Togni's Reagent

To investigate the mechanism of the reaction, TEMPO was employed as a radical-capturing agent in the presence of catalyst to afford the TEMPO-CF $\mathbf{C l}_{\mathbf{( 2 . 5 1}} \mathbf{( 2 )}$ adduct (Figure 2.19 bottom). When a cyclopropyl-bearing substrate (2.52) was subjected to standard reaction conditions, the ring-opened product (2.53) was observed (Figure 2.19 top).


Figure 2.19: Buchwald's Radical Probe Studies in the Oxytrifluoromethylation of Alkenes

These experiments suggest the intermediacy of a $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical and an $\alpha-\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ alkyl radical intermediate formed under the reaction condition. Based on these results, the proposed mechanism involves single electron transfer between (2.48) and the $\mathrm{Cu}^{\mathrm{I}}$ catalyst, generating a $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical and a $\mathrm{Cu}^{\text {II }}$ complex. The $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical then adds across the alkene to give (2.54), which undergoes enantioselective $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}$ bond formation via the $\mathrm{Cu}^{\text {II }}$ complex, thus affording the lactone (2.50) while regenerating the $\mathrm{Cu}^{\mathrm{I}}$ catalyst (Figure 2.20).


Figure 2.20: Proposed Mechanism of Buchwald's Oxytrifluoromethylation of Alkenes

In 2013, Fu and coworkers developed a copper-promoted Sandmeyer trifluoromethylation of aniline and its derivatives (2.55) using Umemoto's reagent (2.9) in good yield (Figure 2.21). ${ }^{31}$ To gain insight into the formation of the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical under the reaction conditions EPR studies were conducted. When Umemoto's reagent (2.9), copper metal, and TEMPO were combined, the EPR signal of TEMPO is suppressed and TEMPO-CF ${ }_{3}$ (2.51) adduct was identified. This implies that copper facilitates the generation of the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical under the reaction conditions. Furthermore, using 2-(allyloxy) aniline (2.56) as substrate yielded cyclized product (2.57); acyclic product ( $\mathbf{( 2 . 5 8}$ ) was not observed, suggesting the intermediacy of an aryl radical under the reaction conditions (Figure 2.22).


Figure 2.21: Fu's Radical Sandmeyer Trifluoromethylation of Anilines using Umemoto's Reagent





Figure 2.22: Fu's Radical Probe Studies in the Trifluoromethylation of Anilines

Based on these results, the author proposes copper-mediated SET in Umemoto's reagent (2.9) to generate the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical. The $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical combines with Cu to give $\mathrm{CuCF}_{3}$, which reacts with the aryl radical (2.59) generated from the aryldiazonium ion to give the desired product (2.60) (Figure 2.23).


Figure 2.23: Proposed Mechanism of Fu's Radical Trifluoromethylation of Anilines

### 2.7 Development of Reaction Conditions

Our group was interested in developing a mild method to trifluoromethylate a diverse array of nitroalkanes to synthesize $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)nitroalkanes, which can be easily converted into medicinally relevant $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)amines. Given the likelihood for a radical-anion coupling mechanism in our C-alkylation chemistry using copper catalysis (see Section 2.1), ${ }^{3-4,6}$ We believed we could access $\alpha$ (trifluoromethyl) nitroalkanes by generating a $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical in situ using copperdiketimine catalyst.

My colleague Dr. Peter Gildner was the first to investigate this reaction. In preliminary studies, using Umemoto's reagent (2.9) as an electrophile, ${ }^{27 a, 32}$ and secondary nitroalkane (2.61) as the model nucleophile, he observed a $22 \%$ yield of the desired product (2.62) in the presence of CuBr , diketimine ligand, and $\mathrm{NaOSiMe}_{3}$ (Table 2.6, entry 1 ).

Table 2.6: Optimization of Reaction Condition for the Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkanes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Base | Additive | T ( $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Yield 2.62 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 1 | $\mathrm{NaOSiMe}_{3}$ | $20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{CuL}^{\text {b }}$ | 40 | 22\% |
| 2 | $\mathrm{NaOSiMe}_{3}$ | none | 40 | 24\% |
| 3 | DBU | none | 40 | 52\% |
| 4 | DBU | none | rt | 58\% |
| 5 | DBU | none | -25 | 90\% |
| 6 | DBU | none | -50 | 91\% |

${ }^{a} 1.3$ equiv 2.9; yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{b}$ $20 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{CuBr}, 20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ bis- $N, N^{\prime}$-(2,6-dimethylphenyl)-2,4-diiminopentane added to reaction.

After this preliminary result, my colleague Dr. Amber Gietter-Burch began optimization of the trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using Umemoto's reagent. Through control experiments, she determined that the reaction did not require catalytic additives (Table 2.6, entry 2). Switching the base from sodium trimethylsilanolate to 1,8-Diazabicyclo[5.4.0]undec-7-ene (DBU) increased the yield to $52 \%$. Finally, lowering the temperature from $+40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ afforded optimal amounts of the desired product (entry 3-5). Further decreasing the temperature did not afford an increase in yield (entry 6).

Finally, examination of trifluoromethylating reagents showed Umemoto's reagent was uniquely effective in the transformation (Table 2.7 , entry 1). Togni's reagent did afford desired product, although the yield was lower (Table 2.7, entry 2). trifluoromethyl iodide and trimethyl(trifluoromethyl)silane (Ruppert's reagent) were ineffective, affording no yield of desired product under the optimized reaction conditions (Table 2.7, entry 3-4).

Table 2.7: Optimization of Trifluoromethylating Reagent

| Entry | Trifluoromethylating Reagent | Yield $2.62^{a}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{\mathrm{b}}$ | Umemoto's Reagent (2.9) | $83 \%$ |
| 2 | Togni's Reagent (2.28) | $31 \%$ |
| $3^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{I}$ | $0 \%$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{TMSCF}_{3}$ | $0 \%$ |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{b}$ Isolated
Yield. ${ }^{b}$ Reaction performed under a balloon of $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{I}$

### 2.8 Scope of Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkanes

After Dr. Gietter-Burch optimized the reaction conditions, I joined with her to examine the scope of trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes. The reaction is general for a broad range of secondary nitroalkanes (Figure 2.24). The model substrate was isolated in $83 \%$ yield (2.62). ${ }^{3}$ Other homobenzylic nitroalkanes (2.63) led to similar results. Both benzylic substrates (2.64-2.67) ${ }^{33}$ and Michael reaction adducts (e.g., 2.68-2.71) were also well-tolerated. Sterically demanding substrates could also be used; for example, even neopentylic substrates led to appreciable yields of products (2.73) containing vicinal fully substituted centers. In contrast to secondary substrates, primary nitroalkanes provide very little reactivity; for example, only traces of (2.72) were observed. Further studies will be directed at expanding the scope of the reaction to primary nitroalkanes.



$2.73,36{ }^{d}{ }^{d}$

2.74, 73\% (>95:5), ${ }^{e}$ X-ray

2.75, 63\% (>95:5)



2.78, $74 \%$ (67:33)

2.79, 58\% (89:11)

2.80, 68\% (>95:5), X-ray
${ }^{a}$ Isolated yields unless otherwise noted. Diastereomeric ratios (dr) determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of crude reaction. ${ }^{b} 1.5$ equiv of XX used. ${ }^{c} 18 \mathrm{~h} .{ }^{d} 48 \mathrm{~h} .{ }^{e} 24 \mathrm{~h} .{ }^{f}$ Yield determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.

Figure 2.24: Scope of the Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkanes

Significantly, nitroalkanes bearing a tertiary stereocenter $\alpha$ to the nitro group proved to be excellent substrates. ${ }^{4}$ In these cases, good to excellent levels of diastereoselection were observed. For example, amide (2.74) was formed with greater than $>95: 5$ selectivity favoring the diastereomer shown (Figure 2.24). Similar selectivity was observed for the Weinreb amides (2.75). Related ester products could also be prepared (2.76-2.78), albeit with slightly lower levels of diastereoselection. These results mirror the selectivity previously observed in Michael additions of $\beta$ nitrocarbonyls. ${ }^{34}$



Figure 2.25: Proposed Model for Observed Diastereoselectivity and Crystal Structure of 2.74

A rapid reversible deprotonation of the diastereomeric mixture of nitroalkane (2.81) establish a tautomer (2.82). Intramolecular hydrogen bonding to the adjacent carbonyl organize compound. From this common intermediate, the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical is expected to react away from alkyl group as shown (Figure 2.25). This model is consistent with the observed relative stereochemistry of the products. This model is also consistent with high diastereoselectivity observed for substrates bearing more basic carbonyl groups such as amides (2.74) and (2.75). On the other hand, esters (2.76-2.78), which bear a less basic carbonyl group than amides, produce slightly lower level of diastereoselection.



Figure 2.26: Determination of Relative Stereochemistry of Trifluoromethylated Henry Reaction Substrate and Crystal Structure 2.84

Henry reaction products (2.79), ${ }^{\text {1a }}$ as well as those from conjugate addition of nitroalkanes (2.80), ${ }^{35}$ could both be trifluoromethylated with good to excellent levels of diastereoselectivity. In the latter case, stereoselectivity is consistent with addition of the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group away from the large aromatic ring (Figure 2.24 and 2.27).



Figure 2.27: Crystal Structure of $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$

The functional group tolerance of the reaction is very high. In addition to those already mentioned, tolerated functional groups include aryl halides (2.62 and 2.74), heterocycles ( $\mathbf{2 . 6 3}, \mathbf{2 . 6 6}, \mathbf{2 . 6 7}$, and 2.79), alkenes (2.69), aryl ethers (2.64), nitriles (2.68), ketones (2.65), protected and free alcohols (2.76 and 2.77), sulfones (2.70), and protic nitrogen functional groups (2.73 and 2.74).

### 2.9 Synthesis of Vinyl Trifluoromethylalkenes

The method does show some limitations with respect to nitroalkanes bearing acidic and sterically accessible $\beta$-protons. In such cases, elimination of an equivalent of nitrous acid from the trifluoromethylated product can be observed. For example, under standard conditions using DBU as base, the reaction of (2.86) did not lead to the trifluoromethylated nitroalkane (2.87) (Figure 2.28 top). Instead, the trifluoromethyl alkene (2.88) was observed in moderate yield. In some cases, the use of the bulkier base, tetramethylguanidine (TMG), enabled access to the desired product without significant elimination, albeit with less than ideal conversion and yield. In other cases, such as with ester (2.89), elimination could not be avoided regardless of the base used (Figure 2.28 bottom).


Figure 2.28: Competitive Alkene Formation and Role of Base

Interestingly, the trifluoromethylalkenes described in figure 2.28 all formed with significant selectivity for the E-isomer (as determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ Heteronuclear Overhauser Effect Spectroscopy, HOSEY NMR). ${ }^{36}$ We attribute this selectivity to the
larger steric size of the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group compared to an n-alkyl group. ${ }^{8 a}$ Recognizing the possible utility of this process for preparing trifluoromethyl alkenes, ${ }^{37}$ I investigated if this base promoted process can be triggered in less acidic products. Using substrate (2.62) as a model system, we found that exposure to $\mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ led to nearly quantitative yield of corresponding vinyl trifluoromethylalkene (2.92) with modest E:Z selectivity (Figure 2.29). This method potentially provides a mild, high yielding, two step synthesis of vinyl trifluoromethylalkenes from a variety of complex nitroalkanes.


Figure 2.29: Synthesis of Vinyl Trifluoromethylalkene

### 2.10 Synthesis of $\alpha$-(trifuoromethyl)amines

Trifluoromethylnitroalkanes are readily reduced to $\alpha$-(trifluoromethyl)amines. As shown in Figure 2.30 (top and middle), both $\mathrm{Zn} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ reduction and hydrogenolysis can be effective. However, we note that with $\alpha$-aryl nitroalkanes, which are prone to denitration, ${ }^{38}$ hydrogenolysis is the preferred method for reduction (Figure 2.30, bottom).


Figure 2.30: Preparation of $\alpha$-(trifuoromethyl)amines

### 2.11 Mechanistic Studies

### 2.11.1 Radical Probing Experiment

I investigated the mechanism of trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using Umemoto's reagent (2.9). Umemoto's reagent (2.9) is known to act as an either electrophilic or radical trifluoromethylating reagent. ${ }^{26 h}$ Additionally, nitronate anions have been shown to undergo a radical anion coupling mechanism. ${ }^{39}$ Consistent with our earlier results, ${ }^{3-4,6}$ preliminary mechanistic studies suggest that the reaction proceeds via a radical mechanism. As shown in (Table 2.8), when introducing a variety of known radical scavengers, the yield of $\alpha$-(trifuoromethyl)nitroalkane (2.62) is greatly retarded (entries 2-4). ${ }^{40}$

Table 2.8: Effect of Radical Scavengers on the Formation of $\alpha$ (trifuoromethyl)nitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$

${ }^{a}$ Yield determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxy benzene as an internal standard

### 2.11.2 Deprotonation Studies - ${ }^{1}$ H NMR Spectroscopy

I performed several in situ ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR studies in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, which revealed many details of the reaction mechanism. First, combining DBU and nitroalkane (2.61) at low temperature reveals that a significant equilibrium concentration of nitronate anion (2.96) is produced (Table 2.9 and Figure 2.32). However, the deprotonation event is slow, taking about 10 minutes for a $2: 1$ mixture of DBU and (2.61) to reach equilibrium at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure 2.31: Deprotonation Event between $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ and DBU

The yields of starting material (2.61) and nitronate anion (2.96) were determined by integrating signals shown in the table below:

Table 2.9: Chemical Shift of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 9 6}$ in ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR

| Compound | ${ }^{1}$ H NMR signal |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ | $\delta 7.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $\mathbf{2 . 9 6}$ | $\delta 7.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ |




Figure 2.32: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR Monitoring of Deprotonation of $2.61[0.05] \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Compared to Spectra of Reagents and Products Under the same conditions

Table 2.10: Yield of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 9 6}$ over Time using DBU

| Time(min) | Yield 2.61 $^{a}$ | Nitronate anion 2.96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 3 | 86 | 16 |
| 6 | 74 | 30 |
| 9 | 68 | 35 |
| 12 | 65 | 37 |
| 15 | 66 | 37 |
| 18 | 65 | 37 |
| 21 | 64 | 37 |
| 24 | 65 | 37 |
| 27 | 67 | 36 |
| 30 | 69 | 36 |

${ }^{a}$ Yield determined by 1H NMR using hexamethyldisiloxane as an internal standard


Figure 2.33: Ratio of Compound $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ and Nitronate Anion $\mathbf{2 . 9 6}$ over Time

### 2.11.3 Interaction of DBU with Umemoto's Reagent - ${ }^{1}$ H NMR study.

In 2015, Yu and coworkers reported a mild condition for the direct $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ trifluoromethylation of heteroarenes using Umemoto's reagent via an electron-donoracceptor (EDA) complex (Figure 2.34). ${ }^{41}$ They showed that Umemoto's reagent (2.9)
forms electron-donor-acceptor (EDA) complexes with basic tertiary amines such as N methylmorpholine (Figure 2.35). ${ }^{41-42}$ Using ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR study, it was shown that combining Umemoto's reagent (2.9) and excess $N$-methylmorpholine produced a new set of signals which was attributed to the electron-donor-acceptor (EDA) complex (2.97). Although no structural spectroscopic evidence of complex (2.97) was reported, theoretical studies show that the formation of the EDA complex is thermodynamically favored. In addition, Electron Paramagnetic Resonance (EPR) studies suggest the intermediacy of trifluoromethyl radical generated in situ.


Figure 2.34: Yu's Radical Trifluoromethylation of Heteroarenes with Umemoto's Reagent


Figure 2.35: Yu's Proposed EDA complex 2.97

Based on these results, the proposed mechanism involves the slow decomposition of complex 2.97 to the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical and dibenzothiophene. The generated $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ radical adds to arene to give radical intermediate $\mathbf{2 . 9 8}$, which can be
oxidized by either radical cation of $N$-methylmorpholine (path A) or by Umemoto's reagent 2.9 (path B) to give benzylic cation $\mathbf{2 . 9 9}$, which upon deprotonation gives the desired product 2.100.


Figure 2.36: Proposed Mechanism of Yu's Trifluoromethylation of Heteroarenes via (EDA) Complex 2.97

To understand possible interactions between DBU and Umemoto's reagent, I studied their reaction by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in the absence of other reagents (Figure 2.37).

From the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra we observed the complete disappearance of Umemoto's reagent and formation of new adduct, bearing related aromatic signals. Prior studies have shown that (2.9) forms electron-donor-acceptor (EDA) complex with basic amine (see above) and we have tentatively assigned this as the EDA complex 2.9•DBU. Traces of dibenzothiophene and fluoroform were also observed. The conversion happens within seconds, and the resulting solution is stable at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
for extended time (as judged by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals are tabulated below (Table 2.11) (Figure 2.38).


Figure 2.37: Interaction Between Umemoto's Reagent $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ and DBU

Table 2.11: Chemical Shift of 2.9, 2.9•DBU, dibenzothiophene and fluoroform in ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR

| Compound | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}$ signal |
| :---: | :---: |
| dibenzothiophene | $\delta 8.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.0,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.88(\mathrm{dt}, J=$ |
|  | $7.1,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.53-7.42(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{H}$ | $\delta 6.61(\mathrm{q}, J=79,1 \mathrm{H})$ |
|  |  |
| Umemoto's reagent 2 | $\delta 8.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.23(\mathrm{td}, J=7.8,1.2$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.03(\mathrm{td}, J=7.7,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 7.82(\mathrm{td}$, |
|  | $J=7.9,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $2.9 \cdot \mathrm{DBU}$ | $\delta 8.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 8.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, |
|  | $2 \mathrm{H}) 7.99(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 7.79(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, |
|  | $2 \mathrm{H})$ |



Figure 2.38: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR Study of Interaction Between Umemoto's reagent 2.9 and DBU, [ 0.05 M$] \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Compared to Spectra of Reagents and Products Under the Same Conditions.

From this data, I find that: (1) a DBU adduct of Umemoto's reagent can form; (2) the reaction kinetics are fast; (3) I was able to identify its ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals for use in the studies below.

### 2.11.4 ${ }^{1}$ H NMR Monitoring of Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkane:

I monitored trifluoromethylation of nitroalkane reaction using ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR at -25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (Figure 2.39). Under the optimized reaction conditions [ 0.1 M ], a very rapid reaction was observed that was too fast to adequately monitor by NMR. Spectra
traces from this reaction are shown below. Furthermore, the optimized reaction conditions are slightly heterogeneous for the first few minutes of the transformation, due to the saturation of Umemoto's reagent in methylene chloride at the reaction temperature. I was concerned that such heterogeneous behavior might obscure the reaction profile due to mass transport issues. To address both problems, I diluted the reaction (2-fold, to 0.05 M ) for NMR studies. Under these conditions, the reaction slowed enough to allow better observation by transient NMR experiments, and was fully homogenous at the start of the reaction.


Figure 2.39: Trifluoromethylation of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}[0.05 \mathrm{M}]$

Data were collected periodically for the first 30 minutes then, collected for every 30 minutes.

Yields of starting material 2.61, product 2.62, 2.9•DBU and 2.101 was determined by integrating signals shown in the table below:

Table 2.12: Chemical Shift of 2.61, 2.62, 2.9•DBU and $\mathbf{2} .101$ in ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR

| Compound | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signal |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ | $\delta 0.93(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ | $\delta 1.01(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 0 1}$ | $\delta 7.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ |
| $\mathbf{2 . 9} \cdot \mathbf{D B U}$ | $\delta 7.73(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$ |




Figure 2.40: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR Monitoring of Trifluoromethylation of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ [0.05 M] $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Compared to Spectra of Reagents and Products Under the Same Conditions.


Figure 2.41: Kinetic Profile of Trifluoromethylation of $2.61[0.05 \mathrm{M}] \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and Change of 2.61, 2.62, 2.101 and 2.9•DBU over Time.

From the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR time study, I observed fast rate of formation of product (2.62) that slows considerably as the reaction progresses and the disappearance of starting material (2.61) (Figure 2.40). Under these conditions, two reactive intermediates are observed. First, a high concentration buildup of the peak at $\delta$ $7.73 \mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{ca} .2 \mathrm{~min}$ ) is observed that matches matches $\mathbf{2 . 9} \cdot \mathbf{D B U}$ at the beginning of the reaction, then gradually disappears at the end (Figure 2.41).

Second, another intermediate with ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals at $\delta 8.13,7.27,6.80,0.6$ ppm is observed. The concentration of these peaks increase and decrease together. These complex bears ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals that are relate to both the nitroalkane (2.61) and Umemoto's reagent (2.9), but are not identical to either. Based upon this spectra data,
we believe that this intermediate is the associated ion pair (2.101), where the nitronate anion has replaced triflate in Umemoto's reagent.

Based on our NMR study of DBU interaction with Umemoto's reagent we propose that the peak at $\delta 7.7 \mathrm{ppm}$ is adduct $(\mathbf{2 . 9} \cdot \mathbf{D B U})$ which is formed between Umemoto's reagent and DBU and the peak at $\delta 8.13,7.27,6.80,0.6 \mathrm{ppm}$ is an ion pair (2.101), which is formed reversibly between (2.9•DBU) and nitronate anion (2.96).

### 2.11.5 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR monitoring of Trifluoromethylation of Secondary Nitroalkane (optimal reaction condition):

The reaction at standard conditions showed similar overall features. Spectra traces from this reaction are shown below (Figure 2.42 and 2.43).


Figure 2.42: Trifluoromethylation of $\mathbf{2 . 6 1}$ at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}[0.1 \mathrm{M}]$



Figure 2.43: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR Monitoring of Trifluoromethylation of 2.61 [0.1 M] $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Compared to Spectra of Reagents and Products under The Same Conditions.


Figure 2.44: Kinetic Profile of Trifluoromethylation of $2.61[0.1 \mathrm{M}] \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and Change of 2.61, 2.62, 2.101 and 2.9•DBU over Time

### 2.11.6 Proposed Mechanism

Based upon the observations of several ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR experiments (section 2.11.12.11.5), we propose the following reaction mechanism (Figure 2.45). Early in the reaction, DBU and (2.9) form the EDA complex ( $\mathbf{2 . 9} \cdot \mathbf{D B U}$ ). As the nitronate anion (2.96) is formed, (2.9•DBU) is consumed and the ion pair (2.101) is formed. The salt complex (2.101) then undergoes slow decomposition to a nitronate radical (2.102), $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$-radical, and dibenzothiophene via electron transfer. Rapid recombination of the two radicals results in the formation of the observed product (2.62). We cannot rule out the possibility of alternative radical-chain mechanism.


Figure 2.45: Proposed Mechanism for Nitroalkane Trifluoromethylation

### 2.12 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have developed mild reaction conditions for the trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using a commercially available trifluoromethylating reagent. This procedurally simple protocol allows rapid access to highly complex quaternary $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkanes in good yields and diastereoselectivity. The wide functional group tolerance highlights the power of this transformation as a method for late-stage installation of a trifluoromethyl group. In addition, we have demonstrated that these products can be reduced to medicinally interesting $\alpha$-trifluoromethylamines. We have also shown that, in at least some cases, base-induced elimination of $\mathrm{HNO}_{2}$ allows the products to be converted to highly substituted trifluoromethylalkenes with good levels of stereocontrol. Finally, I have conducted ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR mechanistic studies, which confirms the presence of two reactive intermediates proposed to be derived from Umemoto's reagent. Accordingly, these studies led to our proposed mechanism for the nitroalkane trifluoromethylation. This work was communicated in Organic Letters in 2017.

### 2.13 Experimental Section

### 2.13.1 General Experimental Details

Benzene, diethyl ether, dichloromethane, and dioxane were dried on alumina according to a published procedure. ${ }^{43}$ Copper bromide, sodium methoxide and sodium trimethylsilanolate were purchased commercially; the bulk was stored in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ filled glovebox; samples were removed from the glovebox and stored in a desiccator under air for up to two weeks prior to use. All hot glassware was oven dried for a minimum of two hours or flame-dried under vacuum prior to use. 4-nitrobutyl acetate, ${ }^{44}$ methyl-4-nitrobutyrate, ${ }^{45} \quad \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{~N}$-dimethyl-4-nitrobutanamide, ${ }^{46} \quad$ (E)-N-((Z)-4-(2,6-dimethylphenylamino)pent-3-en-2-ylidene)-2,6-dimethylaniline, ${ }^{47}$ 3-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,2-dimethylpropyl 2-bromopropanoate, ${ }^{4}$ 3-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,2-dimethylpropyl 2-methyl-3-nitropentanoate, ${ }^{4}$ 5-bromo-1-(p-toluenesulfonyl)-1H-indole, ${ }^{48}$ benzyl-4-nitrobutanote, ${ }^{49}$ 1-bromo-4-(2nitrobutyl)benzene, ${ }^{3} \quad \mathrm{~N}$-(3,4-dichlorobenzyl)-2-ethyl-3-nitropentanamide, ${ }^{4}$ rac-2-(4-trifluoromethylphenyl)-1-nitrocyclohexane, ${ }^{35}$ 4-acetyl-(1-nitropropyl)benzene, ${ }^{33 \mathrm{a}}$ methyl 4-nitropentanoate, ${ }^{50}$ 1-ethyl 6-methyl 3-nitro-2-propylhexanedioate, ${ }^{4}$ ethyl-5-(tert-butoxycarbonylamino)-2,2-dimethyl-3-nitropentanoate, ${ }^{4} \quad \mathrm{~N}$-methoxy-N,2-dimethyl-3-nitropentanamide, ${ }^{4}$ 2-(2-nitrobutyl)pyridine, ${ }^{3}$ and 2-(2nitrobutyl)benzo[d]oxazole (2.86) ${ }^{3}$ were synthesized according to published procedures. All other substrates and reagents were purchased in highest analytical purity from commercial suppliers and used as received. All NMR yields and diastereoselectivity are reported using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. All reactions were set up using standard Schlenk technique. Reactions were heated with stirring in temperature controlled oil baths and cooled with stirring using

Cryo cooling units. "Double manifold" refers to a standard Schlenk-line gas manifold equipped with N 2 and vacuum (ca. 0.1 mm Hg ).

### 2.13.2 Instrumentation and Chromatography:

$400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 101 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, and $376 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ spectra were obtained on a 400 MHz FT-NMR spectrometer equipped with a Bruker CryoPlatform. $600 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and $151 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra were obtained on a 600 MHz FTNMR spectrometer equipped with a Bruker SMART probe. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra were recorded using Attached Proton Test phase pulse sequence; carbons with an odd number of protons are phased down and those with an even number of protons are phased up. ${ }^{51}$ All samples were analyzed in the indicated deutero-solvent and were recorded at ambient temperatures. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were calibrated using the residual protiosignal in deutero-solvents as a standard. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were calibrated using the deutero-solvent as a standard. IR spectra were recorded on a Nicolet Magma-IR 560 FT-IR spectrometer as thin films on NaCl plates or using KBr pellets. Unless otherwise noted, column chromatography was performed with $40-63 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ silica gel with the eluent reported in parentheses. Where noted $5-20 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ silica gel was used to improve separation. Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on precoated glass plates and visualized by UV or by staining with KMnO4. GCMS data was collected using an Agilent 6850 series GC and 5973 MS detectors. Low resolution ESI data was collected on a Thermo LCQ Advantage running in positive ion mode. High resolution MS data was obtained on a Waters GCT Premier spectrometer using chemical ionization (CI) or liquid injection field desorption ionization (LIFDI) or on a Thermo Scientific, Q Exactive model orbitrap using electrospray ionization (ESI).

### 2.13.3 Synthesis of Novel Nitroalkane Starting Materials:

(2.S1) was synthesized by modification of a previously published procedure. ${ }^{33 \mathrm{a}}$ A hot 200 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed and tris(dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0) ( $129 \mathrm{mg}, 141$ $\mu \mathrm{mol})$, BrettPhos ( $177 \mathrm{mg}, 330 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), cesium carbonate ( $3.68 \mathrm{~g}, 11.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 4bromoanisole ( $1.76 \mathrm{~g}, 9.42 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dioxane ( 47 mL ) and 1-nitrohexane ( $2.62 \mathrm{~mL}, 18.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added via syringe. The resulting heterogeneous solution was heated in an oil bath at 50 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 40 h . Once complete, the reaction was cooled to rt . Saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for 10 minutes. Another 10 mL saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for another 10 minutes. The reaction was then diluted with diethyl ether ( 25 mL ), washed twice with brine ( 25 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography (65:35 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.S1) ( $1.83 \mathrm{~g}, 82 \%$ ) as a yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.94-6.87(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.40(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.6,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.51-2.38$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=12.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 160.7,129.2,126.9,114.3,91.2,55.4,33.8,31.2,25.8$, 22.4, 14.0; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2957, 2860, 1550, 1253, 1179. HRMS (LIFDI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{3}\right]^{+}: 237.1365$; found: 237.1339.

(2.S2) was synthesized by modification of a previously published procedure. ${ }^{33 \mathrm{a}}$ A hot 100 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed and tris(dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0) (110 $\mathrm{mg}, 120$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ), BrettPhos ( $147 \mathrm{mg}, 280 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), cesium carbonate ( $3.13 \mathrm{~g}, 9.60 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 5bromophthalide ( $1.70 \mathrm{~g}, 8.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dioxane $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and nitroethane $(855 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 12.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added via syringe. The resulting heterogeneous solution was heated in an oil bath at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . Once complete, the reaction was cooled to rt . Saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for 10 minutes. Another 10 mL saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for another 10 minutes. The reaction was then diluted with diethyl ether ( 25 mL ), washed twice with brine $(25 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography (80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.S2) (757 $\mathrm{mg}, 32 \%)$ as a thick orange oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.62(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.1,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.36(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.19-4.08$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.68-2.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.1,170.1,147.5,140.2,129.0,127.4,126.7,121.7$, $90.4,69.6,63.0,31.0,25.4,21.0 ;$ FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2961, 1780, 1767, 1553, 1245, 1050; HRMS (LIFDI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}_{6}\right]^{+}: 294.0978$; found: 294.0983.

(2.S3) was synthesized by modification of a previously published procedure. ${ }^{52}$ A hot 100 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed and bis(triphenylphosphine)palladium (II) chloride ( $386 \mathrm{mg}, 550 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) and sodium methoxide ( $1.19 \mathrm{~g}, 22.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous methanol ( 22 mL ) and methyl 4-nitrobutanoate ( $2.56 \mathrm{~mL}, 20.0$ mmol ) were added via syringe. The resulting yellow suspension was heated in an oil bath at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , during which time the suspension turned brown. The reaction was cooled to rt and transferred to pre-cooled bath at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. allyl acetate $(4.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 40$ mmol ) was added via syringe and the reaction was allowed to stir at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . Once complete, the reaction was warmed to rt . The reaction was then diluted with diethyl ether ( 40 mL ), washed thrice with brine ( 30 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 95:5 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.S3) $(552 \mathrm{mg}$, $15 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.78-5.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.20-5.16(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.67-4.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.77-2.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.60-2.48$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.49-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 172.4,131.2,119.9,87.0,52.0,38.0,30.0,28.1 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2954,2918,2849$, 1734, 1654, 1558, 993, 927 ; GC/MS (EI) 156.1 (M-OCH3) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\right]^{+}: 188.0923$; found: 188.0917.

(2.S4) To a 50 mL round bottom equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added benzyl- $\gamma$-nitrobutanote ( $2.63 \mathrm{~g}, 12.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), dichloromethane ( 2.5 mL ), water ( 21 mL ), methyl vinyl sulfone ( $1.06 \mathrm{~mL}, 12.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and sodium hydroxide $(61.0 \mu \mathrm{~g}, 1.52 \mathrm{mmol})$. The biphasic reaction was vigorously stirred at room temperature for 4 days. Dichloromethane ( 20 mL ) was added and the aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, dried with magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography ( $70: 30$ benzene : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.S4) ( $513 \mathrm{mg}, 12 \%$ ) as a pale yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.41-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.13(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 4.83-4.70(m, 1H), $3.05(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.56-2.42(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.42-$ $2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.23-2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.5,135.5,128.8$, 128.6, 128.5, 85.5, 67.0, 50.7, 41.3, 30.0, 28.7, 26.0; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2931, 1733, 1550, 1299, 1133; $\mathrm{mp}=68-69{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. ESI-MS: $352.3(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{~S}\right]^{+}: 330.10058$; found: 330.09975 .

(2.S5) To a 200 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added N,N-dimethyl-4-nitrobutanamide $(5.23 \mathrm{~mL}, 40.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, acrylonitrile ( $2.62 \mathrm{~mL}, 40.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), dichloromethane ( 8 mL ), sodium hydroxide ( $192 \mathrm{mg}, 4.80 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and water ( 67 mL ). The flask was sealed with a polypropylene cap and stirred at room temperature for 42 h. The reaction was then diluted with dichloromethane $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic layer was separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( 20 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography (18:80:2 hexanes : ethyl acetate : triethylamine)
to afford (2.S5) (1.65 g, 19\%) as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.74(\mathrm{tt}$, $\mathrm{J}=8.7,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.50-2.33(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.3,117.9,86.4,37.1,35.7,29.6,28.9,28.8,14.4$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2938,2248,1645,1550,1150 ; \mathrm{mp}=53-55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; GC/MS (EI) 167.1 (M$\left.\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 214.1192$; found: 214.1192.

2.S6A dr: 46:54
(2.S6) A hot 50 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. ${ }^{4}$ Once cool, the septum was removed and $\mathrm{CuBr} \quad(84.3 \mathrm{mg}, 588 \quad \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, (E)-N-((Z)-4-(2,6-dimethylphenylamino)pent-3-en-2-ylidene)-2,6-dimethylaniline ( $180 \mathrm{mg}, 588 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), and sodium trimethylsilanolate ( $429 \mathrm{mg}, 3.82 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with N2 three times. Anhydrous benzene ( 17 mL ), 4-nitrobutyl acetate ( $663 \mathrm{mg}, 4.12$ mmol ), and 3-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,2-dimethylpropyl 2-bromopropanoate $(1.04 \mathrm{~g}, 2.91 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added via syringe. The reaction was heated to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 48 h . Once completed, the reaction was cooled to room temperature, the septum was removed and the reaction mixture was diluted with diethyl ether (50 mL ). The crude reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis revealed a $46: 54$ mixture of syn and antiisomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica chromatography (90:10:1 hexanes: ethyl acetate: acetic acid) to afford a mixture of diastereomers of $\beta$-nitroester (2.S6) ( $760 \mathrm{mg}, 60 \%$ ) as a yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached
spectra for details) $\delta$ 2.S6A: $4.69(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.6,9.2,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9.0$, $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 2.S6B: $4.77(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=8.9,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.19(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=7.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 2.S6A: 172.2, 89.8, 68.4, 63.2, 43.8, 29.0, 25.3, 21.6, 14.7; S6B: $172.5,88.1,68.5,63.3,42.5,27.1,24.8,21.5,13.5$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-}$ ${ }^{1}$ ): 2956, 1741, 1555, 1248, 1099, 776; GC/MS (EI) $376.3\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}\right)^{+} ; 329.1$ (M$\left.\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{NO}_{7} \mathrm{Si}^{+}\right.$: 434.2574; found: 434.2575 and 434.2573 .

(2.S7) To a 500 mL round bottom flask with a stir bar was added 3-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,2-dimethylpropyl 2-methyl-3-nitropentanoate ( $800 \mathrm{mg}, 2.22 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), THF ( 74 mL ), and $3 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(55$ mL ). The flask was sealed with a polyethylene stopper and stirred vigorously at rt for 4.5 h . Once complete, the reaction was diluted with brine ( 20 mL ) and extracted with ethyl acetate ( $3 \mathrm{x}, 35 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layers were combined, washed with brine ( 1 x , 20 mL ), dried with magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis revealed a 62:38 mixture of syn and anti-isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica chromatography (60:40 hexanes: ethyl acetate) to afford alcohol (2.S7) ( $463 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details) $\delta$ 2.S7A: 3.05-2.96(m, 1H), 0.93 (s, 6H); 2.S7B: $3.20(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9.1,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91$ (apparent d, 6 H ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 2.S7A: 173.0, 91.5, 68.2, 43.5, 36.5, $25.5,14.4,10.6$; 2.S7B: $173.7,89.8,68.1,42.0,36.6,24.0,13.9,9.5 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right):$ 3446, 2971, 1734, 1552, 1375; ESI-MS: $270.2(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$; HRMS (ESI) m/z, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{NO}_{5}\right]^{+}: 248.14925$; found: 248.14849 .

(2.S8) To a 100 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added 2-benzofurancarboxaldehyde ( $4.15 \mathrm{~mL}, 34.2$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and nitroethane $(24.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 342 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath and tetramethylguanidine ( $216 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.71 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition was complete, the ice bath was removed and the flask was allowed to warm to rt where it was stirred for 12 h . The crude reaction was transferred to a seperatory funnel and diluted with brine ( 15 mL ). The reaction was acidified with $5 \% \mathrm{HCl}$. The aqueous layer was extracted with ethyl acetate. The organic layer was dried with magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis revealed a $63: 37$ mixture of isomers. The crude reaction was purified via flash silica gel chromatography (93:7 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$ nitroalcohol (2.S8) $(6.60 \mathrm{~g}, 87 \%)$ as a yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details) $\delta$ 2.S8 (major): 6.81 (s, 1H), 5.22 (dd, J = 8.5, 6.2 Hz , 1H), $5.14-5.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.49(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathbf{2 . S 8}$ (minor): $6.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.57(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.01(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$ $=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta \mathbf{2} . \mathbf{S 8}$ (major): $155.1,153.1,127.5,125.4,123.5,121.6,111.7,106.4,86.1,70.2,16.5 ; 2 . S 8$ (minor): $155.0,153.8,127.7,124.9,121.5,123.4,111.5,105.1,84.7,69.3,12.9 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ : 3508, 3066, 2993, 1553, 1454, 753; $\mathrm{mp}=68-70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; GC/MS (EI) retention time $=$ 11.566, $174.0\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{HNO}_{2}\right)^{+}$; retention time $=11.633,173.9\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{HNO}_{2}\right)^{+} . \mathrm{HRMS}(\mathrm{CI})$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 222.0766; found: 222.0759 and 222.0755.

(2.83) A hot 100 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, septum was removed and $2.58(2.00 \mathrm{~g}, 9.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous diethyl ether ( 45 mL ) and 4-methoxybenzyl-2,2,2trichloroacetimidate $(3.33 \mathrm{~g}, 11.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added via syringe. The reaction was stirred for five minutes then trimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate $(90.0 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 494$ $\mu \mathrm{mol})$ was added dropwise via syringe. Once addition was complete, the reaction was stirred at rt for 20 h . Once complete, the reaction was washed with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ (2x, 15 $\mathrm{mL}), 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(1 \mathrm{x}, 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and brine ( $1 \mathrm{x}, 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The reaction was dried with magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis revealed a 79:21 mixture of isomers. The crude reaction was purified via flash silica chromatography (95:5 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.83) ( $358 \mathrm{mg}, 12 \%$ ) as a yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details) $\delta \mathbf{2 . 8 3}$ Major: 4.53 (d, J = 11.4 $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.36(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;$ 2.83 Minor: $4.63(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.39(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \mathbf{2 . 8 3}$ Major: 159.6, 155.5, 151.2, 129.8, 128.6, $127.5,125.4,123.4,121.5,113.9,111.8,108.5,85.3,75.5,71.0,55.4,16.4 ; 2.83$ Minor: 159.7, 155.3, 152.5, 129.9, 128.8, 127.7, 125.0, 123.3, 121.5, 114.0, 111.7, $106.8,84.4,74.9,71.8,55.4,13.7$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2937, 2837, 1556, 1251, 1175; mp: $72-74{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{EI}) 235.0\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{O}\right)^{+} ; 234.9\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{O}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (LIFDI) m/z, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{5}\right]^{+}: 341.1263$; found: 341.1247.

(2.S10) was synthesized by modification of a previously published procedure. ${ }^{33 \mathrm{a}}$ A hot 100 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed and tris(dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0) ( $82.0 \mathrm{mg}, 90.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), BrettPhos (110 $\mathrm{mg}, 210 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, cesium carbonate ( $2.35 \mathrm{~g}, 7.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 5-bromo-1-(p-toluenesulfonyl)-1H-indole ( $2.09 \mathrm{~g}, 6.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dioxane ( 40 mL ) and 4-nitrobutyl acetate ( $2.58 \mathrm{~g}, 16.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added via syringe. The resulting heterogeneous solution was heated in an oil bath at 50 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . Once complete, the reaction was cooled to rt . Saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for 10 minutes. Another 10 mL saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the reaction was stirred for another 10 minutes. The reaction was then diluted with diethyl ether ( 25 mL ), washed twice with brine ( 25 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using flash silica gel chromatography ( $65: 35$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (2.S10) ( $911 \mathrm{mg}, 44 \%$ ) as a thick yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.99$ (d, J $=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.63(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ 8.7, 1.7 Hz, 1H), $7.24(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.67(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $2.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 145.5$, $135.4,135.1,131.1,130.7,130.2,127.6,127.0,123.9,120.8,114.1,109.0,86.4,21.8$, 19.7; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3144, 2989, 1550, 1373, 1175; HRMS (LIFDI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}\right]^{+}: 344.0831$; found: 344.0845.

(2.89) A hot 150 mL high-pressure reaction vessel equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a Teflon cap and a Kontes cap was attached to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the Teflon cap was removed, and $\mathrm{CuBr}(940 \mathrm{mg}, 6.55 \mathrm{mmol})$, (E)-N-((Z)-4-(2,6-dimethylphenylamino)pent-3-en-2-ylidene)-2,6-dimethylaniline ( $2.00 \mathrm{~g}, 6.55 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and sodium trimethylsilanolate ( $2.06 \mathrm{~g}, 18.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The Teflon cap was replaced, the flask was attached to a double manifold, and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ five times. The Kontes cap was removed and replaced with a rubber septum, and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 77 mL ), 1-nitropropane ( $1.52 \mathrm{~mL}, 17.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and benzyl bromoacetate ( $2.10 \mathrm{~mL}, 13.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added via syringe. The Kontes cap was replaced and the resulting heterogeneous solution was submerged in an oil bath. The reaction was heated at $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 21 h . Once completed, the reaction was cooled to room temperature, the septum was removed and the reaction mixture was diluted with diethyl ether ( 50 mL ). The crude reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of Celite and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by silica gel flash chromatography (82:15:3 hexanes : benzene : ethyl acetate) to afford $\beta$-nitroester ( $\mathbf{2 . 8 9}$ ) ( $1.23 \mathrm{~g}, 40 \%$ ) as a yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.40-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,7.5,5.7,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{dd}$, $\mathrm{J}=17.3,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17.4,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.04-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ 7.4 Hz, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 169.3, 135.3, 128.8, 128.7, 128.5, 84.4, 67.3, 36.8, 27.2, 10.0; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3066,2975,2883,1738,1552 ;$ GC/MS (EI) 107.0 $\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 238.1079; found: 238.1072.

### 2.13.4 General Protocol for the Synthesis of $\alpha$-Trifluoromethylnitroalkanes:

General Protocol A: Synthesis of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-Trifluoromethylnitroalkanes: A hot 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber spectrum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and nitroalkane (1 equiv) and 5-(trifluoromethyl)dibenzothiophenium trifluoromethanesulfonate (Umemoto's reagent 2.9, 1.3 equiv) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to a double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dichloromethane was added via syringe and the flask was lowered into a precooled $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ cooling bath and stirred. 1,8-Diazabicycloundec-7-ene (DBU, 2 equiv) was then added dropwise via syringe. The resulting homogenous solution was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h after which the flask was removed from the cooling unit and the septum was removed. The reaction mixture was washed with brine (1x), dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.

( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU $(299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(100: 0 \rightarrow$ 99:1 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 6 2}$ $(270 \mathrm{mg}, 83 \%)$ as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.45(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 7.01 (d, J = $8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $3.51(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{dq}$, $\mathrm{J}=15.9,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.8,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$

NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 132.1,132.0,131.0,122.6,123.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 94.3(\mathrm{q}$, $\mathrm{J}=25.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 38.9, 26.1, 8.3; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-69.5; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right):$ 2987, 2957, 1561, 1490, 1195, 839, 812; GC/MS (EI) $278.0\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{BrF}_{3}\right]^{+}: 324.9925$; found: 324.9930.

(2.63) According to general protocol A: 2-(2-Nitrobutyl)pyridine (180 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent $2.9(532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (75:25 hexanes : ethyl acetate). A second column (50:50 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to remove trace dibenzothiophene afforded $\alpha$ trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.63 ( $158 \mathrm{mg}, 64 \%$ ) as a orange oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.55-8.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.7,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.20(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.1,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.53(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.41-2.26(m, 2H), 1.10-1.06(m,3H), ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 153.3, 149.6, $136.8,124.8,123.8(q, J=288 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.8$, $94.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 39.6,25.1,8.6 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-71.3; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2986, 2955, 1563, 1439, 1241, 1186; $\mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}$ (EI) $202.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 249.0851; found: 249.0850 .

(2.64) According to general protocol A: 2.S1 (237 mg, 1.00 mmol ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under
$\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ petroleum ether : benzene) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.64 ( $263 \mathrm{mg}, 86 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.54(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.16(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.41-2.30(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09-0.96(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $0.75(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 160.7,128.6,123.8,123.0(\mathrm{q}$, $\mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 114.2,96.3(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=27.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 55.5,34.5,31.9,23.6,22.3,14.0 ;{ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-69.2$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2960, 1563, 1518, 1263, 1180, 832. HRMS (LIFDI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 305.1239$; found: 305.1242 .

(2.65) According to general protocol A: 4-Acetyl-(1nitropropyl)benzene ( $207 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $\left.299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}\right)$ was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (99:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 6 5}$ ( $214 \mathrm{mg}, 78 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $7.43(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.69$ (hept, $\mathrm{J}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.63(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 197.0,138.3,136.3,128.8,127.5,122.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ 285 Hz ), $96.8(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=27.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 28.2,26.8,8.7 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F} \operatorname{NMR}\left(565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-68.7$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2955, 1692, 1565, 1411, 1269, 1169, 824. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 276.0848$; found: 276.0823.

(2.66) According to general protocol A: 2.S2 ( $248 \mathrm{mg}, 850 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (65:35 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$ trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.66 ( $246 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ ) as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.45(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.13(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.72(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=10.6,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.86(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 1.77-1.67 (m, 1H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.0,169.6,147.3,137.5$, 127.9, 127.9, 126.7, $122.4(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 121.2,96.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=28.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 69.6,63.2$, 31.9, 23.6, 21.0, ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-68.5$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2960, 1773, 1739, 1567, 1240; $\mathrm{mp}=109-110{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; HRMS (LIFDI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 361.0773; found: 361.0766.

(2.67) According to general protocol A: 2.S10 (344 mg, 1.00 $\mathrm{mmol})$, Umemoto's reagent $2.9(523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol})$ and anhydrous dichloromethane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU (299 $\left.\mu \mathrm{L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}\right)$ was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 2.67 (309 mg, 75\%) as a light yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=4.8,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.39-7.31(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 7.29-7.24(m, 2H), $6.69(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.37(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 145.6,135.4,135.0,130.9,130.24,127.9,127.0,126.6,122.8(\mathrm{q}$,
$\mathrm{J}=283 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.7,120.3,114.0,108.9,92.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=28.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 21.8$, 20.9; 19F NMR ( $376 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-72.3$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3146,2925,1564,1376,1173,1135 ; \mathrm{mp}:$ 104-105 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; HRMS (LIFDI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{SF}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 412.0705; found: 412.0703.

(2.68) According to general protocol A: 2.S5 (213 mg, 1.00 mmol ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica get chromatography (60:40 benzene : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 6 8}$ (198 mg, 70\%) as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.75-2.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-$ $2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.3$. $122.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 117.4,91.7$ ( $q$, $\mathrm{J}=27.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $37.1,35.9,28.8,28.4,27.0,12.8(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 565 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-70.57$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2940,2254,1644,1558,1189 ; \mathrm{mp}=52-54{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}$ (EI) $235.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$; HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 282.10600$; found: 282.10552 .

(2.69) According to general protocol A: methyl 4-nitrohept-6enoate 2.S3 ( $187 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 (523 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography $\left(100: 0 \rightarrow 95: 5\right.$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $2.69(119 \mathrm{mg}, 47 \%)$ as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$

NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.69$ (dd, J = 17.2, $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 5.33 - 5.25 (m, 2H), 3.71 $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.57(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 2.56-2.42 (m, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.8,128.1,122.7,122.9$ $(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 92.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 52.2,37.6,28.2,27.3 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 565 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \quad \delta-71.1 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3089,2957,1742,1652,1563,1439,1201,936 ;$ GC/MS (EI) $224.0\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right)^{+}$; HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 256.0797; found: 256.0810 .

(2.70) According to general protocol A: benzyl 6-(methylsulfonyl)-4-nitrohexanoate 2.S4 ( $315 \mathrm{mg}, 960 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.24 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU (299 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $95: 5 \rightarrow 80: 20$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$ trifluoromethylnitroalkane $2.70(250 \mathrm{mg}, 66 \%)$ as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.41-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.19(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=12.9,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=$ 12.7, $4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.81-2.72(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.69-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.7,135.3,128.8,128.7,128.5,122.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 91.5(\mathrm{q}$, $\mathrm{J}=27.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 67.3, 49.0, 41.0, 28.2, 28.1, 25.0; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-70.8$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3011,1731,1565,1451,1308,1176,755$; ESI-MS $420.3(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$. HRMS (ESI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{~S}\right]^{+}: 398.0880$; found: 398.0869.

(2.71) According to general protocol A: Methyl 4-nitropentanoate (484 mg, 3.00 mmol ), Umemoto's reagent $2.9(1.57 \mathrm{~g}, 3.90 \mathrm{mmol})$ and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 30 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$
and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $897 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 6.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified via silica gel flash chromatography $(95: 5 \rightarrow$ 80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.71 ( $624 \mathrm{mg}, 91 \%$ ) as a yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 3.68(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.77-2.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.48-2.27(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.6,123.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=287 \mathrm{~Hz}), 90.0$ $(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=29.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 52.3,28.7,28.05,17.6 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-75.7$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2361,1652,1559,1540,1175 ; \mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}$ (EI) 198.1 (M-OCH3) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 230.0640; found: 230.0626.
(2.73) According to general protocol A: Ethyl 5-(tert-
 butoxycarbonylamino)-2,2-dimethyl-3-nitropentanoate ( 318 mg , $1.00 \mathrm{mmol})$, Umemoto's reagent $2.9(532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L} .2 .00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (89:11 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 2.73 (141 $\mathrm{mg}, 36 \%)$ as a pale yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.76(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.13(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}$ $=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.47-3.32(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,10.3,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.40$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}), 1.23(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 171.6, 155.7, 123.1 (q, J = 287 Hz ), $96.1(q, J=26.3 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 79.9, 62.4, 49.2, 36.2, 32.0, 28.5, 23.3, 23.1, 13.8; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-62.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3350, 2981, 1720, 1568, 1174; mp: 58-60 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; ESI-MS: $409.1(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na})^{+}$. HRMS (ESI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{Na}\right]^{+}$: 409.15569 ; found: 409.15437.
(2.74) According to general protocol A: N-(3,4-dichlorobenzyl)-2-ethyl-3-nitropentanamide (332 mg, 1.00 mmol ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $532 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (75:25 hexanes : ethyl acetate). A second column (50:50 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to remove trace dibenzothiophene afforded $\alpha$ trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.74 ( $291 \mathrm{mg}, 73 \%$ ) as a light yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.41(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.06(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.2,1.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=15.1,5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.07-2.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.74-2.64$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{tq}, \mathrm{J}=14.2,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $12.8,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 168.1,137.6,132.9,131.9,130.8,129.8,127.1,122.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=287 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $96.8(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=25.8), 54.0,43.0,21.9,21.0,12.6,8.3 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-$ 65.5; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): $3297,3088,1658,1563,1201,1088,1032 ; 116-118{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; ESI-MS: $401.2(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$. HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 401.06411 ; found: 401.06349; X-ray crystals were obtained by vapor diffusion (dichloromethane/ hexanes).

(2.75) According to general protocol A: N-methoxy-N,2-dimethyl-3nitropentanamide ( $204 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 (532 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up
according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:5 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.75 ( 172 mg , $63 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.05(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.71$ (s, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.15(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=15.9,7.5,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.1,123.1(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=287 \mathrm{~Hz}), 95.3(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=25.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 61.6,39.2,32.4,22.7$, 13.8, 8.5; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR (565 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-66.9; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2985,2951,1670,1565$, 1203, 1179 ; GC/MS (EI) 226.1 (M-NO2) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 273.1062$; found: 273.1064.

2.76A 23:17 2.76B
(2.76) According to general protocol A : 3-Hydroxy-2,2-dimethylpropyl 2-methyl-3-nitropentanoate $\mathbf{2 . S 7}$ ( 315 mg , 1.00 mmol ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU (299 $\mu \mathrm{L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an $83: 17$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:5 $\rightarrow$ 80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.76 ( $157 \mathrm{mg}, 50 \%$ ) as a clear oil: The product was isolated as a mixture of diastereomers (dr: 88:12): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed) $\delta \mathbf{2 . 7 6 A}: 3.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.39(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 17 \mathrm{~B}: 3.60(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \mathbf{2 . 7 6 A :} 170.5,122.8$
$(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=287 \mathrm{~Hz}), 95.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26 \mathrm{~Hz}), 68.1,44.5,36.2,22.7,21.5,12.8,8.5$; 2.76B: $170.3,123,0(q, J=287 \mathrm{~Hz}), 95.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26 \mathrm{~Hz}), 68.3,43.9,23.8,13.0 ;{ }^{19}$ F NMR ( 565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 2.76A: -66.8, 2.76B: -67.1 ; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3435, 2962, 1742, 1569, 1470, 1245, 1203, 824; GC/MS (EI) $212.0\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right)^{+}$; $212.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 316.1372$; found: 316.1364.

2.77A


85:15
(2.77) According to general protocol A: 2.S6 (433 mg, 1.00 mmol ), Umemoto's
reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an $85: 15$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified flash silica gel chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 95:5 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.77 ( $292 \mathrm{mg}, 58 \%$ ) as a clear oil. The product was isolated as a mixture of diastereomers (dr: 92:08): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed) $\delta$ 2.77A: $3.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.76(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 18 \mathrm{~B}: 3.88(\mathrm{~d}$, $\mathrm{J}=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \mathbf{2 . 7 7 A}$ : $170.9,169.8,122.8$, (q, $\mathrm{J}=288 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 94.2, ( $\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 71.5, 63.8, 44.4, 43.9, 36.2, $26.1,25.9,23.2,21.5,21.4,20.9,18.3,12.9,-5.5,-5.6$; 18B: 71.4, 63.7, 43.9, 13.2, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.77 \mathrm{~A}:-67.2,2.77 \mathrm{~B}:-67.5$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2957,2897$,

1745, 1572, 1473, 1365, 1236, 838, 776; GC/MS (ESI) 524.3 (M+Na) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{NO}_{7} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{Si}^{+}\right]^{+}$: 502.2442; found: 502.24267.

2.78A 67:33

2.78B
(2.78) According to the general protocol: 1-Ethyl 6-methyl 3-nitro-2propylhexanedioate $(275 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 1.00$ mmol ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 67:33 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The reaction was purified by silica gel flash chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 95:5 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.78 ( $254 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%$ ) as a yellow oil. The product was isolated as a mixture of diastereomers (dr: 73: 27): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (600 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details): $\delta \mathbf{2 . 7 8 A}: 4.15(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.71$ (s, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.44(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=12.1,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{t}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 19 \mathrm{~B}: 4.25-4.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.73(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=12.0,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{t}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 2.78A: 172.0, 169.2, $122.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=286 \mathrm{~Hz}), 62.2,50.3,29.3,28.5,24.8,21.3,13.9$, 13.7, 13.5; 2.78B: 172.1, 169.5, $122.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=287 \mathrm{~Hz}), 62.1,49.5,29.9,23.9$, 28.6, 20.8, 14.0, 13.5; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR (565 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 2.78A: -66.2, 2.78B: -68.1 ; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2965,2878,1743,1570,1190 ; \mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{EI}) 297.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+} ; 297.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 344.1321$; found: 344.1329 .

2.79A


89:11
(2.79) According to general protocol A: $\mathbf{2 . 8 3}$ ( $341 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 (523 mg, 1.30 mmol$)$ and anhydrous dichloromethane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU (299 $\left.\mu \mathrm{L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}\right)$ was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 89:11 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(100: 0 \rightarrow 95: 05$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.79 ( $236 \mathrm{mg}, 58 \%$ ) as a clear oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed) $\delta$ 2.79A: $7.57(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.50(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.36-7.32(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), 7.21 (d, J = $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.15(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.88(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.53$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.62(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.42(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathbf{2 . 7 9 B}: 7.54$ (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 1H), $7.09(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.57(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.50(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.27(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \mathbf{2 . 7 9 A}: 159.9,155.6,149.5,130.1,128.1,125.5,123.5,122.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ 287 Hz ), 119.9, 111.8, 109.7, 109.3, 93.16, (q, J = 26.5 Hz), 74.5, 72.3, 55.4, 13.5; 20B: 159.8, 155.7, 149.3, 129.9, 128.0, 125.6, 109.7, 73.9, 71.6, 12.9; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR (565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 2.79A: -72.0, 2.79B: -73.2 ; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2936,2838,1613,1566$, 1453, 1254, 751; GC/MS (EI) $409.0(\mathrm{M})^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 409.1137$; found: 409.1135 .
(2.80) According to general protocol A: rac-2-(4-Trifluoromethylphenyl)-1-nitrocyclohexane ( $410 \mathrm{mg}, 1.50 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $785 \mathrm{mg}, 1.95 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 15 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{DBU}(448 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and purified by flash silica gel chromatography (77:20:3 hexanes : benzene : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$ ( $333 \mathrm{mg}, 65 \%$ ) as a light yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.33$ (dd, $\mathrm{J}=12.6,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.38(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=13.0,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-$ $1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{ddp}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,8.7,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 142.9,130.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=35.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 129.9,125.3(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=3.64 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 124.1 ( $\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=272 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $122.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=284 \mathrm{~Hz}), 92.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=25.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 46.4,31.5,29.1$, 24.8, 20.6; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $376 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-62.7,-70.9$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2947, 1561, 1328, 1161, 1123; $\mathrm{mp}=43-45{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; GC/MS (EI) $341.1(\mathrm{M})^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]^{+}: 341.0871$; found: 341.0850 ; crystals for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation of hexanes.
(2.87) A hot 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic
 stir bar and a rubber spectrum was attached to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and 2-(2-nitrobutyl)benzo[d]oxazole ( $220 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00$ mmol ) and Umemoto's reagent $2.9(523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to a double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) was added via syringe and
the flask was lowered into a precooled $-25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ cooling bath and stirred. 1, 1,3,3,Tetramethylguanidine ( $121 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added dropwise via syringe. The resulting homogenous solution was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h , after which the flask was removed from the cooling unit and warmed to rt . The reaction mixture was washed with brine (1x), dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 95:5 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.87 ( $128 \mathrm{mg}, 44 \%$ ) as a pale yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.74-7.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.56-7.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7.41-7.32 (m, 2H), $3.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.54(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 158.7$, $150.8,140.9,125.7,124.9,122.8(q, J=291 \mathrm{~Hz}), 120.4,110.9,92.4(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=26.9 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $30.39(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=1.41 \mathrm{~Hz}), 25.2,8.45(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.66 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $376 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 72.9; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2985, 1567, 1455, 1180, 1169; GC/MS (EI) 288.1 (M) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 289.0800$; found: 289.0794 .
(2.88) According to general protocol A: 2-(2-
 Nitrobutyl)benzo[d]oxazole ( $220 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 ( $523 \mathrm{mg}, 1.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous dichloromethane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis revealed $\mathrm{a}>95: 5$ mixture of E and Z isomers. The crude reaction was purified flash silica gel chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 98:2 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford vinyltrifluoromethylalkene 2.88 ( $147 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$ ) as a yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.79(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.57(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.40(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=7.2,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$,

2H), $6.96(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.97(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.30(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 159.6,150.4,142.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=28.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 141.9,126.3,125.1,123.2,120.8$, 117.3 ( $\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 110.9, 21.0, 13.2; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-68.3$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2981,2944,2883,1652,1451,1181,745 ; G C / M S(E I) 241.1(M)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{NOF}_{3}\right]^{+}: 242.0793$; found: 242.0780. The relative stereochemistry of compound $\mathbf{2 . 8 8}$ was determined using a combination of 1 D nOe and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ HOSEY correlations. ${ }^{36}$ The results from these experiments is summarized in the tables and figures below:

1D nOe Correlation For 2.88
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Shift Irradiated } \\ (\mathrm{ppm})\end{array} & 1 \text { D nOe Correlation Seen } \\ (\mathrm{ppm})\end{array}\right]$

2D HOSEY Correlation for 2.88: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ to ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$

| ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ Shift $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | ${ }^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{H}$ Correlations Seen (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: |
| -68.3 | 1.23 |
| -68.3 | 2.90 |
| -68.3 | 6.88 |




2.91A


88:12
(2.91) According to general protocol A: 2.89 ( $238 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Umemoto's reagent 2.9 (523 mg, 1.30 mmol ), and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10 mL ) were combined under
$\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and cooled to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. DBU ( $299 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise and the reaction was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h . The reaction was worked up according to the
general protocol and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 88:12 mixture of E and Z isomers. The crude reaction was purified flash silica gel chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow 98: 2$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford mixture of vinyltrifluoromethylalkene 2.91A and 2.91B ( $154 \mathrm{mg}, 60 \%$ ) as a clear oil. An analytically pure sample of product 2.91 A was obtained by column chromatography. Alkene 2.91B was isolated contaminated with alkene 2.91A. Diagnostic peaks for alkene 2.91A are listed below: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $7.41-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.21(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.70(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 164.5,148.4$ (q, J = 28.9 Hz), 135.5, 128.8, 128.7, $123.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=276 \mathrm{~Hz}) 121.5,(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.20 \mathrm{~Hz}), 120.9,66.9,20.4,13.4,{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-69.2 ;$ FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3036, 2982, 1731, 1669, 1309, 1191, 696; GC/MS (EI) $258.1(M)^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 258.0868$; found: 258.0896 .

Alkene 2.91B was isolated contaminated with alkene 2.91A. Diagnostic peaks for alkene 27B are listed below: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.06(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.20(\mathrm{~s}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.33(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=7.3,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 164.8,135.3,128.8,128.7,128.6,123.5,67.4,24.5,11.8 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (565 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-63.5; GC/MS (EI) $258.1(\mathrm{M})^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 258.0868$; found: 258.0859 .

The relative stereochemistry for alkenes 2.91A and 2.91B was determined using 1D nOe and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}:{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ HOSEY. The results from these experiments is summarized in the tables and figures below:

1D nOe Correlation For 2.91A

| Shift Irradiated (ppm) | 1 D nOe Correlation Seen (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6.38 | n/a |

2D HOSEY Correlation For 2.91A: 1H to 19F

| ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ Shift $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | ${ }^{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{H}$ Correlations Seen $(\mathrm{ppm})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| -69.2 | 1.17 |
| -69.2 | 2.69 |
| -69.2 | 6.34 |

1D nOe Correlation For 2.91B

| Shift Irradiated <br> $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | 1 D nOe Correlation Seen <br> $(\mathrm{ppm})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6.10 | $2.35,1.16$ |
| 2.36 | $6.10,1.16$ |
| 1.16 | $2.36,1.16$ |



(2.92) A hot 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber spectrum was attached to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and 1-bromo-4-(2-nitro-2-(trifluoromethyl)butyl)benzene 2.62 ( $163 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium tert-butoxide ( $84.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.75 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous dichloromethane ( 5 mL ) were added and the reaction was stirred in an oil bath at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 h . The reaction mixture was washed with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{x} 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried over magnesium sulfate, and
concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 72:28 mixture of E and Z isomers. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography ( $100 \%$ hexanes) to afford a mixture of vinyltrifluoromethylalkene 2.92A and 2.92B ( $130 \mathrm{mg}, 93 \%$ ) as a clear oil. The product was isolated as a mixture of $\mathrm{E}: \mathrm{Z}(72: 28)$ isomers. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ : mixture of E and Z isomer; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed; see attached spectra for details) $\delta$ 2.92A: $7.14-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), $0.90(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; 2.92B: $6.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}$ $=7.4,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.92 \mathrm{~A}$ : 133.6, 133.2, 131.9, $130.8(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 130.5,124.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=274 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.6,19.8$, 13.4; 28B: 134.4, 133.1, $132.7(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 131.3,130.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 124.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}$ $=276 \mathrm{~Hz}), 122.1,25.9,13.1 ;{ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-59.4,-66.7$. FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ : 2975, 2942, 1653, 1489, 1251, 1161, 1115, 901; GC/MS (EI) 278.0 (M) ${ }^{+}$. HRMS (CI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$: 277.9918 ; found: 277.9909.

1D nOe Correlation For 2.92A

| Shift Irradiated <br> $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | 1 D nOe Correlation Seen <br> $(\mathrm{ppm})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6.73 | 6.55 |

1D nOe Correlation For 2.92B
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Shift Irradiated } \\ (\mathrm{ppm})\end{array} & 1 \text { D nOe Correlation Seen } \\ (\mathrm{ppm})\end{array}\right]$



2D HOSEY Correlation For 2.92A: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ to ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$

| ${ }^{19}$ F Shift (ppm) | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ Correlations Seen (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: |
| -66.7 | 0.90 |
| -66.7 | 2.09 |
| -66.7 | 6.72 |

2D HOSEY Correlation For 2.92B: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ to ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$

(2.93) To a 10 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $2.68(100 \mathrm{mg}, 356 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ and acetic acid ( 1.19 mL ). The flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath and zinc dust ( $233 \mathrm{mg}, 3.56 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise. Once addition of zinc was complete, the reaction was warmed to rt and stirred for 13 h . The crude reaction was filtered through Celite and diluted with ethyl acetate $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction was washed with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(3 \mathrm{x}, 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was basified with 1 M NaOH . The water was removed in vacuo and the crude solid was washed with chloroform ( 25 mL ). The mother liquor was concentrated in vacuo to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylamine 2.93 ( $70.1 \mathrm{mg}, 78 \%$ ) as a light pink solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$

NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) $\delta 3.02$ (s, 3H), 2.93 (s, 3H), 2.82-2.70 (m, 1H), 2.70-2.57 $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.58-2.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.36-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta$ 173.7, 156.0, 125.4 (q, J = 286 Hz ), 73.3 ( $\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=27.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 37.2, 35.5, 25.9, 24.2, 24.0, 21.7; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $376 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-76.7; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3412, 2239, 1687, 1635, 1160; mp: 180-182 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; ESI-MS: $268.1(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{OH})^{+}$. HRMS (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{OF}_{3}\right]^{+}: 252.13182$; found: 252.13130 .

(2.94) To a 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$ ( $75.0 \mathrm{mg}, 220$ $\mu \mathrm{mol})$, methanol ( 2.2 mL ), and $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(15.0 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \mathrm{wt} \%)$ The flask was equipped with a rubber septum and a needle was inserted into the septum. The flask was placed in a Parr reactor and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ five times. On the last refill, the reactor was sealed at a $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ pressure of 400 psi . The reactor was placed on a stir plate and the reaction was stirred at rt for 24 h . Once complete, the reactor was vented and the crude reaction was diluted with ethyl acetate and filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo to afford $\alpha$-trifluoromethylamine 2.94 (66.8 $\mathrm{mg}, 98 \%$ ) as a thick colorless oil. NMR analysis revealed a $>99: 1$ mixture of syn and anti isomers: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.57(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.34(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.62(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.13(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.0,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $13.4,4.7,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{qd}, \mathrm{J}=13.2,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.39$ $(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 144.8,129.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=30.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 129.3,127.0$ $(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=288 \mathrm{~Hz}), 125.4(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=3.53 \mathrm{~Hz}), 124.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=273 \mathrm{~Hz}), 64.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=22.3), 46.3$, 29.1, 26.3, 26.1, 20.3; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-69.5, -78.5; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3307$, 2943, 2865, 1166, 1120; GC/MS (EI) $310.1(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H})^{+}$. HRMS (CI) m/z, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NF}_{6}\right]^{+}: 312.1187$; found: 312.1190 .

(2.95) To a 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.67 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 242 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), Pearlman's catalyst ( $10 \mathrm{mg}, 10 \mathrm{wt} \%$ ), and methanol ( 2.42 mL ). The flask was equipped with a rubber septum and a needle was inserted into the septum. The flask was placed in a Parr reactor and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ five times. On the last refill, the reactor was sealed at a $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ pressure of 200 psi. The reactor was placed on a stir plate and the reaction was stirred at rt for 16 h . Once complete, the reactor was vented and the crude reaction was diluted with ethyl acetate, filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified via flash silica chromatography (80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$ trifluoromethylamine $2.95(60.1 \mathrm{mg}, 65 \%)$ as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.81-7.75(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.59(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.55$ (d, J = $8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.67(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.48(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.48(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 145.3,135.3,134.6,131.4,130.9,130.1,127.1,127.0,126.2(\mathrm{~J}=285 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 123.7, 120.7, 113.5, 109.1, $66.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=23.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 21.8,18.8$; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 376 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-74.1 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3422,2923,1371,1170,1132 ; \mathrm{mp}=93-95^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;$ HRMS (LIFDI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{~S}\right]^{+}: 382.0963$; found: 382.1037.


(2.84) To a 50 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added $\alpha$ trifluoromethylnitroalkane 2.79 ( $825 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0$ mmol), Pearlman's catalyst ( $165 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \mathrm{wt} \%$ ), and methanol ( 20.0 mL ). The flask was equipped with a rubber septum and a needle was inserted into the septum. The flask was placed in a Parr reactor was purged with
$\mathrm{H}_{2}$ five times. On the last refill, the reactor was sealed at a $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ pressure of 200 psi . The reactor was placed on a stir plate and the reaction was stirred at rt for 20 h . Once complete, the reactor was vented and the crude reaction was diluted with ethyl acetate, filtered through Celite and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 93:07 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified via flash silica chromatography (90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\alpha$ trifluoromethylhydroxylamine 2.84 ( $551 \mathrm{mg}, 70 \%$ ) as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.52(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=8.4,7.2$, $1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.27(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.25-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.90-6.84(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.39$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.37(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 159.6, 155.3, 153.4, 129.8, 129.3, 127.9, $126.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=288 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 124.7, 123.3, 121.3, $113.9,111.6,107.4,73.8,71.9,66.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=24 \mathrm{~Hz}), 55.4,13.2 .{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 565 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$-71.9; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3282,2937,2837,1612,1585,1514,1613,1566,1453$, 1251, 752; $\mathrm{mp}=97-99{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]$ : 396.14357; found: 396.14172; Crystals for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation of diethylether.

### 2.13.5 Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 2.74, 2.80, 2.84:

X-ray structural analysis for 2.74, 2.80 and 2.84: Crystals were mounted using viscous oil onto a plastic mesh and cooled to the data collection temperature. Data was collected on a Bruker-AXS APEX II DUO CCD diffractometer with Mo-K $\alpha$ radiation ( $\lambda=0.71073 \AA$ ) monochromated with graphite for $\mathbf{2 . 7 4}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$, and with $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation $(\lambda=1.54178 \AA)$ focused with Goebel mirrors for $\mathbf{2 . 8 4}$. Unit cell parameters were obtained from 36 data frames, $0.5^{\circ} \omega$, from three different sections of the Ewald
sphere. The systematic absences in the diffraction data are uniquely consistent with Pbca for $\mathbf{2 . 7 4}, \mathrm{P} 21 / \mathrm{c}$ for $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$, and $\mathrm{P} 21 / \mathrm{n}$ for $\mathbf{2 . 8 4}$. The data-sets were treated with multi-scan absorption corrections. ${ }^{53}$ The structures were solved using direct methods and refined with full-matrix, least-squares procedures on F217. Four symmetry unique compound molecules were located in the asymmetric unit of 21 different from each only in $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}$ single bond rotations of the -CF 3 and -NO 2 groups, respectively. All non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. The amine H -atoms in $\mathbf{2 . 7 4}$ and $\mathbf{2 . 8 4}$ were located from the electron density difference map and assigned an idealized fixed N-H distance of $0.87(2) \AA$ with Uiso equal to 1.2 Ueq of the attached nitrogen atom. All other hydrogen atoms were treated as idealized contributions with geometrically calculated positions and with Uiso equal to 1.2 , or 1.5 for methyl, Ueq of the attached atom. Atomic scattering factors are contained in various versions of the SHELXTL program library. ${ }^{54}$ Structural information has been deposited with the Cambridge Structural Crystallographic Centre under depositary numbers CCDC 1411931 for 2.74, CCDC 1411932 for $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$, and CCDC 1532771 for $\mathbf{2 . 8 4}$.
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## Chapter 3

## NICKEL CATALYZED ENANTIOSELECTIVE C-ALKYLATION OF NITROALKANES WITH $\alpha$-BROMOAMIDES: SYNTHESIS OF $\beta$ NITROAMIDES

### 3.1 Introduction

As discussed in appendix D, I have discovered the first enantioselective copper-catalyzed $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using an $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.1) as the alkyl electrophile. By utilizing a $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ symmetric chiral 1,2 diamine ligand (3.2), we could produce enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides (3.3) with up to $72 \%$ ee and good yield (Figure 3.1). However, we are unable to achieve higher enantioselectivities, which led me to investigate catalysts derived from other first-row transition metals. Such complexes are known to generate transient radicals when treated with simple alkyl halides (see Chapter $\mathbf{1}$ section $\mathbf{1 . 3}$ for detailed discussions). ${ }^{1}$ I was particularly cognizant of the recent advances in enantioselective nickel-catalyzed cross-couplings of racemic alkyl halides with carbon nucleophile. ${ }^{2}$


Figure 3.1: Copper-Catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.2 Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective Reactions Using $\alpha$-Halocarbonyls As Electrophiles

As discussed in Chapter 1 (section 1.3.1) nickel is by far the superior metal for the cross coupling of simple alkyl halides with carbon nucleophiles. ${ }^{3}$ Seminal reports from Fu and coworkers showed the nickel-catalyzed cross-coupling of secondary alkyl bromides with $\beta$-hydrogens and alkylzinc reagents (Chapter 1, see section 1.3.1). This report is ground breaking, because it opened the door to asymmetric synthesis of tertiary stereocenters. ${ }^{4}$ Towards this end, the Fu group have published the first nickelcatalyzed enantioselective Negishi-type cross-coupling reaction between activated alkyl electrophiles such as the racemic secondary $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.4) and organozinc reagent (3.5). Thus, a chiral nickel/pybox (3.6) catalyst achieves an array of alkylalkyl couplings with excellent enantioselectivity and excellent yield (3.7) (Figure 3.2).


Figure 3.2: Fu's Pioneering Studies on Enantioselective Cross-Coupling Between $\alpha$ bromoamide and Alkylzinc Reagents.

The fact that both yield and ee's are high suggests that this is not a kinetic resolution in which the chiral catalyst selectively reacts with one enantiomer of the electrophile and leaves the other enantiomer unreacted; instead, it is an
enantioconvergent reaction in which both enantiomers of the racemic starting material are converted into a single enantiomer of desired product (Figure 3.3).

Fu suggests that the electrophile probably undergoes a radical oxidative addition ${ }^{5}$ in which both enantiomers of the racemic alkyl halide are converted through a common planar radical intermediate (3.8). This radical (3.8), combines with an enantiopure nickel catalyst (Cat*) to afford a single enantiomer of an alkylmetal complex (3.9), which proceed to form a single enantiomer of the desired product (3.10). ${ }^{6}$


Figure 3.3: Fu's Enantioconvergent Cross-Coupling via a Radical Intermediate

In 2010, Fu and coworkers, reported the first nickel-catalyzed enantioselective cross-coupling between activated alkyl electrophile such as racemic secondary $\alpha$ chloroamide (3.11) and organoboron reagent (Figure 3.4). By utilizing a chiral nickel/1,2-diamine (3.12) catalyst, a wide variety of tertiary $\alpha$-arylcarbonyl compounds (3.13) can be synthesized with excellent enantioselectivities and yields. ${ }^{7}$ In addition, the amide products can be easily transformed into enantioenriched $\alpha$ arylcarboxylic acids without erosion of the ee. However, scope with respect to activated alkyl electrophile and nucleophiles is limited. $\alpha$-Chloroamides other than
indoline amides and alkyl boronic acids are not suitable coupling partners under these reaction conditions.


Figure 3.4: Fu's Studies on Enantioselective Cross-Coupling Between $\alpha$ Chloroamide and Organoboron Reagents.

### 3.3 Discovery and Optimization of Enantioselective Nickel-Catalyzed $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes with $\alpha$-bromoamides

Early in the initial optimization of our $C$-alkylation conditions when using benzyl bromides and 1-nitropropane, Dr. Peter Gildner observed modest reactivity when using bis(1,5-cyclooctadiene) nickel ( 0 ) ( $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ ) and cyclohexyl 1,2-diamine (3.14) as a precatalyst. Ultimately, optimization was continued with the superior copper (I) bromide (Table 3.1) and further investigation of nickel catalyst in these systems was not pursued.

Table 3.1: Comparing Copper and Nickel Catalyst with Diamine ligand


| 1 | CuBr | $43 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ | $12 \%$ |

However, the similar structure of the activated $\alpha$-haloamide substrates in the enantioselective nickel-catalyzed work of the Fu group (section 3.2) to the $\alpha$ bromocarbonyls suitable for our $C$-alkylation conditions, as well as their use of chiral 1,2-diamines led me to further examine nickel as a potential catalyst in the enantioselective transformations.

Table 3.2: Investigating Nickel Catalysts in the C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Ni source | Ligand | Yield 3.3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ee $3.3{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 1 | $\mathrm{NiBr}_{2} \cdot$ diglyme | 3.16 | 22\% | 60\% |
| 2 | $\mathrm{NiBr}_{2} \cdot$ diglyme | 3.17 | 12\% | 71\% |
| $3{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{NiBr}_{2} \cdot$ diglyme | 3.17 | 9\% | 73\% |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ | 3.17 | 40\% | 63\% |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase ${ }^{\mathrm{c}} 40 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Zn}$ powder added

$(S, S)-3.16$

( $R, R$ )-3.17

Towards this end, I used nickel (II) bromide with ( $1 R, 2 R$ )- $N, N^{\prime}$-dimethyl-1,2-diphenylethane-1,2-diamine (3.16) in the enantioselective $C$-alkylation of 1 -
nitropropane with $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.1). Despite a modest yield I observed, (22\%) of the C-alkylated product (3.3), significant enantioselectivity of $60 \%$ ee (Table 3.2, entry 1). Importantly, this is the first example of asymmetric nickel-catalyzed $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes. Switching it to cyclohexyl 1,2-diamine ligand (3.17), which had promise in the copper-catalyzed conditions, led to increased enantioselectivity with slightly diminished yield (entry 2). Addition of catalytic amount of zinc powder as a internal reductant to reduce $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ to $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ did not significantly alter the reactivity (entry 3$).{ }^{8}$ However, using $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ precatalyst such as $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ led to improved yields with only slight decrease in the enantioselectivity (entry 4).

### 3.4 Initial Experiments with DBU as the Base

Optimizing the reaction condition with $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ in conjunction with chiral diamine (3.17) as the ligand, I observed improved yields of $\beta$-nitroamides (3.3) when using the organic base 1,8-diazabicycloundec-7-ene (DBU) (Table 3.3 Entry 2). Lower temperatures led to increased reactivity and higher enantioselectivity (Table 3.3, Entry $3)$.

Table 3.3: Discovery of DBU as the Base in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3 & \text { DBU } & -20 & 78 \% & 73 \% \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
& { }^{\text {Y }} \text { Yields determined by }{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \text { NMR using } 1,3,5 \text {-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. } \\
& \text { b ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase }
\end{aligned}
$$

### 3.4.1 Electronic Effect in the Nickel-Catalyzed C-Alkylaiton of Nitroalkanes

I carried out further optimization using DBU as the base as it produced the desired product 3.3 in $78 \%$ yield with $73 \%$ ee. The modular nature of the $\mathrm{C}_{2}-$ symmetric chiral 1,2-diamine allowed me to study the linear free energy relationship (LFER) for the enantioselective nickel-catalyzed $C$-Alkylation of nitroalkanes.

Table 3.4: Examining Electronic Effect in the Nickel-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

Towards this end, LFER analysis revealed a correlation between ligand electronic variation and enantioselectivity (Table 3.4). ${ }^{9}$ To quantify this electronic effect, Hammett $\sigma$-parameters, derived from the acidities of substituted benzoic acid were used. ${ }^{10}$ The $\sigma_{\text {para }}$ value of the substitutents in the chiral 1,2-diamine ligand was plotted against the enantioselectivity of the product (3.3) and the Hammett plot was
found to be linear with a negative $\rho$ value, indicating that electron-donating ligand (3.17) gave high enantioselectivity and buildup of positive charge in the rate determining step was stabilized by the ligand (3.17) (Figure 3.5).


Figure 3.5: Hammett Plot of Enantioselective as a Function of Ligand Electronics

### 3.4.2 Origin of Enantioselectivity in the Nickel-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

In an effort to understand the origin of enantioselectivity in the nickelcatalyzed $C$-alkylation reactions, I was wondering if the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bonds in the chiral 1,2diamine ligand may be crucial for the observed enantioselectivity. To test this hypothesis, I designed and synthesized ligand (3.21) and (3.22) which has one and zero $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bond, and tested this ligand in the enantioselective reaction. Although the ligand lacking $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bonds provided similar level of catalytic activity ( $60 \%$ yield) only the ligand bearing $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bond provided enantioselection. This potentially suggests that
the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bond of the chiral ligand is involved in the enantiodetermining step, by organizing the transition state via complex hydrogen bond with the substrates to produce good enantioselectivity (Figure 3.6).


Figure 3.6: Role of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ bonds in the Enantioselective $C$-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.4.3 Examination of Chiral 1,2-diamine Ligands Under DBU Conditions

In order to increase the enantioselectiviy of the reaction, I studied the effect of substitution at the 3,5 position of the aryl ring in the chiral 1,2 diamines (3.19) under our nickel-catalyzed conditions using DBU as the base. The derivatives bearing electron donating group ( $\mathrm{Me}, \mathbf{3 . 2 3}$ ) in the 3,5 position of the aryl ring provided products showing high enantioselectivity and comparable reactivity to the unsubstituted ligand (3.19). Interestingly, the sterically encumbered ligand ( ${ }^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{Bu}, \mathbf{3 . 2 4}$ ) further enhanced the enantioselectivity and reactivity. However, further increasing the steric bulk (2,6-phenyl, 3.25) did not increase the ee's. The chiral ligand (3.24) is the
optimal ligand for the tert- $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.1) substrate giving the product (3.3) in $80 \%$ ee with $78 \%$ yield.

3.3


Figure 3.7: Steric Effect in the 3,5-position of Chiral 1,2 diamines

### 3.4.4 Activated Secondary Alkyl Electrophile as Coupling Partners

As discussed in section 3.4.3, chiral nickel/1,2-diamine catalyst (3.24) could differentiate the faces of the prochiral nitronate anion and couples with achiral tert- $\alpha$ bromo Weinreb amide (3.1) giving $80 \%$ ee with $78 \%$ yield of the desired product (3.3). Next, I wanted to examine the alkylation of more interesting and useful racemic,
sec- $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.26) with achiral nitronate anion under the DBU conditions. This class of secondary alkyl electrophiles, when coupled with nitronate anion, sets two adjacent stereocenters and opens the door to control both absolute and relative stereochemistry of the desired $\beta$-nitroamide products. Significantly, the resulting enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides from the reaction can be used as nucleophiles in conjugate addition, ${ }^{11}$ trifluoromethylation, ${ }^{12}$ or Tsuji Trost allylation reactions ${ }^{13}$ to set enantioenriched, congested, fully substituted nitrogen centers which cannot be access by nitro-Mannich reactions. ${ }^{14}$


Figure 3.8: First Example of Nickel-catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes Using Racemic Secondary Alkyl Electrophile

Gratifyingly, the racemic sec- $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.26) couples with the prochiral 1-nitrohexane in the presence of chiral nickel/1,2-diamie catalyst (3.27) afforded (3.28) in $82 \%$ yield as a mixture of diastereomers ( $80: 20$ syn:anti). Enantioenrichment was observed for both the diastereomers with $85 \%$ ee for the major syn diastereomer and $20 \%$ ee for the minor anti diastereomer (Figure 3.8). Significantly, this is the first example where the chiral nickel catalyst controls both absolute and relative stereochemistry in the $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using racemic secondary activated alkyl electrophiles.

Even though the desired $\beta$-nitroamide (3.28) was produced in good diastereoand enantioselectivity, the results were inconsistent. After several runs of the reaction, depicted in Table 3.5, the enantioselectivity and diastereoselectivity could not be reproduced, suggesting that $\beta$-nitroamide (3.28) was not stable under the reaction condition using DBU as the base (Table 3.5, entry 1-4).

Table 3.5: Inconsistent Results Using DBU as the Base

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

In an effort to study the kinetic stability of the syn and anti diastereomers of $\beta$ nitroamide (3.28), I subjected the racemic, syn diastereomer (3.28) to our nickelcatalyzed enantioselective alkylation reaction using tert- $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.1) as electrophile and 1-nitropropane as nucleophile. Disappointingly, the racemic, syn diastereomer (3.28) was epimerized to mixture of diastereomers (syn:anti 61:39)
(Figure 3.8, top) and similar results were obtained on subjecting racemic, anti diastereomer (3.28) to the reaction conditions (Figure 3.8, bottom).


Figure 3.8: Epimerization Studies

Based on my previous deprotonation studies between $\mathrm{DBU}\left(\mathrm{pK}^{\prime}{ }_{\mathrm{a}} \sim 12\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ and nitroalkanes ( $\mathrm{pK}_{\mathrm{a}} \sim 10$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) using ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy, the deprotonation event is slow, taking about 10 minutes for a $2: 1$ mixture of nitroalkane and nitronate anion to reach equilibrium at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (see chapter 2 , section 2.11 .2 for more details) (Figure 3.9). ${ }^{12}$ Under our working mechanistic hypothesis, there would be a significant concentration of soluble DBU base and soluble nitronate anion under the homogeneous reaction conditions. Presumably, the soluble DBU deprotonates the
formed enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide (3.28) slowly, consequently the products lose its configurational integrity.


Figure 3.9: Rationalization for Epimerization of $\beta$-nitroamide $\mathbf{3 . 2 8}$

To circumvent this epimerization issue, we reasoned that utilizing a much stronger base than DBU, such as metal alkoxides, might prove useful because the metal alkoxides ( $\mathrm{pK}^{\prime}{ }_{\mathrm{a}} \sim 17$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) would quantitatively deprotonates the nitroalkane ( $\mathrm{pK}_{\mathrm{a}} \sim 10$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) generating weakly basic metal nitronate anions which are sparingly soluble in the non-polar reaction media (Figure 3.10). Importantly, the heterogeneous reaction media might prevent the formed enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide (it would be in the solution phase) from epimerization as the weakly basic metal nitronate anion would be in the solid phase.


Figure 3.10: Proposed Metal Alkoxide Base in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.5 Identification of Metal Alkoxide Bases and Optimization

Towards this end, I examined a few metal alkoxide bases under our nickelcatalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation conditions. The racemic, sec- $\alpha$-bromo Weinreb amide (3.26) couples with the prochiral 1-nitrohexane in the presence of lithium tert-butoxide and nickel/1,2-diamine catalyst (3.27) affording (3.28) in 17\% yield, 71:29 d.r with $0 \%$ enantioselectivity. By switching to a larger counter ion bearing metal alkoxide, such as sodium tert-butoxide, produces the product (3.28) in $31 \%$ yield with $49 \%$ ee and 77:23 d.r (Table 3.6 entry 2 ). Potassium tert-butoxide was found to be more effective than sodium tert-butoxide (Table 3.6 entry 3). It is interesting to note that lithium and sodium alkoxide did not induce enantioselectivity in the copper catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes (Appendix $\mathbf{D}$, section D. 7 and D.8) using chiral 1,3 diketimine ligand D.15.

Table 3.6: Investigation of Metal Alkoxide Bases

|  | $\gamma y_{4}^{\mathrm{Me}}$ |  |  |  |  <br> ( $R, R$ ) -3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Base | T ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Yield 3.28 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\text { d.r } 3.28$ <br> syn:anti | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{ee} \\ 3.28^{\mathrm{b}} \\ \text { syn/anti } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | $\mathrm{LiO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ | -20 | 17\% | 71:29 | 00/00\% |
| 2 | $\mathrm{NaO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ | -20 | 31\% | 77:23 | 49/28\% |
| 3 | $\mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ | -20 | 51\% | 75:25 | 58/32\% |
| 4 | $\mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ | -20 | 53\% | 76:24 | 58/31\% |
| 5 | $\mathrm{KO}^{t} \mathrm{Bu}$ | rt | 53\% | 80:20 | 77/40\% |

[^0]${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

Significantly, the results were reproducible using potassium tert-butoxide as the base and this suggests that the enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide (3.28) does not epimerize under the reaction conditions (Table 3.6 entry 4). Room temperature was found to be effective, giving product in $53 \%$ yield, $77 \%$ ee and $80: 20$ d.r. After the identification of potassium tert-butoxide as the base, I wanted to extensively study the reaction conditions using a wide variety of ligand scaffolds, bases, solvents, different $\alpha$-bromo carbonyls, etc to improve reactivity, diastereo- and enantioselectivity.

I screened several solvents under the new heterogeneous reaction condition using potassium tert-butoxide as the base. The polar aprotic solvent such as dimethyl acetamide (DMA) gave poor diastereoselectivity of the desired product (3.28) (Table 3.7 entry 1), halogenated solvent such dichloromethane (DCM) gave slightly better d.r and enantioselectivity (Table 3.7 entry 2), non-polar solvents such as benzene increased the diastereoselectivity to $82: 18$ with comparable enantioselectivity to DCM. Finally, weakly coordinating solvent such as diethyl ether found to be optimal solvent affording $45 \%$ yield with $70 \%$ ee for the major syn diastereomers and 90:10 d.r (Table 3.7 entry 4). Further optimization was carried out using $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as the solvent.

In our previous reaction conditions for the enantioselective $C$-alkylation reaction using DBU as the base, high catalyst loading was required. By reducing the catalyst loading, the enantioselectivity and reactivity significantly reduced. However, using potassium tert-butoxide as the base at lower catalyst loading, enantio- and diastereoselectivity were increased (Table 3.7 entry 5-7). Further optimization was carried out using $5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ as the precatalyst.

Table 3.7: Optimization of Solvent and Catalyst Loading

|  | $Y f_{4}^{\mathrm{Me}}$ |  |  |  |  <br> $(R, R)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | Solvent | Catalyst Loading | Yield 3.28 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\text { d.r } 3.28$ <br> syn:anti | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{ee} \\ 3.28^{\mathrm{b}} \\ \text { syn/anti } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | DMA | 20 mol \% | 53\% | 55:45 | 56/24\% |
| 2 | DCM | 20 mol \% | 60\% | 67:33 | 70/30\% |
| 3 | benzene | 20 mol \% | 48\% | 82:18 | 70/28\% |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 20 mol \% | 45\% | 90:10 | 70/52\% |
| $5^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 20 mol \% | 51\% | 85:15 | 72/10\% |
| $6^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $10 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{\%}$ | 60\% | 87:13 | 76/10\% |
| $7{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ | 53\% | 87:13 | 77/10\% |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}(R, R)-3.29$ was used as ligand

( $R, R$ )-3.29

I performed a brief ligand study in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes using newly identified base, solvent and catalyst loading. Towards this end, I found derivatives bearing electron donating group (Me, 3.23) in the 3,5 position of the aryl ring provided products showing comparable enantioselectivity and yield and slightly higher diastereoselectivity than the unsubstituted ligand (3.19). Significantly, $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group (3.30), which is sterically bigger than methyl group and also inductively electron withdrawing group increased the
enantioselectivity of the product (3.28) to $80 \%$ with $72 \%$ yield and $80: 20$ d.r. (Figure 3.11). It is interesting that in our previous copper (appendix D Section D.11.2) and nickel/DBU enantioselective condition (section 3.4.3), electron rich chiral 1,2 diamines found to be effective. However, with the new heterogeneous reaction condition with stronger metal alkoxide base electron deficient diamine ligand was found to effective. Further optimization of the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective reaction was carried out using electron deficient chiral diamine ligand 3.30.



Figure 3.11: Identification of Electron Deficient Ligand $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$

Although Weinreb amides are synthetically useful, the enantioselectivity could not be achieved beyond $80 \%$ so I tested a few $\alpha$-bromoamide bearing electronically different amide backbone. These studies found that $\beta$-nitroamides were produced in good enantioselectivity. For example, using 1-nitropropane as a nucleophile the
electron rich, secondary $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.31) produced desired product (3.32) in $82 \%$ ee with $74: 26$ d.r and $74 \%$ yield. Significantly, the $N$-benzyl- $N$-phenyl amide (3.33) afforded (3.34) in $84 \%$ ee with $77: 23$ d.r and $84 \%$ yield (Figure 3.12). To further enhance the enantioselectivity, the $N$-benzyl- $N$-phenyl amide (3.34) was choosen as the optimal substrate for the further optimization.

yield determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using an internal standard. ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase
Figure 3.12: Examination of Amide Backbone in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.6 Optimization of Reaction Conditions using $N$-Benzyl- $N$-Phenyl Amide as a Model Substrate

After identifying $N$-benzyl- $N$-phenyl amide (3.33) as a model substrate, I was interested in examining the role of base under these new catalytic reaction conditions. Since potassium tert-butoxide produced $84 \%$ ee of the $\beta$-nitroamides (3.34) with the $N$-benzyl- $N$-phenyl amide (3.33), I screened several potassium bases which bear smaller anions than tert-butoxide. Potassium ethoxide produced (3.34) in $89 \%$ ee with

74:26 d.r and $85 \%$ yield (Table 3.8 entry 2 ). The potassium methoxide produced comparable results as the potassium ethoxide (Table 3.8 entry 3). Switching to LiOMe decreased the yield and enantioselectivity (Table 3.8 entry 4), however NaOMe produced $88 \%$ ee with $81: 19$ d.r and $74 \%$ yield (Table 3.8 entry 5). Although, potassium bases were found to be superior to NaOMe , I realized the yields with potassium bases were not consistent. Consequently, I choose NaOMe as the optimal base for further optimization.

Table 3.8: Role of Smaller Counter-Anion Bases

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

### 3.6.1 Examination of Diverse Chiral Bidentate Nitrogen Ligands

After identifying $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}, \mathrm{NaOMe}, \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and N -benzyl- N -phenyl amide (3.33) amide as optimal reaction components for the enantioselective $C$-alkylation of
nitroalkanes, I next undertook extensive studies of ligand architecture to increase the enantioselectivity beyond $88 \%$. Especially, I was interested in studying several chiral bidentate nitrogen ligands that haven't been examined under our new nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation conditions. These classes of ligands have been extensively utilized in enantioselective $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions ${ }^{2 b}$ and it has showed promising results in our earlier copper-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes (see Appendix D section D.11.5 for more discussions).

Towards this end, using racemic, secondary amide (3.33) and 1-nitropropane as a model substrates several chiral bidentate nitrogen ligands have been tested under enantioselective $C$-alkylation reaction condition (Figure 3.13). The bis(oxazoline) BOX ligand (3.35) and pyBOX (3.36) ligands, which have been used in several enantioselective nickel-catalyzed radical reactions, ${ }^{2 a}$ were found to be ineffective. The $C_{2}$ symmetric chiral 1,2 diamine (3.16) gave $83 \%$ ee with $85: 15$ d.r albeit with low yield. The $(R, R)-N, N$ '-ethylenebis(1-phenylethylamine) (3.37) gave excellent reactivity with $78 \%$ ee and $73: 27$ d.r. In contrast, the chiral cyclohexyl 1,2 diamine (3.29), gave $44 \%$ yield with slight increase in the enantio and diastereoselectivity compared to ligand (3.16). The benzyl substituted cyclohexyl diamine ligand (3.19) produced $\beta$-nitroamides (3.34) in $60 \%$ yield with similar enantio- and diastereoselectivity as ligand (3.29). After examining a variety of chiral bidentate nitrogen ligands, I found chiral 1,2 diamine scaffold (3.19) to be optimal ligand architecture for the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes for the synthesis of enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides.


Figure 3.13: Diverse Chiral Bidentate Nitrogen Ligands in the Nickel-Catalyzed $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

As discussed in section 3.5 the new heterogeneous reaction condition with stronger metal alkoxide base and electron deficient diamine ligand (3.30) was found to be effective. To further enhance the enantioselectivity, I designed and synthesized several substituted derivatives of chiral diamine ligand (3.19) that bears electron withdrawing group in the phenyl ring. For example, the derivatives bearing electron withdrawing group $\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3} 3.20\right.$ and 3.38) in the para and meta-position gave similar diastereoselectivity and yield, however the ligand (3.38) which bears $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group in the meta position gave slightly higher ee. The $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ substitution at the 3,5 position of the aryl ring produced $88 \%$ ee with $82: 18$ d.r and $74 \%$ yield (Figure 3.14).

yield determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using an internal standard. ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase.
ee of the major syn diastereomer reported.
Figure 3.14: Examination of Electron Deficient Chiral Diamine Ligands

However, extremely electron withdrawing pentafluoro ligand (3.39) was found to be ineffective producing (3.34) in $16 \%$ yield. Further tuning the ligands (3.40, 3.41, 3.42, and 3.43) with several electron deficient groups in the aryl ring did not increase the enantioselectivity beyond $86 \%$. Further optimization of the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective reaction was carried out using chiral diamine ligand (3.30).

### 3.6.2 Effect of $\alpha$-Alkyl Substitution in the Electrophile

After identifying optimal ligand for the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes, I examined the scope of alkyl substitution at the $N$-benzyl-$N$-phenyl amide (3.33).

Table 3.9: Comparison of "methyl" vs "ethyl" Substitution in the $\alpha$-Bromoamide 3.33

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

To my disappointment, the catalytic condition was not effective for the $\alpha$ bromoamide (3.45), which possess $\alpha$-ethyl substitution. For example, the amide (3.45)
provided desired product (3.44) in $84 \%$ ee with $62: 38$ d.r albeit with low yield (Table 3.9 entry 2). In an effort to increase the yield of (3.44), I studied different ligand scaffold, bases, solvents etc with substrate (3.45), but the yield could not be improved beyond $45 \%$.

### 3.6.3 Identification of $\mathbf{E t}_{2} \mathbf{Z n}$ as the Internal Reductant

Our working hypothesis for the inefficiency of the catalyst is that, 1,5cyclooctadience (COD) from the $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ precatalyst may act as a competitive ligand leading to competitive non-enantioselective pathway. I reasoned that in situ generated $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ pre catalyst may circumvent this problem and produces a more effective catalyst system than $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ precatalyst. It has been well documented in several cross coupling reactions that internal reductants such as $\mathrm{Zn}, \mathrm{Mn}$, organometallic reagents, and organoborane reagents were known to reduce the $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ to $\mathrm{Ni}(0)^{8,15}$, and it is the low valent, electron rich Ni species that is involved in several alkyl electrophile crosscoupling reactions. ${ }^{16}$

Towards this end, I tested several internal reductants using $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ precatalyst. The control experiment without added reductant did not furnish desired product (3.44), which suggests that $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ is not active catalyst in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes. Furthermore, Zn metal, Mn metal and Ph -Bpin were ineffective and they produced desired product in only trace amount (Table 3.10 entry 1-3). Significantly, MeMgCl and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ both were found to be effective. For example, MeMgCl , gave product (3.44) in $76 \%$ yield with $57: 43$ d.r and $80 \%$ ee (Table 3.10 entry 5); $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ gave product (3.44) in $48 \%$ yield with $62: 38$ d.r and $40 \%$ ee (Table 3.10 entry 6). These results suggest that $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ is reduced to low valent Ni species which catalyze the reaction.

Table 3.10: Survey of Internal Reductant for $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ to $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

Next, I reduced the loading of internal reductant to see if it helps in increasing both yield and enantioselectivity. Reducing the MeMgCl loading was detrimental to both the yield and enantioselectivity (Table 3.11 entry 1-3). However, reducing the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ was found to be fruitful. For example, reducing $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ loading to $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ increased the yield to $88 \%$ with $69 \%$ ee (Table 3.11 entry 4-5), further reducing $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ concentration increases the enantioselectivity. At $1 \mathrm{~mol}^{\%} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ loading, desired enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides (3.44) was produced in $95 \%$ yield with $60: 40$ d.r and $84 \%$ ee for the major syn diastereomer (Table 3.11 entry 7).

Table 3.11: Reducing the Loading of MeMgCl and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$


$(R, R)-\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$

| Entry | Reductant <br> Loading | Yield <br> $3.44^{\mathrm{a}}$ | d.r 3.44 <br> syn:anti | ee <br> $3.44^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> syn/anti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{MeMgCl}(20 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $76 \%$ | $57: 43$ | $80 / 74 \%$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{MeMgCl}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $49 \%$ | $59: 41$ | $80 / 81 \%$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{MeMgCl}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{\%})$ | $18 \%$ | $60: 40$ | $82 / 82 \%$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $48 \%$ | $62: 38$ | $40 / 44 \%$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{\%})$ | $88 \%$ | $58: 42$ | $69 /--\%$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(2.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $89 \%$ | $62: 38$ | $75 / 70 \%$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $95 \%$ | $60: 40$ | $84 / 82 \%$ |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase
It is important to note that for the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$ alkylation of nitroalkanes for the synthesis of the $\beta$-nitroamides, in situ generated $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ pre-catalyst proved to be more efficient catalytic system than the $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ precatalyst using $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ (Table 3.12). Furthermore, high concentration of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ is necessary for the efficient catalytic system which will be discussed later. The $\mathrm{NiBr} 2 \cdot$ glyme/ $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ catalyst was used as catalyst for further optimization.

Table 3.12: Comparison of Efficiency of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2}$ and $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}) / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ Catalytic System

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

### 3.6.4 Identification of Single Component Pre-catalyst

After identification of efficient $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}) / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ catalytic system, I examined the scope of nitroalkanes in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation conditions. Disappointingly, even modestly functionalized nitroalkanes produced poor yields of (3.47). By using 1-nitrohexene (3.46) as the nucleophile and racemic, secondary $\alpha$ bromoamide (3.33) as the electrophile, (3.47) was produced in excellent 95:5 d.r with $86 \%$ ee of the $s y n$ diastereomer albeit with $25 \%$ yield.


Figure 3.15: Poor Reactivity of Functionalized Nitroalkane $\mathbf{3 . 4 6}$

We hypothesized that the functionalized nitroalkane coordinates with the active Ni species, and the rate of ligation of (3.30) with the Ni species would be slower. Consequently, sufficient concentration of active catalyst would not be present for the efficient catalytic turnovers. In an effort to address this limitation, We reasoned that single component pre-catalyst may be effective for the functionalized nitroalkanes. Towards this end, Dr. Rajgopal Sharma (postdoc) synthesized single component pre-catalyst (3.48) from $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ species and ligand (3.30) in $85 \%$ yield (Figure 3.16). ${ }^{17}$


Figure 3.16: Preparation of Single Component Pre-catalyst 3.48

After synthesizing pre-catalyst (3.48), I tested it in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective reaction using functionalized nitroalkane (3.46). Gratifyingly, the single component pre-catalyst (3.48) was found to be effective. As shown in Table 3.13 entry 2 , the catalyst (3.48), produced enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides (3.47) in $70 \%$ yield with $88: 12$ d.r and $86 \%$ ee.

Table 3.13: Comparison of Single Component Pre-Catalyst 3.48 and MultiComponent Catalyst $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$


| Entry | Ni Catalyst | Yield <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{a}}$ | d.r <br> 3.47 <br> syn:anti | ee <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> syn/anti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{NiCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{dme} /(R, R) \mathbf{- 3 . 3 0}$ | $25 \%$ | $95: 05$ | $86 / 76 \%$ |
| 2 | $(R, R)-\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ | $70 \%$ | $88: 12$ | $86 / 76 \%$ |

[^1]

$(R, R)-3.48$

Furthermore, I investigated a variety of reductants using single component precatalyst (3.48), hoping to see if it has effect on enantio- and diastereoselectivity on the formation of $\beta$-nitroamides (3.47). Single electron reductant such as $\mathrm{SmI}_{2}$ and strong bases were ineffective as reductants (Table 3.14 entry 1-2). $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ gave trace yield with $87 \%$ ee. It is interesting to note that reactive reductant such as $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ gave (3.47) in $99 \%$ yield with $84 \%$ ee. Several alkyl and aryl Grignard reagents as internal reductant were found to be effective with respect to yield and enantioselectivity, albeit with slightly lower levels of diastereoselection (Table 3.14 entry 5-9). Like organomagnesium reagents, alkyl and aryl zinc reagents worked well except diphenyl zinc which produced (3.47) in $24 \%$ yield (Table 3.14 entry 10-14). After extensive reductant screen, $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ was found to be optimal producing (3.47) in $88 \%$ ee with 88:12 d.r and 78\% yield.

Table 3.14: Investigation of Internal Reductants using Single Component Pre-catalyst 3.48


( $R, R$ )-3.48

| Entry | Reductant | Yield <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{a}}$ | d.r 3.47 <br> syn:anti | ee <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> syn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{SmI}_{2}$ | $<1 \%$ | - | - |
| 2 | NaH | $<1 \%$ | - | - |


| 3 | $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ | $16 \%$ | $95: 05$ | $87 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ | $99 \%$ | $74: 26$ | $84 \%$ |
| 5 | MeMgCl | $99 \%$ | $78: 22$ | $87 \%$ |
| 6 | ${ }^{i} \mathrm{PrMgCl}$ | $92 \%$ | $76: 24$ | $87 \%$ |
| 7 | BnMgCl | $91 \%$ | $80: 20$ | $87 \%$ |
| 8 | PhMgCl | $83 \%$ | $84: 16$ | $84 \%$ |
| 9 | $4-\mathrm{MeO}-\mathrm{PhMgCl}$ | $97 \%$ | $78: 22$ | $87 \%$ |
| 10 | BuLi | $90 \%$ | $82: 18$ | $87 \%$ |
| 11 | PhLi | $85 \%$ | $85: 15$ | $86 \%$ |
| $12^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{Ph}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ | $24 \%$ | $95: 05$ | $87 \%$ |
| $13^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ | $82 \%$ | $86: 14$ | $87 \%$ |
| $14^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ | $78 \%$ | $88: 12$ | $88 \%$ |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase ${ }^{\mathrm{c}} 1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ zinc reagent added

### 3.6.5 Effect of Temperature

It is well established that several enantioselective reactions perform well under low temperature, encouraged by these precedence, I sought to examine the effect of temperature in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes. Gratifyingly, changing the temperature improved ee as well as yield of the product (3.47) slightly. For example, at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the racemic, secondary $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.33) was reacted with prochiral 1-nitrohexene using chiral nickel pre-catalyst (3.48) to give (3.47) in $90 \%$ ee with $80: 20$ d.r and $87 \%$ yield (Table 3.15). However, further lowering temperature adversely affected the yield. Under these heterogeneous reaction conditions the chiral nickel catalyst (3.48) could control both the absolute and relative stereochemistry of the $\beta$-nitroamides (3.47) effectively. The generality of the reaction was studied using this catalytic system at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ unless otherwise mentioned. It is important to mention that the reaction was air sensitive and attempts to run the reaction on the bench top adversely affected the yield. Consequently, the reaction performed in the glove box and we designed a cooling unit and John Famiglietti
(Department's electrical engineer) built it. All the reactions were performed in the glove box at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using the cooling unit (Figure 3.17).


Figure 3.17: Reaction Set Up in the Glove Box Using Cooling Unit

Table 3.15: Role of Temperature

3.46
3.47
racemic

( $R, R$ R -3.48

| Entry | Temperature ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Yield <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{a}}$ | d.r 3.47 <br> syn:anti | ee <br> $3.47^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> syn/anti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 25 | $74 \%$ | $86: 14$ | $88 / 76 \%$ |
| 2 | 0 | $87 \%$ | $80: 20$ | $90 / 80 \%$ |
| 3 | -30 | $34 \%$ | $78: 22$ | $90 / 79 \%$ |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

### 3.7 Reaction Scope with Respect to Nitroalkanes

With optimized conditions in hand, we investigated the scope of the nitroalkanes (Figure 3.18). A variety of primary nitroalkanes was subjected to the reaction using racemic N -benzyl-2-bromo- N -phenylpropionamide as the alkylating reagent. High ee was observed for 1 -nitropropane (3.44) as well as those with $\beta$ branched nitroalkane (3.49). Using $10 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{\%}$ catalyst loading a variety of functionalized nitroalkanes including alkene, aryl, aryl ether, acetate, free alcohol, ester, free and protected ketone were all alkylated in good to high ee (3.47, 3.50-3.56). In all the above cases, modest to high levels of d.r were observed. Nitromethane can also be alkylated albeit with low yield and slightly low ee (3.57).



3.54, 78\%, (71:29)
syn/anti 87/63\% ee, X-ray (minor)

3.55, 71\%, (67:33)
syn/anti 85/84\% ee
3.56, 86\%, (71:29) syn/anti 89/75\% ee年

$3.57,41 \%, 82 \%$ ee
${ }^{a} 5 \mathrm{~mol} \% 8,1 \mathrm{~mol}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}^{\mathrm{b}} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase. diastereomeric ratio determined from NMR of crude product using trimethoxybenzene as internal standard.

Figure 3.18: Scope of Nitroalkanes in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective CAlkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.8 Reaction Scope with Respect to Electrophile and Amide Backbone

The scope of the reaction with respect to the $\alpha$-bromoamide is broad. Good d.r's and high ee's were observed for amides possessing electron-rich, electron-poor and sterically encumbered groups (3.58-3.60, Figure 3.19 top). Importantly, $\alpha$ bromoamide possessing $\alpha$-alkyl substituents larger than methyl were also tolerated well with good ee albeit with poor d.r (3.44, 3.61, Figure 3.19 bottom). Significantly, several amide back bone including indoline (3.62), morpholine (3.63), aryl-alkyl
(3.64), and synthetically useful Weinreb amide (3.65), all performed well with high d.r and high to excellent ee. However, slightly lower level of d.r and ee were observed for nitroalkanes that lack $\beta$-branching (3.65-3.69) (Figure 3.20).


syn/anti $90 / 82 \%$ ee

3.59,79\%, (79:21) syn/anti 89/80\% ee

3.60, 76\%, (83:17) syn/anti $91 / 83 \%$ ee

3.44, $90 \%$, (55:45) syn/anti 85/81\% ee

3.61, 89\%, (54:46)
syn/anti $83 / 77 \%$ ee

Figure 3.19: Scope of Electrophiles in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

${ }^{\text {a }} 1.1$ equiv $\mathrm{KO}^{\text {tB }} \mathrm{Bu}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase. diastereomeric ratio determined from NMR of crude product using trimethoxybenzene as internal standard.

Figure 3.20: Scope of Amide Backbone in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

The reaction exhibits modest to excellent levels of diastereoselectiviy. In several cases, the diastereomers were easily separated by standard column chromatography. The relative and absolute stereochemistry of both diastereomers were determined by X-ray crystallography (3.54, 3.62) (see experimental section). The absolute configuration of the other $\beta$-nitroamide products were assigned by analogy. Correlation of the structure to their ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra revealed that the syn-isomer consistently displayed upfield shift at the hydrogen atom $\alpha$ to the carbonyl group compared to the anti-isomer (Figure 3.21). Based on this analysis, we could conclude that the $\operatorname{syn}$ isomer was the major diastereomer in all cases.


Figure $3.21{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of 3.54 syn and anti diastereomers

### 3.9 Preliminary Results

Preliminary results suggest that this strategy is applicable to tertiary bromides, providing (3.3) with low yield and ee. Interestingly, other preliminary result suggest that this protocol could also be used to alkylate secondary nitroalkanes, albeit with low yield and ee $(\mathbf{3 . 7 0}, \mathbf{3 . 7 1})$ (Figure 3.22 ). However, these products bear fully substituted nitrogen center, which are challenging to prepare by other methods.


Figure 3.22: Preliminary Results in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective CAlkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.10 Down Stream Functionalization of Alkylated Products

The enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide from the alkylation reaction are useful intermediates in the further downstream functionalization. For example, the enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide can be used as a handle for further $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond forming reactions. In 2015, our group published a highly diastereoselective Michael reaction using $\alpha$-substituted, $\beta$-nitrocarbonyls as nucleophiles to afford functional group rich stereodiads containing fully substituted nitrogen-bearing centers (see Chapter 1, section 1.1.3 for discussions). ${ }^{11}$ Encouraged by this work, I sought to examine whether these conditions might prove highly diastereoselective for enantioenriched $\beta$ nitroamide to form sterically congested, functional group dense nitroalkane with high diastereo- and enantioselectivity. Towards this end, I subjected nitroamide (3.47) as a single syn diastereomer to the previously optimized diastereoselective Michael addition conditions. The conjugate addition product (3.72) was obtained with $91 \%$ ee and excellent diastereoslectivity (Table 3.16 entry 1). Interestingly, subjecting mixture
of stereoisomers (79:21 syn:anti and 91/82\% ee) of nitroamide (3.47), produced product (3.72) in $89 \%$ ee with excellent diastereoselectivity (Table 3.16 entry 2 ). The relative stereochemistry of product (3.72) was assigned based on analogy to our diastereoselective Michael reaction using $\alpha$-substituted, $\beta$-nitrocarbonyls as nucleophiles. ${ }^{11}$

Table 3.16: Diastereoselective Michael Addition of Enantioenriched $\beta$-Nitroamide 3.47


| 3.47 |  |  | Yield 3.72 | d.r 3.72 <br> Entry <br> syn:anti | ee <br> $\mathbf{3 . 7 2}^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> d.r |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

${ }^{a}$ diastereomeric ratio determined from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of crude product using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

Using the diastereomeric and enantiomeric ratios of nitroamide (3.47) (Table 3.16 entry 1), I calculated the relative percentage of each stereoisomer subjected into the Michael addition with methyl acrylate (Figure 3.23 left). With the percentage of each stereoisomer known and given the complete diastereoselectivity of the Michael reaction, we could calculate the theoretical enantioselectivity of the resultant product (Figure 3.21 bottom). Since the deprotonation should occur exclusively alpha to the nitro group the stereoconter alpha to the carbonyl should be preserved. The measured enantioselectivity of Michael addition product (3.72) (89\% ee) closely matched the
theoretical enantioselectivity of the Michael addition product (3.72) ( $88 \%$ ee) assuming retention of stereochemistry alpha to the carbonyl group.


Figure 3.23: Theoretical Enantioselectivity of Michael Addition based on Relative Ratio of Stereoisomers

In 2017, we pusblished mild reaction conditions for the trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes using a commercially available Umemoto's reagent (Chapter 2). ${ }^{12}$ This procedurally simple protocol allows rapid access to highly complex quaternary $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkanes in good yields and diastereoselectivity. Inspired by this work, I sought to examine whether these conditions might prove highly diastereoselective for enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide to form enantioenriched quaternary $\alpha$-trifluoromethylnitroalkanes with high diastereo- and enantioselectivity. Towards this end, I subjected nitroamide (3.34) as a single syn diastereomer to the previously optimized trifluromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes conditions. The quaternary $\alpha$-trifluoromethylated product (3.73) was obtained with $90 \%$ ee with excellent diastereoslectivity (Table 3.17 entry 1). Similar to the conjugate addition
reaction, subjecting mixture of stereoisomers ( $76: 24$ syn:anti and $90 / 84 \%$ ee) of nitroamide (3.34), produced product (3.73) in $86 \%$ ee with excellent diastereoselectivity (Table 3.17 entry 2). The relative stereochemistry of product (3.73) was assigned based on analogy to our trifluoromethylation of secondary nitroalkanes reactions. ${ }^{12}$

Table 3.17: Synthesis of Enantioenriched Quaternary $\alpha$-Trifluoromethylnitroalkane (3.73)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{3 . 3 4} \\ \text { d.r } \end{gathered}$ | 3.34, \%ee | Yield 3.73 | $\text { d.r 3.73 }{ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ <br> syn:anti | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{ee} \\ \mathbf{3 . 7 3}{ }^{\text {b }} \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | >95:05 | 90 | >95:05 | >95:05 | 89 |
| 2 | 76:24 | 90/84 | >95:05 | >95:05 | 86 |

${ }^{a}$ diastereomeric ratio determined from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of crude product using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

In addition to the conjugate addition and trifluoromethylation reaction, I also subjected enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide under Tsuji-Trost allylation reactions. ${ }^{13}$ For example, the amide (3.34) was treated with allyl carbonate (3.74) under palladium catalysis affording allylated nitroalkane (3.75) with excellent diastereo- and enantioselectivity (Figure 3.24).


Figure 3.24: Tsuji-Trost Allylation Reaction of Enantioenriched $\beta$-Nitroamide

Furthermore, the enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamides (3.72, 3.73, 3.75) were transformed to corresponding chiral tertiary amines (3.76-3.78) using $\mathrm{Zn} / \mathrm{AcOH}$ (Figure 3.25). The reduced products are congested, nitrogen-bearing, fully substituted carbon centers, and it is important to note that the ability to functionalize $\alpha$ to the nitro group highlights the importance of this transformation compared to other protocol to prepare $\beta$-azacarbonyls such as $\beta$-aminocarbonyl that results from Mannich reactions. ${ }^{14 a}$


Figure 3.25: Reduction of Alkylated Products

### 3.11 Investigation of Reaction Mechanism

To investigate the mechanism of the enantioselective $C$-alkylation reaction several experiments were performed. First, when the reaction was run in the presence of 1 equiv TEMPO, a known radical scavenger, ${ }^{18}$ no alkylation product (3.34) was formed (Figure 3.26 top) and I did not observe the TEMPO adduct. Second, the reaction of substrate (3.79), which bears a cyclopropyl ring results exclusively in ring opened product (3.80) in $25 \%$ yield, suggesting a radical intermediate (Figure 3.26 bottom). ${ }^{19}$ Furthermore, $16 \%$ ee is encouraging, as it would give opportunity to control the absolute stereochemistry in the $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated electrophiles.


Figure 3.26: Radical Probe Studies in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

Third, I examined the stereoconvergence in the reaction. To do this I prepared two enantiomeric $\alpha$-bromoamide $(\boldsymbol{R})$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ and $(\boldsymbol{S})$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ and used each isomer in the alkylation of 1-nitropropane using our optimal reaction condition (Figure 3.27). At partial conversion ( 20 minutes), ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR reavealed a $81: 19$ mixture of the syn and anti-isomers and identical enantioselectivity of (3.66) in both reaction with slightly different yields. Several implications can be drawn from these results. First, the reaction is stereoconvergent and not stereospecific. This suggests that mechanism of the reaction proceeds through at least one common intermediate (see section 3.2). ${ }^{3}$ Second, ee of the product (3.66) is controlled by the chirality of the catalyst (3.48) rather than substrate (3.81). Finally, the ee of the unreacted (3.81) at partial conversion is unchanged, which suggests that the breaking of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Br}$ bond is irreversible in nature. Taken together, the result presented in Figure 3.26 and 3.27 strongly supports a radical based mechanism in this transformation. ${ }^{16,20}$


Figure 3.27: Stereoconvergence in the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$ Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

To study the mechanism of nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation reaction, I investigated the dependence of product enantiomeric excess ee on catalyst ee. To perform this study I prepared enantiomer of the ligand $(S, S) \mathbf{- 3 . 3 0}$, and mixed with $(R, R)-3.30$ ligand to afford $75 \%, 50 \%, 25 \%$ ee of the catalyst. I subject this into the reaction condition using $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.82) as the electrophile and 1 nitropropane as nucleophile (Table 3.18). A linear correlation was observed by plotting the ee of syn-isomer of (3.69) (Figure 3.26) against the ee of the catalyst and similar linearity was observed for the anti-isomer (3.69) (Figure 3.28). ${ }^{21}$ This linear relationship between enantiomeric excess and catalyst ee reveals that the active catalyst is likely a monomeric species.

Table 3.18: Study of Product ee and Catalyst ee

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase


Figure 3.28: Enantiomeric excess of the catalyst Vs enantiomeric excess of the syn diatereomer 3.69


Figure 3.29: Enantiomeric excess of the catalyst Vs enantiomeric excess of the anti diatereomer 3.69

Table 3.19: Revisiting Internal Reductant Screen


|  |  |  |  |  | trace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | PhLi | $85 \%$ | $85: 15$ | $86 \%$ | 3.84, <br> trace |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $78 \%$ | $88: 12$ | $88 \%$ | - |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase


Table 3.20: Effect of Catalyst Loading

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

First, while investigating various internal reductants using single component pre-catalyst (3.48), I noticed the formation of trace amount of biaryl and bibenzyl byproducts such as $\mathbf{3 . 8 3}, \mathbf{3 . 8 4}$, and 3.85 when using aryl organometallic reductants (Table 3.19 entry 1-4). Second, catalyst loading study shows that high concentration of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ is necessary for the efficient catalytic system and (Table 3.20 and 3.11, section 3.6.3). It is important to mention that while using $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}(1 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ that the concentration of $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ generated is low, theoretically $9: 1$ ratio of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}) / \mathrm{Ni}(0)$ produced. Taken together, from Table 3.19 and 3.20, I reasoned that organometallic reagents transmetallate on to $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ species (3.86), followed by reductive elimination to afford biaryl product and $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ species (3.87). Then $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ presumably, comproportionates ${ }^{20 b, f, 22}$ with high concentration of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ to afford $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ species (3.88), which likely is catalytically active (Figure 3.30). Other possibility of generating $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ species (3.88), cannot be ruled out such as $\mathrm{Ni}(0)$ abstracting a halogen atom from $\alpha$-bromocarbonyl to give $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ and alkyl radical, but this would not require excess $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ species.


Figure 3.30: Proposed Mechanism for the Generation of Low-Valent Ni Species and Alkyl Radical

Based on these mechanistic studies, and the identification of redox inactive chiral 1,2 diamine ligand (3.30), we propose the following $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} / \mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}$ catalytic cycle (Figure 3.31). The base quantitatively deprotonates nitroalkane, and generates sodium nitronate anion, which is sparingly soluble in the aprotic reaction medium. Presumably, the insoluble nitronate anion combines with chiral precatalyst (3.48) to form the soluble nitro bound nickel (II) complex (3.89). Subsequently, transient alkyl radical generated from $\mathrm{NiX}_{2} \mathrm{~L}^{*} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ (see Figure 3.30) adds to the nitronate anion, which is bound to the nickel (II) complex to give $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ species (3.90) via an outer-
sphere mechanism. Then fast single electron transfer from the nitronate radical to $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ species (3.90) generates $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ species (3.91). The enantioenriched product is released to generate active $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ catalyst (3.88), which abstracts a halogen atom from alkyl electrophile to generate alkyl radical and $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ catalyst (3.48), which brings more nitronate anion into the liquid phase. We think that the $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ complex (3.48) has two roles. First, it is involved in enantioselective nickel catalysis to forge $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond. Second it acts as a phase transfer catalyst, where it brings the insoluble nitronate anion from solid phase to liquid phase.


Figure 3.31: Proposed Outer Sphere Mechanism for the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

We propose an alternative mechanism which involves a $\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{I}} / \mathrm{Ni}^{\text {III }}$ catalytic cycle (Figure 3.32). Like the previous mechanism, the chiral precatalyst (3.48) brings the insoluble nitronate anion from solid phase to liquid phase. In this case, we propose an inner-sphere mechanism where transient alkyl radical adds to the $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ (3.48) center to give stable $O$-bound $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{III})$ (3.92) species. This $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{III})$ species (3.92) equilibrates with the less stable, more reactive, $C$-bound $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{III})$ species (3.93), which reductively eliminates to afford enantioenriched product and active $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{I})$ catalyst (3.88). The remaining steps are similar to previous outer-sphere mechanism (Figure 3.31). Our current experiments do not allow us to distinguish between outer sphere and inner sphere mechanisms. However, future work in our group will be directed toward exploring fundamental steps of this reaction.


Figure 3.32: Proposed Inner Sphere Mechanism for the Nickel-Catalyzed Enantioselective $C$-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

### 3.12 Other Nickel-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes Reactions

Our lab developed a general catalytic method for alkylating nitroalkanes using benzyl bromides, $\alpha$-bromo carbonyls, and $\alpha$-bromonitriles as alkylating agents, which is a significant advance in the field of nitroalkane $C$-alkylation (Figure 3.33). However, all of these reactions required radical stabilizing groups adjacent to the electrophilic site. ${ }^{23}$ Alkyl halides lacking such a stabilization group were not suitable coupling partners under previous copper catalysis. We realized that a method capable
of utilizing non-stabilized alkyl electrophiles would significantly enhance the scope and synthetic utility of nitroalkane alkylation (Figure 3.34).


Figure 3.33: Copper-Catalyzed C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes


Figure 3.34: Proposed C-alkylation of Nitroalkanes with Unactivated Alkyl Halides Under Nickel Catalysis

Preliminary experiments were focused on alkylating nitroalkanes using cyclohexyl halides as the model substrates. By using catalytic $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{COD})_{2} /$ cylohexyl 1,2 diamine (3.17), and DBU as a base, no desired product (3.94) was formed (Table 3.21 entry 1-2). However, at room temperature a trace amount of desired product (3.94) was formed along with cyclohexene by-product (Table 3.21 entry 3 ). In an attempt to suppress the $\beta$-hydride elimination product I used tridentate nitrogen ligand (3.95). Gratifyingly, $15 \%$ yield of (3.94) was produced (Table 3.21 entry 4).

Table 3.21: Initial Studies on Alkylation of 1-nitropropare using Cyclohexyl Iodide


| Entry | X | $\mathrm{T}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Ligand | Yield 3.94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Br | -20 | 3.17 | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | I | -20 | 3.17 | $0 \%$ |
| 3 | I | 25 | 3.17 | $5 \%$ |
| 4 | I | 25 | 3.95 | $15 \%$ |

${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.



With this preliminary result for the nickel-catalyzed $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated alkyl halides, my colleague Dr. Sina Razazadeh further optimized the reaction conditions. He found nickel complex (3.96) (generated from $\mathrm{NiBr}_{2} \cdot d m e$ and a redox active bidentate nitrogen ligand such as bathocuproine), and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ as the internal reductant catalyzes the $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated alkyl iodides as the alkylating agent. It is important to note that the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$, which I discovered in the nickel-catalyzed enantioselective $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes was also found to be effective for alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated alkyl halides.

Dr. Sina Rezazadeh studied the scope of this transformation extensively and found broad scope for both coupling partners. For example, primary alkyl iodides bearing a high degree of functionality (3.99, 3.100 and 3.101) (Figure 3.35) and biologically relevant heterocycles were all tolerated in the reaction $\mathbf{( 3 . 9 9}, \mathbf{3 . 1 0 0}$ and
3.101). Significantly, secondary and tertiary alkyl iodides can also be used in the reaction. A variety of functionalized nitroalkanes (3.102, $\mathbf{3 . 1 0 3}$ and 3.106) can be tolerated in the reaction. For example, nitroalkanes bearing alkenes, acetyl protected alcohols, esters, phthalimides, and Boc-protected amines all provided good yields (3.102-3.106). Upon reduction of the nitro group to the corresponding amine, biologically relevant adapromine can be obtained in good yields. This work was communicated in The Journal of the American Chemical Society in 2017. ${ }^{24}$


Figure 3.35: Sample Scope of Nickel-Catalyzed C-alkylation of Nitroalkanes Using Unactivated Alkyl Halides

### 3.13 Conclusion

In conclusion, the first Ni-catalyzed asymmetric $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes has been developed. This method enables formation of highly enantioenriched $\beta$ nitroamide from readily available $\alpha$-bromoamide and the mild reaction conditions are compatible with wide range of functional groups. Significantly, we showed that the absolute stereocenter $\alpha$ to the nitro group can be controlled. The variety of $\beta$ nitroamide are used subsequently synthetic manipulations to form highly enantioenriched products with nitrogen-bearing fully substituted carbon centers. Efforts to expand the scope of this nitroalkylation to secondary nitroalkanes and tertiary electrophiles substrates and to determine the reaction mechanism are underway. Furthermore, I was involved in the development of the first nickelcatalyzed $C$-alkylation of nitroalkanes using unactivated alkyl halides allowed the preparation of a diverse array of complex nitroalkanes using simple starting materials. Significantly, this system allows for the alkylation of primary, secondary, and tertiary alkyl iodides without the requirement of radical stabilizing groups.

### 3.14 Experimental Section

### 3.14.1 General Experimental Details

Benzene, dichloromethane, and diethyl ether were dried on alumina according to a published procedure. ${ }^{25}$ Trifluorotoluene and dimethyl acetamide were purchased in anhydrous septa sealed bottle. Nickel(II)bromide methoxy ethyl ether, nickel(II) chloride ethylene glycol dimethyl ether, potassium tert-butoxide, lithium methoxide, lithium tert-butoxide, lithium trimethylsilanolate, potassium trimethylsilanolate, sodium methoxide, potassium methoxide, lithium methoxide and sodium trimethylsilanolate were purchased commercially; the bulk was stored in a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ filled
glovebox; samples were removed from the glovebox and stored in a desiccator under air for up to two weeks prior to use. All hot glassware was oven dried for a minimum of two hours or flame-dried under vacuum prior to use. 2-methyl-1-nitropropane, ${ }^{26}$ 6-nitrohex-1-ene, ${ }^{27}$ 4-nitrobutyl acetate, ${ }^{28}$ methyl 4 -nitrobutanoate, ${ }^{29}$ 5-nitropentan-2one, ${ }^{30}$ 2-methyl-2-(3-nitropropyl)-1,3-dioxolane, ${ }^{31}$ (2-nitroethyl)benzene, ${ }^{23 a}$ 5-(2nitroethyl)benzo[d][1,3]dioxole, ${ }^{32}$ methyl 4-nitropentanoate, ${ }^{33}$ 2-bromo- $N$-methoxy$\mathrm{N}, 2$-dimethylpropanamide, ${ }^{23 \mathrm{~b}}$ allyl tert-butyl carbonate, ${ }^{34}$ 2-bromo- N -methoxy- N methylpropanamide, ${ }^{35} \mathrm{~N}$-benzyl-2-bromo- N -phenylpropanamide (3.33), ${ }^{4} \mathrm{~N}$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylbutanamide (3.45), ${ }^{4}$ and $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylhexanamide, ${ }^{4}$ and (+)-(R,R)-N,N,N,N-tetrabenzyl-1,2-diaminocyclohexane (3.22) ${ }^{36}$ were synthesized according to the published procedures. Bis(1,5-cyclooctadiene) nickel was purchased commercially and stored in a nitrogen filled glovebox freezer at $-35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. All other substrates and reagents were purchased in highest analytical purity from commercial suppliers and used as received. All NMR yields are reported using 1,3,5trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. All reactions were set up using standard Schlenk technique. Reactions were heated with stirring in temperature controlled oil baths and cooled with stirring using Cryo cooling units. "Double manifold" refers to a standard Schlenk-line gas manifold equipped with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and vacuum (ca. 0.1 mm Hg ).

### 3.14.2 Instrumentation and Chromatography

$400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 101 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, and $376 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ spectra were obtained on a 400 MHz FT-NMR spectrometer equipped with a Bruker CryoPlatform. $600 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and $151 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra were obtained on a 600 MHz FTNMR spectrometer equipped with a Bruker SMART probe. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra were recorded using Attached Proton Test phase pulse sequence; carbons with an odd number of protons are phased down and
those with an even number of protons are phased up. ${ }^{37}$ All samples were analyzed in the indicated deutero-solvent and were recorded at ambient temperatures. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were calibrated using the residual protiosignal in deutero-solvents as a standard. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were calibrated using the deutero-solvent as a standard. IR spectra were recorded on a Nicolet Magma-IR 560 FT-IR spectrometer as thin films on NaCl plates or using KBr pellets. Column chromatography was performed with $40-63 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ silica gel or neutral $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (Brockmann type I, 50-200 $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ) with the eluent reported in parentheses. Analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on precoated glass plates and visualized by UV or by staining with $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$. GCMS data was collected using an Agilent 6850 series GC and 5973 MS detectors. High resolution MS data was obtained on a Waters GCT Premier spectrometer using chemical ionization (CI) or liquid injection field desorption ionization (LIFDI) or on a Thermo Scientific, Q Exactive model orbitrap using electrospray ionization (ESI).

### 3.14.3 Procedure for Initial Experiments with DBU as Base:

See notebook pages: DVR01249, DVR01253, DVR01255, DVR01294, DVR01029, DVR02065


In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ filled glovebox, to a $15 \times 45 \mathrm{~mm}$ vial containing a magnetic stir bar was added sequentially Ni source ( $25 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), diamine ligand ( $25 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), base (138 $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ), anhydrous trifluorotoluene $(750 \mu \mathrm{~L})$, 1-nitropropane $(13.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 150 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), and
$\alpha$-bromoamide 3.1 ( $26.3 \mathrm{mg}, 125 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$. The vial was sealed with a Teflon lined cap and the heterogeneous mixture was stirred at the given temperature for 20 h . After cooling to room temperature, the vials were removed from the glovebox and opened to air. For reaction involving lower temperature the vial was sealed with a septum cap, removed from the glovebox, and submerged in an isopropanol bath at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ or $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ chilled using a cryocool. A nitrogen spaghetti line was added and $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.1) ( $26.3 \mathrm{mg}, 125 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added via syringe using Schlenk technique. The reaction was allowed to continue stirring at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ or $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h then warmed to room temperature and opened to air. For all reactions 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene ( $10.5 \mathrm{mg}, 63$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ) was added and the mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate (ca. 1.5 mL ). The solution was passed through a plug of celite and concentrated in vacuo. The reactions were analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard to report yields. The product (3.3) is a known compound and its spectra are in accordance with literature data. ${ }^{23 b}$ The enantiomeric excess was determined by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=11.341 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=12.722 \mathrm{~min}$.

### 3.14.4 Synthesis of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-nitroamide:

See notebook page: DVR02093, DVR02100, DVR02121, DVR02127, DVR02131 for using racemic, secondary, $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.26) as electrophile.

See notebook page DVR02136 for kinetic stability study

3.28A

3.28B

In a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ filled glovebox, to a $15 \times 45 \mathrm{~mm}$ vial containing a magnetic stir bar was added sequentially Ni source ( $25 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), diamine ligand (3.27) (25 $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ), base (138 $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ),
anhydrous trifluorotoluene ( $750 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), and 1-nitrohexane ( $19.2 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 138 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ). The vial was sealed with a Teflon lined cap removed from the glovebox, and submerged in an isopropanol bath at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ chilled using a cryocool. A nitrogen spaghetti line was added and $\alpha$-bromoamide (3.26) ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 125 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added via syringe using Schlenk technique. The reaction was allowed to continue stirring at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h then warmed to room temperature and opened to air. 1,3,5-Trimethoxybenzene (10.5 $\mathrm{mg}, 63 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added and the mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate (ca. 1.5 mL ). The solution was passed through a plug of celite and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 80:20 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10 $\rightarrow$ 80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products (3.28) ( $25 \mathrm{mg}, 77 \%$ combined) as clear oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \mathbf{3 . 2 8 A}$ (syn): 4.68 (td, J = 10.7, 2.8 Hz, 1H), 3.78-3.70 (m, 8H), $3.42(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.22(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 H), 1.91(q d, J=10.2,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,9.5,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.60$ (m, 1H), 1.50 (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=13.6,11.3,7.5,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.92-0.83$ $(\mathrm{m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 3.28A: 172.5, 90.6, 61.7, 45.8, 32.3, 32.2, 30.9, 25.5, 23.2, 22.3, 13.9, 10.9; GC/MS (EI) $214.2\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right) 200.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{NO}\right) \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ $($ syn $)=10.714 \mathrm{~min} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \mathbf{3 . 2 8 B}$ (anti): $4.85(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.6,3.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.7,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.74-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.37-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=16.2,7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; \mathrm{GC} / \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{EI}) 214.2\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right) 200.1\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{NO}\right) \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ anti $)=10.883 \mathrm{~min}$. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $85 \%$ ee for syn isomer by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK OD, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 0.5 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=7.923 \mathrm{~min} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=8.415 \mathrm{~min}$. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be

20\% ee for anti isomer by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK OD, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, $0.5 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=14.182 \min \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=15.460 \mathrm{~min}$.

3.26

A hot 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ the septum was removed, and $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}$-dimethylhydroxylamine $\cdot \mathrm{HCl}(6.79 \mathrm{~g}, 69.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The septum was replaced, the flask was attached to a double manifold, and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous DCM (120.0 mL), and triethylamine $(9.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 69.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2-bromobutyryl bromide ( $7.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 58.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(30.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 2 x 100 mL ). The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford (3.26) ( $8.76 \mathrm{~g}, 72 \%$ Yield) as a clear oil: 1 H NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.69(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.79(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.23(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{dp}, \mathrm{J}=14.5,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{dp}, \mathrm{J}=14.8,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$.

### 3.14.5 Synthesis of Novel Chiral 1,2 Diamine Ligands:

Note: All yields in this section are unoptimized
Novel chiral 1,2 diamine ligands were synthesized based on previously published procedure. ${ }^{38}$


## General Protocol A:

A 25 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stirbar and rubber septum is cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The flask was opened to air, $(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-$ 1,2-Diaminocyclohexane ( 1.0 equiv) and anhydrous methanol were sequentially added under air. The rubber septum was replaced, purged with nitrogen for ca. 3 min and then aromatic aldehyde ( 2.0 equiv) was added dropwise over 3 minutes via syringe. The flask was fitted with condenser and refluxed (oil bath, $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) for 1 h 30 min with stirring. The reaction was cooled to rt , and reflux condenser was removed. The reaction cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath, and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ (2.1 equiv) was added portionwise under air. After the vigorous effervescence subsided the reaction flask was fitted with condenser and refluxed (oil bath, $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) for 1 h with stirring. The reaction was then cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath and quenched the excess $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ by adding $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ until the bubbling subsides. The aqueous layer extracted with DCM (3x) and combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.

Several novel chiral 1,2 diamine ligands were synthesized by reductive amination using sodium triacetoxy borohydride. ${ }^{39}$


## General Protocol B:

A 100 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stirbar and rubber septum is cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The flask was opened to air, $(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-$ 1,2-Diaminocyclohexane (1.0 equiv) and anhydrous 1,2-dichloroethane were sequentially added under air. The rubber septum was replaced, purged with nitrogen for ca. 3 min and then aromatic aldehyde ( 2.0 equiv) was added dropwise over 3 minutes via syringe. The rubber septum was removed and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}$ ( 2.5 equiv) was added portionwise over 10 minutes, septum replaced and stirred at rt overnight under nitrogen. The reaction mixture was quenched with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ extracted with DCM (3x) and combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.


3.51
(3.S1) A hot 100 mL Schlenk equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was attached to a double manifold and allowed to cool. Once cool, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ the septum was replaced, the flask was removed and tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium (0) (0.39 g, 0.34 mmol$)$, methyl 3,5dibromobenzoate ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 3.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 2,6-dimethyl boronic acid ( $1.22 \mathrm{~g}, 8.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(1.44 \mathrm{~g}, 13.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to the double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. DME ( 35 mL ) and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(7 \mathrm{~mL})$ were sequentially added via syringe. The resulting suspension was heated in an oil bath at $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 27 h . Once complete, the reaction was cooled to rt , diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the contents of the reaction transferred to separatory funnel, extracted with ethyl acetate ( 2 x 50 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified using silica gel chromatography (95:05 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 1}(0.64 \mathrm{~g}, 55 \%)$ as white solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.15(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$,
7.11 (d, J = $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.07$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 12 \mathrm{H})$.

(3.S2) $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}(82 \mathrm{mg}, 2.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ was placed in a flame-dried 25 mL round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum and the flask was purged with nitrogen for 10 minutes. Anhydrous THF ( 5 mL ) was added via syringe and the flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath. A solution of ester $\mathbf{3 . S 1}(0.50 \mathrm{~g}, 1.45$ mmol ) in anhydrous THF ( 3 mL ) was added dropwise via syringe, the bath was removed, and the resulting grey suspension was allowed to stir at room temperature overnight. The reaction was opened to air, cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{NaSO}_{4} \cdot 10 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.0 \mathrm{~g})$ was added slowly and then stirred for 1 h . The reaction, which contains granular precipitate, was filtered through a celite pad, washed with ethyl acetate $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvent was evaporated in vacuo to provide the crude alcohol ( 0.4 g ), which was taken on to the oxidation step without further purification.

A flame-dried 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was cooled under a stream of nitrogen and charged with anhydrous DCM ( 1.0 mL ) and DMSO ( $46 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) via syringe. The mixture was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a dry-ice/acetone bath. The solution of oxalyl chloride ( $60 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.70$ mmol ) in anhydrous DCM ( 1.0 mL ) was added to the flask containing DMSO via syringe and the mixture was allowed to stir for 10 minutes at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The crude alcohol $(0.19 \mathrm{~g}, 0.59 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in anhydrous $\mathrm{DCM}(1.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and this solution was added dropwise into the flask containing DMSO and stirred for 15 minutes at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Triethylamine ( $41 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.92 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added via syringe and stirred for 10 minutes at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 10 minutes, the reaction was warmed to room temperature. After 1 h, TLC indicated full conversion of the starting material. The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with water $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and diluted
with $\operatorname{DCM}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The layers were separated and the organic layer was washed with water ( 20 mL ) and brine ( 2 x 20 mL ). The combined aqueous layers were backextracted with with DCM ( 20 mL ). The combined organic layers were dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered and the solvent was evaportated in vacuo to provide the crude aldehyde 3.S2 $(0.148 \mathrm{~g})$, which was taken on to the oxidation step without further purification.

3.25
(3.25): According to general protocol B : $(1 R, 2 R)-(-)$-1,2-Diaminocyclohexane $(24 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.21 mmol ), 3.S2 ( $130 \mathrm{mg}, 0.41 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE ( 1.0 mL ) were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(0.11 \mathrm{~g}, 0.52 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B . The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethylamine) to afford $\mathbf{3 . 2 5}$ as a white solid ( $0.11 \mathrm{~g}, 76 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.12(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.06(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 7.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.78(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.53(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.24(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H})$, $2.02(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=29.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 141.72$, $141.45,141.12,135.85,135.79,128.07,127.19,127.14,126.88,60.59,50.97,31.68$, 25.01, 20.87.; HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{52} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}: 711.4600$; found: 711.4659.

(3.17): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 \mathrm{R}, 2 \mathrm{R})-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane (500 mg, 4.4 mmol$)$, 4-Methoxy
benzaldehyde, ( $1.06 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous $1,2 \mathrm{DCE}(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to afford 3.17 as a white solid (1.10 g, $71 \%) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=62.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.25-7.20$ (m, 4H), 6.87 - $6.81(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.58(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.9$ Hz, 2H), $2.27-2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=13.4,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, 1.22 (tdd, $\mathrm{J}=9.8,3.4,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=16.3,6.7,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 164.4,158.4,133.2,129.1,113.6,60.7,55.2,50.2,31.5,25.0$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3207,2922,1612,1510,1446,1246,1178,1032,817 ; \mathrm{mp}=78-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}: 355.2386$; found: 355.2366 .

(3.18): According to general protocol $A:(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 4-Methyl benzaldehyde, ( $1.04 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.0$ mL ) were combined under air and refluxed for $1: 30 \mathrm{~h}$ with stirring. The solution allowed to cool to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-bath and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ ( $347 \mathrm{mg}, 9.2$ mmol) was added portionwise. After the vigorous effervescence had subsided the mixture was refluxed for 1 h with stirring. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol A. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to afford 3.18 ( $973 \mathrm{mg}, 69 \%$ ). $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-$ $78.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{2} \mathrm{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.20(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.12$ (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 4H), $3.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.33(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$,
$2.31-2.22(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=11.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.71(\mathrm{tq}, \mathrm{J}=15.8,6.2,4.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), $1.31-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 137.6, $136.3,130.0,128.0,60.6,50.4,31.3,24.9,21.1 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3299,2924,1514,1456$, 1355, 1112, 803. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$: 323.2487; found: 323.2479 .

(3.19): According to general protocol A: (1R,2R)-(-)-1,2Diaminocyclohexane ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Benzaldehyde, ( 0.89 mL , $8.8 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and refluxed for 1:30 h with stirring. The solution allowed to cool to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-bath and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(347 \mathrm{mg}, 9.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise. After the vigorous effervescence had subsided the mixture was refluxed for 1 h with stirring. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol A. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $98: 2 \mathrm{DCM}$ : triethyl amine) to afford SX ( $1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 78 \%$ ) as a viscous yellow oil. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-83.4^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.29-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.60(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.26-2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=13.2,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{dp}, \mathrm{J}=9.3,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.26-1.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.05-0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 141.0,128.2,127.9,126.6,60.8,50.8,31.4,24.9$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3300,2926,2853,1603,1452,1117,1028,857,697$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$: 295.2174; found: 295.2162.

(3.20): According to general protocol A: (1R,2R)-(-)-1,2Diaminocyclohexane $(500 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 4.4 \mathrm{mmol})$, 4(Trifluoromethyl)benzaldehyde, ( $1.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and
anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(3.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and refluxed for $1: 30 \mathrm{~h}$ with stirring. The solution allowed to cool to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-bath and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(347 \mathrm{mg}, 9.2$ mmol) was added portionwise. After the vigorous effervescence had subsided the mixture was refluxed for 1 h with stirring. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol A. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to afford $3.20(1.41 \mathrm{~g}, 75 \%) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=$ $62.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.41$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.19$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=13.0,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=8.4,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.32-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.12-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 145.1, $129.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=32 \mathrm{~Hz}), 128.15,125.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 124.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=272 \mathrm{~Hz}), 60.9,50.3$, 31.5, 24.9; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-62.4$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3299, 2931, 1619, 1458, 1328, 1124, 823. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]^{+}$: 431.1922; found: 431.1908.

(3.23): According to general protocol B: (1R,2R)-(-)-1,2Diaminocyclohexane ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.38 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 3,5Dimethylbenzaldehyde, ( $1.18 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32$ $\mathrm{g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B . The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $98: 2 \mathrm{DCM}$ : triethyl amine) to afford $\mathbf{3 . 2 3}$ $(0.890 \mathrm{mg}, 58 \%)$ as yellow oil. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-59.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(400 \mathrm{MHz}$,
$\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 6.95(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.87(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.58(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), 2.29 ( $\mathrm{s}, 14 \mathrm{H}$ ), 2.17 (dt, J = 13.4, $2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{qt}, \mathrm{J}=9.7,4.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.15-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ $141.0,137.7,128.3,125.8,61.1,50.9,31.6,25.1,21.2 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3300,2924$, 2854, 1607, 1458, 1118, 841. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$: 351.2800; found: 351.2790 .

(3.24): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 \mathrm{R}, 2 \mathrm{R})-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane (797 mg, 6.99 mmol ), 3,5-Di-tertbutylbenzaldehyde, $(3.050 \mathrm{~g}, 14.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(25.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(3.70$ $\mathrm{g}, 17.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B . The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to $3.24(2.46 \mathrm{~g}, 68 \%) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-37.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.28(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.14(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.34-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.24-2.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78$ $-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.34-1.31(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}, 36 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 150.5,140.0,122.3,120.7,61.0,51.7,34.7,31.6,31.5$, 25.0; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2962,2361,1600,1457,1248,871,713 ; \mathrm{mp}=56-58^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{HRMS}$ (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$: 519.4678; found: 519.4663.

(3.30): According to general protocol B : (1R,2R)-(-)-1,2Diaminocyclohexane $(500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.38 \mathrm{mmol})$, 3,5-

Bis(trifluoromethyl)benzaldehyde, ( $1.44 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B . The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to afford 3.30 (1.93 g, 78\%). Note: Impure fractions can be further purified by recrystallization using $\mathrm{EtOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ mixture. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=-45.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.78(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.74(\mathrm{~s}$, 2H), 4.01 (d, J = 14.1 Hz, 2H), 3.81 (d, J = $14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.34-2.23$ (m, 2H), 2.16 (dt, J = 13.9, 2.6 Hz, 2H), $1.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,6.6,6.1,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-$ $1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 143.8,131.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ 33 Hz ), 128.0, $123.4(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=273 \mathrm{~Hz}), 120.9,61.5,50.2,31.6,24.8 ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-63.01$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3258,2933,2866,1493,1382,1281,1127,705 ;$ $\mathrm{mp}=66-68{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{12}\right]^{+}: 567.1670$; found: 567.1659.

(3.40): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 \mathrm{R}, 2 \mathrm{R})-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane $(500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.38 \mathrm{mmol})$, 3,5Dimethoxybenzaldehyde, $(1.46 \mathrm{~g}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol})$, and anhydrous 1,2 DCE ( 16.0 mL ) were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}$ $(2.32 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $98: 2 \mathrm{DCM}$ : triethyl amine) to afford $3.40(1.34 \mathrm{~g}, 74 \%)$ as a yellow oil. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25}=54.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$

NMR (400 MHz, CDCl ${ }_{3}$ ): $\delta 6.49$ (d, J = 2.3 Hz, 4H), 6.33 (t, J = 2.3 Hz, 2H), 3.88 (d, $\mathrm{J}=13.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.73(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.83(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.37-2.26$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.4,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 160.7,142.6,105.8,98.9,60.5,55.1,50.7,31.1,24.8$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3298,2930,2837,1596,1461,1204,1152,1063,857$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 415.2597$; found: 415.2587.

(3.39): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane (500 mg, 4.38 mmol$), 2,3,4,5,6-$ Pentafluorobenzaldehyde, ( $1.08 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32 \mathrm{~g}$, 11.0 mmol ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethylamine) to afford 3.39 as a white solid (1.22 g, 59\%). $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-38.0^{\circ}$ (c $\left.=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 3.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $13.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.86-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.31-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-$ $0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 146.6$ - $146.3(\mathrm{~m}), 144.1-143.9(\mathrm{~m})$, $141.8-141.4(m), 139.2-138.9(m), 138.8-138.4(m), 136.3-135.9(m), 114.0-$ 113.6 (m), 60.6, 37.9, 31.4, 24.8; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-144.7(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=22.5$, $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}),-155.9(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=20.7 \mathrm{~Hz}),-162.3(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=22.3,8.6 \mathrm{~Hz})$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3293,2924$, 2851, 1447, 1366, 1134, 888, 727; $\mathrm{mp}=44-46{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{10}\right]^{+}$: 475.1232 ; found: 475.1219.

(3.43): According to general protocol B: $(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane (500 mg, 4.38 mmol$)$, 4(trifluoromethoxy)benzaldehyde, ( $1.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE ( 16.0 mL ) were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethylamine) to afford $3.43(1.29 \mathrm{~g}, 64 \%) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-62.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.35-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.29-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-2.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.86(\mathrm{~s}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.79-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 148.0,139.8,129.2,120.9,120.4(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=258 \mathrm{~Hz}), 60.9,50.1,31.5$, 24.9; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-57.9$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3300,2930,2857,1508$, 1263, 1161, 920, 846. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]^{+}$: 463.1743; found: 463.1809.

$\mathrm{g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $98: 2 \mathrm{DCM}$ : triethylamine) to afford $3.38(1.35 \mathrm{~g}, 72 \%)$ as a pale yellow oil. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-50.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$

NMR (400 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.58$ (s, 2H), 7.50 (dt, J = 8.3, $1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.41 (t, J = 7.6 $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.31-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 2.17 (dt, J = 13.1, 2.5 Hz, 2H), $1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.10-0.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 142.0,131.3,130.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=32$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 128.8,124.6,124.2(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=272 \mathrm{~Hz}), 123.7,61.1,50.5,31.6,24.9$; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-62.6$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3298, 2930, 2857, 1449, 1329, 1123, 796, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]^{+}$: 431.1743; found: 431.1913.

(3.42): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane $(500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.38 \mathrm{mmol}), 3,4,5-$ trifluorobenzaldehyde, ( $0.99 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32$ $\mathrm{g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B . The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethylamine) to afford 3.42 as a white solid ( $1.19 \mathrm{~g}, 68 \%) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-66.0^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=1.00$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 6.99-6.90(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.82(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), $3.62(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.24-2.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.67$ $(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.21(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=11.8,7.9,5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.06-0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 152.3(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 149.8(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.9,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 139.7(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=15.4$ Hz ), 137.6 - 137.0 (m), 111.5 (d, J = 21.2 Hz), 60.9, 49.7, 31.4, 24.8; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR (565 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-134.8(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=22 \mathrm{~Hz}),-163.1(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=22 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3294,2930$, 2863, 1618, 1526, 1444, 1226, 1038, 857; mp $=60-62{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]^{+}$: 403.1609; found: 403.1611.

(3.41): According to general protocol $\mathrm{B}:(1 R, 2 R)-(-)-1,2-$ Diaminocyclohexane ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.38 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 3,5difluorobenzaldehyde, ( $0.96 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.77 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous 1,2 DCE $(16.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under air and $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(2.32$ $\mathrm{g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 10 minutes and stirred at rt overnight. The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol B. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethylamine) to afford $3.41(1.11 \mathrm{~g}, 70 \%)$ as yellow oil. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-60.0^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=1.00$, $\left.\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 6.89-6.81(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 6.67(\mathrm{tt}, \mathrm{J}=9.0,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 H), 3.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16-$ $2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.30-1.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.01(\mathrm{tdd}, \mathrm{J}=$ 17.0, 8.4, 4.0 Hz, 2H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 164.2(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 161.7$ ( $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $145.3(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 111.4-109.6(\mathrm{~m}), 102.1(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=25.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 60.8$, 50.1, 31.5, 24.8; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-110.32$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2930, 2856, 1652, 1596, 1457, 1315, 1116, 1044, 847. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right]^{+}: 366.1719$; found: 366.1791 .

(3.27): According to general protocol A: (1R,2R)-(-)-1,2Diaminocyclohexane ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 4.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 4-tert-butyl benzaldehyde, ( $2.03 \mathrm{~mL}, 8.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous MeOH ( 3.0 mL ) were combined under air and refluxed for $1: 30 \mathrm{~h}$ with stirring. The solution allowed to cool to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-bath and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(347 \mathrm{mg}, 9.2$ mmol) was added portionwise. After the vigorous effervescence had subsided the mixture was refluxed for 1 h with stirring. The reaction was worked up according to
the general protocol A. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (98:2 DCM : triethyl amine) to afford 3.27 ( $1.10 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.33(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.27-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.33-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.2,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $1.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-0.99(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H})$.

### 3.14.6 General Protocol for Synthesis of Previously Unknown $\alpha$-bromo amides:

Note: All yields in this section are unoptimized
General Protocol C. A hot round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF, triethylamine ( 1.1 quiv), and amine ( 1.0 equiv) were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \alpha$-Bromoacylbromide (1.0 quiv) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with 1 M HCl (1x) and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (2x). The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1x). The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography.

(3.S3): According to general protocol C: A hot 500 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF ( 104.0 mL ), triethylamine ( $8.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 57.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and morpholine ( $5.02 \mathrm{~mL}, 57.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added
to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2Bromopropionyl bromide ( 5.41 mL , 51.7 mmol ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(50.0$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{x} 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $60: 40$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 3}$ ( $8.3 \mathrm{~g}, 65 \%$ ) as a colorless oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 4.51(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $13.3,5.2,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77-3.66(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=17.7,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.47$ (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=13.6,10.6,6.9,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 167.6,66.6,66.2,46.5,42.5,37.7,21.5 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2970,2857,1653,1434,1375$, 1248, 1115, 1029, 847. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$: 222.0051; found: 222.01230 .

(3.S4): According to general protocol C: A hot 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF ( 50.0 mL ), triethylamine ( $3.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 27.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and N -methylaniline ( $3.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 27.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2-Bromopropionyl bromide ( $2.61 \mathrm{~mL}, 25.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(50.0$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{x} 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed
once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 4}(3.75 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%)$ as off white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.50-7.37(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.27(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.30(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.74(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.5,142.8,129.9,128.4,127.1,39.1,38.1,21.8 ; \operatorname{FTIR}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2923$, 1668, 1595, 1495, 1388, 1120, 700; $\mathrm{mp}=35-37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NOBr}\right]^{+}: 242.0102$; found: 242.0173 .

(3.S5): According to general protocol C: A hot 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF $(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$, triethylamine ( $3.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 27.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and indoline ( $3.08 \mathrm{~mL}, 27.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ}$ C. 2-Bromopropionyl bromide ( $2.61 \mathrm{~mL}, 25.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with 1 M HCl $(30.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with ethyl acetate $(2 \mathrm{x} 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by recrystallization using Ethyl acetate to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 5}(4.31 \mathrm{~g}, 68 \%)$ as pale brown crystalline solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d6): $\delta 8.09$ (d, J = $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.27 (dd, J = 7.5, 1.4 Hz , $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.32-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.20-4.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.28-3.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$,

3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta 166.9,142.6,132.2,127.1,125.0,124.0$, 116.4, 47.4, 42.6, 27.4, 21.3; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2923, 1647, 1594, 1480, 1370, 1162, 758; $\mathrm{mp}=138-140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NOBr}\right]^{+}$: 254.0102; found: 254.0169.


(3.S6): A 250 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar and rubber septum is cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The flask was opened to air, 4-methoxy aniline ( $2.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous 1,2-DCE ( 80.0 mL ) were sequentially added under air. The rubber septum was replaced, purged with nitrogen for ca. 3 min and then benzaldehyde ( $2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise over 3 minutes via syringe. The rubber septum was removed, $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}$ $(7.0 \mathrm{~g}, 33 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 15 minutes, and then acetic acid (1.35 $\mathrm{mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added slowly via pipette, septum replaced, and stirred at rt overnight under nitrogen. The reaction mixture was quenched with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, extracted with DCM ( 3 x 30 mL ) and combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to afford 3.S6 $(5.0 \mathrm{~g})$. The product was taken to the next step without further purification.


(3.S7): A hot 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and 3.S6 ( $5.0 \mathrm{~g}, 23.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The septum was replaced, the flask was attached to a double manifold, and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF ( 45.0 mL ), and triethylamine ( $3.56 \mathrm{~mL}, 25.5$ mmol ), were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2-Bromopropionyl bromide ( $2.42 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with 1 $\mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{x} 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.S7 (5.25 g, 65\%) as a colorless oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.31-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.17(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $6.95(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.86-6.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.25(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 169.7,159.2,136.8,133.4,129.2,128.7,128.3,127.4,114.5,55.3$, 53.5, 39.4, 21.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2932, 2850, 1668, 1511, 1444, 1251, 1180, 1038, 838. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$: 348.0599; found: 348.0593.


(3.S8): A 250 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar and rubber septum is cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The flask was opened to air, 3,5-dimethyl aniline ( $2.95 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous 1,2-DCE ( 80.0 mL ) were sequentially added under air. The rubber septum was replaced, purged with nitrogen for ca. 3 min and then benzaldehyde $(2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6$ mmol ) was added dropwise over 3 minutes via syringe. The rubber septum was removed, $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(7.0 \mathrm{~g}, 33 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 15 minutes, and then acetic acid ( $1.35 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added slowly via pipette, septum replaced, and stirred at rt overnight under nitrogen. The reaction mixture was quenched with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, extracted with DCM (3x 30 mL ) and combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to afford 3.S8 $(4.5 \mathrm{~g})$. The product was taken to the next step without further purification.


(3.S9): A hot 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and $\mathbf{3 . S 8}(4.5 \mathrm{~g}, 21.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added. The septum was replaced, the flask was attached to a double manifold, and
evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous THF ( 40.0 mL ), and triethylamine ( $3.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2-Bromopropionyl bromide ( $2.42 \mathrm{~mL}, 21.2$ mmol ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{x} 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.S9 (4.3 g, 62\%) as a viscous yellow oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.31$ $-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.66(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 169.5,140.9,139.3,136.8,130.1,128.6$, $128.3,127.3,125.5,53.5,39.5,21.8,21.0 ;$ FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2920, 1668, 1594, 1399, 1236, 1184, 1061, 855, 710. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$: 346.0807; found: 346.0802.

(3.S10): A 250 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar and rubber septum is cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The flask was opened to air, 4-(trifluoromethyl) aniline ( $2.96 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous $1,2-\mathrm{DCE}(80.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were sequentially added under air. The
rubber septum was replaced, purged with nitrogen for ca. 3 min and then benzaldehyde ( $2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise over 3 minutes via syringe. The rubber septum was removed, $\mathrm{NaBH}(\mathrm{OAc})_{3}(7.0 \mathrm{~g}, 33 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added portionwise over 15 minutes, and then acetic acid ( $1.35 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added slowly via pipette, septum replaced, and stirred at rt overnight under nitrogen. The reaction mixture was quenched with $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, extracted with $\mathrm{DCM}(3 \mathrm{x} 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 1 0}(5.0 \mathrm{~g})$ as a yellow oil. The product was taken to the next step without further purification.


(3.S11): A flame-dried 100 mL round-bottomed flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was cooled under stream of $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ for 10 minutes. 3.S10 ( $5.0 \mathrm{~g}, 19.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous THF ( 40.0 mL ) was added sequentially via syringe. The mixture was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath. $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{BuLi}(8.64 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 2.60 M solution in hexane, 21.9 mmol ) was added to the flask via syringe slowly, and the reaction allowed to stir for 30 minutes at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .2$ Bromopropionyl bromide ( $2.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 21.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, ice bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ (50.0 $\mathrm{mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{x} 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and
concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . S 1 1}(2.5 \mathrm{~g}, 33 \%)$ as a pale yellow solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.62(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.32-$ $7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.13(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $169.2,144.2,136.3,130.8(q, J=33 \mathrm{~Hz}), 128.9,128.8,128.7,127.9,126.9,123.6(q, J$ $=273 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 53.6, 39.1, 21.7; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$-63.6; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2928$, 1672, 1613, 1324, 1169, 1069, $851 ; \mathrm{mp}=48-50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NOBrF}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 386.0367 ; found: 386.0369.

(3.81): A hot 100 mL round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was purged with a stream of nitrogen until cool. Indoline ( $1.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ( S )-(-)-2-bromopropanoic acid ( $0.88 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.80 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{DCM}(33.0 \mathrm{~mL})$, and triethylamine ( $1.37 \mathrm{~mL}, 9.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath. The rubber septum was removed, HATU ( $4.1 \mathrm{~g}, 10.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 3 min , septum replaced and stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours and upon completion (as monitored by TLC) the reaction was quenched with brine (30 mL ) and diluted with DCM ( 30 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was then transferred to separatory funnel and the layers were separated. The organic layer was washed with brine ( 2 x 30 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give crude product. The crude reaction was purified by recrystallization using DCM to afford $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}(1.27 \mathrm{~g}, 51 \%)$ as white crystalline solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d6): $\delta 8.09$ (d, J = $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.27 (dd, J = 7.5, 1.4 Hz , $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$,
$4.32-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.20-4.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.28-3.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta 166.9,142.6,132.2,127.1,125.0,124.0$, 116.4, 47.4, 42.6, 27.4, 21.3; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2923, 1647, 1594, 1480, 1370, 1162, 758; $\mathrm{mp}=138-140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+143.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NOBr}\right]^{+}: 254.0102$; found: 254.0169 .
The $R-(\mathbf{3 . 8 1})$ was prepared based on the above procedure and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, NMR matches with $S$-(3.81) except the specific rotation $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-143.0^{\circ}$.

### 3.14.7 Synthesis of Radical clock substrate 3.79

Note: All yields in this section are unoptimized


(3.S12): A hot 100 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was purged with a stream of nitrogen until cool. N Benzylaniline ( $2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), cyclopropyl acetic acid ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0$ mmol ), DCM ( 33.0 mL ), and diisopropyl ethylamine ( $5.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 30.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath. The rubber septum was removed, HATU ( $4.5 \mathrm{~g}, 12.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added portionwise over 3 min , septum replaced and stirred at rt for 2 hours and upon completion (as monitored by TLC) the reaction was quenched with brine ( 30 mL ) and diluted with DCM ( 30 mL ). The resulting biphasic mixture was then transferred to separatory funnel and the layers were separated. The organic layer was washed with brine ( $2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered through a glass frit and
concentrated in vacuo to give crude product. The crude reaction was partially purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford of slightly impure $\mathbf{3 . S 1 2}(1.72 \mathrm{~g})$. The product was taken to the next step without further purification.


(3.79): A flame-dried 100 mL round-bottomed flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was cooled under stream of $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ for 10 minutes. 3.S12 ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 3.76 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and anhydrous THF ( 35 mL ) was added sequentially via syringe. The mixture was cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a dryice/acetone bath. NaHMDS ( 2.8 mL of a 2.0 M solution in THF, 5.64 mmol ) was added to the flask via syringe slowly, and the reaction allowed to stir for 45 minutes at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. N-Bromosuccinimide ( $0.8 \mathrm{~g}, 4.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in 8 mL THF and then, the solution was added dropwise via syringe. Once the addition is complete, dryice/acetone bath was removed and the reaction stirred overnight at rt . The septum was removed and the reaction was quenched with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with EtOAc (2x 100 mL ). The combined organic layers are washed once with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (50.0 mL ). The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.79 ( $0.672 \mathrm{~g}, 52 \%$ ) as a white solid: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.35-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.20(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.3,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 7.07 - $6.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.03(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83$ (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=12.9,10.0,8.1,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89-0.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.81-$
$0.72(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.28-0.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 168.5$, 141.0, 136.7, 129.7, 128.8, 128.6, 128.4, 128.2, 127.5, 53.4, 51.2, 16.1, 9.2, 6.8; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ : $3062,1667,1594,1498,1409,1178,699 ; \mathrm{mp}=103-105{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NOBr}\right]^{+}: 344.0572$; found: 344.0638.

### 3.14.8 Synthesis of Starting Nitroalkanes

Note: All yields in this section are unoptimized

(3.S13)A flame-dried 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber septum was charged with the 6 -nitrohex-1-ene $(3.0 \mathrm{~g}, 23.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and the flask was purged with a stream of nitrogen for 5 minutes and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath. Anhydrous THF $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via syringe. Borane-dimethylsulfide complex ( $\sim 18.0 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 2 M solution in THF, 34.8 mmol ) was added to the flask slowly via syringe. The mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 25 minutes, then warmed to rt and stirred for 4 hours. The mixture was stirred was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice-water bath and $3 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}(12 \mathrm{~mL}$, 34.8 mmol ) was added slowly via syringe (caution: vigorous gas evolution). Next, $30 \%$ aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via syringe. The mixture was warmed to rt and stirred overnight. The septum was removed, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc ( 80 mL ) and the layer were separated. The organic layer was washed with brine ( 50 mL ). The combined aqueous layers were extracted with EtOAc ( 50 mL ). The combined organic layers were again washed with brine ( 50 mL ), dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was
purified by flash silica gel chromatography (70:30 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.S13 ( $2.5 \mathrm{~g}, 74 \%$ Yield) as a colorless oil: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 4.39(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{tdd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,5.4,2.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.43(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 75.5,62.4,32.2$, 27.3, 26.0, 25.0; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3355, 2935, 1551, 1434, 1383, 1055, 733. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{NO}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 148.0895 ; found: 148.0962.

### 3.14.9 Synthesis of the single-component pre-catalyst 3.48.

A 100 mL oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with magnetic stir bar was sealed with a septum and cooled under a stream of nitrogen. The septum was partly removed and the diamine ligand $(\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{R})-\mathbf{3 . 3 0}(1.36 \mathrm{~g}, 2.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{NiCl} 2 \cdot$ dme $(0.54 \mathrm{~g}, 2.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added. The septum was replaced and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(64 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added under nitrogen. The reaction mixture was stirred under nitrogen at rt for 24 h . The reaction was concentrated under reduced pressure and the contents were dissolved in DCM ( 10 mL ). The insoluble particles were removed using filtration through filter paper and product recrystallized by vapor diffusion (DCM/hexanes) to afford green crystals. X-ray quality crystals were obtained by slow evaporation of saturated solution of complex $(R, R) \mathbf{- 3 . 4 8}$ in toluene (Figure 3.36). The complex $(R, R)-\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ crystallized as tetrameric species. To isolate $(R, R)-\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$, the DCM was decanted and the green crystals were washed with hexane. The crystals were transferred to a new vial via spatula and crushed to provide a green powder. The resulting complex $(R, R)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ was dried under vacuum to afford $1.43 \mathrm{~g}, 85 \%$ yield. Anal. Calculated: C, $41.42 \%$; H, $3.48 \%$; N, $4.02 \%$; Found: C, $41.32 \%$; H, $3.15 \%$; N, 4.95\%. HRMS (LIFDI) (M) ${ }^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$, calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{~F}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Ni}\right]^{+}$: 694.0322; found: 694.0334 .


Figure 3.36: X-ray Structure of Single Component Precatalyst (R,R)- 3.48

### 3.14.10 General Protocol for Asymmetric Alkylation of Nitroalkanes

General Protocol D: Synthesis of enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(5 \mathrm{~min}$ prestirring): In a nitrogen-filled, moisture and oxygen free glovebox, $(R, R)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ (0.1 equiv) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added into a 20 mL vial (Vial A) containing magnetic stir bar. Vial A was sealed with a Teflon-lined screw cap and the resulting mixture was stirred at rt for 30 min . In a separate 20 mL vial (Vial B, preforming nitronate anion), base (1.1 equiv), nitroalkane (1.2 equiv), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$, and stir bar were added sequentially, and Vial B was capped with a Teflon-lined scew cap. Vial B was then stirred at rt for 5 min . After 5 min , the electrophile (1.0 equiv)
was added as a solid (unless otherwise noted) to Vial B, and Vial B was cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ was then added into Vial A, stirred for 2 minutes at rt , and then was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resulting brown, homogeneous solution in Vial A was transferred to Vial $B$ via pipette; Vial A was rinsed with $2.0 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ rinse was then transferred into Vial B. The reaction mixture was then stirred vigorously at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for indiacated time (ca. 20-26h). Once completed, the reaction was warmed to room temperature and removed from the glovebox. The reaction mixture was then opened to air, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through Celite, which was then rinsed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo and the crude reaction was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.

General Protocol E: Synthesis of enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~min}$ prestirring): In a nitrogen-filled, moisture and oxygen free glovebox, $(R, R)$-3.48 (0.1 equiv) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added into a 20 mL vial (Vial A) containing magnetic stir bar. Vial A was sealed with a Teflon-lined screw cap and the resulting mixture was stirred at rt for 30 min . In a separate 20 mL vial (Vial B, preforming nitronate anion), base (1.1 equiv), nitroalkane (1.2 equiv), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$, and stir bar were added sequentially, and Vial B was capped with a Teflon-lined scew cap. Vial B was then stirred at rt for 30 min . After 30 min , the electrophile ( 1.0 equiv) was added as a solid (unless otherwise noted) to Vial B, and Vial B was cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ was then added into Vial A, stirred for 2 minutes at rt , and then was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resulting brown, homogeneous solution in Vial A was transferred to Vial B via pipette; Vial A was rinsed with $2.0 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ rinse was then transferred into Vial B. The reaction mixture was then stirred vigorously at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for
indiacated time (ca. 20-26h). Once completed, the reaction was warmed to room temperature and removed from the glovebox. The reaction mixture was then opened to air, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through Celite, which was then rinsed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo and the crude reaction was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.

General Protocol F: Synthesis of enantioenriched $\beta$-nitroamide at rt (5 min prestirring): In a nitrogen-filled, moisture and oxygen free glovebox, $(R, R)$-3.48 (0.1 equiv) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added into a 20 mL vial (Vial A) containing magnetic stir bar. Vial A was sealed with a Teflon-lined screw cap and the resulting mixture was stirred at rt for 30 min . In a separate 20 mL vial (Vial B, preforming nitronate anion), base ( 1.1 equiv), nitroalkane ( 1.2 equiv), anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and stir bar were added sequentially, and Vial B was capped with a Teflon-lined screw cap. Vial B was then stirred at rt for 5 min . After the indicated time had passed, the electrophile ( 1.0 equiv) was added as a solid (unless otherwise noted) to Vial B. $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{Zn}$ was then added into Vial A, stirred for 2 minutes at rt . The resulting brown, homogeneous solution in Vial A was transferred to Vial B via pipette; Vial A was rinsed with $2.0 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and the $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ rinse was then transferred into Vial B. The reaction mixture was then stirred vigorously at rt for indicated time (ca. 20-26h). Once completed, the reaction was removed from the glovebox. The reaction mixture was then opened to air, diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through Celite, which was then rinsed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo and the crude reaction was purified by silica gel flash chromatography.

(3.34) According to general protocol D: 3.48 ( $34.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ phenylpropionamide $(\mathbf{3 . 3 3}, 318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}), 1-$ nitropropane ( $107 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 75:25 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:5 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 3 4}$ ( $290 \mathrm{mg}, 89 \%$ combined).
3.34A (SYN) ( $91 \%$ ee, $221 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $91 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 0.8 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=13.858 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=15.236 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $49.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-$ $7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95-6.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.87(\mathrm{q}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=$ $10.6,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.5,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,10.8,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.92(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13}{ }^{1} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.9,141.2,136.9,130.0,128.9,128.7$, $128.5,128.4,127.7,93.4,53.2,41.0,25.8,15.7,10.4$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2974,2881,1653$, 1545, 1405, 1200, 812, 700. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 327.1703; found: 327.1704.
3.34B (ANTI) ( $83 \%$ ee, $70 \mathrm{mg}, 21 \%$, off-white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $83 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 0.8 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=36.585 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=40.556 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+54.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.38-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.29-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.15-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.11-7.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,8.7,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.01(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=$ $10.1,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.5,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.67$ (ddq, J = 14.7, 8.8, 7.3 $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.9,141.4,137.1,129.6,128.7,128.6,128.4,128.3,127.4,90.5,53.2$, $39.2,23.9,14.5,9.3 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2975,1653,1545,1407,1259,810,700 ; \mathrm{mp}=101-$ $103{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) m/z calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 327.1703$; found: 327.1704 .

3.47A

3.47B
(3.47) According to general protocol D: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), N -benzyl-2-bromo- N phenylpropionamide (3.33, $318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0$ mmol ), 1-nitrohexene ( $164 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 79:21 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $100: 0 \rightarrow 95: 05$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products 3.47 ( $307 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ combined).
3.47A (SYN) ( $91 \%$ ee, $241 \mathrm{mg}, 66 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $91 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=18.968 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=15.837 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $30.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.37(\mathrm{dp}, \mathrm{J}=5.5,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.29-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.94-6.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.73(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0$, $10.2,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06-4.93(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.81-4.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $2.14-1.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.82-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.37-1.26(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H), $1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.8,141.2$, 137.4, $137.0,130.0,129.0,128.7,128.5,128.4,127.7,115.5,91.8,53.3,41.1,32.8,31.7$, 24.9, 15.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3064, 2929, 1653, 1549, 1405, 1262, 915, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 367.2016$; found: 327.2014.
3.47B (ANTI) $(79 \%$ ee, $66 \mathrm{mg}, 18 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $79 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 0.8 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=31.082 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=28.802 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+50.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.38-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.29-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.14-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.10-7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9$, $10.2,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00-4.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.92-4.84(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.99 (dq, J = 10.1, $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.10-1.95$ (m, 2H), $1.88-1.79$ (m, 1H), 1.64 (dtd, J $=14.8,9.8,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{dddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.3,13.5,10.9,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.8,141.3,137.3,137.0,129.6,128.7$, $128.3,128.3,127.4,89.3,53.1,39.8,32.7,30.0,24.1,14.5$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3064,2930$, 1653, 1548, 1409, 1251, 916, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(M+H)^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 367.2016$; found: 367.2015.

(3.50) According to general protocol F: 3.48 (34.7 mg, 0.05 mmol ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ phenylpropionamide ( $\mathbf{3 . 3 3}, 318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2phenylnitroethane ( $181 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 88:12 mixture of $s y n$ and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 85:15 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 0}$ ( $321 \mathrm{mg}, 83 \%$ combined).
3.50A (SYN) ( $87 \%$ ee, $274 \mathrm{mg}, 71 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $87 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=11.475 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=10.712 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $58.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.39(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.31$ $-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.15-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.6,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2H), $5.04-4.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.14(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.00-2.87(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.7$, 141.1, 136.9, 135.4, 128.9, 128.7, 128.6, 128.5, 128.4, 127.7, 127.4, 93.3, 53.3, 41.1, 38.4, 15.5; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3031, 2980, 1652, 1553, 1456, 1258, 859, 747. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 389.1859$; found: 389.1860.
3.50B (ANTI) ( $68 \%$ ee, $47 \mathrm{mg}, 12 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $68 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=23.708 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=13.292 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+46.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ): $\delta 7.35-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.27-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.14-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.04-6.98(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 5.09(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.4,3.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.21(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,3.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9.7,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13}{ }^{13} \mathrm{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ ) $\delta 172.6,141.3,137.0,134.9,129.6,128.7$, 128.7, 128.7, 128.4, 128.3, 127.4, 127.4, 90.5, 53.1, 39.6, 36.9, 14.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): $3648,2360,1653,1558,1456,1250,858,699$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 389.1859$; found: 389.1861 .

3.51A

3.51B
(3.51) According to general protocol D: $3.48(69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1$ mmol), $\quad N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ phenylpropionamide $(\mathbf{3 . 3 3}, 318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, 5 -(2-nitroethyl)benzo[1,3]dioxole ( $234 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 83:17 mixture of $s y n$ and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10 \rightarrow 80: 20$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 1}$ ( $346 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ combined).
3.51A (SYN) ( $89 \%$ ee, $295 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $89 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=31.504 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=34.915 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $77.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.44-7.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.32-$ $7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.3,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.00-6.91(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.70(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $6.63(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.57(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.9,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.93(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.99-4.91$ (m, 2H), $4.84(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.05(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.2,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92-2.84(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.6,147.9,146.9$, $141.0,136.9,130.0,129.0,128.9,128.8,128.5,128.4,127.7,121.9,109.0,108.4$, 101.0, 93.6, 53.3, 41.0, 38.2, 15.5; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2979, 1652, 1550, 1492, 1249, 1039, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}$: 433.1758; found: 433.1764.
3.51B (ANTI) ( $81 \%$ ee, $51 \mathrm{mg}, 12 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $81 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=28.783 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=25.203 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+6.4^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.36-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.27-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.14-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.05-6.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.49(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.45(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.0,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.92(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.4,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $4.91(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.8,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.02(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.5,147.7,146.9,141.2,136.9,129.6,128.7$, $128.4,128.3,128.3,127.4,121.9,109.0,108.4,101.0,90.7,53.0,39.6,36.7,14.6$;

FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2936, 2337, 1653, 1550, 1446, 1250, 1039, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 433.1758$; found: 433.1762.


(3.44) According to general protocol D: 3.48 (69.4 mg, 0.1 mmol ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ phenylbutanamide ( $332 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1nitropropane ( $107 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 55:45 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 4 4}(305 \mathrm{mg}, 90 \%$ combined).
3.44A (SYN) ( $85 \%$ ee, $162 \mathrm{mg}, 48 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $85 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=16.928 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=13.016 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $16.8^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.33(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.27(\mathrm{dd}$, $\mathrm{J}=5.0,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.17(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.5,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95-6.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.66(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.83(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.5,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.76$ (m, 2H), $1.75-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=13.7,7.4,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.87(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.7,141.0,137.0$, 129.7, 129.1, 129.1, 128.5, 128.4, 127.6, 92.8, 53.5, 46.6, 25.7, 23.9, 10.9, 10.5; FTIR
$\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2970,1653,1549,1495,1276,1079,701 . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 341.1859$; found: 341.1854.
3.44B (ANTI) ( $81 \%$ ee, $143 \mathrm{mg}, 42 \%$, off-white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $81 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IF, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=21.365 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=23.468 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+51.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.36-7.29(\mathrm{~m}$, 3H), $7.28-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.16-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.09-7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.91-4.83(\mathrm{~m}$, 3 H ), 3.00 (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=9.7,7.4,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.4,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.70$ (ddq, $\mathrm{J}=14.5,9.6,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.4,141.2,137.1,129.4,128.9,128.8,128.3,128.2$, 127.4, 90.0, 53.3, 45.0, 23.8, 22.0, 10.6, 9.7; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2972, 1652, 1546, 1495, 1270, 1079, $700 ; \mathrm{mp}=88-90{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 341.1859 ; found: 341.1854.

(3.61) According to general protocol D: $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ (69.4 mg, 0.1 mmol ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ phenylhexanamide ( $360 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1 nitropropane ( $107 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide $(59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol})$, diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a $54: 46$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $95: 05 \rightarrow 90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford
mixture of diastereomers 3.61A and 3.61B $(327 \mathrm{mg}, 89 \%$ combined, isolated dr $53: 47$ ). The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $83 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis for SYN diastereomer, 3.61A (CHIRALPAK IE, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{tR}($ major $)=13.522 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{tR}($ minor $)=15.697 \mathrm{~min}$; The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $77 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis for ANTI diastereomer, 3.61B (CHIRALPAK IE, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=$ $42.670 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=55.276 \mathrm{~min}$. Optical rotation for the mixture of diastereomers 3.61A and 3.61B $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-5.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$; The reported spectra are for a mixture of two diastereomers ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.41-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 7.29$ $-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 7.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.94-6.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.94-4.88(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.87-4.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.63(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=9.9,8.7,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.02$ (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=9.6,7.8,4.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.6,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.5$, $3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87-1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.77-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.55-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.45-$ $1.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=6.3,5.1,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.94-0.80(\mathrm{~m}$, 12H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.7,170.9,141.1,140.9,137.1,136.9,129.7$, $129.4,129.1,129.1,128.9,128.8,128.6,128.4,128.3,128.2,127.7,127.4,93.1,90.3$, $53.5,53.3,45.6,44.2,30.7,28.8,28.6,28.2,25.7,23.9,22.9,22.7,13.8,13.8,10.6$, 9.8; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2958, 1653, 1595, 1495, 1198, 1080, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 369.2172$; found: 369.2166 .

$318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), methyl 4-nitrobutyrate ( $152 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide
( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 71:29 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10 $\rightarrow$ 80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ ( $298 \mathrm{mg}, 78 \%$ combined).
3.54A (SYN) ( $87 \%$ ee, $208 \mathrm{mg}, 54 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $87 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.5 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=46.611 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=34.712 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $27.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-$ $7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.96-6.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.83$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1$, $6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 2.37 (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=16.1,9.7,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=16.5,9.7,5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H ), 2.20 (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=16.2,9.5,6.3,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.9,171.4,140.9,136.8,130.0,128.9$, $128.7,128.5,128.3,127.7,90.8,53.2,51.9,40.9,30.4,27.3,15.6 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2950$, 1734, 1653, 1550, 1495, 1257, 989, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 385.4320$; found: 385.1752 .
3.54B (ANTI) $(63 \%$ ee, $90 \mathrm{mg}, 24 \%$, off-white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $63 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=14.988 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=16.460 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+45.7^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.40-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$,
$7.26-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.15-7.04(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.95-4.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.89$ (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=$ $15.1,10.1,7.9,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ $172.5,172.2,141.2,136.9,129.7,128.7,128.4,127.4,88.5,53.1,51.9,39.9,29.6$, $25.9,14.5 ;$ FTIR (cm ${ }^{-1}$ ): 2951, 1738, 1654, 1549, 1495, 1257, 1079, 702; $\mathrm{mp}=97-99$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}$: 385.1758; found: 385.1755. Crystals for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation of diethyl ether.

(3.55) According to general protocol E : 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide (3.33, 318 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 5 -nitro-2-pentanone ( $157 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( 59.4 mg , 1.1 mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 67:33 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10 \rightarrow 80: 20$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}$ ( $261 \mathrm{mg}, 71 \%$ combined).
3.55A (SYN) ( $85 \%$ ee, $174 \mathrm{mg}, 47 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $87 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} / \mathrm{hexane}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=29.473 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=26.210 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $31.4^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.41-7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-$
$7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.99-6.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $4.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.6,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,6.6$ Hz, 1H), 2.51 (ddd, J = 18.1, 9.9, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.37 (ddd, J = 18.1, 10.2, $4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 2.17 (ddt, J = 14.7, 4.7, $2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.14(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 205.7, 171.5, 141.0, 136.8, 130.0, 128.9, 128.7, 128.5, 128.4, 127.7, 91.0, 53.3, 41.0, 39.7, 29.9, 26.1, 15.6; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2938$, 1718, 1653, 1594, 1495, 1256, 1079, 702. HRMS (ESI) (M+H) ${ }^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 369.1808$; found: 369.1807.
3.55B (ANTI) ( $84 \%$ ee, $87 \mathrm{mg}, 24 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $84 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} / \mathrm{hexane}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=49.050 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=43.622 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+66.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.38-7.32(\mathrm{~m}$, 3H), $7.28-7.21$ (m, 3H), $7.13-7.09$ (m, 2H), $7.09-7.05(m, 2 H), 4.88(d, \mathrm{~J}=14.3$ Hz, 1H), $4.84(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.96(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1$, $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.53$ (dt, J = 18.5, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.42 (ddd, J = 18.4, 8.1, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.26 - $2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}=15.4,10.5,7.9,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 206.1,172.6,140.9,136.9,129.6,128.7$, $128.6,128.4,127.4,88.8,53.1,40.2,38.8,30.1,24.7,14.6$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2938,1717$, 1653, 1548, 1495, 1256, 1079, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 369.1808$; found: 369.1807 .

3.52A
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3.52B
(3.52) According to general protocol

E: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$ -
benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide (3.33, $318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 4-nitrobutyl acetate $(172 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol})$, sodium methoxide $(59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol})$, diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 72:28 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10:1 $\rightarrow$ 80:20:1 hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 2}$ ( $281 \mathrm{mg}, 71 \%$ combined).
3.52A (SYN) ( $91 \%$ ee, $203 \mathrm{mg}, 51 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $91 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=33.625 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=30.039 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $14.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-$ $7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95-6.89(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84$ $-4.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.10-3.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.89$ $-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=13.0,9.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=12.8,9.1,6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.5,170.9,140.9$, $136.8,130.0,128.8,128.7,128.4,128.2,127.6,91.3,63.0,53.2,41.0,29.0,25.1,20.9$, 15.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2938, 1739, 1654, 1550, 1494, 1240, 1079, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 399.1914$; found: 399.1921.
3.52B (ANTI) $(77 \%$ ee, $78 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $77 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=24.744 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=16.721 \mathrm{~min}$.
$[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+35.6^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.38-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.28-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.14-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.09-7.04(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.95-4.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.07-3.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.00(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 H), 1.98-1.88(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ) ${ }^{13}{ }^{1} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.6,170.9,141.1,136.9,129.6,128.6$, $128.4,128.4,127.4,88.9,63.1,53.1,39.7,27.3,24.4,20.8,14.5$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2938$, 1738, 1655, 1549, 1495, 1243, 1074, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 399.1914$; found: 399.1923.

3.53A

3.53B
(3.53) According to general protocol E : 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide (3.33, 318 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, 6-nitrohexanol ( $164 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (10.0 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a $72: 28$ mixture of $s y n$ and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(85: 15: 1 \rightarrow 60: 40: 1$ hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $3.53(260 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%$ combined).
3.53A (SYN) ( $88 \%$ ee, $181 \mathrm{mg}, 47 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $88 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=24.526 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=43.331 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$
$28.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-$ $7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95-6.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.81$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=9.9,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}$ $=10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.57-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.46-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.29-1.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.8$, $141.0,136.9,130.0,128.9,128.7,128.5,128.3,127.7,91.7,62.6,53.2,41.1,32.2$, 25.6, 24.8, 15.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3421, 2935, 2862, 1653, 1549, 1495, 1200, 1077, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 385.2121$; found: 385.2129.
3.53B (ANTI) $(77 \%$ ee, $79 \mathrm{mg}, 21 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $77 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=10.167 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=12.878 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+35.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.30-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $7.21-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.06-7.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.83-4.78(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $4.70(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{dtt}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,5.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.57(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=14.5,9.5,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-$ $1.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.13(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.98(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.8,141.4,137.1,129.6,128.7,128.6,128.4,128.4,127.4,89.4,62.5$, 53.2, 39.9, 32.2, 30.7, 25.1, 24.9, 14.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3431, 2933, 2862, 1653, 1548, 1495, 1279, 1074, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 385.2121; found: 385.2127.



71:29
(3.56) According to general protocol E: 3.48 ( $34.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$ -
benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide (3.33, $318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-methyl-2-(3-nitropropyl)-1,3-dioxolane ( $210 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.01 \mathrm{mmol}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 71:29 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10: 1 \rightarrow 80: 20: 1$ hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 6}$ ( $353 \mathrm{mg}, 86 \%$ combined).
3.56A (SYN) ( $89 \%$ ee, $249 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $89 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=24.103 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=16.561 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $37.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-$ $7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95-6.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.83$ $(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00-3.84(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.81(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=$ $10.3,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94$ (dddd, $\mathrm{J}=13.7,10.6,5.9,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=14.6$, $10.3,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.67 (ddd, J = 14.0, 10.0, $5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.56-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.7,141.1,137.0$, $130.0,128.9,128.7,128.5,128.3,127.6,108.9,91.6,64.7,53.2,41.1,34.9,27.0,24.0$, 15.6; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2982, 1654, 1550, 1495, 1257, 1075, 857, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 413.1998$; found: 413.2070.
3.56B (ANTI) ( $75 \%$ ee, $104 \mathrm{mg}, 25 \%$, off white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $75 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=36.984 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=22.725 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+38.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.39-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.28-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94-4.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.78$ (d, J = 14.3 Hz, 1H), $3.93-3.87(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.87-3.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99$ (ddt, J = 14.9, 11.4, $4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=13.6$, $11.1,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.24(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.7,141.2,136.9,129.6,128.6,128.5,128.4,128.3$, $127.4,108.9,89.3,64.6,53.1,39.7,34.2,25.1,23.82,14.5 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2982,1655$, $1548,1495,1257,858,701 ; \mathrm{mp}=107-109^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}$: 413.1998; found: 413.2071.

3.49A

3.49B
(3.49) According to general protocol $D$ : 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide (3.33, 318 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-methyl-1-nitropropane ( $130 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( 59.4 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 92:08 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products 3.49 ( $295 \mathrm{mg}, 87 \%$ combined).
3.49A (SYN) ( $94 \%$ ee, $270 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $94 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=17.559 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=22.117 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $74.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-$ $7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.99-6.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.15(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.84$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.9,141.0,136.9,129.9,128.9$, 128.7, 128.4, 128.2, 127.6, 96.2, 53.2, 38.4, 30.1, 20.1, 17.0, 16.0; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2972$, 1654, 1545, 1495, 1200, 1079, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 341.1859$; found: 341.1849 .
3.49B (ANTI) $(76 \%$ ee, $25 \mathrm{mg}, 7 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $76 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=16.688 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=8.950 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+27.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.39-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.25-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.16-7.08(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.7$, $2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.12(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.7,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=$ 13.7, 6.8, 3.5, 2.9 Hz, 1H), $1.09(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.68(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}$ $=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.1,141.3,137.0,129.5,128.6$, $128.4,128.3,127.4,94.0,53.0,37.8,27.8,20.6,15.5,14.6 ;$ FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2970, 1655, $1545,1495,1259,1079,700$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 341.1859; found: 341.1847.

3.58A

3.58B
(3.58) According to general protocol D: $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ $(69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ -(4-methoxyphenyl)propanamide (3.S7, 348 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitrohexene ( $164 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2$ mmol), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (10.0 mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a $82: 18$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 8}$ ( $312 \mathrm{mg}, 79 \%$ combined).
3.58A (SYN) ( $90 \%$ ee, $260 \mathrm{mg}, 66 \%$, white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $90 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=29.259 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=22.363 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $35.4^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.30-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.19-$ $7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.87-6.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.80(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.73(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.2$, 6.7 Hz, 1H), $5.05-4.97(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79-4.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70$ (d, J = 14.0 Hz, 1H), $3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.84(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-1.99(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 1.75 (td, J = 8.1, $6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}=15.1,13.3,8.1,6.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.07 ( $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.1$, 159.3, 137.4, $137.1,133.7,129.3,128.9,128.4,127.6,115.4,115.0,91.8,55.4,53.2,40.9,32.7$, 31.7, 25.0, 15.5; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2933, 1653, 1549, 1405, 1250, 1037, $701 ; \mathrm{mp}=66-68$
${ }^{\circ}$ C. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 397.2121; found: 397.2103.
3.58B (ANTI) ( $82 \%$ ee, $52 \mathrm{mg}, 13 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $82 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 0.8 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} / \mathrm{hexane}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=44.576 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=40.614 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+34.7^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.29-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.15-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.87-6.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0$, $10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.99-4.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.74(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.00(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-$ $1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.65(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,9.7,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.29$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.2,159.2,137.3$, $137.1,133.9,128.8,128.4,127.4,115.5,114.6,89.3,55.3,53.2,39.7,32.7,30.0,24.1$, 14.5; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2932, 1653, 1549, 1409, 1250, 916, 700. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 397.2121 ; found: 397.2103.

(3.60) According to general protocol $D$ : 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitrohexene ( $164 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$ -(3,5-dimethylphenyl)propanamide (3.S9, $346 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the
crude reaction mixture revealed a $83: 17$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 6 0}$ ( $300 \mathrm{mg}, 76 \%$ combined).
3.60A (SYN) ( $91 \%$ ee, $250 \mathrm{mg}, 63 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $91 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=21.293 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=17.692 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $49.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.32-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-$ $7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.49(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.72(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.2,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.05-$ $4.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82-4.73(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.15-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.80-1.69(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.7,141.0,139.6,137.4,137.1,130.3,128.9,128.3,127.5$, $125.8,115.4,91.8,53.2,40.9,32.8,31.7,24.9,21.1,15.7$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2925,1653$, 1555, 1403, 1217, 915, 711. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 395.2329; found: 395.2312 .
3.60B (ANTI) $(83 \%$ ee, $50 \mathrm{mg}, 13 \%$, off white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $83 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 8.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=39.319 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=50.571 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+32.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.30-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.16-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.69(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.2,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.02-4.87(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{td}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{q}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.03(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.26$
$(\mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-1.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.72-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.44-1.28(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $1.06(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.8,141.2,137.4$, $137.2,129.9,128.6,128.3,127.3,115.5,89.3,53.1,39.8,32.8,29.9,24.2,21.1,14.7$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2924,1654,1549,1406,1233,915,711 ; \mathrm{mp}=84-86^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 395.2329; found: 395.2310.

3.59A

3.59B
(3.59) According to general protocol $D: 3.48$ ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitrohexene ( $164 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, 1.2 mmol),
$N$-benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-(4(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)propanamide (3.S11, $386 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an 79:21 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 5 9}$ ( $342 \mathrm{mg}, 79 \%$ combined).
3.59A (SYN) $(89 \%$ ee, $274 \mathrm{mg}, 63 \%$, off white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $89 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=12.618 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=10.102 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $29.7^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.33$ $-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.18-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.73(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.2$,
$6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06-4.94(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.80-4.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.74(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.16-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.38-1.29$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.10(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.4,144.3,137 ., 4$ 136.4, $131.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=33 \mathrm{~Hz}), 129.0,128.9,128.7,128.0,127.3,127.2,123.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=273$ Hz ), 115.6, 91.5, 53.2, 41.3, 32.8, 31.7, 25.0, 15.6; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (565 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 62.7; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2932,1661,1555,1404,1325,852,701 ; \mathrm{mp}=89-9{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 435.1890; found: 435.1887.
3.59B (ANTI) $(80 \%$ ee, $68 \mathrm{mg}, 16 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $80 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IC, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=24.873 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=30.304 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+37.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.23(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.13-7.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.68(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=$ $17.0,10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.03-4.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.93-4.86(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.92(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.90-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64$ $(\mathrm{dtd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,9.8,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.28(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (151 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.5,144.6,137.2,136.5,130.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=33 \mathrm{~Hz}), 129.1$, 128.7, 128.6, 127.8, 126.8, 126.8, $123.6(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=273 \mathrm{~Hz}), 115.6,89.3,53.1,40.0,32.7$, 30.0, 24.2, 14.6; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-62.6$; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2932, 1661, 1550, 1408, 1325, 853, 700. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 435.1890; found: 435.1887.

(3.57) According to general protocol D: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), N -benzyl-2-bromo- $N$-phenylpropionamide ( $\mathbf{3 . 3 3}, 318 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 3.57 nitromethane ( $322 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide $(59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$
mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with rapid stirring for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.57 ( $84 \% \mathrm{ee}, 121$ $\mathrm{mg}, 41 \%$ Yield) as a white solid. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $84 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=210$ $\mathrm{nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=20.837 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=18.654 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+73.0^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=1.00$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.38-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.22(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.19-7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.13-7.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.97(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.4,10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $14.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.17(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.4,4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,10.9,7.1,3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.05(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.5,141.3,137.0$, 129.7, 128.7, 128.6, 128.4, 128.4, 127.4, 76.7, 53.3, 35.0, 14.9; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2982$, 1653, 1551, 1414, 1380, 1079, 699; mp $=110-112{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 299.1390$; found: 299.1386.

3.62
(3.62) According to general protocol F: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo-1-(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one (3.55, $254 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-methyl-1-nitropropane ( $128 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 95:05 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford diastereomerically pure product $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ ( $99 \% \mathrm{ee}, 242 \mathrm{mg}, 88 \%$ Yield) as off-white
solid. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $99 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=15.458$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=17.698 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=58.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(400 \mathrm{MHz}$, DMSO-d6): $\delta 8.07$ (d, J = $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.26(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $7.03(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.8,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.36-4.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.38$ - $3.27(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.13(\mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ 6.7 Hz, 3H), $0.93(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta 169.9$, 142.6, $132.3,127.0,124.9,123.9,116.5,95.5,47.7,39.5,29.9,27.4,19.0,17.6,14.1$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2970,1656,1545,1482,1413,1161,758 ; \mathrm{mp}=129-131^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 277.1546$; found: 277.1540. Crystals for Xray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation of diethyl ether.


(3.66) According to general protocol F: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo-1-(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one ( $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}, 254 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1 nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a $88: 12$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 80:20 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 6 6}$ ( $225 \mathrm{mg}, 86 \%$ combined).
3.66A (SYN) ( $85 \%$ ee, $198 \mathrm{mg}, 76 \%$, white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $85 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=17.566 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=21.375 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $59.4^{\circ}$ (c = 1.00, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz, DMSO-d6): $\delta 8.09(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.26(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.16(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.04(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.68(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.6,9.3,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.33-4.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.29-3.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.18 (t, J = $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.95 (ddq, $\mathrm{J}=14.4,10.6,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.7$, $7.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.86(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta 169.8,142.5,132.4,127.0,124.9,124.0,116.5,92.8,47.8,42.0$, $27.4,25.2,14.4,10.2 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2973,1653,1548,1482,1263,940,759 ; \mathrm{mp}=72-$ $74{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 263.1317$; found: 263.1386.
3.66B (ANTI) ( $64 \%$ ee, $27 \mathrm{mg}, 10 \%$, white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $64 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=15.807 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=11.990 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+21.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz, DMSO-d6): $\delta 8.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.25(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.14(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.1,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), 4.86 (td, J = 9.7, 8.3, 3.6 Hz, 1H), 4.21 (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=9.6,7.8,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.45-$ $3.35(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.20(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.16-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.92-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.20$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta 171.5$, $142.6,132.1,127.0,124.9,123.8,116.3,90.1,47.6,40.6,27.4,23.7,13.5,9.2 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2975,1655,1548,1420,1278,1132,759 ; \mathrm{mp}=102-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 263.1317; found: 263.1391 .

3.65A 93:07
(3.65) According to general protocol F: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo- N -methoxy- N methylpropanamide ( $\mathbf{3 . 8 2}, 196 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-methyl-1-nitropropane ( $130 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium tert-butoxide ( $123 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 93:07 mixture of $s y n$ and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford a mixture of diastereomers $\mathbf{3 . 6 5}$ ( $90 \%$ ee, isolated dr $96: 04,161 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%$ Yield) as clear oil: The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $90 \%$ for $\mathbf{3 . 6 5 A}$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} / \mathrm{hexane}, \lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=7.159 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=7.980 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}^{24}=22.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$; The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $44 \%$ for 3.65B by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=13.241$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (minor) $=12.513 \mathrm{~min} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details): $\delta$ 3.65A: $4.68(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.4,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.58(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9$, $2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, 3.65B: $4.81(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.0,3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 3.65A: 173.4, 95.6, 61.7, 36.8, 32.3, 30.2, 19.7, 17.0, 15.4, 3.65B: 93.1, 61.4, 27.8, 20.6, 13.8; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2973, 1664, 1548, 1464, 1376, 1178,
996. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 219.1267; found: 219.1339 .

(3.69) According to general protocol F: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo- N -methoxy- N methylpropanamide ( $\mathbf{3 . 8 2}, 196 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 92:08 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford a mixture of diastereomers $\mathbf{3 . 6 9}$ ( $85 \%$ ee, isolated dr $93: 07$, $147 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%$ Yield) as clear oil: The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $85 \%$ for 3.69A by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IF, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=$ $11.489 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=14.258 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=47.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$; The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $52 \%$ for 3.69B by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=28.742$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=33.026 \mathrm{~min} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details): $\delta$ 3.69A: $4.63(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.6,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.42(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=13.3,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.20(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.89(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.4,10.5,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.8,7.4,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.94(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), \mathbf{3 . 6 9 B}: 4.81(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.2,8.7$, $3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=11.0$,
7.5, 3.6 Hz, 1H), $0.98(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 3.69A: 172.9, 92.8, 61.8, 39.4, 32.1, 25.9, 15.0, 10.3, 3.69B: 89.5, 61.4, 38.1, 31.9, 23.9, 13.6, 9.3; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2975,1663,1550,1462,1376,1178,994$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 205.1110; found: 205.1183 .

(3.64) According to general protocol F: 3.48 (69.4 $\mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, $\quad$ 2-bromo- N -methyl- N Phenylpropanamide (3.S4, $242 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-methyl-1-nitropropane ( $128 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 91:09 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10:01 hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford diastereomerically pure product $\mathbf{3 . 6 4}$ ( $211 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ combined).
3.64A (SYN) $(90 \%$ ee, $170 \mathrm{mg}, 64 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $90 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK ID, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=15.659 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=17.670 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $135.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.51-7.39(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-$ 7.18 (m, 2H), 4.72 (dd, J = 10.3, $4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.10(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.82(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.0,142.9,130.1,128.6$, 127.0, 96.2, 38.1, 37.7, 30.0, 20.0, 16.9, 15.9; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2972,1653,1541,1496$,

1271, 1032, 703. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 265.1474; found: 265.1536 .
3.64B (ANTI) $(43 \%$ ee, $41 \mathrm{mg}, 16 \%$, combined 3.64 A and 3.64 B , clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $43 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=11.390$ $\min , t_{R}($ minor $)=7.949 \mathrm{~min}$. The diastereomer 3.64B is contaminated with diastereomer 3.64A: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ : mixture of diastereomers; useful diagnostic peaks for each compound are listed. See attached spectra for details): $\delta$ 3.64A: $4.72(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.10(\mathrm{pd}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.83$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), \mathbf{3 . 6 4 B}: 4.82(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10.7,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.23(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.16(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=$ $10.7,7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=6.9,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.02(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ 7.0 Hz, 3H), $0.69(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \mathbf{3 . 6 4 A}: 172.0$, $142.9,130.1,128.6,127.0,96.2,38.1,37.7,30.0,20.0,16.9,15.9,3.64 B: 173.0$, $143.2,129.8,128.2,127.4,93.9,37.6,37.5,27.8,20.5,16.0,14.5 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2969$, 1654, 1538, 1458, 1274, 1123, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 265.1474$; found: 265.1544.


(3.68) According to general protocol F: 3.48 (69.4 $\mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, $\quad$ 2-bromo- N -methyl- N Phenylpropanamide (3.S4, $242 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $1-$ nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were
combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 79:21 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 $\rightarrow$ 85:15 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 6 8}$ ( $210 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ combined).
3.68A (SYN) ( $84 \%$ ee, $168 \mathrm{mg}, 67 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $84 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=13.082 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=14.879 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $101.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.52-7.44(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.44-$ $7.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.65(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.4,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.87$ (dq, J = 10.3, 6.7 Hz, 1H), $1.92-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.07(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ 7.3 Hz, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.9,142.9,130.2,128.5,127.2,93.4$, 40.7, 37.6, 25.8, 15.6, 10.4; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2974, 1655, 1596, 1549, 1496, 1390, 1120, 1029, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 251.1317$; found: 251.1387.
3.68B (ANTI) $(54 \%$ ee, $42 \mathrm{mg}, 17 \%$, white solid): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $54 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} / \mathrm{hexane}, \lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=27.086 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=33.261 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+27.5^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.47(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.2,7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.41-7.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.34-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=10.0,8.9,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.23(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.05(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=10.1,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66$ $(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,9.0,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.04(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$

NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \quad 172.9,143.2,129.9,128.2,127.4,90.5,39.0,37.6,23.9$, 14.4, 9.4; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2975, 1653, 1558, 1446, 1378, 1280, 1071, 709; $\mathrm{mp}=95-97$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 251.1317; found: 251.1387.

(3.63) According to general protocol F: 3.48 (69.4 mg, $0.1 \quad \mathrm{mmol}$ ) $\alpha$ bromomorpholinopropanamide (3.S3, 222 mg , 1.0 mmol ), 2-methyl-1-nitropropane ( $128 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( 59.4 mg , 1.1 mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 92:08 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10: 1 \rightarrow 80: 20: 1$ hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford single diastereomer 3.63A ( $88 \% \mathrm{ee}, 199 \mathrm{mg}, 82 \%$ ) as clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $88 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH $/$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=8.623$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=10.790 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=23.0^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(400 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 4.80(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,4.8,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77-3.63(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.62-3.51(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,6.9,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{dtdd}, \mathrm{J}=13.6,6.8,4.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.0,6.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.6,95.8,66.6,46.1,42.1,36.6,29.8,19.7,16.5,15.7 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right):$ 2971, 1639, 1545, 1437, 1226, 1116, 849. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 245.1495$; found: 245.1490 .

3.67A

3.67B
(3.67) According to general protocol F: 3.48 (69.4 mg, 0.1 mmol ), $\alpha$ bromomorpholinopropanamide (3.S3, 222 mg , 1.0 mmol ), 1-nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed an $81: 19$ mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10: 1 \rightarrow 75: 25: 1$ hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford two diastereomerically pure products $\mathbf{3 . 6 7}$ ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 87 \%$ combined).
3.67A (SYN) ( $82 \%$ ee, $164 \mathrm{mg}, 71 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $82 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=11.920 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=9.460 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $28.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 4.80(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=10.3,4.8,1.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77-3.63(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.62-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=10.5,6.9,1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.20$ (dtdd, $\mathrm{J}=13.6,6.8,4.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.8,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.97$ (ddd, $\mathrm{J}=14.0,6.9,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.6,95.8,66.6$, 46.1, 42.1, 36.6, 29.8, 19.7, 16.5, 15.7; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2974, 2858, 1645, 1548, 1457, 1225, 1116, 1028, 813. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 231.1267; found: 231.1337.
3.67B (ANTI) $(49 \%$ ee, $36 \mathrm{mg}, 16 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $49 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=16.599 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=19.398 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+31.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 4.86(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,8.6$, $3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.55-3.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.10(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=15.0,7.5,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,8.8,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), $0.98(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 171.56, 90.17, $66.60,46.18,42.32,37.49,24.05,14.06,9.36$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2974,2857,1643,1548$, 1439, 1378, 1115, 809. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$: 231.1267; found: 231.1340 .

(3.70) According to general protocol F: $\mathbf{3 . 4 8}$ ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo--(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one ( $\mathbf{3 . S 5}, 254 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1$ mmol ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0$ mL ) were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . 7 0}$ (61\%ee, 107 $\mathrm{mg}, 41 \%$ ) as white solid. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $61 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=21.497 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=16.497 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-18.2^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 8.20(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22-7.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.07-7.02$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.34(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.7,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.15(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.58(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.33-3.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta \quad 170.8,142.6,131.4,127.5,124.6,124.1,117.5,91.0$, 48.6, 45.5, 27.9, 23.9, 13.7; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2988, 1653, 1539, 1482, 1418, 1264, 757; $\mathrm{mp}=126-128{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 263.1317$; found: 263.1386 .

(3.71) According to general protocol F: $3.48(69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1$ mmol), 2-bromo-1-(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one ( $\mathbf{3 . 5 5}, 254 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a 56:44 mixture of syn and anti isomers. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography $(90: 10 \rightarrow 80: 20$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford two diastereomerically pure products 3.71 ( $157 \mathrm{mg}, 44 \%$ combined).
3.71A $(S Y N)(67 \%$ ee, $81 \mathrm{mg}, 24 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $67 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=15.224 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=13.146 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-$ $42.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 8.21(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.24-7.17(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.06(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=7.4,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.8,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.16(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=9.9,7.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68-3.57(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.36-3.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.30-2.07$
$(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.23(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 172.2, 169.9, 142.7, 131.5, 127.6, 124.7, 124.4, 117.6, 94.2, 51.9, 48.9, 46.1, 33.2, 28.8, 27.9, 17.1, 13.4; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2952, 1738, 1656, 1598, 1540, 1481, 1264, 1077, 760. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}$: 335.1529; found: 335.1593.
3.71B (ANTI) $(49 \%$ ee, $66 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \%$, clear oil): The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $49 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=24.124 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=19.707 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+6.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 8.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.36-4.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.13-4.07(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.47(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.24(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=15.7,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.46-2.33$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.32-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta \quad 172.5,170.9,142.7,131.3,127.5,124.5,124.1,117.5,92.8,52.0$, 48.3, 45.4, 33.5, 28.4, 28.0, 18.8, 13.8; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2952,1738,1655,1598,1539$, 1482, 1263, 1081, 759. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}$: 335.1529; found: 335.1596 .

(3.3) According to general protocol F: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-bromo- $N$-methoxy-N,2-dimethylpropanamide $\quad(\mathbf{3 . 1}, 210 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0$ mmol ), 1-nitropropane ( $107 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( 59.4 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.3 ( $78 \% \mathrm{ee}, 83$
$\mathrm{mg}, 38 \%$ ) as clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $78 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=11.341 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=12.722 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+29.1^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 5.07$ (dd, J = 11.6, 2.2 Hz, 1H), 3.73 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), 3.19 (s, 3H), $2.10(\mathrm{ddq}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,11.7,7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{dqd}, \mathrm{J}=14.8,7.4,2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{~s}$, $6 \mathrm{H}), 0.95(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 174.6, 94.3, 60.8, 46.5, 34.1, 22.3, 22.1, 20.3, 11.2; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2976, 1649, 1548, 1462, 1365, 1295, 997. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}: 219.1267$; found: 219.1331.

(3.72) To a 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added 3.47 (Run 1: $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol}$, dr: >95:05, $91 \%$ ee), (Run 2: $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{dr}:>79: 21$, $91 / 82 \%$ ee $)$, acetonitrile ( 5.5 mL ), methyl acrylate ( $147 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.63 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and DBU $(243 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.63 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was sealed with a polypropylene cap. The resulting homogenous solution was stirred at rt for 1 h . The reaction was diluted with ethyl acetate ( 10 mL ), washed with brine ( 2 x 10 mL ), dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo. NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a $>95: 05$ mixture of syn and anti isomers for both runs. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.72 (Run 1: 91\% ee, $205 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ Yield), (Run 2: $89 \%$ ee, $202 \mathrm{mg}, 83 \%$ Yield) as a clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $91 \%$ for Run 1 and $89 \%$ for Run 2 by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IF, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \%$ i $-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=31.502 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=25.165 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-30.8^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.34$ (dd, J = 5.2, $2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.26(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$,
$7.19-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.97(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.70(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=17.0,10.3,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0 \mathrm{H}), 5.03-4.95$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.03(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0 \mathrm{H}), 2.48(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,10.5$, $5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 0 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.6,12.7,4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.02(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14.6,12.5,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.33(\mathrm{dddd}, \mathrm{J}=19.8,12.4,7.2,4.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 0 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.26-1.16(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.8,171.8,141.5$, $137.4,137.0,129.8,128.9,128.5,128.4,128.3,127.5,115.6,94.9,53.2,51.8,42.4$, 34.4, 33.6, 29.0, 28.5, 23.2, 14.3; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 2950, 1738, 1660, 1540, 1403, 1198, 993, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right]^{+}: 453.2311$; found: 453.2390 .

(3.76): 3.72 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.44 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ethyl acetate ( 13 mL ), ethanol ( 18 mL ), and $\mathrm{HCl}(6 \mathrm{M}, 15.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.64 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added to a 100 mL round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and Zn dust ( $1.44 \mathrm{~g}, 22.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in 3 portions over 10 minutes under air. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1 h . The resulting mixture was quenched with brine (50 mL ) and extracted with ethyl acetate ( $50 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{x}$ ). The aqueous layer contains insoluble zinc salts was filtered through celite and back extracted with ethyl acetate ( $30 \mathrm{~mL}, 3 \mathrm{x}$ ). The combined organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo to afford 3.76 ( $89 \% \mathrm{ee}, 189 \mathrm{mg}, 94 \%$ ) as a white solid. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $88 \%$ by reverse-phase chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IF$3,1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 10 \% \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} /$ water isocratic 1 minute, then 30 minute gradient $35 \%$
$\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} /$ water, 30 minute isocratic $35 \% \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} /$ water $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (major) $=38.342$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=41.382 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-20.3^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}(600 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 8.37(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.38(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.1,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.28(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.0,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 7.13 (dd, J = 6.6, 2.9 Hz, 2H), $6.93(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.4,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.67(\mathrm{ddt}, \mathrm{J}=16.9,10.2$, 6.6 Hz, 1H), $4.95-4.89(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.72$ (ddd, J $=16.7,11.3,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.41(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=16.3,11.1,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), 2.19 (ddd, J = 15.5, 11.1, 5.6 Hz, 1H), $2.09-1.92(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.93-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.27(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.21-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.82(\mathrm{dh}, \mathrm{J}=12.8,6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.3,172.8,140.5,137.4,136.2,130.1,129.1,128.9$, $128.6,127.9,127.8,115.7,61.0,53.1,52.1,39.2,33.0,31.2,29.4,28.0,21.5,12.8 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2942,1735,1634,1592,1493,1201,914,703 ; \mathrm{mp}=68-70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{HRMS}$ (ESI) $(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 423.2642$; found: 423.2652 .

(3.73) A hot 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber spectrum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with N 2 , the septum was removed, and $\mathbf{3 . 3 4}$ (Run 1: $215 \mathrm{mg}, 0.66 \mathrm{mmol}$, dr: $>95: 05,90 \%$ ee), (Run 2: $215 \mathrm{mg}, 0.66 \mathrm{mmol}$, dr: $76: 24,90 / 84 \%$ ee), and Umemoto's reagent ( $344 \mathrm{mg}, 0.86 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to a double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dichloromethane was added via syringe and the flask was lowered into a precooled $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ cooling bath and stirred. DBU ( $\left.197 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.32 \mathrm{mmol}\right)$ was then added dropwise via syringe. The resulting homogenous solution was stirred at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h after which the flask was removed from the cooling unit and the septum was
removed. The reaction mixture was washed with brine ( $10 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{x}$ ), dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite. The product was purified by silica gel flash chromatography (100:0 $\rightarrow$ 95:05 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.73 (Run 1: $88 \%$ ee, $174 \mathrm{mg}, 67 \%$ ), (Run 2: $86 \% \mathrm{ee}, 174 \mathrm{mg}, 67 \%$ ) as a clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $89 \%$ for Run 1 and $86 \%$ for Run 2 by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 2.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=9.605 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=6.687 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=59.1^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl} 3) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.40-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.16-7.11$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.05-6.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{q}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.07(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=15.1$, $7.5,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.13(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=$ 7.3, 3.9 Hz, 3H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.1,140.8,136.6,129.7,128.8$, 128.6, 128.4, 127.5, $122.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=288 \mathrm{~Hz}), 94.9(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=24 \mathrm{~Hz}), 53.3,40.0,22.9,14.0$, 8.5; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-67.2$; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 2986,1665,1562,1495$, 1408, 1202, 1120, 824, 701. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}\right]^{+}: 395.1504$; found: 395.1568 .

(3.77): $\alpha$-Trifluoromethylnitroalkane 3.73 ( $190 \mathrm{mg}, 0.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ethyl acetate $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$, ethanol ( 19 mL ), and $\mathrm{HCl}(6 \mathrm{M}, 17.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, 2.9 mL ) were added to a 100 mL round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and Zn dust ( $1.57 \mathrm{~g}, 24.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in 3 portions over 10 minutes. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1 h . The resulting mixture was quenched with 1.0 M aqueous NaOH $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with ethyl acetate $(50 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{x})$. The aqueous layer contains insoluble zinc salts was filtered through celite and back extracted with ethyl acetate
(30mL, 3x). The combined organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography ( $90: 10 \rightarrow 80: 20$ hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.77 ( $88 \%$ ee, $142 \mathrm{mg}, 81 \%$ Yield) as a clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $88 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i-PrOH/hexane, $\lambda=220$ $\mathrm{nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=17.099 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=20.364 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-75.3^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=1.00$, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 7.34-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.26-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.19-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=14.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.62(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.24(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.66(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=15.2,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.49-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 0.66(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.9,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.4,141.5,137.1$, 129.4, 128.9, 128.3, 128.2, $128.0(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=288 \mathrm{~Hz}), 127.3,60.5(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=24.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 52.8$, 35.4, 27.4, 12.9, 7.5; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $565 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta-74.5 ; \operatorname{FTIR}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3403,2974$, $1656,1593,1495,1403,1143,915,701 ; \mathrm{mp}=55-57^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OF}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 365.1835 ; found: 365.1827.

(3.75) 3.75 was synthesized by modification of a previously published procedure. ${ }^{13}$ A hot 10 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and a rubber spectrum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. Once cooled, the flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and $\operatorname{tris}($ dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0)-chloroform adduct ( $3.4 \mathrm{mg}, 3.3 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), ( $\pm$ )BINAP ( $6.2 \mathrm{mg}, 6.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), and $3.34(215 \mathrm{mg}, 0.66 \mathrm{mmol}, 90 \%$ ee) were added. The septum was replaced, the flask was reattached to a double manifold and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous DMSO ( 0.66 mL ) was added via syringe
and the reaction was stirred at rt for 5 minutes. $\mathrm{DBU}(10 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 66 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, and tert-butyl allyl carbonate ( $144 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.79 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added via syringe. The resulting brown solution was stirred in an oil bath at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h . Once complete, the reaction was cooled to rt , opened to air, diluted with ethyl acetate ( 40 mL ) and it was filtered through celite. The filtrate was washed with water ( $20 \mathrm{~mL}, 3 \mathrm{x}$ ). The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo onto Celite. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (95:05 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}(90 \% \mathrm{ee}, 178 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%)$ as a clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $90 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IE, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, $3.0 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=38.353 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=29.727 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-46.4^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.36-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $7.29-7.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.20-7.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.01-6.94(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.54$ (ddt, J = 17.1, 10.1, $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 5.09 (dd, J = 17.2, $1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.86(\mathrm{q}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.04(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}$ $=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15.2,6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.72(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15.2,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35$ $(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.9,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=14.7,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $0.86(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 172.2,141.5,137.1,131.9$, 129.6, 128.9, 128.4, 128.4, 128.3, 127.4, 95.5, 53.1, 41.8, 37.5, 27.7, 14.2, 8.4; FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3063,2979,1658,1594,1494,1403,1245,924,702$. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}: 367.2016$; found: 367.2005.

(3.S14) 3.75 ( $350 \mathrm{mg}, 0.96 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ethyl acetate ( 29 mL ), ethanol $(38 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $\mathrm{HCl}(6 \mathrm{M}, 34.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.7 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added to a 200 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The flask was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and Zn dust ( $3.125 \mathrm{~g}, 47.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in 3 portions over 10
minutes. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1 h . The resulting mixture was quenched with brine $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with ethyl acetate ( $80 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{x}$ ). The aqueous layer contains insoluble zinc salts was filtered through celite and back extracted with ethyl acetate ( $50 \mathrm{~mL}, 3 \mathrm{x}$ ). The combined organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuo to afford crude ( 336 mg ) as a white solid. The crude material was taken to the next step without further purification.

(3.78) A hot 10 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and rubber septum was attached via needle to a double manifold and cooled under vacuum. The flask was backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$, the septum was removed, and the $\mathbf{3 . S 1 4}(120 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32 \mathrm{mmol})$, p-toluene sulfonyl chloride ( $68 \mathrm{mg}, 0.35 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 4 -(dimethylamino) pyridine ( $8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.064 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), was added sequentially. The septum was replaced, the flask was attached to a double manifold, and evacuated and backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ three times. Anhydrous dichloromethane (1.6 mL ), and triethylamine ( $90 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), were added to the flask sequentially via syringe and the reaction stirred at rt for 8 h . The septum was removed and the reaction was diluted with dichloromethane $(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with water $(10 \mathrm{~mL}, 2 \mathrm{x})$. The aqueous layer was back extracted with dichloromethane ( $10 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{x}$ ). The organic layers were combined, dried over magnesium sulfate, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (90:10 hexanes : ethyl acetate) to afford 3.78 ( $96 \%$ ee, $133 \mathrm{mg}, 85 \%$ ) as a white solid. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $96 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IB, 1.0 $\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}, 3.0 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=210 \mathrm{~nm}) ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=25.128 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=$ $23.737 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=-11.8^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.76(\mathrm{~d}$,

2H), $7.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.37-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.24-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.16$ $(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6.7,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.99-6.88(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.97-5.82(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.08-4.98(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), $4.92(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.75(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.39(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.38-2.26(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.20(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94(\mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=15.0,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.51-1.38(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.31(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $175.9,142.2,141.5,141.2,136.8,133.7,129.7,129.2,129.0,128.5,128.1,127.6$, $127.0,117.8,64.0,52.8,42.7,39.8,29.5,23.6,21.5,13.2,7.1 ;$ FTIR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 3220$, $2975,1635,1594,1495,1404,1340,1149,702 ; \mathrm{mp}=120-122{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \operatorname{HRMS}(\mathrm{ESI})$ $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}\right]^{+}: 491.2290$; found: 491.2342. Crystals for X-ray analysis were obtained by slow evaporation of diethyl ether.

(3.80) According to general protocol C: 3.48 ( $69.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1$ mmol), N-benzyl-2-bromo-2-cyclopropyl-N-phenylacetamide (3.79, $222 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitropropane ( $108 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium methoxide ( $59.4 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, $0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20$ $\mu \mathrm{L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt for 24 h . The reaction was worked up according to the general protocol. The crude reaction was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (75:25:01 hexanes : ethyl acetate : acetic acid) to afford $\mathbf{3 . 8 0}(16 \%$ ee, $87 \mathrm{mg}, 25 \%)$ as a clear oil. The enantiomeric excess was determined to be $16 \%$ by chiral HPLC analysis (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 5.0 \%$ i- $\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ ); $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=22.898$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ (minor $)=25.021 \mathrm{~min} .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{24}=+5.9^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=1.00, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(400 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.38-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 7.03-6.96(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.85(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}=$
15.1, $6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.72(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{tt}, \mathrm{J}=9.1,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.06$ (dtdd, $\mathrm{J}=20.8,14.5,9.6,7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.91$ (ddt, $\mathrm{J}=14.6,9.3,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.80-1.64(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.91(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 165.4$, $142.9,141.7,137.3,129.4,128.6,128.3,128.3,127.8,127.3,123.3,89.2,53.1,31.8$, 28.4, 27.2, 10.1; FTIR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 3063, 2979, 1658, 1594, 1494, 1403, 1245, 924, 702. HRMS (ESI) $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}$: 353.1787; found: 353.1844.

### 3.14.11 Procedure for Stereoconvergence in the Nickel Catalyzed Enantioselective C-Alkylation of Nitroalkanes:

Reaction beginning with $(R)-\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$


According to general protocol C: 3.48 ( $17.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.025 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), ( $R$ )-2-bromo-1-(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one (3.81, $64 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitropropane ( $28 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.3$ mmol ), sodium methoxide ( $14.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.275 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, 0.005 mmol, $5 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt . After 30 min , the reaction was removed from the glovebox and quenched by opening the reaction to air. 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene ( $10.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0625 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added as an internal standard and the reaction was worked up according to the general protocol C. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a diastereomeric ratio of 81:19 favoring of syn isomer and $86 \%$ conversion of starting material $(R)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ and $84 \%$ yield of $\mathbf{3 . 6 6}$. The chiral HPLC analysis of starting material $(R) \mathbf{- 3 . 8 1}$ showed
ee of $99 \%$ and a product $\mathbf{3 . 6 6}$ ee of $84 \%$. (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 1.0 \%$ i$\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; starting material $(R)-\mathbf{3 . 8 1}: \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=26.099 \mathrm{~min}$, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=32.910 \mathrm{~min}$; product 3.66: $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=16.738 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=20.710$ min).

Reaction beginning with $(S)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$


According to general protocol C: $\mathbf{3 . 4 8} \mathbf{( 1 7 . 3 \mathrm { mg } ,} 0.025 \mathrm{mmol})$, (S)-2-bromo-1-(indolin-1-yl) propan-1-one ( $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}, 64 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1-nitropropane ( $28 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.3$ mmol ), sodium methoxide ( $14.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.275 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diethyl zinc ( 1 M in hexane, 0.005 mmol, $5 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and stirred rapidly at rt . After 30 min , the reaction was removed from the glovebox and quenched by opening the reaction to air. 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene ( $10.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0625 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added as an internal standard and the reaction was worked up according to the general protocol C. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude reaction mixture revealed a diastereomeric ratio of 81:19 favoring of syn isomer and $80 \%$ conversion of starting material $(S)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ and $70 \%$ yield of 3.66. The chiral HPLC ananlysis of starting material $(S)$ - $\mathbf{3 . 8 1}$ showed ee of $99 \%$ and a product 3.66 ee of $84 \%$. (CHIRALPAK IA, $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, $1.0 \% \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} /$ hexane, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; starting material $(S)-\mathbf{3 . 8 1}: \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=32.910 \mathrm{~min}$,
$\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=26.099 \mathrm{~min}$; product 3.66: $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ major $)=16.509 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}($ minor $)=20.422$ min).

### 3.14.12 Determination of Stereochemistry of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-nitroamides


(R,S)-3.62
The relative and absolute stereochemistry of $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ (major diastereomer) was determined by X-ray crystallographic analysis. This compound was prepared using general procedure C from 3.S5 and 2-methyl-1-nitropropane with ( $\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{R})$-3.48 as catalyst.


Figure 3.37: Stereochemistry of Major Diastereomer $\mathbf{3 . 6 2}$


The relative and absolute stereochemistry of $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}$ (minor diastereomer) was determined by X-ray crystallographic analysis. This compound was prepared using general procedure B from 3.33 and methyl-4-nitrobutanoate with ( $\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{R})$-3.48 as catalyst.


Figure 3.38: Stereochemistry of Minor Diastereomer 3.54


The relative and absolute stereochemistry of $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$ was determined by X-ray crystallographic analysis. This compound was prepared by reducing $\mathbf{3 . 7 5}$ followed by tosylation.


Figure 3.39: Relative and Absolute Stereochemistry of $\mathbf{3 . 7 8}$

### 3.14.13 Crystallographic Details:

Crystals were mounted using viscous oil onto a plastic mesh and cooled to the data collection temperature. Data were collected on a Bruker-AXS APEX II DUO CCD diffractometer with with graphite-monochromated $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation ( $\lambda=0.71073$ $\AA$ ) for 59 and $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation $(\lambda=1.54178 \AA$ ) focused with Goebel mirrors for 3.54, 3.62 and 3.78. Unit cell parameters were obtained from 36 data frames, $0.5^{\circ} \omega$, from three different sections of the Ewald sphere. The unit cell parameters, and systematic absences in the diffraction data are consistent with P21 (4) and P21/m (11) for 3.48; and, uniquely, for P 212121 for $\mathbf{3 . 5 4}, \mathbf{3 . 6 2}$ and 3.78. The non-centrosymmetric space groups are consistent with the chiral compound molecules and they yielded chemically reasonable and computationally stable results of refinement. Refinement of the absolute structure parameters to nil indicates the true hands of the data have been determined. The data were treated with multi-scan absorption corrections. ${ }^{40}$ The
structures were solved using intrinsic phasing methods and refined with full-matrix, least-squares procedures on F2.

Compound 3.48 consistently packs inefficiently leading to multiple crystal growth, high mosaicity and disorder at the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ groups. The results herein represent the best of several trials. Two symmetry unique but chemically identical compound molecules and seven cocrystallized toluene solvent molecules were found in the asymmetric unit of 3.48. In order to converge the chemically reasonable model, the $\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ groups and toluene solvent molecules were treated as idealized rigid groups and three-dimensional rigid bond restraints were required.

All non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. Hydrogen atoms were treated as idealized contributions with geometrically calculated positions and with Uiso equal to 1.2 (or 1.5 for methyl) Ueq of the attached atom. Atomic scattering factors are contained in the SHELXTL program library. ${ }^{41}$
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$100^{\circ}$
20.2
$9 て ゙ し ー$





































عトレー
Sع＇$\llcorner$
$\angle \varepsilon^{\prime} \downarrow$
ル「Z
$\varepsilon!\cdot z$
Sl＇Z
$\angle 1 \cdot Z-$
6 －て
しでて
S8＇Z

| $98^{\circ} Z$ |
| :--- |
| $98^{\prime}$ |

$98 \cdot{ }^{\prime}$
L8＇Z
88 て
88＇て－
$68 . Z$
06
06
06
16 Z
Z6．Z
Z6．Z
ع6＇Z
เ6＇Z
เ6＇Z
S6． 2
G6＇Z
G1．$\varepsilon$
LC $\varepsilon$
てO＇t
tO
$\mathrm{GO}-\mathrm{b}$
CO
LO＇t




Crude
dr: 83:17
2.76B

Me

| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR03126CRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 300.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 203 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |



(
















$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { LS' } Z \\ \varepsilon S^{\prime} Z- \\ S^{\prime} Z^{-}- \\ \angle S^{\prime} Z^{-}\end{array}\right]$




























(mdd) l

(mdd) $\downarrow$










## Appendix B

## SPECTRAL DATA FOR CHAPTER 3













$6 L^{\circ} \downarrow \mathrm{t}$
$18{ }^{\circ} \downarrow \mathrm{L}$

| $66 . \downarrow$ |
| :--- |
| $10 \cdot \mathrm{G}$ |



$$
3 . S 11
$$

| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05082B.1.fid |  |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI 3 |
| 3 Temperature | 296.9 |  |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |  |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 128 |  |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |  |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7300 |  |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |  |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |  |




$6 L^{\circ} \downarrow \mathrm{t}$
$18{ }^{\circ} \downarrow \mathrm{L}$

| $66 . \downarrow$ |
| :--- |
| $10 \cdot \mathrm{G}$ |



$$
3 . S 11
$$

| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05082B.1.fid |  |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI 3 |
| 3 Temperature | 296.9 |  |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |  |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 128 |  |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |  |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7300 |  |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |  |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |  |






## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Chl 220nm |  |  | PeakTable |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| $1)$ | 10.881 | 1546789 | 105485 | 49.965 | -52.192 |
| $2 \mid$ | 11.945 | 1548959 | 96625 | 50.035 | 47.808 |
| Total |  | 3095748 | 202110 | 100.000 | $\underline{100.000}$ |



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 11.341 | 6877760 | 429717 | 88.925 | 89.090 |
| 2 | 12.722 | 856564 | 52623 | $\boxed{11.075}$ | 10.910 |
| Total |  | 7734330 | 482340 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 11.343 | 11403339 | 714499 | 88.999 | 89.219 |
| 2 | 12.724 | 1409584 | 86336 | 11.001 | 10.781 |
| Total |  | 12812924 | 800835 | 100.000 | 100.000 |



3.18

20.1
$+0 \cdot$
SO＇ $20^{\circ}$ $20 \cdot$ 01 $91 \cdot$ LL． 61.7 $61^{\circ}$
しでし
しでし てて＇し てでし とでし sで sでレ 89＇ $69^{\circ}$ 0L＇ LL＇L LL．し ZL＇レ EL＇L カLL $\stackrel{\square}{\square \cdot} \cdot \square$
カレZ

## カレて

Sl＇Z
91・て

ャでて
GZ゙て
9 9＇Z $^{2}$
9 9でて
Lでて
Lでて
8でて
6て＇Z $0 \varepsilon$ て เどて
てと＇乙
とと＇乙
09 ．$\varepsilon$
เ9 ${ }^{-} \varepsilon$
S8．$\varepsilon$
68 ．$\varepsilon$
いし
で・く
$\stackrel{m}{~}$
$81 \cdot 2$
61.2
$61^{\circ} 2$
0でく
しでし」

$98 \cdot$


|  ヘヘヘN八人 人 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | Value |
| 1 Title | DVR050780．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 11 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |

\[

\]



| 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



| 1.0 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | -0.5 | -1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



3.23



しでし入
8 8゙L $^{87}$

| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR05078E．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 7 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |

3.24




3.25


| Parameter |  | Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR02205 ETHYL BR WEIREB AMIDE.1.fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 298.0 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 128 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 | Nucleus | 1 H |



|  |
| :---: |
| SO＇L－ |
| $90^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ |
| てでし |
| とでし |
| 七でし |
| ¢でし |
| ¢でし |
| 9 9＇レ |
| $9 て ゙ \downarrow$ |
| Lでし |
| $0 \mathrm{C}^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ |

L゙し

$\varepsilon L \cdot$
$\varepsilon L^{\circ} L-1$
$\nabla L L \cdot$
$\square L^{\circ} L$
S8．1－

| $9 L^{\prime}$ |
| :--- |
| $9 L^{\prime}$ |

くいて
8トでて
sでて
Lでて
2でて
$8 て$
8でて

| $0 \varepsilon$ |
| :--- |
| 29 |
| 29 |


| 79 |
| :--- |
| 98 |
| 98 |

$\left.\begin{array}{l}98^{\circ} \varepsilon \\ 88^{\circ} \varepsilon\end{array}\right]$
GでL
$9 Z^{\circ}\llcorner$
$9 て ゙ く$

$\downarrow \varepsilon$ ¿


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR01297product．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 8 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 101 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |

$78{ }^{\circ} 0$
98.0 $98^{\circ} 0$ $\angle 80^{\circ} 0$ $88^{\circ} 0$ 060 しでし てでし とでし とでし七でし
ャて＇し GZ： Gでし 9でし
 －で しでし 8でし 8でし 6てし 6で 6でレ 6でレ 0 0．レ

OG＇
0G＇ $0 \mathrm{O}^{\prime}$
LG＇
ZG＇

ZL．
06

| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR02121syn1．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 8 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 101 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |
|  |  |


－



| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR02121anti1．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 8 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 114 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency 600.32 |  |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |







| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR04226.2.fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 297.3 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 90 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 3.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 11.6200 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency | 564.81 |
| 9 | Nucleus | 19 F |


カ8＇ャて— 99＊ 1 －
ZZ＇OS－
$\angle カ 19 —$


$160^{\circ}$
26
20 $\checkmark 6.0$
80．1
60 1
$\rightarrow L^{\circ}$
GL．
92.

LL．
8 $L^{\circ}$
8Lレ $08^{\circ}\llcorner$
ع8．
七8．
S8．
S8．
$98 \cdot$
$\angle 8.1$
08 ${ }^{\circ}$ Z
$\stackrel{N}{\infty}$
18＇Z
て8 $て$
Z8＇Z
と8＇${ }^{\circ}$
$89^{\circ} \dagger$
$89^{\circ} \circ$
69＊$\downarrow$
0 $L^{\circ} \downarrow$
しぐ
と8 $\downarrow$
$98^{\circ} \downarrow$
L8＇も
$68^{\circ} \downarrow$
し6．
て6
Z
Z6．9
Z6．9
Z6．9
ع6＇9
ع6•9
ع6．9
ع6＇9

Gl．L
$9 l^{\circ} 2$
91．




$\varepsilon 8.0$
98.0
98.0 SO： 20．1 ャ9・レ 99＇ 99＇ 29．1 29． 89． 89． $69 \cdot 1$
ع6．
七6．
S6． g6．
96．
L6．
$00 \cdot \varepsilon$
$\begin{array}{r}10 \varepsilon \\ 10 \\ \hline\end{array}$
ع0＇$\varepsilon$
LL＇$L^{\circ}$
七8＊$\downarrow$
$\stackrel{7}{\square} \downarrow$
G8．$\downarrow$
$98^{\circ} \downarrow$
$\angle 8{ }^{\circ} \downarrow$
$88^{\circ} \downarrow$
$68^{\circ} \downarrow$
て6 $\downarrow$
$80^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$
$80^{\circ} \angle$
$60^{\circ} 2$
$60^{\circ} 2$

てト난
てい＇し
$\varepsilon L^{\circ}$
とでく
とでし
ャでく

3．34B


Parameter
1 Title
2 Solvent
3 Temperature 4 Number of Scans

5 Receiver Gain 6 Relaxation Delay

7 Pulse Width $\begin{array}{ll}5 \text { Receiver Gain } & 256\end{array}$
16 1.0000 00 $\angle^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.905 | 2190844 | 95013 | 50.043 | 52.727 |
| 2 | 15.048 | 2187053 | 85184 | 49.957 | 47.273 |
| Total |  | 4377897 | 180197 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210 nm |
| :--- |
| Peak\# Ret. Time Area Height Area $\%$ Height $\%$ <br> 1 13.906 4055770 175507 50.093 $52.761 \mid$ <br> 2 15.050 4040646 157140 49.907 47.239 <br> Total  1 8096415 332647 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04136 SYN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04136 SYN 2 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04136 SYN 2 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 7 | Bn N |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |
| Data File Name | DVR04136 SYN 2_7142016_1001 AM_7.Icd | Ph Me |
| Method File Name | col2_0.8isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.lcm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | 3.34A |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 91\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 7/14/2016 1:25:10 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 7/14/2016 1:55:11 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector ACh1 220nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.858 | 5398412 | 229800 | 95.553 | 95.199 |
| 2 | 15.236 | 251218 | 11590 | 4.447 | 4.801 |
| Total |  | 5649631 | 241390 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


|  |  | PcakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 13.859 | 9954946 | 422399 | 95.449 | 95.115 |
| 2 | 15.236 | 474650 | 21693 | 4.551 | 4.885 |
| Total |  | 10429596 | 444092 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04135RAC ANTI 3_7162016_1752 PM_2.Icd: LC User |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04135RAC ANTI 3 |  | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Sample ID | : DVR04135RAC ANTI 3 |  | 1 三 |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  | N |
| Vail \# | : 6 |  | Me |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04135RAC ANTI 3_7162016_1752 PM_2.Icd | ( | 3.34B |
| Method File Name | : col2_0.8isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and $210 . \mathrm{lcm}$ | (-) | racemic |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |  |
| Data Acquired | : 7/16/2016 6:38:35 PM |  |  |
| Data Processed | : 7/16/2016 10:46:56 PM |  |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 37.456 | 817118 | 11850 | 49.593 | 53.836 |
| 2 | 40.653 | 830543 | 10161 | 50.407 | 46.164 |
| Total |  | 1647661 | 22011 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cl12 2 10nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 37.456 | 1545683 | 22392 | 49.041 | 53.793 |
| 2 | 40.656 | 1606133 | 19234 | 50.959 | 46.207 |
| Total |  | 3151816 | 41627 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04135 AN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | LC User |  |
| Sample Name | DVR04135 ANTI 3 |  |
| Sample ID | DVR04135 ANTI 3 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Tray\# | 1 | Bn |
| Vail \# | 7 | N |
| Injection Volume | 2 uL | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{Me}$ |
| Data File Name | DVR04135 ANTI 3_7162016_1752 PM_4.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | col2_0.8isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.1cm | 3.34B |
| Batch File Name | DMM.Icb | 83\% ee |
| Report File Name | Default.lcr | 83\% ee |
| Data Acquired | 7/16/2016 8:19:26 PM |  |
| Data Processed | 7/16/2016 10:48:54 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210 nm

| Peakif | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 36.585 | 3325547 | 46346 | 90.964 | 90.776 |
| 2 | 40.569 | 330327 | 4709 | 9.036 | 9.224 |
| Total |  | 3655875 | 51055 | 100.000 | 100.000 |





3.39


| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR05078I．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 9 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |






ल
ल





Sع'Z91-0どZ91- SZ'Z91-
-144.60

$\begin{array}{lll}-144.60 & -144.66 & -144.72\end{array}$

86'SGL- 76 'SGL- 06'SGL-



3.41


$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { F } 00^{\circ} \mathrm{Z} \\ \text { 上 } 96^{\circ} \mathrm{L}\end{array}\right.$



3.42

| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR05078M．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 9 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |




3.43
$66^{\circ} 0$

| $00 \cdot 1$ |
| :--- |
| 20. |


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05078K．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 8 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 1.0000 |
| 8 | 15.0000 |
| 9 | Spectrometer Frequency 400.13 |
|  | 1 H |


| 0 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | -0.5 | -1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |




${ }_{0}{ }^{\circ}$
$88^{\circ} 0$
06.0
02.

て8．1
Z8．1
Z8＇



 78．
G8．
18て
て8＇て
ع8＇乙
ع8＇乙
$78^{\circ} \mathrm{Z}$
$\mathrm{G} 8^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}$

เ6．9
Z6．9
Z6．9
て6．9
ع6．9マ
L．＇
LI． 2
$81^{\circ}$
GでL
9で
9で
しでし
Lで
しでし
8で
SE．
$9 \varepsilon^{\prime} L$
$9 \varepsilon^{\prime}$
LE＇L
LE＇L
$L \varepsilon^{\circ} \angle$
$8 \varepsilon^{\circ} L^{ـ}$





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIData\DMMIDVR04150 RAC SYN 1_822016_841 AM_25.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.001 | 1683886 | 9654 | 48.958 | $56.693 \mid$ |
| 2 | 16.920 | 1755548 | 73745 | 51.042 | 43.307 |
| 2 |  | 3439434 | 170286 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.003 | 2977086 | 170612 | 48.719 | 56.656 |
| 2 | 16.922 | 3133617 | 130525 | 51.281 | 43.344 |
| Total |  | 6110703 | 301138 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04150 SY <br> : LC User | 29.1cd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04150 SYN 1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04150 SYN 1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail\# | : 4 | Bn |
| Injection Volume | : 1 uL | , |
| Data File Name | : DVR04150 SYN 1_822016_841 AM_29.lcd | Ph Et |
| Method File Name | : col3_3isoiPA_20min_1ML_220and210.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.44A |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 85\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 8/2/2016 8:28:03 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 8/2/2016 8:48:05 PM |  |

## <Chromatogram>


mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 13.016 | 94791 | 5413 | 7.531 | 9.707 |
| 2 | 16.928 | 1163865 | 50348 | 92.469 | 90.293 |
| Total |  | 1258656 | 55761 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.017 | 166990 | 9557 | 7.511 | 9.698 |
| 2 | 16.930 | 2056243 | 88980 | 92.489 | 90.302 |
| Total |  | 2223234 | 98536 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04150 ANTI_812016_1017 AM_2.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 21.365 | 326032 | 11828 | 90.671 | 92.066 |
| 2 | 23.468 | 33547 | 1019 | 9.329 | 7.934 |
| Total |  | 359579 | 12847 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| $1 \mid$ | 21.366 | 585715 | 21277 | 90.446 | 92.013 |
| 2 | 23.473 | 61872 | 1847 | 9.554 | 7.987 |
| Total |  | 647587 | 23124 | 100.000 | 100.000 |



| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR04130CRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 297.8 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 144 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |



### 3.47B
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## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report $====$

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04128RAC D <br> : LC User | M_4.lcd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04128RAC D1 | $\mathrm{O} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Sample ID | : DVR04128RAC D1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | Bn |
| Vail \# | : 1 | P |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | Ph Me |
| Data File Name | : DVR04128RAC D1_7182016_1401 PM_4.lcd |  |
| Method File Name | : col3_2isoiPA_30min_1ML_254and210.1cm | 3.47 A |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 7/18/2016 3:52:45 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 7/18/2016 4:22:47 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.792 | 145324 | 6641 | 50.250 | 55.124 |
| 2 | 18.927 | 143877 | 5406 | 49.750 | 44.876 |
| Total |  | 289200 | 12047 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.794 | 3980250 | 182070 | 50.162 | 55.173 |
| 2 | 18.926 | 3954586 | 147927 | 49.838 | 44.827 |
| Total |  | 7934836 | 329997 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04128 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04128 D1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04128 D1 | $\xrightarrow{\mathrm{O}}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 | Br |
| Vail \# | : 2 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | Ph Me |
| Data File Name | : DVR04128 D1-7182016_1401 PM_8.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col3_2isoiPA_30min_1ML_254and210.lcm | 3.47A |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 90\% ee |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 7/18/2016 5:03:45 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 7/18/2016 5:33:46 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 15.809 | 4289 | 192 | 5.271 | 6.220 |
| 2 | 18.967 | 77076 | 2897 | 94.729 | 93.780 |
| Total |  | 81364 | 3089 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.837 | 104022 | 4891 | 4.655 | 5.792 |
| 2 | 18.968 | 2130706 | 79554 | 95.345 | 94.208 |
| Totai |  |  | 2234727 | 84445 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Chl 220nm |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| $1 \mid$ | 27.745 | 457217 | 9571 | 51.168 | 52.288 |
| $2 \mid$ | 30.543 | 436342 | 8733 | 48.832 | 47.712 |
| Total |  | 893559 | 18304 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 27.747 | 851750 | 17849 | 51.218 | 52.190 |
| $2 \mid$ | 30.542 | 811240 | 16351 | 48.782 | 47.810 |
| Total |  | 1662990 | 34200 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \# Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04128 ANTI D2_7192016_1355 PM_6.Icd
: LC User
: DVR04128 ANTI D2
DVR04128 ANTI D2
: 1
: 3
1 uL
: DVR04128 ANTI D2_7192016_1355 PM_6.Icd
: col2_0.8isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210. $\overline{\mathrm{cm}}$
DMM.lcb
: Default.lcr
3.47B
: 7/19/2016 3:51:55 PM
80\% ee

: 7/19/2016 4:36:58 PM
<Chromatogram>


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 28.804 | 272983 | 5675 | 10.343 | 12.534 |
| 2 | 31.080 | 2366354 | 39606 | 89.657 | 87.466 |
| Total |  | 2639337 | 45281 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 28.802 | 521687 | 10686 | 10.578 | 12.586 |
| 2 | 31.082 | 4409944 | 74216 | 89.422 | 87.414 |
| Total |  | 4931631 | 84902 | 100.000 | 100.000 |






## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.491 | 2997080 | 118652 | 50.031 | 56.408 |
| 2 | 21.921 | 2993359 | 91694 | 49.969 | 43.592 |
| Total |  | 5990440 | 210346 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


|  |  | PcakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 17.493 | 5481415 | 216292 | 50.105 | 56.428 |
| 2 | 21.923 | 5458508 | 167013 | 49.895 | 43.572 |
| Total |  | 10939923 | 383305 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \# Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04196 SYN1_9262016_954 AM_1.Icd
: LC User
: DVR04196 SYN1 DVR04196 SYN1
: 1
: 2
: 2 uL
: DVR04196 SYN1_9262016_954 AM_1.lcd
: col1_1isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210..cm
DMM.lcb
: Default.lcr
: 9/26/2016 4:04:56 PM
: 9/26/2016 4:34:56 PM
<Chromatogram>


2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.559 | 4033823 | 162734 | 97.235 | 97.433 |
| 2 | 22.117 | 114706 | 4288 | 2.765 | 2.567 |
| Total |  | 4148529 | 167022 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.561 | 7372880 | 296393 | 97.038 | 97.348 |
| 2 | 22.122 | 225026 | 8074 | 2.962 | 2.652 |
| Total |  | 7597906 | 304467 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report $====$

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04192 RAC ANTI : LC User | .lcd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04192 RAC ANTI |  |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04192 RAC ANTI |  | $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |  |
| Vail \# | : 1 |  |  |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL | Ph |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04192 RAC ANTI _9252016_1431 PM_1.Icd |  |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.lcm ${ }^{\text {- }}$ |  | 3.49B |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |  |
| Data Acquired | : 9/25/2016 3:04:06 PM |  |  |
| Data Processed | : 9/25/2016 3:34:09 PM |  |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8.933 | 1508239 | 123366 | 50.180 | 65.477 |
| 2 | 16.638 | 1497399 | 65044 | 49.820 | 34.523 |
| Total |  | 3005638 | 188411 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8.935 | 2705991 | 221558 | 50.166 | 65.484 |
| 2 | 16.640 | 2688042 | 116781 | 49.834 | 34.516 |
| Total |  | 5394033 | 338339 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04192 AN <br> LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04192 ANTI |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04192 ANTI |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | O |
| Vail\# | : 2 | Bn ل Cl |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL | N |
| Data File Name | : DVR04192 ANTI_9252016_1431 PM_5.lcd | Ph Me Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.1cm | Ph Me Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.49B |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 76\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 9/25/2016 4:15:02 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 9/25/2016 4:45:04 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04192 ANTI _9252016_1431 PM_5.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8.950 | 167797 | 13712 | 12.237 | 20.879 |
| 2 | 16.688 | 1203456 | 51963 | 87.763 | 79.121 |
| Total |  | 1371253 | 65676 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 8.952 | 302717 | 24702 | 12.268 | 20.922 |
| 2 | 16.690 | 2164882 | 9335 | 87.732 | 79.078 |
| Total |  | 2467599 | 118067 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
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## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 10.760 | 1093144 | 74436 | 50.032 | 51.502 |
| 2 | 11.537 | 1091760 | 70093 | 49.968 | $48.498 \mid$ |
| Total |  | 2184904 | 144529 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1 | 10.762 | 2254340 | 153508 | 50.098 | 51.537 |
| 2 | 11.539 | 2245525 | 144353 | 49.902 | 48.463 |
| Total |  | 4499866 | 297861 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutions\DatalDMMIDVR04140 SYN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04140 SYN 1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04140 SYN 1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail \# | : 5 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04140 SYN 1_7202016 1046 AM 6.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_15min_1ML_220and210.Icm | Ph Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM̄.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 3.50A |
| Data Acquired | : 7/20/2016 11:43:09 AM | 87\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 7/20/2016 11:58:11 AM |  |

<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04140 SYN 1_7202016_1046 AM_6.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch $1 / 220 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 10.712 | 92346 | 6486 | 6.370 | 6.968 |
| 2 | 11.475 | 1357267 | 86586 | 93.630 | 93.032 |
| Total |  | 1449613 | 93072 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cli2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 1 | 10.714 | 189162 | 13361 | 6.329 | 6.961 |
| 2 | 11.477 | 2799668 | 178582 | 93.671 | 93.039 |
| Total |  | 2988829 | 191943 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04140RAC ANTI_7202016_1046 AM_10.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254nm

| Peakiti | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.305 | 97959 | 5205 | 49.970 | 64.063 |
| 2 | 23.745 | 98077 | 2920 | 50.030 | 35.937 |
| Total |  | 196036 | 8124 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peakit | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.307 | 2280277 | 121019 | 50.026 | 64.053 |
| 2 | 23.744 | 2277909 | 67917 | 49.974 | 35.947 |
| Total |  | 4558186 | 188936 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PcakTable
Detector A Ch1 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.292 | 20287 | 1051 | 16.159 | 25.144 |
| 2 | 23.708 | 105258 | 3128 | 83.841 | 74.856 |
| Total |  | 125544 | 4179 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 210nm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.291 | 454382 | 24182 | 15.632 | 24.942 |
| 2 | 23.709 | 2452271 | 72770 | 84.368 | 75.058 |
| Total |  | 2906652 | 96953 | 100.000 | 100.000 |




| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR04148CRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 9 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |
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| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR04148AD1．1．fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 298.0 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 203 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency 600.32 |  |
| 9 | Nucleus | 1 H |


3．51A



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>
C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04148 RAC D1_7282016_1137 AM_39.Icd


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220 mm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 31.541 | 351187 | 7591 | 51.175 | 53.528 |
| 2 | 34.910 | 335062 | 6591 | 48.825 | 46.472 |
| Total |  | 686249 | 14182 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PeakH $\#$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 31.537 | 659926 | 14299 | 51.196 | 53.593 |
| 2 | 34.908 | 629093 | 12382 | 48.804 | 46.407 |
| Total |  | 1289019 | 26681 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report $===$

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04148 D | 43.lcd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04148 D1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04148 D1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 3 | NO |
| Injection Volume | : 1 uL | Br |
| Data File Name | : DVR04148 D1_7282016_1137 AM_43.lcd |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.lcm | Ph Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 3.51A |
| Data Acquired | : 7/29/2016 5:09:21 AM | 89\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 7/29/2016 5:54:23 AM |  |

## <Chromatogram>


mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 31.504 | 1984056 | 42980 | 94.535 | 94.787 |
| 2 | 34.915 | 114704 | 2364 | 5.465 | 9.213 |
| Total |  | 2098760 | 45344 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| etector A C | 2210 nm |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 31.506 | 3721912 | 80347 \| | 94.562 | 94.757 |
| 2 | 34.960 | 214020 | 4446 | 5.438 | 5.243 |
| Total |  | 3935932 | 84793 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====





1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 25.063 | 269990 | 5265 | 49.936 | 50.107 |
| 2 | 29.031 | 270677 | 5242 | 50.064 | 49.893 |
| Total |  | 540666 | 10507 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 25.072 | 506479 | 9808 | 50.801 | 50.336 |
| 2 | 29.040 | 490498 | 9677 | 49.199 | 49.664 |
| Total |  | 996977 | 19485 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 25.203 | 78122 | 1532 | 9.695 | 9.909 |
| 2 | 28.783 | 727654 | 13928 | 90.305 | 90.091 |
| Total |  | 805775 | 15460 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# $\#$ Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 25.210 | 141313 | 2831 | 9.455 | 9.829 |
| 2 | 28.786 | 1353283 | 25973 | 90.545 | 90.171 |
| Total |  | 1494596 | 28804 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title |
| 2 | Solvent |
| 3 | Temperature |
| 4 | Number of Scans |
| 5 | Receiver Gain |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay |
| 7 | 298.0 |
| 8 Pulse Width | 16 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 1.08 |
| 9 Nucleus | 10.7700 |







## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \# Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:\LabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04167 D1 RAC_8212016_1521 PM_1.Icd
: LC User
: DVR04167 D1 RAC
: DVR04167 D1 RAC
$: 1$
: 1
7 uL
: DVR04167 D1 RAC_8212016_1521 PM_1.Icd
: col2_1isoiPA_45min_1ML_220 and210.Icm
: DMM.lcb
: Default.Icr
: 8/21/2016 4:07:01 PM
: 8/21/2016 4:52:04 PM
<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector $\mathrm{ACh}_{1} 220 \mathrm{~mm}$

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 29.128 | 1305476 | 25180 | 49.826 | 52.953 |
| 2 | 33.478 | 1314597 | 22372 | 50.174 | 47.047 |
| Total |  | 2620073 | 47552 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 29.130 | 2424.328 | 46353 | 49.960 | 52.975 |
| 2 | 33.480 | 2428165 | 41147 | 50.040 | 47.025 |
| Total |  | 4852493 | 87501 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


Pcak'Table
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakH | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 30.066 | 365998 | 6533 | 5.361 | 6.313 |
| 2 | 33.626 | 6460729 | 96957 | 94.639 | 93.687 |
| Total |  | 6826726 | 103490 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04167 D2 RAC_8212016_1521 PM_9.Icd
mAU

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Clı 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.755 | 56733 | 2346 | 50.344 | 59.378 |
| 2 | 24.858 | 55958 | 1605 | 49.656 | 40.622 |
| Total |  | 112690 | 3951 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cli2 210nm

| Peaki\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.757 | 1449925 | 59478 | 50.026 | 59.132 |
| 2 | 24.865 | 1448408 | 41106 | 49.974 | 40.868 |
| Total |  | 2898332 | 100584 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04167 D2 | 3.1 d |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04167 D2 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04167 D2 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail\# | 4 | Bn |
| Injection Volume | 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04167 D2_8212016_1521 PM_13.17d | Ph Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_05isoiPA_30min_1ml_254and210.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.52B |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 76\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 8/21/2016 8:24:48 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 8/21/2016 8:54:51 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>


Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.724 | 1288866 | 53750 | 11.620 | 16.189 |
| 2 | 24.744 | 9802457 | 278264 | 88.380 | 83.811 |
| Tota 1 |  | 11091323 | 332014 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR04186BCRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 64 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 8 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 6.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |







## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====




PeakTable
Detector ACl 2210 mm

| Peakit | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 24.508 | 643739 | 17786 | 49.731 | 64.074 |
| 2 | 43.320 | 650704 | 9973 | 50.269 | 35.926 |
| Total |  | 129.4443 | 27759 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====





1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable

| Detector A Chl 220mm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pcak ${ }_{\text {H }}$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 24.526 | 134003 | 3734 | 6.313 | 10.848 |
| 2 | 43.331 | 1988561 | 30690 | 93.687 | 89.152 |
| Total |  | 2122564 | 34424 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cli2 210mm

| Peak \#eakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 2 | 24.526 | 229459 | 6505 | 6.186 | 10.782 |
| Total | 43.333 | 3479887 | 53829 | 93.814 | 89.218 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 210mm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 10.180 | 1824405 | 113225 | 50.147 | 54.363 |
| 2 | 12.865 | 1813704 | 95049 | 49.853 | 45.637 |
| Total |  | 3638109 | 208274 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Ch1 220nm |
| :--- |
| Peak\# Ret. Time Area     Height Area $\%$ Height $\%$ <br> 1 10.167 1660610 102762 88.791 90.266     <br> 2 12.878 20963  11081 11.209     |
| Total |








## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIData\DMMIDVR04153 RAC SYN_8102016_1351 PM_3.lcd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04153 RAC SYN | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Sample ID | : DVR04153 RAC SYN | Bn |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 1 | Ph Me |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04153 RAC SYN_8102016_1351 PM_3.Icd | 3.54A |
| Method File Name | : col1_1.5isoiPA_55min_1ml_220and210.lcm | racemic |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 8/10/2016 3:37:04 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 8/10/2016 4:32:07 PM |  |

## <Chromatogram>



PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# $\#$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 34.760 | 1036821 | 21570 | 49.769 | 57.706 |
| 2 | 46.865 | 1046448 | 15809 | 50.231 | 42.294 |
| Total |  | 2083269 | 37379 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



PeakTable
Detector $\wedge \mathrm{Ch} 2210 \mathrm{~mm}$

| PeakH | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 34.705 | 279420 | 5785 | 6.590 | 8.862 |
| 2 | 46.613 | 3960833 | 59486 | 93.410 | 91.138 |
| Total |  | 4240253 | 65270 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Chi 254mm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak $\#$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 1 | 14.988 | 190860 | 886.3 | 81.634 | 82.328 |
| 2 | 16.460 | 42939 | 1902 | 18.360 | 17.672 |
| Total |  | 233790 | 10765 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Peakitable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak:" | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 14.990 | 4691540 | 217336 | 81.423 | 82.165 |
| 2 | 16.460 | 1070383 | 47175 | 18.577 | 17.835 |
| Total |  | 5761923 | 264510 | 100.000 | 100.000 |






## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PcakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 25.646 | 2422797 | 65652 | 49.984 | 53.023 |
| 2 | 28.971 | 2424345 | 58167 | 50.016 | 46.977 |
| Total |  | 4847142 | 123819 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIRS-01-247-D1_ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : RS-01-247-D1 |  |
| Sample ID | : RS-01-247-D1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | O |
| Vail \# | : 92 | Bn. |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : RS-01-247-D1_10242016_2114 PM_4.Icd | Ph Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_60min_1ML_254and210.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | 3.55A |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 85\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 10/24/2016 10:06:00 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 12/20/2016 12:42:13 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 26.237 | 210828 | 5600 | 7.591 | 8.553 |
| 2 | 29.466 | 2566655 | 59873 | 92.409 | 91.447 |
| Total |  | 2777482 | 65.474 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



PeakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210nm |
| :--- |
| Peak\# Ret. Time Area Height Area \% 1leight \% <br> 1 43.640 1888494 29071 7.384 8.229 <br> 2 49.056 23688716 $\ldots$ 324191 92.616 <br> Total  25577210  353262 100.000$] 100.000$ |







## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 2 | 16.567 | 1385353 | 59416 | 50.092 | 59.595 |
| Total | 24.139 | 1380273 | 40283 | 49.908 | 40.405 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210mm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.569 | 2486420 | 106893 | 49.990 | 59.569 |
| 2 | 24.140 | 2487449 | 72551 | 50.010 | 40.431 |
| Total |  | 4973869 | 179444 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04176D1 S |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04176D1 SYN |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04176D1 SYN |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail \# | : 2 | Bn |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04176D1 SYN_912016_1826 PM_6.Icd | Ph M |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.Icr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 9/1/2016 8:07:38 PM | 89\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 9/1/2016 8:37:39 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220 mm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Arca $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.561 | 178292 | 7696 | 5.702 | 8.267 |
| 2 | 24.103 | 2948606 | 85402 | 94.298 | 91.733 |
| Total |  | 3126898 | 93098 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 16.563 | 320036 | 13837 | 5.672 | 8.257 |
| 2 | 24.104 | 5321908 | 153737 | 94.328 | 91.743 |
| Total |  | 5641945 | 167574 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04176D2 RAC_922016_1106 AM_2.Icd <br> : LC User |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04176D2 RAC |  |  |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04176D2 RAC |  |  |  |
| Tray\# |  |  |  | - |
| Vail \# | : 1 |  |  |  |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |  |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04176D2 RAC_922016_1106 AM_2.Icd |  |  |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.1cm |  |  |  |
| Batch File Name Report File Name | : DMM.lcb | (土) |  | racemic |
| Report File Name Data Acquired | : Default.lcr |  |  |  |
| Data Acquired | : 9/2/2016 11:52:31 AM |  |  |  |
| Data Processed | : 9/2/2016 12:37:32 PM |  |  |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PcakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak.\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.703 | 1695439 | 49784 | 49.579 | 61.673 |
| 2 | 37.009 | 1724221 | 30939 | 50.421 | 38.327 |
| Total |  | 3419661 | 80723 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PcakTable
Detector A Cl2 210nm

| Peak*\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.705 | 3103114 | 91134 | 49.746 | 61.735 |
| 2 | 37.010 | 3134829 | 56487 | 50.254 | 38.265 |
| Total |  | 6237943 | 147621 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04176D2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired Name | : DVR04176D2 anti |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04176D2 anti |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | - $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail \# | : 2 | Bn |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04176D2 anti_922016_1106 AM_6.Icd | Ph M |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.Icm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 75\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 9/2/2016 1:33:25 PM | 75\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 9/2/2016 2:18:28 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch $1 / 220 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.725 | 532796 | 15633 | 12.406 | 18.626 |
| 2 | 36.984 | 3761888 | 68295 | 87.594 | 81.374 |
| Total |  | 4294684 | 83928 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cl22 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 1 | 22.727 | 982074 | 28668 | 12.515 | 18.662 |
| 2 | 36.985 | 6865144 | 124952 | 87.485 | 81.338 |
| Total |  | 7847218 | 153621 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

$\stackrel{\llcorner }{\dot{m}} \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{m}}$
$91 \cdot \varepsilon$
$91 \cdot \varepsilon$
$\angle 1 \cdot \varepsilon$
$81 \cdot \varepsilon$
8
$81 \cdot \varepsilon$
$61^{\circ} \varepsilon$

$0 て ゙ \varepsilon$
$91 \cdot \downarrow$
91.7

8 8． 7
Z8 $\quad \mathrm{b}$
G6．

$66^{\circ} \downarrow$
$60^{\circ} \angle$

| $0 \mathrm{O}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} \cdot \mathrm{C}$ |

$91^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$
$91 .<$
$91^{\circ}$
L1． 27
81゙く
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| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR04216D1．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 297.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 203 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |


3.57


S6＊ャレー


8 ® $^{\circ}$ ZLレー


#### Abstract

| 10 | 200 | 190 | 180 | 170 | 160 | 150 | 140 | 130 | 120 | 110 | 100 | 90 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 0 | -1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector ACh1220nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Arca $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 18.467 | 779496 | 30751 | 50.358 | 56.225 |
| 2 | 20.558 | 768425 | 23941 | 49.642 | 43.775 |
| Total |  | 1547921 | 54692 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Detector A Cli2 210nm |  | PcakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pcakif | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Arca \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 18.468 | 1419230 | 56009 | 50.219 | 56.182 |
| 2 | 20.562 | 1406872 | 43683 | 49.781 | 43.818 |
| Total |  | 2826102 | 99693 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | : LC User <br> C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04216_10152016_2043 PM_2.Icd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04216 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04216 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 1 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04216_10152016_2043 PM_2.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.1cm | Bn |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | N |
| Report File Name | Default.lcr | Ph Me |
| Data Acquired | : 10/15/2016 8:54:06 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 10/15/2016 9:24:09 PM | 84\% ee |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector AChI 220 mm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 18.654 | 1541824 | 60100 | 90.868 | 92.496 |
| 2 | 20.837 | 154941 | 4876 | 9.132 | 7.504 |
| Total |  | 1696765 | 64975 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210mm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 18.656 | 2802804 | 109497 | 91.979 | 92.920 |
| 2 | 20.836 | 244404 | 8343 | 8.021 | 7.080 |
| Total |  | 3047208 | 117840 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


3.58B



| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR04203D1.1.fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 300.0 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 161 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 | Nucleus | 1 H |


3.58A



| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR04203D2.1.fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 300.0 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 144 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 | Nucleus | 1 H |


3.58B



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04203 RAC SYN_9292016_1421 PM_2.Icd : LC User |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by |  |  |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04203 RAC SYN |  |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04203 RAC SYN |  |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |  |
| Vail \# | : 1 |  |  |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04203 RAC SYN_9292016_1421 PM_2.lcd |  |  |
| Method File Name | : col3_2isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.lcm |  | 3.58A |
| Batch File Name | : DMM. Icb |  | racemic |
| Report File Name | Default.lcr | OMe |  |
| Data Acquired | 9/29/2016 3:07:12 PM |  |  |
| Data Processed | : 9/29/2016 3:52:14 PM |  |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.276 | 2659822 | 77815 | 50.873 | 63.959 |
| 2 | 29.312 | 2568546 | 43848 | 49.127 | 36.041 |
| Total |  | 5228369 | 121663 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.278 | 3778750 | 110421 | 51.048 | 63.956 |
| 2 | 29.312 | 3623583 | 62230 | 48.952 | 36.044 |
| Total |  | 7402333 | 172651 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220 nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.363 | 265768 | 7743 | 4.856 | 7.942 |
| 2 | 29.259 | 5206917 | 89759 | 95.144 | 92.058 |
| Total |  | 5472685 | 97503 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector $\Lambda \mathrm{Cl}_{2} 210 \mathrm{~mm}$

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.358 | 377460 | 11067 | 4.868 | 8.003 |
| 2 | 29.259 | 7376937 | 127221 | 95.132 | 91.997 |
| Total |  | 7754396 | 138288 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 210nm

| PeakH | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 38.557 | 4806533 | 51199 | 51.067 | 53.053 |
| 2 | 43.484 | 4605717 | 45307 | 48.933 | 46.947 |
| Total |  | 9412251 | 96505 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>









## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====





1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 2 | 10.004 | 802330 | 53218 | 50.985 | 68.246 |
| Total | 12.563 | 771334 | 24762 | 49.015 | 31.754 |

Detector A Clı2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 10.005 | 1348201 | 89182 | 50.972 | 68.225 |
| 2 | 12.565 | 1296787 | 41535 | 49.028 | 31.775 |
| Total |  | 2644988 | 130717 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210mm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 10.106 | 126593 | 8417 | 5.283 | 10.226 |
| 2 | 12.618 | 2269788 | 73897 | 94.717 | 89.774 |
| Total |  | 2396380 | 82314 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 24.870 | 1855855 | $47618 \mid$ | 50.177 | $55.620 \mid$ |
| 2 | 30.258 | 1842744 | 37995 | 49.823 | 44.380 |
| Total |  | 3698599 | 85612 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report $====$


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 24.873 | 2991187 | 76619 | 90.165 | 91.787 |
| 2 | 30.304 | 326271 | 6856 | 9.835 | 8.213 |
| Totall |  | 3317458 | 83475 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 24.875 | 5010876 | 128349 | 90.308 | 91.847 |
| 2 | 30.289 | 537780 | 11394 | 9.692 | 8.153 |
| Total |  | 5548656 | 139742 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR04208CRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 300.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 114 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 10.7700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |








## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail\#
Injection Volume
Data File Name
Method File Name
Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04208 RAC SYN_1052016_1934 PM_2.Icd : LC User<br>: DVR04208 RAC SYN<br>0

: DVR04208 RAC SYN
: 1
: 1
: 2 uL
: DVR04208 RAC SYN_1052016_1934 PM_2.Icd
: col3_2isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.lcm
: DMM.lcb
: Default.lcr
: 10/5/2016 8:04:47 PM
: 10/5/2016 8:34:50 PM


Report File Name
<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PcakTable
Detector $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{Ch}_{1} 220 \mathrm{~mm}$

| Peakit | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.639 | 2341462 | 88122 | 49.919 | 54.847 |
| 2 | 21.308 | 2349054 | 72547 | 50.081 | 45.153 |
| Total |  | 4690517 | 160669 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Cli2 210 mm

| Peakít | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.641 | 3828553 | 144185 | 49.931 | 54.846 |
| 2 | 21.309 | 3839066 | 118705 | 50.069 | 45.154 |
| Total |  | 7667619 | 262890 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



PeakTable
Detector ACh1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.692 | 244609 | 9507 | 4.360 | 5.410 |
| 2 | 21.293 | 5366253 | 166221 | 95.640 | 94.590 |
| Total |  | 5610862 | 175728 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peakít | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 17.695 | 399783 | 15548 | 4.355 | 5.400 |
| 2 | 21.294 | 8780463 | 272387 | 95.645 | 94.600 |
| Total |  | 9180246 | 287934 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

# ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ==== 

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04208 rac d2_1062016_1716 PM_2.lcd : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | DVR04208 rac d2 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04208 rac d2 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | Bn |
| Vail \# | : 2 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04208 rac d2_1062016_1716 PM_2.lcd |  |
| Method File Name | : col3_8isolPA_60min_1mL_254and280.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 10/6/2016 5:46:50 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 10/6/2016 6:46:53 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/280nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 39.537 | 173539 | 2778 | 49.844 | 56.853 |
| 2 | 50.724 | 174629 | 2108 | 50.156 | 43.147 |
| Total |  | 348168 | 4886 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 280nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 39.558 | 46436 | 760 | 49.192 | 56.7651 |
| 2 | 50.692 | 47963 | 578 | 50.808 | $43.235 \mid$ |
| Total |  | 94399 | 1338 | 100.000 | $100.000 \mid$ |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/280nm
Detector A Ch1 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 39.319 | 81.3272 | 12797 | 91.477 | 93.159 |
| 2 | 50.571 | 75775 | 940 | 8.523 | 6.841 |
| Total |  | 889047 | 13736 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 280mm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 39.330 | 219035 | 3412 | 91.165 | 92.897 |
| 2 | 50.566 | 21228 | 261 | 8.835 | 7.103 |
| Total |  | 240263 | 3673 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllllllll}1.0 & 9.5 & 9.0 & 8.5 & 8.0 & 7.5 & 7.0 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 5.5 & 5.0 & 4.5 & 4.0 & 3.5 & 3.0 & 2.5 & 2.0 & 1.5 & 1.0 & 0.5 & 0.0 & -0.5 & -1\end{array}$



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIRS-01-240-RES | 220 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : RS-01-240-RES |  |
| Sample ID | : RS-01-240-RES |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | 13. |
| Vail \# | : 91 |  |
| Injection Volume | 2 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : RS-01-240-RES_10122016_1001 AM_2.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col5_3isoiPA_60min_1.0ML_254and210.lcm |  |
| Batch File Name | DMM.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 10/12/2016 10:16:44 AM |  |
| Data Processed | : 10/12/2016 11:16:45 AM |  |

<Chromatogram>


## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210 nm

| PeakH | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.523 | 5197100 | 268121 | 49.269 | 52.943 |
| 2 | 15.710 | 5351355 | 238314 | 50.731 | 47.057 |
| Total |  | 105.48455 | 506435 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

# ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ==== 

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIRS-01-229-final_ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |
| Sample Name | : RS-01-229-final |
| Sample ID | : RS-01-229-final |
| Tray\# | : 1 |
| Vail \# | : 92 |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |
| Data File Name | : RS-01-229-final_10122016_1001 AM_3.lcd |
| Method File Name | : col5_3isoiPA_60min_1.0ML_254and210.Icm |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |
| Data Acquired | : 10/12/2016 11:17:19 AM |
| Data Processed | : 10/12/2016 12:17:22 PM |

<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIRS-01-229-final_10122016_1001 AM_3.lcd



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.522 | 80975 | 4207 | 91.552 | 92.401 |
| 2 | 15.697 | 7472 | 346 | 8.448 | 7.599 |
| Total |  | 88447 | 4553 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.523 | 2016783 | 105053 | 91.495 | 92.403 |
| 2 | 15.688 | 187468 | 8638 | 8.505 | 7.597 |
| Total |  | 2204252 | 113690 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch $1 / 254 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 42.877 | 211348 | 3617 | 50.119 | 60.969 |
| 2 | 54.749 | 210348 | 2316 | 49.881 | 39.031 |
| Total |  | 421696 | 5933 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 1 | 42.868 | 4542037 | 78030 | 50.118 | 61.045 |
| 2 | 54.746 | 4520585 | 49793 | 49.882 | 38.955 |
| Total |  | 9062621 | 127824 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 42.636 | 2163440 | 36678 | 88.746 | 92.388 |
| 2 | 55.191 | 274361 | 3022 | 11.254 | 7.612 |
| Total |  | 2437801 | 39700 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05049CRD CDCL3.1.fid |
| 2 | Solvent |
| 3 | Temperature |
| 4 | Number of Scans |
| 5 | Receiver Gain |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay |
| 7 | 16 |
| 8 | 10 |
| 8 Splse Width | 1.0000 |
| 9 | 15.0000 |


8.288 .268 .248 .22
3.62A





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Chl 254 nm |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 15.881 | 4746999 | 191118 | 50.154 | 53.475 |
| 2 | 18.069 | 4717929 | 166282 | 49.846 | 46.525 |
| Total |  | 9464928 | 357400 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.883 | 7628150 | 306467 | 50.087 | 53.427 |
| 2 | 18.071 | 7601695 | 26148 | 49.913 | 46.573 |
| Total |  | 15229845 | 573615 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.458 | 5749436 | 242233 | 99.419 | 99.426 |
| 2 | 17.698 | 33618 | 1397 | 0.581 | 0.574 |
| Total |  | 5783054 | 243630 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.460 | 9262467 | 388183 | 99.470 | 99.457 |
| 2 | 17.693 | 49334 | 2118 | 0.530 | 0.543 |
| Total |  | 9311801 | 390302 | 100.000 | 100.000 |




| - | ${ }_{\text {d }}^{\text {d }}$ | ๕ |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \#
Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05024 RAC COL1_292017_1055 AM_4.Icd : LC User
: DVR05024 RAC COL1
: DVR05024 RAC COL1
: 1
: 1
: 3 uL
: DVR05024 RAC COL1_292017_1055 AM_4.Icd
: col1_5isoiPA_30min_1M̄L_220and210.lcm
: DMM.Icb
: Default.Icr
: 2/9/2017 12:35:22 PM
: 2/9/2017 1:05:25 PM
<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch $1 / 220 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable

| Detector A Chl 220 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 8.634 | 7177016 | 581006 | 49.806 | 54.856 |
| 2 | 10.745 | 7232806 | 478140 | 50.194 | 45.144 |
| Total |  | 14409822 | 1059146 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


|  |  |  |  | Table |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 8.636 | 14177266 | 1151903 | 49.779 | 54.792 |
| 2 | 10.746 | 14302886 | 950428 | 50.221 | 45.208 |
| Total |  | 28480152 | 2102331 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR05024 col1_292017_1055 AM_15.Icd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR05024 col1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Sample ID | : DVR05024 col1 | Me |
| Tray\# | : 1 | C-Me |
| Vail \# | :2 | $\bigcirc \mathrm{Me} \mathrm{Me}$ |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR05024 col1_292017_1055 AM_15.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_30̄min_1ML_220and 210.1 cm | Syn $88 \%$ |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | 88\% ee |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 2/10/2017 12:29:01 AM |  |
| Data Processed | : 2/10/2017 12:59:03 AM |  |

## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8.623 | 10504819 | 836720 | 94.139 | 94.827 |
| 2 | 10.790 | 653983 | 45642 | 5.861 | 5.173 |
| Total |  | 11158802 | 882362 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8.625 | 20521889 | 1601647 | 94.125 | 94.719 |
| 2 | 10.791 | 1280955 | 89297 | 5.875 | 5.281 |
| Total |  | 21802844 | 1690944 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
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## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume
Data File Name
Method File Name
Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIData\DMMIDVR05053 SYN RAC_3222017_1208 PM_2.Icd
: LC User
: DVR05053 SYN RAC
: DVR05053 SYN RAC
: 1
: 7
: 3 uL
: DVR05053 SYN RAC_3222017_1208 PM_2.Icd
: col4_1isoiPA_30min_1ML_210and220.lcm
: DMM.Icb
: Default.Icr
: 3/22/2017 12:23:51 PM
: 3/22/2017 12:53:54 PM
<Chromatogram>
C:ILabSolutionsIData\DMMIDVR05053 SYN RAC_3222017_1208 PM_2.Icd
mAU

mAU

1 Det.A Ch1/210nm
2 Det.A Ch2/220nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.677 | 4350073 | 105559 | 50.347 | 52.301 |
| 2 | 17.397 | 4290082 | 96271 | 49.653 | 47.699 |
| Total |  | 8640155 | 201830 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 15.680 | 2144959 | 52093 | 50.222 | 52.168 |
| 2 | 17.398 | 2125976 | 47763 | 49.778 | 47.832 |
| Total |  | 4270935 | 99856 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05053R1_ <br> : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR05053R1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05053R1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail \# | : 6 | Ph |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | , |
| Data File Name | : DVR05053R1_3222017_1101 AM_2.lcd | Me Me Me |
| Method File Name | : col4_1isoiPA_30min_1ML_210and220.1cm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.64A |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 90\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 3/22/2017 11:16:45 AM |  |
| Data Processed | : 3/22/2017 11:46:46 AM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/210nm
2 Det.A Ch2/220nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 15.659 | 18070828 | 409433 | 94.732 | 94.656 |
| 2 | 17.670 | 1004850 | 23116 | 5.268 | 5.344 |
| Total |  | 19075678 | 432549 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Detector A Ch2 220nm |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height. | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 15.659 | 9038728 | 206005 | 94.800 | 94.755 |
| 2 | 17.664 | 495833 | 11403 | 5.200 | 5.245 |
| Total |  | 9534561 | 217408 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>


mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

|  |  |  |  | Table |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Chl 220nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 7.973 | 1003185 | 92461 | 50.237 | 58.486 |
| 2 | 11.444 | 993731 | 65631 | 49.763 | 41.514 |
| Total |  | 1996916 | 158092 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | -7.975 | 1917627 | 176028 | 50.094 | 58.360 |
| 2 | 11.445 | 191044 | 125595 | 49.906 | 41.640 |
| Total |  | 3828068 | 301623 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05053 ANTI_3222017_1526 PM_6.Icd : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR05053 ANTI |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05053 ANTI |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Vail\# | : 2 | Ph , لم Cl |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | N |
| Data File Name | : DVR05053 ANTI_3222017_1526 PM_6.Icd | Me Me Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.lcm |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.64B |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 43\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 3/22/2017 4:53:20 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 3/22/2017 7:24:22 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 7.949 | 1032740 | 95668 | 28.309 | 35.617 |
| 2 | 11.390 | 2615418 | 172937 | 71.691 | 64.383 |
| Total |  | 3648159 | 268605 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 7.951 | Area | 1971180 | Height | 182055 |
| 2 | 11.392 | 4977953 | 32655 | 28.366 | Area |
| Total |  | 6949133 |  | 508713 | 100.634 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title |
| 2 | DVRO5096 |





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05096 RAC1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | DVR05096 RAC1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05096 RAC1 | $\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 | MeO , Me |
| Vail \# | :3 | N |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | $\mathrm{Me} \mathrm{Me} \mathrm{Me}^{\mathrm{Me}}$ |
| Data File Name | : DVR05096 RAC1_6222017_1847 PM_2.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col2_2isoiPA_20-min_1ML_220and210.1cm | 3.65A |
| Batch File Name | : DMM̄.lcb | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 6/22/2017 6:58:25 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 6/22/2017 7:18:27 PM |  |



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 7.216 | 335148 | 32765 | 49.851 | 51.031 |
| 2 | 7.971 | 337158 | 31441 | 50.149 | 48.969 |
| Total |  | 672306 | 64206 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Detector A Ch2 210 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 7.218 | 676907 | 66033 | 49.917 | 51.038 |
| 2 | 7.972 | 679157 | 63346 | 50.083 | 48.962 |
| Total |  | 1356064 | 129379 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



Peak'lable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak'\# | Ret. Time | Area | Heakhtable |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 7.159 | 14946443 | 1348215 | Area $\%$ | Height \% |
| 2 | 7.980 | 791193 | 94.973 | 94.971 |  |
| Total |  | 15737636 | 1392 | 5.027 | 5.029 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 12.401 | 1753453 | 102119 | 49.556 | 51.741 |
| 2 | 13.149 | 1763598 | 95247 | 50.144 | 48.259 |
| Total |  | 3517051 | 197366 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Ileight \% |
| 1 | 12.512 | 753.49 | 4503 | 28.007 | 29.709 |
| 2 | 13.239 | 193688 | 10655 | 71.993 | 70.291 |
| Total |  | 269037 | 15158 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peatable |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 2 | 12.513 | 158531 | 9527 | 27.733 | 29.604 |
| Total | 13.241 | 413097 | 22654 | 72.267 | 70.396 |







## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.134 | 28484540 | 949339 | 49.925 |
| 2 | 20.827 | 28569783 | -842484 | 50.075 |
| Total |  | 57054323 |  | 1791823 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report $====$




1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.566 | 4379186 | 167345 | 92.314 | 93.285 |
| 2 | 21.375 | 364615 | 12046 | 9.686 | 6.715 |
| Total |  | 4743801 | 179391 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 17.567 | 7242536 | 276749 | 92.329 | 93.267 |
| $2 \mid$ | 21.377 | 601759 | 19978 | 7.671 | 6.733 |
| Total |  | 7844295 | 296727 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Chl 220nm |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Heipht \% |
| 1 | 11.990 | 1302409 | 76793 | 49.604 | 57.681 |
| 2 | 15.898 | 1323191 | 56341 | 50.396 | 42.319 |
| Total |  | 2625600 | 133134 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


|  |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peal\# | Ret. Time | Area | Heipht | Area \% | Heiọht \% |
| 1 | 11.992 | 3277661 | 194717 | 49.618 | 57.758 |
| 2 | 15.899 | 3328124 | 142408 | 50.382 | 42.242 |
| Total |  | 6605785 | 337125 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====





1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 11.990 | 448172 | 26222 | 17.777 | 23.091 |
| 2 | 15.807 | 2072970 | 87337 | 82.223 | 76.909 |
| Total |  | 2521141 | 113559 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 11.992 | 1122696 | 65808 | 17.661 | 22.853 |
| 2 | 15.809 | 5234057 | 222154 | 82.339 | 77.147 |
| Total |  | 6356753 | 287962 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05064CRD.1.fid |
| 2 | Solvent |
| 3 Temperature | CDCI3 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 160.0 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 161 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 13.1400 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency 600.32 |  |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |



81:19
3.67A

Crude
3.67A





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume
Data File Name
Method File Name Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05062B SYN RAC_4132017_1444 PM_1.Icd
: LC User
: DVR05062B SYN RAC
DVR05062B SYN RAC
: 1
: 1
3 uL
: DVR05062B SYN RAC_4132017_1444 PM_1.Icd
:col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.Icm
: DMM.lcb
: Default.lcr
4/13/2017 4:27:31 PM
: 4/26/2017 8:07:54 PM

## <Chromatogram>



Peak Table
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 9.503 | 6685168 | 499845 | 50.023 | 54.929 |
| 2 | 11.878 | 6678977 | 410134 | 49.977 | 45.071 |
| Total |  | 13364145 | 909979 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume
Data File Name
Method File Name
Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05064SYN_4272017_1056 AM_2.Icd
: LC User
: DVR05064SYN
: DVR05064SYN
: 1
: 1
: 3 uL
: DVR05064SYN_4272017_1056 AM_2.Icd : col1_5isoiPA_35-min_1ML_220and210.lcm DMM.lcb
: Default.lcr

: 4/27/2017 11:12:37 AM
3.67A
: 4/27/2017 4:51:01 PM
<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 9.462 | 18152526 | 1311597 | 90.899 | 92.084 |
| 2 | 11.922 | 1817481 | 112747 | 9.101 | 7.916 |
| Total |  | 19970007 | 1424344 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \# Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05064ANTI RAC 2_892017_1946 PM_2.Icd : LC User
: DVR05064ANTI RAC 2
: DVR05064ANTI RAC 2
: 1
: 1
: 5 uL
: DVR05064ANTI RAC 2_892017_1946 PM_2.Icd
: col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and210.lcm
: DMM.Icb
: Default.lor
: 8/9/2017 7:57:11 PM
: 8/11/2017 11:21:57 AM
<Chromatogram>
C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05064ANTI RAC 2_892017_1946 PM_2.Icd
mAU



1 Det.A Ch $1 / 220 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A ChI 220 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Arca | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.093 | 13862.47 | 54558 | 50.838 | 54.487 |
| 2 | 19.820 | 1340558 | 45572 | 49.162 | 45.513 |
| Total |  | $27268(05$ | 100130 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.094 | 2723976 | 107119 | 50.856 | 54.491 |
| 2 | 19.821 | 2632268 | 89461 | 49 | 4.14 |
| Total |  | 5356244 | 196580 | 100.400 | 15.509 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


|  |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{ChI}^{\text {220mm }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Areal \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 16.599 | 6611030 | 26807 | 74.380 | 77.191 |
| 2 | 19.398 | 227688 | 7921 | 25.620 | 22.809 |
| Total |  | 888718 | 34728 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR05063crd．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 299.4 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 8 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 181 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.9700 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.15 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1H |


4.854 .804 .754 .704 .65
F $6 L^{\circ} 0$
F 2でO
3．68A

3．68B


## 3．68A






## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume Data File Name
Method File Name
Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05063 SYN RAC_4142017_1035 AM_4.Icd : LC User
: DVR05063 SYN RAC
DVR05063 SYN RAC
: 1
: 1
: 3 uL
: DVR05063 SYN RAC_4142017_1035 AM_4.Icd
: col2_1isoiPA_45min_1ML_220 and210. 1 cm
: DMM.Icb
: Default.lcr
: 4/14/2017 12:21:24 PM
: 4/14/2017 9:27:36 PM
<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05063 SYN RAC_4142017_1035 AM_4.Icd



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.437 | 1875039 | 89147 | 49.907 | 51.483 |
| 2 | 14.922 | 188004 | 84011 | 50.09 | 48.517 |
| Total |  | 3757042 | 173158 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.439 | 3640912 | 172661 | 49.757 | 51.429 |
| 2 | 14.924 | 367496 | 163067 | 50.243 | 48.571 |
| Total |  | 7317407 | 335728 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.082 | 15144440 | 630793 | 91.992 | 91.337 |
| 2 | 14.879 | 1318328 | 59830 | 8.008 | 8.663 |
| Total |  | 16462767 | 690623 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.084 | 28213573 | 1139857 | 91.710 | 90.757 |
| 2 | 14.881 | 2550271 | 116082 | 8.290 | 9.243 |
| Total |  | 30763844 | 1255939 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name
Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume
Data File Name
Method File Name
Batch File Name
Report File Name
Data Acquired
Data Processed Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05063 ANTI RAC_4142017_1035 AM_6.Icd : LC User DVR05063 ANTI RAC
: DVR05063 ANTI RAC
: 1
: 3
: 3 uL
: DVR05063 ANTI RAC_4142017_1035 AM_6.Icd col2_1isoiPA_45min_1ML_220 and210.lcm : DMM.Icb
: Default.lcr
: 4/14/2017 3:13:18 PM
: 4/14/2017 3:58:18 PM

3.68B racemic

## <Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 27.804 | 918935 | 16637 | 49.096 | 48.143 |
| 2 | 33.414 | 952791 | 17920 | 50.904 | 51.857 |
| Total |  | 1871727 | 34557 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 27.806 | 1751437 | 32953 | 47.277 | 47.555 |
| 2 | 33.417 | 1953216 | 36341 | 52.723 | 52.445 |
| Total |  | 3704653 | 69294 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 27.087 | 7752624 | 130001 | 76.981 | 74.578 |
| 2 | 33.260 | 2318221 | 44313 | 23.019 | 25.422 |
| Total |  | 10070845 | 174314 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Parameter | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Title | DVR05058CRD.1.fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCl3 |
| 3 Temperature | 300.0 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 181 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 13.1400 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 600.32 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/210nm
2 Det.A Ch2/220nm

| Detector A Chl 210 nm |  |  | PeakTable |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 11.779 | 1892057 | 127392 | 49.826 | 54.694 |
| 2 | 14.772 | 1905263 | 105526 | 50.174 | 45.306 |
| Total |  | 3797320 | 232918 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 11.781 | 991580 | 66313 | 50.039 | 54.729 |
| 2 | 14.774 | 990019 | 54853 | 49.961 | 45.271 |
| Total |  | 1981598 | 121166 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/210nm
2 Det.A Ch2/220nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 210nm

| Peak\# \| | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Heig̣ht $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 11.489 | 8231186 | 578832 | 92.537 | 93.512 |
| $2 \mid$ | 14.258 | 663851 | 40164 | 7.463 | 6.488 |
| Total |  | 8895037 | 618996 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 220nm

| Peal\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 11.490 | 4294914 | 301110 | 92.621 | 93.458 |
| 2 | 14.260 | 342155 | 21079 | 7.379 | 6.542 |
| Total |  | 4637070 | 322189 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/210nm
2 Det.A Ch2/220nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 28.165 | 11971890 | 336483 | 48.889 | 53.786 |
| $2 \mid$ | 32.224 | 12516074 | 289114 | 51.111 | 46.214 |
| Total |  | 24487965 | 625597 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 \mid$ | 28.166 | 5944017 | 166301 | 48.907 | 53.781 |
| $2 \mid$ | 32.225 | 6209711 | 142920 | 51.093 | 46.219 |
| 2 | 12153728 | 309221 | 100.000 | 100.000 |  |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

DVR05058 SYN AND ANTI C:LLabSolutions\DatalDMMDVR05058 SYN AND ANTI_3252017_1721 PM_8.lcd
mAU

mAU


1 Det.A Chl / 210nm
2 Det.A Ch2 / 220nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 210 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 28.742 | 1395448 | 41405 | 76.647 | 78.632 |
| 2 | 33.026 | $425178 i$ | 11252 | 23.353 | 21.368 |
| Tota! |  | 1820626 | 52656 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | -28.744 | 681645 | 20378 | 75.992 | 78.385 |
| 2 | 33.029 | 215346 | 5619 | 24.008 | 21.615 |
| Total |  | 89699 | 25998 | 100.000 | 100.000 |




## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A ChI 220nm

| Peak $\#$ \# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.203 | 1278229 | 47202 | 50.021 | 57.413 |
| 2 | 22.785 | 1277175 | 35013 | 49.979 | 42.587 |
| Total |  | 2555404 | 82214 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210 nm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.204 | 3112654 | 114185 | 50.327 | 57.542 |
| 2 | 22.786 | 3072236 | 8.254 | 49.673 | 42.458 |
| Total |  | 6184890 | 198.439 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

# ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ==== 




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable


PeakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Tim e | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 16. 98 | 1856427 | 73951 | 19.108 | 24.742 |
| 2 | 21.499 | 7859066 | 224938 | 80.892 | 75.258 |
| Total |  | 9715493 | 298889 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
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8で


| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Title | DVR05092D1．1．fid |
| 2 Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 Temperature | 298.2 |
| 4 Number of Scans | 16 |
| 5 Receiver Gain | 10 |
| 6 Relaxation Delay | 1.0000 |
| 7 Pulse Width | 15.0000 |
| 8 Spectrometer Frequency | 400.13 |
| 9 Nucleus | 1 H |
|  |  |

F－10．
下－86．
0
0
0
0




## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR05092 D2 RAC | 6.1 cd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by Sample Name | : DVR05092 D2 RAC |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05092 D2 RAC | $\bigcirc \mathrm{OM}^{-} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 | 1 |
| Vail \# | : 5 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 4 uL | Me |
| Data File Name | : DVR05092 D2 RAC_6172017_1946 PM_6.Icd |  |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_30min_1ML_254and210.1cm | 3.71B |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | racemic |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | racemic |
| Data Acquired | : 6/17/2017 10:18:16 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 6/17/2017 10:48:18 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable

| Detector A Chl 254 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | A rea\% | Height \% |
| 1 | 19.705 | 1217550 | 37219 | 50.784 | 55.753 |
| 2 | 24.252 | 1179977 | 29538 | 49.216 | 44.247 |
| Total |  | 2397527 | 66757 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Arca | Height | Area \% | Height\% |
| 11 | $19.7 \overline{06}$ | 1915901 | 58821 | 50.545 | 55.668 |
| 2 | 24.254 | 1874552 | 46844 | 49.455 | 44.332 |
| Total |  | 3790453 | 105665 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05092 D2 <br> : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR05092 D2 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05092 D2 | $\mathrm{OMe} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\cdots$ |
| Vail \# | : 6 | $1 /$ |
| Injection Volume | : 4 uL | - |
| Data File Name | : DVR05092 D2_6172017_1946 PM_8.Icd | Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_3isoiPA_30min_1ML_254and $\mathbf{2} 10.1 \mathrm{~lm}$ |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | 3.71B |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 48\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 6/17/2017 11:18:57 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 6/17/2017 11:49:00 PM |  |

## <Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A ChI 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | -19.707 | $-\frac{1160996}{}$ | 35980 | 25.661 | 29.905 |
| 2 | 24.124 | -3363385 | $\frac{84334}{4524381}$ | -74.339 | 70.095 |
| Total |  | 120314 | 100.000 | 100.000 |  |

PeakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 19.709 | 1989404 | 57153 | 27.205 | 29.959 |
| 2 | 24.126 | 5323123 | 133617 | 72.795 | 70.041 |
| Total |  | 7312526 | 190771 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by Sample Name Sample ID Tray\# Vail \# Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05092 D1 RAC_6172017_1946 PM_2.Icd
: LC User
: DVR05092 D1 RAC
: DVR05092 D1 RAC
: 1
: 3
: 4 uL
: DVR05092 D1 RAC_6172017_1946 PM_2.Icd : col1_3isoiPA_30min_1ML_254and210.lcm : DMM.Icb
: Default.lcr
: 6/17/2017 8:16:52 PM
: 6/17/2017 8:46:53 PM
<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05092 D1 RAC_6172017_1946 PM_2.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13.250 | 3931393 | 214397 | 50.191 | 54.162 |
| 2 | 15.410 | 3901537 | 181450 | 49.809 | 45.838 |
| Total |  | 7832930 | 395847 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PcakTable

| Detector A Ch2 210 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 13.252 | 6496471 | 351300 | 50.419 | 54.184 |
| 2 | 15.412 | 6388544 | 297041 | 49.581 | 45.816 |
| Total |  | 12885016 | 648342 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====





1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 13.146 | 2098119 | -115398 | 16.430 | 18.876 |
| 2 | 15.224 | 10672153 | 495958 | 83.570 | 81.124 |
| Total |  | 12770272 | 611356 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13.148 | 3449008 | 189265 | 16.599 | 19.176 |
| 2 | 15.226 | 17329891 | 797699 | 83.401 | 80.824 |
| Total |  | 20778900 | 986964 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


0どャレー

$88^{\circ} \downarrow 6-$

SL．LCL
$6 L^{\circ} 215$

| Parameter | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title | DVR04232．2．fid |
| 2 | Solvent | CDCI3 |
| 3 | Temperature | 299.0 |
| 4 | Number of Scans | 1024 |
| 5 | Receiver Gain | 2050 |
| 6 | Relaxation Delay | 5.0000 |
| 7 | Pulse Width | 10.6300 |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency | 150.97 |
| 9 | Nucleus | $13 C$ |



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| LabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04232 rac 1_10272016_853 AM_2.lcd |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | LC User |  |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04232 rac 1 |  |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04232 rac 1 |  | $\mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  | ${ }_{2}$ |
| Vail \# | : 2 |  |  |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL |  |  |
| Data File Name | : DVR04232 rac 1_10272016_853 AM_2.Icd |  | Me |
| Method File Name | : col6_3isoiPA_36min_1ML_220and210.1cm |  |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM..lcb - - |  | 3.72 |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 1 | racemic |
| Data Acquired | : 10/27/2016 9:29:51 AM |  |  |
| Data Processed | : 10/27/2016 10:05:55 AM |  |  |

<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Clı2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 25.312 | 4202740 | 108032 | 49.810 | 54.197 |
| 2 | 31.771 | 4234796 | 91299 | 50.190 | 45.803 |
| Total |  | 8437535 | 199331 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04232 R <br> : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04232 R1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04232 R1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{O} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N} \quad \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$ |
| Vail \# | : 3 | U |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL | , |
| Data File Name | : DVR04232 R1_10272016_853 AM_6.Icd | 1 |
| Method File Name | : col6_3isoiPA_36min_1ML_220and210.lcm | Ph Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lor | 3.72 |
| Data Acquired | : 10/27/2016 10:52:50 AM | 91\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 10/27/2016 11:28:52 AM |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PcakTable

| Peak ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 25.165 | 113659 | 3031 | 4.515 | 5.504 |
| 2 | 31.502 | 2403724 | 52035 | 95.485 | 94.496 |
| Total |  | 2517382 | 55067 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PcakTable
Detector A Ch2 210 nm

| Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| 1 | 25.167 | 199572 | 5343 | 4.590 | 5.606 |
| 2 | 31.502 | 4148749 | 89962 | 95.410 | 94.394 |
| Total |  | 4348320 | 95305 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====




09：8－
GO゙ャレー
L8＇ZZ－
$+0 \cdot 0 \downarrow-$
$8 て ゙ と \varsigma-$
－ $Z G^{\circ}+6$
$9 L^{\circ}+6-$
$10 \cdot G 6$
$9 Z^{\circ}-96$

い゚0くレー

| Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Title |
| 2 | Solvent |
| 3 | Temperature |
| 4 | CDC13 |
| Number of Scans | 298.1 |
| 5 | 1024 |
| 6 | Receiver Gain |
| 7 | 512 |
| 8 | Pulse Width |
| 8 | Spectrometer Frequency |
| 9 | Nucleus |



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Cli2 210nm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.651 | 6437992 | 709044 | 49.747 | 58.028 |
| 2 | 9.543 | 6503513 | 512864 | 50.253 | 41.972 |
| Tota! |  | 12941504 | 1221908 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04264 _11292016_2144 PM_6.Icd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04264 |  |
| Sample ID | DVR04264 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 | $\mathrm{OO}_{2} \mathrm{~N}^{\text {cF }}$ |
| Vail \# | : 4 | Bn |
| Injection Volume | : 2 uL | Et |
| Data File Name | : DVR04264 _ 11292016_2144 PM_6.Icd | Ph Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_2isoiPA_15min_1ML_254and210.1cm | Ph Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.lcb | 3.73 |
| Report File Name | Default.Icr | 88\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 11/29/2016 10:40:54 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 11/29/2016 10:55:57 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254 nmm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.687 | 29874 | 3354 | 5.685 | 7.954 |
| 2 | 9.605 | 495594 | 38805 | 94.315 | 92.046 |
| Total |  | 525468 | 42159 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak't | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.688 | 581319 | 64771 | 5.780 | 8.074 |
| 2 | 9.607 | 9476777 | 737467 | 94.220 | 91.926 |
| Total |  | 10058095 | 8022.38 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04264 RAC 1 <br> - LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04264 RAC 1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04264 RAC 1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 3 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | $\mathrm{OO}_{2} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{CF}_{3}$ |
| Data File Name | : DVR04264 RAC 1_11302016_2048 PM_2.Icd | $\mathrm{Bn}{ }^{\text {- }}$ |
| Method File Name | : col1_2isoiPA_15min_1ML_254and210.1cm | Bn- |
| Batch File Name | : DMM̄.lcb - - | 1 |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | Ph Me |
| Data Acquired | : 11/30/2016 9:04:28 PM | 3.73 |
| Data Processed | : 11/30/2016 9:19:30 PM | racemic |

<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Chl 254mm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.674 | 564738 | 62397 | 49.815 | 58.217 |
| 2 | 9.568 | 568939 | 44783 | 50.185 | 41.783 |
| Total |  | 1133677 | 107181 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Cl2 210nm

| Peak\# | ReakTable |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Retime | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height \% |
| 2 | 6.676 | 10644936 | 1157078 | 49.477 | 57.720 |
| Total | 9.570 | 10870050 | 847565 | 50.523 | 42.280 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR04265 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |  |
| Sample Name | : DVR04265 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04265 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | 4 | $\mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$ |
| Injection Volume | 2 uL | ${ }^{1}{ }^{-} \mathrm{CF}_{3}$ |
| Data File Name | : DVR04265_11302016_2048 PM_6.Icd | N |
| Method File Name | : col1_2isoiPA_15min_1ML_254and210.1cm | 1 |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb - _ | Ph Me |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |  |
| Data Acquired | : 11/30/2016 9:45:24 PM | 3.73 |
| Data Processed | : 11/30/2016 10:00:25 PM | 86\% ee |

<Chromatogram>


PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 254 mm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.682 | 48174 | 5344 | 6.812 | 9.414 |
| 2 | 9.593 | 659029 | 51421 | 93.188 | 90.586 |
| Total |  | 707203 | 56765 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Cli2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 6.684 | 921805 | 102959 | 6.845 | 9.623 |
| 2 | 9.595 | 12544487 | 967024 | 93.155 | 90.377 |
| Total |  | 13466292 | 1069984 | 100.000 | 100.000 |



F $-\downarrow \cdot \varepsilon$
F $-20 \varepsilon$


## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch1 254nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 29.747 | 593529 | 14336 | 49.395 | 57.284 |
| 2 | 39.003 | 608072 | 10690 | 50.605 | 42.716 |
| Total |  | 1201602 | 25026 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 29.747 | 11134103 | 267848 | 50.058 | 57.486 |
| 2 | 39.003 | 11108142 | 198088 | 49.942 | 42.514 |
| Total |  | 22242245 | 465937 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>


PcakTable
Detector A Chl 254 nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 29.727 | 90114 | 2270 | 4.872 | 7.510 |
| 2 | 38.353 | 1759547 | 27962 | 95.128 | 92.490 |
| Total |  | 1849661 | 30233 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 29.733 | 1685056 | 42713 | 4.901 | 7.615 |
| 2 | 38.353 | 32699963 | 518217 | 95.099 | 92.385 |
| Total |  | 34385020 | 560930 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllll}1.0 & 9.5 & 9.0 & 8.5 & 8.0 & 7.5 & 7.0 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 5.5 & 5.0 & 4.5 & 4.0 & 3.5 & 3.0 & 2.5 & 2.0 & 1.5 & 1.0 & 0.5 & 0.0 & -0.5 & -1\end{array}$


Data File C:\Chem32\1\Data\DVR\DVR05065-1 rac IF3 2017-05-10 12-26-42.D Sample Name: DVR05065-1 rac IF3


| Acq. Operator | : SYSTEM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Operator | SYSTEM |  |
| Acq. Instrument | : LC1 Reverse DAD-WPALS Location 21 |  |
| Injection Date | : 5/10/2017 12:27:17 PM |  |
|  | Inj Volume $5.000 \mu \mathrm{l}$ |  |
| Acq. Method | : C:\Chem32\1\Methods \BZV_Initial_05mL_lowerslope.M |  |
| Last changed | : 5/10/2017 12:23:38 PM by SYSTEM (modified after loading) | $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ |
| Analysis Method | : C:\Chem32\1\Methods \BZV_Initial_05mL_lowerslope.M | $\mathrm{OH}_{3} \mathrm{~N}^{+} \quad \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$ |
| Last changed | : 12/6/2016 3:08:01 PM by SYSTEM | Bn , |
| Sample Info | : 1 min 10/90 MeCN/water 30 min gradient 35/65 MeCN/H2O |  |
|  | 30 min hold 35/65 MeCN/H2O | 3.76 |
|  | 4 min 90/10 MeCn/H2O Flush | racemic |
|  | IF-3 rac |  |
|  | $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ |  |

Additional Info : Peak(s) manually integrated


DAD1 E, Sig=280,4 Ref=off (DVRIDVR05065-1 rac IF3 2017-05-10 12-26-42.D)


Data File C:\Chem32\1\Data\DVR\DVR05065-1 rac IF3 2017-05-10 12-26-42.D
Sample Name: DVR05065-1 rac IF3


Signal 1: DAD1 B, Sig=254,4 Ref=off

| Peak \# | RetTime [min] |  | Width <br> [min] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {\left[\mathrm{mAU}{ }^{*} \mathrm{~s}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | Height [mAU] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 38.185 | MF | 0.9771 | 262.44263 | 4.47667 | 48.9665 |
| 2 | 40.513 | FM | 1.5147 | 273.52121 | 3.00964 | 51.0335 |
| Total | : |  |  | 535.96384 | 7.48630 |  |

Signal 2: DAD1 C, Sig=210,4 Ref=off

| eak <br> \# | RetTime [min] |  | Width <br> [min] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ {\left[\mathrm{mAU}^{*} \mathrm{~s}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | Height <br> [mAU] | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 38.198 | MM | 0.9071 | 6546.96143 | 120.287 | 51. |
| 2 | 40.528 | MM | 1.3773 | 6201.35938 | 75.04160 | 48.6 |

Totals : $\quad 1.27483 \mathrm{e} 4195.32926$

Signal 3: DAD1 E, Sig=280,4 Ref=off

*** End of Report ***

Data File C:\Chem32\1\Data\DVR\DVR05065-ee IF3 2017-05-10 14-06-22.D
Sample Name: DVR05065-ee IF3

Acq. Operator : SYSTEM
Acq. Instrument : LC1 Reverse DAD-WPALS Location : 21
Injection Date : 5/10/2017 2:06:57 PM
Inj Volume : 5.000 $\mu \mathrm{l}$
Acq. Method : C: \Chem32\1\Methods\BZV_Initial_05mL_lowerslope.M
Last changed : 5/10/2017 2:03:03 PM by SYSTEM (modified after loading)
Analysis Method : C: \Chem32\1\Methods\BZV_Initial_05mL_lowerslope.M
Last changed : 12/6/2016 3:08:01 PM by SYSTEM
Sample Info : 1 min $10 / 90 \mathrm{MeCN} /$ water
30 min gradient $35 / 65 \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{O}$ 30 min hold $35 / 65 \mathrm{MeCN} / \mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{O}$ 4 min 90/10 MeCn/H2O Flush IF-3 rac
3.76 $1.0 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$


89\% ee

Additional Info : Peak(s) manually integrated
DAD1 B. Sig=254.4 Ref=off (DVRIDVR05065-ee IF3 2017-05-10 14-06-22.D)
 50
DAD1 C, Sig=210,4 Ref=off (DVRIDVR05065-ee IF3 2017-05-10 14-06-22.D)


DAD1 E, Siq-28 04 Ref=off(DVRIDVR05065-ee IF3 2017-05-10 14-06-22.D)
mAU
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-1




```
Data File C:\Chem32\1\Data\DVR\DVR05065-ee IF3 2017-05-10 14-06-22.D
Sample Name: DVR05065-ee IF3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Area Percent Report} \\
\hline Sorted By & : & Signal & & & \\
\hline Multiplier & : & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline Dilution & : & 1.0000 & & & \\
\hline Sample Amount: & & : & [ng/ul] & (not used & \\
\hline Use Multiplier & & tor wit & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Signal 1: DAD1 B, Sig=254,4 Ref=off
Peak RetTime Type Width Area Height Area
    # [min] [min] [mAU*s] [mAU] %
-----|-------|----|--------|-----------------------------------------
    1 38.329 MF T 0.9395 147.16916 2.61075 93.4228
    2 41.436 EM T 1.4913 10.36101 1.15792e-1 6.5772
Totals : 157.53017 2.72654
Signal 2: DAD1 C, Sig=210,4 Ref=off
```



```
Signal 3: DAD1 E, Sig=280,4 Ref=off
```

```
*** End of Report ***
```

```
*** End of Report ***
```





## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Ch1 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 17.124 | 1797024 | 77416 | 50.015 | 54.705 |
| 2 | 20.291 | 1795951 | 64098 | 49.985 | 45.295 |
| Total |  | 3592976 | 141514 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 17.126 | 3072160 | 132476 | 49.987 | 54.689 |
| 2 | 20.293 | 3073760 | 109758 | 50.013 | 45.311 |
| Total |  | 6145919 | 242234 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMDVR204296 D1 <br> : LC User | 6.lcd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04296 D1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04296 D1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail\# | : 2 | Bn, |
| Injection Volume | : 5 uL | 1 |
| Data File Name | : DVR04296 D1_1122017_1914 PM_6.lcd | Ph Me |
| Method File Name | : col1_5isoiPA_30min_1ML_220and $\mathbf{2} 10.1 \mathrm{~cm}$ |  |
| Batch File Name | : DMM̄.lcb - _ | 3.77 |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 88\% ee |
| Data Acquired | : 1/12/2017 8:56:37 PM |  |
| Data Processed | : 1/12/2017 9:26:41 PM |  |

<Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

| Detector A Chl 220nm |  |  | PeakTable |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 17.099 | 12356691 | 518103 | 94.085 | 94.670 |
| 2 | 20.364 | 776888 | 29168 | 5.915 | 5.330 |
| Total |  | 13133579 | 547271 | 100.000 | 100.000 |


| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  | PeakTable |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| $1 /$ | 17.101 | 21012325 | 874462 | 93.919 | 94.550 |
| $2 \mid$ | 20.367 | 1360378 : | 50401 | 6.081 | 5.450 |
| Total |  | 22372703 | 924864 | 100.000 | 100.000 |




## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

Acquired by
Sample Name Sample ID
Tray\#
Vail \#
Injection Volume Data File Name Method File Name Batch File Name Report File Name Data Acquired Data Processed

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05112 RAC COL2_7312017_1816 PM_6.Icd - LC User
: DVR05112 RAC COL2
: DVR05112 RAC COL2
: 1
: 1
: 4 uL
: DVR05112 RAC COL2_7312017_1816 PM_6.Icd
: col2_3isoiPA_45min_1ML_220and210.lcm
: DMM.Icb
(1)
: Default.lcr

: 7/31/2017 7:33:04 PM
: 8/28/2017 9:09:03 AM
<Chromatogram>

C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05112 RAC COL2_7312017_1816 PM_6.Icd

mAU


1 Det.A Ch $1 / 220 \mathrm{~nm}$
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch 1220 mm

| Peaki\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 23.423 | 887881 | 19932 | 50.195 | 52.288 |
| 2 | 25.054 | 880972 | 18187 | 49.805 | 47.712 |
| Total |  | 1768853 | 38119 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 23.427 | 13416497 | 30.425 | 49.195 | 52.327 |
| 2 | 25.058 | 1373982 | 27719 | 50.505 | 47.673 |
| Total |  | 2720.479 | 58143 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutions\Data\DMMIDVR05113 R1_812017_1914 PM_3.Icd : LC User |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR05113 R1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR05113 R1 | $\geqslant$ |
| Tray\# | : 1 | 0 |
| Vail \# | : 3 | NHTs |
| Injection Volume | : 5 uL | Bn |
| Data File Name | : DVR05113 R1_812017_1914 PM_3.lcd |  |
| Method File Name | : col2_3isoiPA_45min_1ML_254and210.Icm | Ph Me |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb |  |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 96\% |
| Data Acquired | : 8/1/2017 8:30:52 PM | 96\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 8/28/2017 9:06:53 AM |  |

## <Chromatogram>



1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

|  |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector AChI 254 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak.\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | 1-leight \% |
| 1 | 23.830 | 1431 | 50 | 2.515 | 4.018 |
| 2 | 25.105 | 55.18 .4 | 1190 | 97.485 | 95.982 |
| Total |  | 56915 | 12.40 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Cl2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 23.737 | 13302 | 305 | 1.922 | 2.063 |
| 2 | 25.128 | 678853 | 14504 | 98.078 | 97.937 |
| Total |  | 692155 | 1.4810 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
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## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.913 | 1640779 | 49207 | 50.076 | 52.291 |
| 2 | 25.029 | 1635815 | 44896 | 49.924 | 47.709 |
| Total |  | 3276593 | 94103 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## PeakTable

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time |  | Area | Height | Area \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.915 | 2351690 | 70527 | 50.093 | Height \% |
| $2 \mid$ | 25.030 | 2342912 | -64325 | 49.907 | 47.300 |
| Total |  | 4694603 |  | 134852 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

| Acquired by | C:ILabSolutionsIDataIDMMIDVR04258 COL1_11 <br> : LC User | 10.lcd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Name | : DVR04258 COL1 |  |
| Sample ID | : DVR04258 COL1 |  |
| Tray\# | : 1 |  |
| Vail \# | : 1 |  |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL | Bn |
| Data File Name | : DVR04258 COL_1 112320161332 PM $10 . \mathrm{Icd}$ | -N |
| Method File Name | : coll 5isoiPA 30min 1 ML 220]and210.1cm | Ph H |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb | Ph |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr | 3.80 |
| Data Acquired | : 11/23/2016 8:08:57 PM | 16\% ee |
| Data Processed | : 11/28/2016 10:02:36 AM |  |




1 Det.A Ch1/220nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable
Detector A Chl 220nm

| Peal\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22.898 | 1498085 | 44612 | 58.180 | 60.219 |
| 2 | 25.021 | 1076816 | 29471 | 41.820 | 39.781 |
| Totai |  | 2574901 | 74083 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable

|  |  |  |  | Table |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Ch2 210nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 22.900 | 2140251 | 63852 | 58.118 | 60.128 |
| 2 | 25.023 | 1542333 | 42341 | 41.882 | 39.872 |
| Total |  | 3682584 | 106193 | 100.000 | 100.000 |




## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====


<Chromatogram>

mAU


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

|  |  | PeakTable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector A Chl 254 nm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 25.749 | 5523757 | 126927 | 50.001 | 52.473 |
| 2 | 33.014 | 5523525 | 114965 | 49.999 | 47.527 |
| Total |  | 11047282 | 241892 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

Detector A Ch2 210nm

| PeakTable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 25.750 | 14973238 | 341657 | 49.948 | 52.416 |
| 2 | 33.015 | 15004329 | 310163 | 50.052 | 47.584 |
| Total |  | 29977568 | 651820 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Arca \% | Height \% |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 32.347 | 50981975 | 932861 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
| Total |  | 50981975 | 932861 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



# ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ==== 

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05088B_682017 <br>  <br> Acquired by <br> Sample Name |
| :--- | :--- |
| : LC User |  |
| Sample ID PM_2.Icd |  |


using ( $R$ )-3.81, >99\% ee

Injection Volume
3 uL
: DVR05088B 6820171612 PM 2.Icd
: col1_1isoiPA_70min_1ML_254and210.1cm Deł.lub

6/8/2017 4:28:27 PM
: 6/8/2017 5:58:36 PM

## <Chromatogram>




1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
PeakTable

| Detector $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{Ch1} 254 \mathrm{~nm}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 16.736 | 9966909 | 385908 | 91.608 | 92.589 |
| 2 | 20.708 | 913061 | 30889 | 8.392 | 7.411 |
| Total |  | 10879970 | 416797 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable

| ctor A | m |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| 1 | 16.738 | 16383132 | 628903 | 91.531 | 92.486 |
| 2 | 20.710 | 1515871 | 51098 | 8.469 | 7.514 |
| Tota |  | 17899003 | 680001 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionslDatalDMMIDVR05088B_682017_1612 PM_2.Icd |
| :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |
| Sample Name | : DVR05088B |
| Sample ID | : DVR05088B |
| Tray\# | : 1 |
| Vail \# | : 2 |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |
| Data File Name | : DVR05088B_682017_1612 PM_2.Icd |
| Method File Name | : col1_1isoiPA_70min_1ML_254and210.Icm |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |
| Data Acquired | : 6/8/2017 4:28:27 PM |
| Data Processed | : 6/8/2017 5:48:30 PM |

<Chromatogram>


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm

PeakTable
Detector A Ch! 254 nm

| Peak\#t | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Areal \% | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 26.097 | 827395 | 220.11 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
| Total |  | 827395 | 220.11 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area $\%$ | Height $\%$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 26.099 | 2270685 | 60158 | 100.000 | 100.000 |
| Total |  | 2270685 | 60158 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====



## ===:= Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | SolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05088A_682017_1113 AM_2.Icd |
| :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |
| Sample Name | : DVR05088A |
| Sample ID | : DVR05088A |
| Tray\# | : 1 |
| Vail \# | : 1 |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |
| Data File Name | : DVR05088A_682017_1113 AM_2.Icd |
| Method File Name | : col1_1isoiPA_70min_1ML_254and210.1cm |
| Batch File Name | : DMM.Icb |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |
| Data Acquired | 6/8/2017 11:28:54 AM |
| Data Processed | : 6/8/2017 12:48:55 PM |

<Chromatogram>


1 Det.A Ch1/254nm
2 Det.A Ch2/210nm
Detector A Ch 1 254min

| Peak\#\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | Height \% |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 40.690 | 1200115 | 17509 | 27.142 | 40.781 |
| 2 | 58.576 | 3221427 | 25425 | 72.858 | 59.219 |
| Total |  | 4421542 | 42935 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

PeakTable
Detector A Ch2 210nm

| Peak\# | Ret. Time | Area | Height | Area \% | 1/eight \% |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 40.689 | 1897306 | 28196 | 27.003 | 40.638 |
| 2 | 58.579 | 5128882 | 41187 | 72.997 | 59.362 |
| Total |  | 7026188 | 69384 | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## ==== Shimadzu LCsolution Analysis Report ====

|  | C:ILabSolutionsIDatalDMMIDVR05088A_682017_1113 AM_2.Icd |
| :---: | :---: |
| Acquired by | : LC User |
| Sample Name | : DVR05088A |
| Sample ID | : DVR05088A |
| Tray\# | : 1 |
| Vail \# | : 1 |
| Injection Volume | : 3 uL |
| Data File Name | : DVR05088A_682017_1113 AM_2.Icd |
| Method File Name | : col1_1isoiPA_70min_1ML_254and210.lcm |
| Batch File Name | : DMM̄.lcb |
| Report File Name | : Default.lcr |
| Data Acquired | : 6/8/2017 11:28:54 AM |
| Data Processed | : 6/8/2017 12:48:55 PM |

<Chromatogram>
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[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard.

[^1]:    ${ }^{a}$ Yields determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ ee determined by HPLC using a chiral stationary phase

