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#### Abstract

A short, diastereoselective synthesis of homocitric acid lactone is described. The key step is a bioinspired aldol addition to set the stereogenic center in an intermediate that requires only modest oxidation state manipulation to complete the synthesis. This approach enables rapid generation of isotopomers in which carbon and hydrogen can be replaced by heavier nuclei at nearly every position.




Homocitric acid (HCA), which often occurs in its lactone form (1), is an important biosynthetic intermediate and a critical cofactor for nitrogenase. ${ }^{1-5}$ The fleeting intermediacy of this compound makes it poorly available from natural sources and has resulted in many approaches to its synthesis from simple starting materials. ${ }^{6-14}$ In order to enable the synthesis of isotopomers for spectroscopic studies of nitrogenase, we developed a stereoselective synthesis from diethyl oxalate. ${ }^{15}$ Although this approach was reasonably streamlined, the number of steps makes this route cumbersome to larger scale throughput. HCA is made biosynthetically by an aldol addition of acetyl coenzyme A (CoASAc) to alpha ketoglutarate (Figure 1). Chen was able to capitalize on this approach synthetically in an efficient synthesis of $( \pm)-\mathbf{1} .{ }^{16}$ Inspired by this result and its potential to offer a short synthesis of (-)-1, we examined
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Figure 1. Biosynthesis of 1 by fungi and the biomimetic approaches to the chemical synthesis of 1 .
several approaches to absolute stereocontrol in the aldol addition, culminating in a four-step synthesis.

We first attempted to develop an auxiliary controlled variant of Chen's aldol reaction. Although there are few examples of ester-based chiral auxiliaries in aldol reactions, the works of Braun and Robin suggested that diastereocontrol was possible. ${ }^{17,18}$ When the enolate derived from double deprotonation of the monoacetate of (+)-1,1,2-triphenylethanol (5) was treated with diethyl ketoglutarate (2), an appreciable amount of aldol product ( $69 \%$ conversion by NMR) was observed (eq 1). Selectivity was modest ( $61: 39$ ) and chromatographic separation proved to be prohibitively difficult.


We next turned our attention to the use of imide enolates, which offer reduced basicity and a broader array of substrates for controlling asymmetry. Although these enolates have been in use for nearly four decades, there are few examples of high levels of diastereocontrol from unsubstituted enolates derived from $N$-acetyl imides. ${ }^{19-25}$ In addition, imide-based aldol additions rarely involve aldol additions to ketones, ${ }^{26-29}$ and there are only three cases using $\alpha$-keto esters. ${ }^{30-32}$ Mukaiyama reported that $N$-acetylthiazolidinethione (7) would add to dimethyl ketoglutarate (8) with $>90 \%$ enantiomeric excess (ee) when conducted with chiral amine 9 as a stoichiometric additive (Figure 2A). ${ }^{30}$ Later, Chamberlin observed good yield
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Figure 2. Summary of acetate aldol reactions of $\alpha$-keto esters.
in the addition of $N$-acetyloxazolidinone (11) to benzyl lactate (12) with low diastereoselectivity (Figure 2B). ${ }^{31}$ Finally, Zanda has reported that $N$-acetyloxazolidinone (ent-11) will add to ethyl trifluorolactate (14) with diastereoselectivity nearly identical to Chamberlin's via the chlorotitanium enolate (Figure 2C). ${ }^{32}$ Importantly, in both cases where the chiral imide-based aldol reactions lacked selectivity, the diastereomeric products were nearly always separable by silica gel chromatography.

Armed with these examples, we set out to find the best aldol conditions for the synthesis of an intermediate leading to 1 . First we attempted to reproduce the Mukaiyama example, and no conversion to the desired aldol product was observed. ${ }^{30}$ Next, following the other examples, attempted additions of the titanium enolates of both an oxazolidinone and a thiazolidinethione to dimethyl ketoglutarate were unsuccessful.

Inspired by the success of the Evans aldol reaction of benzyl lactate previously investigated by Chamberlin, we reasoned that ketoester 4 might be better behaved as the electrophile, perhaps because the extra ethoxycarbonyl group of 2 might be leading to unproductive modes of coordination to titanium. We first tried the reaction conditions of Chamberlin using LDA, but did not observe any aldol addition. We next turned to a titanium enolate reaction and were gratified to observe significant
conversion to product (Table 1). Unfortunately, the aldol addition products were accompanied by varying quantities of both unreacted acetyloxazolidinone and unsaturated ester 17 resulting from aldol condensation (Table 1, entry 1). The alkene configuration of $\mathbf{1 7}$ is assigned on the basis of chemical shift correlation with related compounds. ${ }^{33}$ The configuration of the aldol products was deduced after conversion of the major isomer to homocitric acid (Scheme 1, vide infra) and confirmed

Scheme 1. Conversion of Aldol Product 16a to (-)-HCA (1)

that the modest preference for 16a matched the results of Chamberlin (Figure 2). The alkene side product could be suppressed by conducting the reaction at lower temperature at the expense of conversion (Table 1, entry 2). Although the aldol product could be formed with little condensation by storing the reaction flask in a $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ freezer for 96 h (Table 1, entry 3), the time required and access to a $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ freezer made the method undesirable. The best results were obtained using conditions reported by Crimmins, in which N -methylpyrrolidinone (NMP) is used as a Lewis basic additive. ${ }^{34}$ Under these conditions, yield is higher with shorter reaction times and elimination is suppressed at the expense of diastereoselectivity (Table 1 entries 4-7). Due to difficulties associated with obtaining the diastereomer ratio ( dr ) from NMR spectroscopy, dr was determined by isolation in most cases. The accuracy of the yield-based dr was established by direct comparison to the ratio determined by GCMS, which required the conversion of the aldol products to the corresponding TMS ethers to prevent decomposition by retro-aldol reaction during gas chromatography (Table 1 , entry 6). When this result was repeated at a shorter reaction time ( 7.5 h ), the isolated yield ( $41 \%$; Table 1, entry 7) of aldol product 16a was comparable to the conversion observed by GCMS (46\%, Table 1, entry 6), with slight

Table 1. Aldol Addition Reactions of $11+4$

|  | $+$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{TiCl}_{4}, i-\mathrm{P} \\ & \mathrm{NMP} \\ & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ${ }_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ <br> nor) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entry ${ }^{a}$ | temp ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ); time ( h ) | NMP (equiv) | conv (\%) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | aldol: elim $^{\text {b }}(\mathbf{1 6 a}+16 \mathrm{~b}): 17$ | $\mathrm{dr}^{c} 16 \mathrm{a}: 16 \mathrm{~b}$ | yield of 16a (\%) |
| $1^{d}$ | -78 to -60; 5 | 0 | 60 | 79:21 | 51:49 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| $2^{d}$ | -78; 5 | 0 | 50 | 93:7 | 72:28 | 36 |
| 3 | -78; 96 | 0 | 77 | 83:17 | 71:29 | 42 |
| 4 | -78 to 0; 5 | 2.0 | 68 | 77:23 | 54:46 | 31 |
| 5 | -78 to -40; 8 | 2.0 | 75 | 93:7 | 63:37 | 34 |
| 6 | -40; 11 | 2.0 | 77 | 96:4 | 62:38 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $46^{e}$ |
| 7 | -40; 7.5 | 2.0 | 73 | 95:5 | 56:44 | 41 |
| $8^{f}$ | -40; 7.5 | 2.0 | 88 | 95:5 | 53:47 | 46 |

${ }^{a}$ Unless otherwise specified, reactions were completed with 1.0 equiv of $\mathbf{1 1}$ (or ent-11) to 1.1 equiv of $4 .{ }^{b}$ Determined by integration in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum. ${ }^{c}$ Determined on the basis of isolated yield, unless otherwise noted. See Experimental Section for details. ${ }^{d}$ Prepared with ent-11. ${ }^{e}$ Determined by GCMS after converting to TMS ether. See Supporting Information. ${ }^{f}$ Completed with 2 equiv of 11 to 1.0 equiv of 4.
variation in the dr. The best results, in terms of generating the largest amount of the major diastereomer, were realized at -40 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with the use of excess enolate (Table 1 , entry 8 ) or with excess ketoester (Table 1 , entry 6). The ability to change the limiting reagent ensures minimum loss of starting materials in a synthesis involving isotopomers. Finally, the use of several oxazolidinone auxiliaries derived from $t$-leucinol, 1-amino-2indanol, and $\beta$-amino- $\alpha, \alpha$-dimethyl-benzenepropanol (aka "superquat") all resulted in poorer conversion (not shown). ${ }^{22,25,35}$

Aldol addition product 16a could be easily converted into homocitric acid lactone (Scheme 1). Hydrolysis to the methyl ester was achieved in high yield using sodium methoxide. Although oxidative cleavage was variable, this transformation produced 19 in at least $50 \%$ yield. Final hydrolysis to HCA was achieved in $71 \%$ yield.

In conclusion, we have described a short asymmetric synthesis of homocitric acid lactone. This synthesis was inspired by the biosynthetic pathway that produces natural homocitric acid, and minimizes the use of protecting groups and oxidation state changes. Although the diastereoselectivity of the key step is modest, the ability to reisolate the unreacted oxazolidinone, paired with the small number of steps, makes carrying out the synthesis on gram scale attainable. Based on recent examples of multigram scale titanium-mediated aldol additions, accessing the aldol intermediate on a gram scale is feasible. ${ }^{36,37}$ Importantly, the modularity of the starting materials enables the installation of heavy carbon at many points in the molecule to enable spectroscopy experiments that will discern the mechanistic role of this cofactor in nitrogen fixation by nitrogenase. ${ }^{38}$

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General Information General Methods. Unless otherwise specified, all commercially available reagents were used as received. All reactions using anhydrous solvents were carried out under an atmosphere of argon in flame-dried glassware with magnetic stirring. Anhydrous solvent was dispensed from a solvent purification system that passes solvent through two columns of dry neutral alumina. Purification of reaction products was carried out by flash chromatography using silica gel F60 (230-400 mesh) or by automated chromatography with an UV/vis detector. Analytical thin layer chromatography was performed on 0.25 mm silica gel $\mathrm{F}-254$ plates. Visualization was accomplished with UV light, $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$, or bromocresol green followed by heating.

Instrumentation. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra and proton-decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were obtained on a 400,600 , or 800 MHz NMR spectrometer. Chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) are reported in parts per million ( ppm ) relative to internal standard (TMS, 0.00 ppm ) or residual solvent ( $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 3.31 \mathrm{ppm}$ ). Multiplicities are given as s (singlet), d (doublet), t (triplet), q (quartet), m (multiplet), or combinations of these signals. Infrared spectra were taken on a FTIR spectrometer. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry data was recorded on a spectrometer using electron impact ionization with an injection temperature of $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a temperature ramp of 50 to $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(20$ $\mathrm{min})$ with a hold at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(15 \mathrm{~min})$. The column used had a diameter of 0.25 mm and was 30.0 m long and $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ thick.

For AMM analysis, samples were analyzed by flow-injection analysis into an orbitrap mass spectrometer operated in the centroided mode. Samples were injected into a mixture of $50 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ and $0.1 \%$ formic $\mathrm{acid} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at a flow of $200 \mu \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}$. Source parameters were 5 kV spray voltage, capillary temperature of $275^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and sheath gas setting of 20 . Spectral data were acquired at a resolution setting of 100,000 fwhm with the lockmass feature, which typically results in a mass accuracy <2 ppm.


Ethyl 2-Oxohex-5-enoate (4). Compound 4 was prepared according to the previously reported procedure. ${ }^{15}$ In a flask, magnesium turnings ( $1.230 \mathrm{~g}, 50.60 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were stirred vigorously overnight under argon. A solution of 4-bromo-1-butene ( $2.20 \mathrm{~mL}, 21.7$ mmol ) in anhydrous THF ( 28 mL ) was added in dropwise aliquots over 15 min to the magnesium turnings under argon, ensuring that the THF did not boil, and stirred for 10 min . The solution was carefully drawn up in a syringe, leaving unreacted magnesium in the flask. The Grignard solution was added dropwise to a flask at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ containing diethyl oxalate ( $2.44 \mathrm{~mL}, 18.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) dissolved in anhydrous $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 35 mL ) and anhydrous THF (17.5) and stirred for 4 h at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was quenched with saturated aq $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After quenching, EtOAc ( 20 mL ) was added to the flask and the flask was allowed to warm to room temperature. The two layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(2 \times 30$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo with the rotary evaporator bath set to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a vacuum that never pulled below 40 Torr. The residue was purified by flash chromatography ( $0: 100$ to $5: 95 \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes) to give 4 as a slightly yellow oil ( $3.108 \mathrm{~g}, 89 \%$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.82(\mathrm{ddt}, J=16.8,10.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.1,1.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.95$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.44-2.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.37(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ $\operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 193.9,161.1,136.2,116.0,62.6,38.5,27.1$, 14.1. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data are consistent with published data. ${ }^{15}$

(R)-3-Acetyl-4-benzyloxazolidin-2-one (11). Compound 11 was prepared according to the previously reported procedure. ${ }^{39}$ To a flask containing ( $R$ )-4-benzyloxazolidin-2-one ( $5.00 \mathrm{~g}, 28.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP $(0.079 \mathrm{~g}, 0.65 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 20 mL ) was added $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ( 3.93 $\mathrm{mL}, 28.2 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and acetic anhydride ( $5.32 \mathrm{~mL}, 56.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise over a period of 5 min . The solution was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred overnight. The reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc (50 $\mathrm{mL})$ and washed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ followed by brine $(2 \times 20$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography ( $0: 100$ to 50:50 EtOAc/hexanes) to give $\mathbf{1 1}$ as white crystals ( $6.002 \mathrm{~g}, 97 \%$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.37-7.31$ (m, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.23-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.73-4.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.25-4.14(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.31(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4,3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.78(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.4$, $9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.56(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.4,153.8,135.4,129.6,129.1,127.5,66.3$, 55.1, 38.0, 24.0; GCMS (EI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{\bullet+}[\mathrm{M}]^{\bullet+} 219.1$, found 219.1, $t_{\mathrm{R}}=9.66 \mathrm{~min}$. $[\alpha]_{365}^{23.1}=-194.20\left(c=0.36, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$. NMR data matches reported literature values. ${ }^{39}$


Ethyl (R)-2-(2-((R)-4-Benzyl-2-oxooxazolidin-3-yll)-2-oxoethyl)-2-hydroxyhex-5-enoate (16a). In a flame-dried flask under argon, $\mathrm{TiCl}_{4}\left(1.05 \mathrm{~mL}\right.$ of 1.0 M in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 1.05 \mathrm{mmol}\right)$ was added dropwise to a solution of $11(0.219 \mathrm{~g}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ in anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10$ mL ) at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and was stirred for $15 \mathrm{~min} . i-\mathrm{Pr}_{2} \mathrm{NEt}(0.19 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.1$ mmol ) was added dropwise to the $\mathrm{TiCl}_{4}$ solution, which resulted in an instant color change to dark red. The reaction mixture was stirred for a further 40 min at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. N-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone $(0.20 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.19$ mmol ) was added dropwise to the solution and stirred for 10 min at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by the addition of $4(0.078 \mathrm{~g}, 0.50 \mathrm{mmol})$ dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 7.5 h at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was quenched dropwise with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ over 30 min at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then allowed to warm to room temperature.

The biphasic mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(15$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude reaction mixture (or an aliquot) can be protected as a silyl ether using TMSCl (see Supporting Information) to determine the product ratio by GCMS. The crude mixture was purified by flash chromatography ( $0: 100$ to $30: 70$ EtOAc:hexanes) to give 16a as a clear oil ( $0.086 \mathrm{~g}, 46 \%$ ).

Major diastereomer 16a: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.34(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.80(\mathrm{ddt}$, $J=16.9,10.3,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.69-4.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.35-4.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.22(\mathrm{t}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.17(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.2,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.22$ (dd, $J=13.5,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.79(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.31-2.23$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.96(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.2,170.6,153.2,137.4$, 134.9, 129.4, 129.0, 127.4, 115.1, 74.5, 66.3, 62.0, 55.0, 44.6, 38.5, 37.6, 27.3, 14.2; IR (thin film) $3514,2929,1782,1737,1700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; TLC (30:70 EtOAc:hexanes) $R_{f}=0.38$; AMM (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{6}^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 376.1755$, found 376.1767. $[\alpha]_{365}^{22.7}=-405.15$ ( $c=0.79, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ ). Diastereomer ratio from NMR calculated using the peaks at 3.22 and 3.25 corresponding to major and minor diastereomers, respectively.

Minor diastereomer 16b: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.32(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}$ $=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.19(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.80(\mathrm{ddt}$, $J=16.8,10.4,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.69-4.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.21(\mathrm{t}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.17(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.1,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=18.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=18.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.25(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.80$ (dd, $J=13.5,9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.33-2.24(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.03-1.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.89-1.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 151 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.3,170.9,153.4,137.6,135.0,129.5,129.1,127.5,115.2$, $74.7,66.4,62.0,54.9,44.8,38.6,37.7,27.5,14.3$; IR (thin film) 3525 , 2981, 1782, 1737, $1700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; TLC (30:70 EtOAc:hexanes) $R_{f}=0.50$; AMM (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{6}{ }^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 376.1755$, found 376.1758. $[\alpha]_{365}^{23.5}=214.80\left(c=0.66, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$.


TMS Ether of $16 a$. In a flame-dried flask under argon, imidizaole $(0.294 \mathrm{~g}, 4.32 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to the crude reaction mixture $(0.081$ g ) from the aldol reaction in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ followed by TMSCl $(0.55 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.32 \mathrm{mmol})$ and stirred at room temperature for 24 h . The reaction was quenched with saturated aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting solution was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was washed with brine $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by flash chromatography ( $0: 100$ to $40: 60$ EtOAc:hexanes) to give the TMS ether of 16a as a clear oil ( $0.038 \mathrm{~g}, 17 \%$ over two steps). GCMS of the crude reaction mixture gave a product ratio of (11:16a:16b $=$ 26:46:28): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.35-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.29-$ $7.25(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.81(\mathrm{ddt}, J=16.8,10.2,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.05(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.2,1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.98(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.72-4.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28-4.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.15$ (dd, $J=9.1,3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.29-3.21(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.10$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91-1.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.30(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.18(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.4,169.8,153.6,137.9,135.2$, 129.7, 129.1, 127.5, 115.0, 77.8, 66.1, 61.3, 55.0, 44.6, 39.4, 37.7, 27.9, 14.3, 2.5; IR (thin film) 2981, 1782, 1752, $1707 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; GCMS (EI) $\mathrm{m} /$ $z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{~S}^{\bullet+}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{\bullet+} 432.2$, found 432.3, $t_{\mathrm{R}}=$ 14.10 min ; AMM (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{Si}^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 448.2150, found 448.2149. $[\alpha]_{365}^{22.8}=-247.72\left(c=0.80, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$.


Ethyl (R,Z)-2-(2-(4-benzyl-2-oxooxazolidin-3-yl)-2-oxoethylidene)hex-5-enoate (17): recovered during aldol reactions with 4 and 11; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.34(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.98(\mathrm{t}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.83$ (ddt, $J=16.8,10.1,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.10(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.1,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.4,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.74-4.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.36-4.25$ (m, 2H), 4.25-4.20 (m, 1H), 4.18 (dd, $J=9.1,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.35$ (dd, $J=13.5,3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.80(\mathrm{dd}, J=13.5,9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.57-2.50(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 2.37-2.29 (m, 2H), $1.33(\mathrm{t}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (201 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 168.7,164.3,153.4,148.5,136.60,135.3,129.6,129.1$, 129.1, 121.8, 116.1, 66.5, 61.5, 55.2, 37.8, 33.8, 31.4, 14.2; IR (thin film) 3029, 1782, 1730, 1689, $1640 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; AMM (ESI) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{5}^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$358.1649, found 358.1651.

## COCO2

1-Ethyl 4-Methyl (R)-2-(but-3-en-1-yl)-2-hydroxysuccinate (18). To a flame-dried flask under argon containing the major diastereomer (16a) ( $0.150 \mathrm{~g}, 0.400 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(6.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added a solution of sodium methoxide ( $0.032 \mathrm{~g}, 0.592 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ ( 4.0 $\mathrm{mL})$ dropwise at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1.5 $h$ and quenched with saturated aq $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting solution was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was purified by flash chromatography ( $0: 100$ to 30:70 EtOAc:hexanes) to give 18 as a clear oil ( $0.092 \mathrm{~g}, 98 \%$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.77(\mathrm{ddt}, J=16.9,10.2,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02$ (dd, $J$ $=17.2,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.1,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32-4.23(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.28-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.74(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 174.8$, 171.1, 137.4, 115.1, 74.7, 62.0, 51.8, 43.4, 38.3, 27.4, 14.1; IR (thin film) 3510, 2959, 1737, $1644 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; AMM (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{5}^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$231.1227, found 231.1228. $[\alpha]_{365}^{23.0}=10.78(c=$ 2.31, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$.


Ethyl (R)-2-(2-Methoxy-2-oxoethyl)-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-carboxylate (19). To a flask containing $18(0.167 \mathrm{~g}, 0.725 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{EtOAc} / \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left(5.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 2: 2: 3\right.$ by volume) was added $\mathrm{NaIO}_{4}$ ( $0.826 \mathrm{~g}, 3.86 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by ruthenium(III) chloride hydrate $(4.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol})$. The solution was stirred at room temperature for 1 h during which a light brown precipitate formed. The reaction was quenched with $i-\operatorname{PrOH}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through Celite. The filter pellet was washed with additional $i-\mathrm{PrOH}(4 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the filtrate was collected and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting oil was purified by flash chromatography (10:90 to 100:0 EtOAc:hexanes) to give 19 as a clear oil $(0.0926 \mathrm{~g}, 55 \%):{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $4.34-4.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.98(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=16.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.75-2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.65-2.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.40-2.32$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 175.5, 170.5, 169.1, 83.0, 62.6, 52.2, 41.4, 31.3, 27.9, 14.1; IR (thin film) 2959, 1789, 1737, $1164 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; AMM (ESI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{6}^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$231.0863, found 231.0885. $[\alpha]_{365}^{22.8}=-37.11(c=$ $\left.0.28, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$.

(R)-(-)-2-(Carboxymethyl)-5-oxotetrahydrofuran-2-carboxylic Acid ((-)-1). $19(0.0449 \mathrm{~g}, 0.195 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in TFA/ $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $2 \mathrm{~mL}, 1: 1$ by volume) and heated to reflux for 24 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated and left on the high vacuum ( $\sim 1$ Torr) for 4 h. If necessary the product was purified on a short silica plug ( $0: 100$ to 40:60 acetone:hexanes), but generally no further purification was necessary to give $(-)-1$ as an amorphous white solid $(0.031 \mathrm{~g}, 85 \%)$. If a column was deemed necessary, fractions were assayed for product by spotting on a TLC and staining with bromocresol green, any fractions containing acidic products were collected. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 600 MHz ,
$\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 3.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=17.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.70-$ $2.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.54-2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.43-2.34(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(151 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 178.7,174.1,172.4,84.7,42.1,32.3,28.7$. $[\alpha]_{D}^{20.2}=-6.01\left(c=0.266, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$. NMR data matches reported literature values. ${ }^{15}$
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