Asymmetric Organocatalysis Revisited: Taming Hydrindanes with Jørgensen–Hayashi Catalyst
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**Abstract**

The organocatalytic Michael reaction of easily available 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde and 1,3-dicarbonyl compounds led to cyclopentanecarbaldehydes on a gram scale with low catalyst loading (2 mol%) and high enantioselectivity. The synthetic potential of 4-acyl-hexahydroindenones from intramolecular aldol condensation was demonstrated by Diels–Alder reaction to a tetracyclic derivative with seven stereogenic centers. The diastereofacial preference of the tetracyclic product was confirmed by DFT calculations. The described reaction sequence is characterized by few redox-economic steps and high degree of molecular complexity.
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Since the pioneering work by Wiechert and Parrish in the early seventies on proline-catalyzed aldol reactions, the field of asymmetric organocatalysis has made tremendous progress. Among the numerous organocatalysts developed so far, the Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst and structurally related diarylprolinol silyl ethers have turned out very successful and reliable in a huge variety of different reactions. Depending on the substrates, Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst operates either through HOMO activation of aldehydes via enamine intermediates or LUMO activation of enals via iminium ion intermediates. Detailed mechanistic insight was gained by NMR spectroscopy, kinetic experiments, reaction calorimetry, and computational studies. In addition, several strategies for immobilization have been successfully developed. Interesting targets for organocatalysis are substituted hydrindanes, that is, bicyclo[4.3.0]nonanes, which are important scaffolds of natural products and synthetic bioactive compounds. Selected examples are amaminol A (2), the tricyclic unit of ikarugamycin (3), or the CD ring unit of deoxycholic acid (4) (Figure 1).
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hydroxyindones whose enone moiety allows further functionalization. Their archetypal organocatalytic synthesis relies on the proline-catalyzed aldol condensation towards Hajos–Parrish diketone 5 (Scheme 1)2,30 which was further functionalized in multiple ways to the desired hydridane target compounds. The unsubstituted member 7 of the hexahydroxyindone family was obtained via sequential intramolecular Michael addition/aldol condensation of enone 8 in the presence of MacMillan imidazolidine catalyst (Scheme 1).31

When considering potential organocatalytic routes to hexahydroxyindones we identified the 4-substituted derivative 9 as a promising target for further manipulation. To access compound 9 from easily available starting materials, we envisaged an intermolecular Michael addition of 1,3-dicarbonyl compounds 12 to 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11) followed by aldol condensation of the resulting intermediate 10 (Scheme 1). Surprisingly, little is known about the use of 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11) in organocatalytic Michael additions.32–36 On the other hand, simple 1,3-carbonyl compounds such as acetylacetone and ethyl acetoacetate were only rarely employed in organocatalytic Michael additions.37,38 Thus, we aimed at a robust and reliable route towards hydridanes 9, which should be amenable to preparative scale while requiring a minimum catalyst loading. Furthermore, we wanted to probe functionalizations of compound 9 towards tri- or polycyclic scaffolds.

In preliminary experiments, the stability of different catalysts on the Michael addition of acetylacetone (12a) to 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11)39 was studied (Table 1). When 11 and 12a were reacted in EtOH for 24 hours without catalyst, no conversion of the starting material 11 was observed by 1H NMR analysis (Table 1, entry 1). In the presence of catalysts pyrrolidine (13a; 50 mol%) and L-proline (13b; 30 mol%), respectively, addition product 10a was isolated in only 3% and 4% yield due to decomposition of 10a upon chromatographic purification (entries 2 and 3). The use of Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst 13c (20 mol%), however, provided 10a in 58% NMR yield with 94% ee (entry 4). A solvent screening for the Michael reaction (Table 1) resulted in toluene as optimal solvent giving 10a in 70% yield and 97% ee (entry 11), while additives such as AcOH deteriorated yield and selectivity (entry 12).

### Table 1 Optimization of Conditions for the Organocatalytic 1,4-Addition of Acetylacetone (12a) to 1-Cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst (mol%)</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
<th>ee (%)^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13a (50)</td>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13b (30)</td>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>58^b</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>H2O</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>CHCl3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>hexane</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13c (20)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Determined by GC on a chiral stationary phase.
^b Determined by 1H NMR spectroscopy with 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene (0.53 equiv) as an internal standard.
^c AcOH as additive.

Next, the robustness of the Michael addition with respect to catalyst loading and scale was studied (Table 2). Reducing the amount of organocatalyst 13c from 5 mol% to 2.5 mol% required longer reaction times but both yield and ee values remained constant (Table 2, entries 1 and 2). The best result was realized with 2 mol% of 13c and convenient purification by simple filtration over a silica pad yielding 10a in 72% with 98% ee even on a 10 mmol scale (entry 4). It should be emphasized that the catalyst loading under these
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When ethyl acetoacetate (12b) was employed as nucleophile under the optimized conditions, additional product 10b was isolated in 91% as a (50:50) diastereomeric mixture after flash chromatography (Table 2, entry 6). Unfortunately, the enantioselectivity could not be determined by GC or HPLC on chiral stationary phases. Longer reaction time or the use of neat 12b without any solvent reduced the yield (entries 7 and 8).

In order to determine the enantioselectivity of the Michael addition with acetoacetate 12b by an indirect method, a sequential Michael addition/Wittig olefination was performed (Scheme 2). Following Method A, cyclopentene-carbaldehyde 11 and acetoacetate 12b were reacted in the presence of catalyst 13a in toluene for 24 hours at room temperature and subsequently treated with phosphonium salt 14 in toluene in the presence of NEt3. After workup, racemic cyclopentane enoate rac-15 was isolated with an E/Z ratio of >95:5 and a diastereomeric ratio of 47:40:8:5. In a parallel experiment Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst 13c in a diastereomeric ratio of (55:45) due to the lack of stereochemical control at the C=C double bond of the Michael acceptor in agreement with previous work by Bernardi.34
With cyclopentanecarbaldehydes 10a,b in hand, we examined the intramolecular aldol condensation to the hexahydroindenones 9 under various conditions (Table 3).

First we used bases as mediator. Treatment of 10a with stoichiometric amounts of KOH in MeOH at 0 °C and warming to room temperature for 2 hours resulted in a complex mixture without any trace of the desired 4-acetylhexahydroindenone (9a) (Table 3, entry 1). As other bases also failed [for details, see Table S1 in Supporting Information (SI)], we followed the method of List,31 in which 10a was first deprotonated with KOH in MeOH at 0 °C and subsequently reacted with mesyl chloride in the presence of NEt3 and DMAP in CH2Cl2. After workup, a single product was isolated in 50%, that, however, was identified as the deacetylated enone 7 (entry 2). Such deacetylation under basic conditions has been reported for several acetoacetone derivatives.40–43

Due to the failure of the base-mediated cyclizations, we focused on the corresponding acid-catalyzed aldol condensation. Indeed, treatment of aldehyde 10a with 0.1 equivalent of TsOH in toluene under reflux for 3 hours gave 9a in 5% yield (Table 3, entry 3). Decrease of TsOH to 0.05 equivalent and the temperature to 50 °C with extended reaction time (36 h) improved the yield to 23% (entry 5). In contrast, neither further temperature decrease nor changing the solvent (THF or MeOH) gave any of the product 9a (entries 4, 6, and 7). However, PPTS as acid catalyst (0.05 equiv) in toluene under Dean–Stark conditions provided 9a in 50% yield (entry 8). Similar yields were obtained with 1 equivalent of PPTS or (+)-CSA (entries 9 and 10). With 1 equivalent of (−)-CSA in toluene at 50 °C the yield increased to 73% (d.r. 94:6) (entry 11). The sense of chirality of the Brønsted acid had no impact on yield and diastereoselectivity, that is, (+)-CSA gave 9a in 71% yield (d.r. 93:7) (entry 12). Under these optimized conditions, however, acetoacetate-derived aldehyde 10b cyclized to 9b in a disappointingly low yield of 19% (entry 13). Other Brønsted acids failed completely (Table S2, SI). As piperidine has been reported to promote aldol condensations,44–46 aldehyde 10b was submitted to condensation in the presence of piperidine/CSA under reflux b (24 h) giving 9b in 16% yield (d.r. 91:9).

**Table 3** Optimization of Intramolecular Aldol Condensation of 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Reagent (equiv)</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOH</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>0 → r.t.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1) KOH</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>0 → r.t.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) MsCl</td>
<td>CH2Cl2</td>
<td>r.t.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TsOH (0.1)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>reflux</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TsOH (0.05)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>r.t.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TsOH (0.05)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TsOH (0.05)</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TsOH (0.05)</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PPTS (0.05)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>reflux&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PPTS (1.0)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>reflux&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(−)-CSA (1.0)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>reflux&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(−)-CSA (1.0)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>73, d.r. 94:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(+)-CSA (1.0)</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>71, d.r. 93:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(−)-CSA (1.0)</td>
<td>toluene&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>piperidine/CSA</td>
<td>toluene&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>50/reflux</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1) DBU</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>0 → r.t.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>44, d.r. 91:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) MeCl&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>CH2Cl2</td>
<td>0 → r.t.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> In the presence of NEt3, DMAP.

<sup>b</sup> Dean–Stark conditions.

<sup>c</sup> c = 0.03 M.
dine (1 equiv) in toluene at 50 °C for 24 hours. Monitoring the reaction by 1H NMR spectroscopy and ESI-MS revealed formation of the aldol adduct 16. Upon subsequent addition of 1 equivalent of (-)-CSA to the reaction mixture and stirring for 1.5 hours, only 12% of 9b could be isolated (entry 14). Finally, a base-induced aldol addition was tested in which 10b was reacted with 1 equivalent of DBU in MeOH at 0 °C for 2 hours. After acidic workup and addition of CH2Cl2, the crude product was treated with mesyl chloride, DMAP, and NET3 for 4 hours to afford indenone 9b in 44% yield with a high diastereoselectivity (d.r. 91:9) (entry 15).

A single crystal of 9a was obtained by crystallization from a diluted solution, which was suitable for X-ray crystal structure analysis (Figure 2). Derivative 9a crystallized with one molecule in the asymmetric unit of the acentric space group P2(1)2(1)2(1). The absolute configuration could be determined from X-ray data by anomalous dispersion characterization by the Flack parameter of x = 0.08(17) revealing the (3aR,4R,7aS)-configuration for the major product of 9a. The five-membered ring system shows an envelope conformation, where C4 is 0.65 Å out of plane. The six-membered ring is characterized by a half-chair conformation with C3 out of plane (0.67 Å).47

As the determination of the enantioselectivity of the Michael addition product 10b had not yet been solved, a sequence of Michael addition/aldol condensation was studied (Scheme 3). For this purpose, 11 and acetooxamate 12b were treated either with pyrrolidine 13a (50 mol%), Method A) or Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst 13c (2 mol%, Method B) under the usual conditions to yield racemic addition product rac-10b in 35% and enantioenriched 10b in 58%, respectively. Subsequent (-)-CSA-mediated aldol condensation gave 30% of rac-9b (d.r. 83:17) and 35% of enantioenriched 9b (d.r. 86:14). Unfortunately, separation of enantiomers was neither possible via GC nor HPLC on chiral stationary phases.

The relative configuration of racemic enones rac-9b was assigned by 1D and 2D NMR experiments (Figures S1 and S2 in SI) as trans,trans for the major and trans,cis for the minor diastereomer, respectively. Due to the similarities of the

NMR spectra of acetylacetone-derived enones 9a combined with the crystal structure of (3aR,4R,7aS)-9a, we assigned the major and the minor diastereomer of the non-racemic acetooxamate-derived enone as (3aR,4R,7aS)-9b and (3aR,4S,7aS)-9b.

As mentioned above, hexahydroindenone 9a was assumed as a potential scaffold for convenient functionalization to polycyclic compounds without the necessity to use protecting groups. To realize this goal, we studied the Diels–Alder reaction between 9a and cyclopentadiene (17) (Scheme 4).

First, different Lewis or Brønsted acids and solvents were screened, but either decomposition or no conversion at all was observed (for details, see Schemes S2 and S3 in SI). However, the desired tetracycle 18 (50:50) could be isolated in 18% when employing 1.4 equivalents of Et2AlCl in CH2Cl2 at −78 °C and warming the mixture to −20 °C over 3 hours followed by hydrolysis with aqueous Seignette salt solution (Method A). Both 1H NMR spectra and GC-MS chromatograms indicated that the crude product contained cyclopentadiene-derived oligomer.48,49 Following Method B, that is, use of trifluoromethanesulfonic acid (20 mol%) in toluene at −78 °C and quenching after 12 hours with NET3 and aqueous workup, provided the tetracycle 18 in 35% (ratio 44:56). Initially, we surmised that the two sets of signals visible in the 1H NMR spectrum of 18 might be caused by the two diastereomers. But HMBC measurements and
comparison with known 1,3-dicarbonyl derivatives\textsuperscript{50} revealed the presence of keto- and enol-tautomer \textit{keto-18}, \textit{enol-18}, whose stereochemical structure was deduced from 2D NOESY experiments (Figures S3 and S4 in SI). It should be emphasized that \textit{enol-18} stereoselectively equilibrates to \textit{keto-18} with the 4\textit{R}-configuration of the acetyl-carrying carbon atom, while the corresponding epimer with \textit{4S}-configuration was not detected. Presumably, the diastereofacial preference of the protonation step is governed by formation of the thermodynamically more stable (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18} with an \textit{equatorial} acetyl moiety as compared to the (4\textit{S})\textit{-keto-18} with \textit{axial} acetyl group. A thermodynamically driven tautomeration as the final step was also proposed by Carrillo and Vicario in the synthesis of trans-decalines.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, upon prolonged storage of tetracycle 18 in CDCl\textsubscript{3} the equilibrium shifted from (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18}\textit{enol-18} = 44:56 to 57:43.

We performed first density functional theory (DFT)-based calculations to elucidate the relative thermodynamic stabilities of (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18} and (4\textit{S})\textit{-keto-18} (Figure 3). Comparing the two configurations we found that (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18} to be 85 kJ/mol more stable than (4\textit{S})\textit{-keto-18}. This result is consistent with the observed diastereofacial preference of (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18} due to a thermodynamically driven tautomeration.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated the first organocatalytic Michael addition of acetaldehyde (12\textit{a}) and ethyl acetooacetate (12\textit{b}) with 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11) in the presence of Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst 13\textit{c} providing highly \textit{oxo}-functionalized cyclopentane derivatives 10 in good yields with high enantioselectivity up to 99:1 on gram scale with a catalyst loading of only 2 mol\%. Acid-mediated intramolecular aldol condensation converted 10 into the corresponding trans-4-acylhexahydro-5H-inden-5-ones 9 in moderate to good yields with high diastereoselectivities (up to 94:6). Hexahydroindenone 9\textit{a} was submitted to a [4 + 2] cycloaddition with cyclopentadiene (17) yielding the tetracyclic tautomers (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18}\textit{enol-18}. Surprisingly, despite the keto/enol tautomeric equilibrium the 4\textit{R}-configuration of the exocyclic acetyl moiety was maintained due to thermodynamic control of the scaffold supported by DFT calculations. Thus, a high degree of molecular complexity (4 rings, 7 stereogenic centers) was obtained in only four steps [including the synthesis of 1-cyclopentene-1-carbaldehyde (11) from commercially available 1,2-cyclohexanediol\textsuperscript{29}]. These results not only expand the scope of the Jørgensen–Hayashi catalyst, but also demonstrate the access to polycyclic derivatives in a few redox-economic steps via synthetically valuable, enantioenriched hexahydroindenones without the use of protecting groups, which paves the way for their application in syntheses of complex target molecules.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{1}H \text{and} \textsuperscript{13}C NMR were recorded on a Bruker Avance 300, an Ascend 400, an Avance 500, and a Bruker Avance 700 spectrometer. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to CDCl\textsubscript{3}, as internal standard. Assignment of NMR spectra was based on correlation spectroscopy (COSY, HSQC, HMBC, and NOESY spectra). Mass spectra and GC-MS were recorded on a Bruker Daltonics micro-TOF-Q instrument, a Varian MAT 711 spectrometer, and an Agilent 6890N Network GC system gas-phase chromatograph equipped with a 5973 Network Mass Selective Detector, respectively. FTIR spectra were recorded on a Bruker Vector 22 spectrometer equipped with a MKII Golden Gate Single Reflection Diamand. GC was performed on a Thermo Scientific Trace 1300 gas-phase chromatograph with fused silica column (30 m × 0.32 mm, 0.25 μm thickness, TG-35 MS phase) (achiral) and on a Fisons Instrument HRGC Mega 2 series 8565 with a fused silica column (25 m × 0.25 mm, thickness 0.25 μm, CP Chirasil DEX CB phase) (chiral). HPLC was performed on a Shimadzu HPLC system on a MZ-Analytical Kromasil 100 Silica 5 μm column (250 × 4.6 mm), on a Chiracel OD-H or on a Chiracel OJ-H column. Optical rotation was performed on a PerkinElmer 241 polarimeter (cuvette l = 0.1 m). The numbering system shown in Figure 4 was used only for NMR assignment.

\textbf{Figure 3} Optimized minimum structures of (4\textit{R})\textit{-keto-18} and (4\textit{S})\textit{-keto-18} and their associated relative stabilities. ΔG\textsubscript{G0} is the electronic energy corrected for the free energy at 300 K in the ground state. The DFT calculations were performed at the B3LYP/AUG-cc-pV TZ level of theory. Light gray: \textit{H}; dark gray: \textit{C}; red: \textit{O}.

\textbf{Figure 4} Numbering system for NMR assignment

\textit{(1R,2R)-2-(1-Acetyl-2-oxopropyl)cyclopentane-carboxaldehyde (10a)}\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Method A:} A solution of 13\textit{a} (111 mg, 1.56 mmol, 0.5 equiv), 12\textit{a} (312 mg, 3.12 mmol, 1 equiv) and 11 (11/Et\textsubscript{2}O = 80:20, 400 mg, 3.12 mmol, 1 equiv) in EtOH (8.0 mL) was stirred for 15 h at r.t. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue purified by chromatography on SiO\textsubscript{2} to give 10\textit{a} as a yellow oil; yield: 9.0 mg (96.8 μmol, 3%); dr. = 50:50 (1H NMR, 6-H).

\textbf{Method B:} To a solution of 12\textit{a} (2.12 g, 21.2 mmol, 2 equiv) and 13\textit{c} (69.1 mg, 212 μmol, 0.02 equiv) in cold toluene (26 mL) at 0 °C was added 11 (11/Et\textsubscript{2}O = 80:20, 1.36 g, 10.6 mmol, 1 equiv), and the reaction mixture was warmed to r.t. After stirring for 48 h, the solvent was removed under reduced pressure.\textsuperscript{34} The residue was purified ei-
ther by filtration over a silica pad with hexanes/EtOAc (2:1) to give 10a as an orange oil; yield: 1.66 g (7.59 mmol, 72%); 88% purity by GC$_{\text{shai}}$ or by flash chromatography on SiO$_2$ with hexanes/EtOAc [gradient 5:1 → 2:1; $R_f$ = 0.16 (hexanes/EtOAc 5:1)] to give 10a (40%); >99% purity by GC$_{\text{shai}}$; [α]$_D^{20}$ = −129.1 (c = 0.77, CHCl$_3$, ee = 98%).

**FT-IR:** 2956 (w), 2871 (w), 1716 (s), 1694 (s), 1420 (w), 1357 (w), 1239 (s), 1185 (w), 1143 (w), 955 (w), 619 (w), 582 (w), 531 cm$^{-1}$ (w).

**HRMS (ESI):** m/z = 249 [M + Na$^+$]; 209, 184, 149, 131.

**MS (ESI):** m/z = 249 [M + Na$^+$] calcd for C$_{12}$H$_{10}$O$_4$Na$: 249.1097$; found: 249.1071.

**Ethyl (2E)-2-[(1R,2R)-2-Formylcyclopentyl]-3-oxobutanato (10b)**

**Method A:** To a solution of 13a (555 mg, 7.80 mmol, 0.5 equiv) and 12b (207 mg, 15.9 mmol, 1.02 equiv) in toluene (40 mL) was added 11 (11.03 g, 42.0 mmol, 1.5 equiv) and the reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h at r.t. After filtration over a silica pad with hexanes/EtOAc (2:1), the filtrate was concentrated, and the residue dissolved in toluene (15 mL). Phosphonium bromide 14 (1.25 g, 2.91 mmol, 1 equiv) and NEt$_3$ (442 mg, 4.37 mmol, 1.5 equiv) were added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h at r.t. Then it was washed with H$_2$O (10 mL), dried (MgSO$_4$), and the solvent removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by chromatography on SiO$_2$ with hexanes/EtOAc (gradient 15:1 → 10:1) to give 15 as a colorless oil; yield: 287 mg (968 µmol, 33%); d$_D$: 47.40:38:55 by GC$_{\text{shai}}$.

**Method B:** A solution of 11 (11.03 g, 87:12, 500 mg, 4.42 mmol, 1 equiv), 12b (575 mg, 4.42 mmol, 1 equiv), and 13c (28.8 mg, 88.4 µmol, 0.02 equiv) in toluene (10 mL) was stirred for 72 h at r.t. After the addition of phosphonium bromide 14 (1.99 g, 4.64 mmol, 1.05 equiv) and NEt$_3$ (0.7 mL, 671 mg, 6.63 mmol, 1.5 equiv), the reaction mixture was stirred for 8 h at r.t. Then H$_2$O (20 mL) was added and the mixture extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (3 × 20 mL). The combined organic layers were dried (MgSO$_4$) and the solvent removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by chromatography on SiO$_2$ with hexanes/EtOAc (gradient 30:1 → 10:1) to give 111 as a colorless oil; yield: 351 mg (118 mg, 22%); D$_{2}$D: 55:45 by GC$_{\text{shai}}$; [α]$_D^{20}$ = 52.6 (c = 0.54, CHCl$_3$); d$_D$: 55:45.

**FT-IR:** 2956 (w), 2871 (w), 1710 (s), 1448 (w), 1368 (w), 1360 (w), 1227 (w), 1194 (w), 1146 (s), 1096 (w), 1033 (w), 984 (w), 941 (w), 862 (w), 810 (w), 730 (s), 647 (w), 540 cm$^{-1}$ (w).

**1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl$_3$):** δ = 1.16 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 3 H, 12-H$_2$D$_1$), 1.18–1.23 (m, 11 H, 1 × 4-H$_2$D$_1$, 1 × 4-H$_2$D$_2$, 1 × 2-H$_3$D$_1$, 1 × 2-H$_3$D$_2$, 1 × 1-H$_2$D$_1$, 1 × 1-H$_2$D$_2$), 1.66–1.75 (m, 2 H, 1 × 3-H$_2$D$_1$, 1 × 3-H$_2$D$_2$), 3.26 (d, J = 8.8, 7.0, 7.0, 3.8 Hz, 1 H, 5-H$_2$D$_1$), 2.92 (d, J = 9.5, 8.8, 7.8, 7.8 Hz, 1 H, 5-H$_2$D$_2$), 2.92 (d, J = 9.7, 8.3, 7.8, 1.8 Hz, 1 H, 5-H$_2$D$_2$), 2.45 (d, J = 7.6, 7.6, 7.6, 1.8 Hz, 1 H, 1-H$_2$D$_1$), 2.57 (d, J = 9.5 Hz, 1 H, 1-H$_2$D$_2$), 3.44 (d, J = 9.7 Hz, 1 H, 1-H$_2$D$_2$), 4.15 (qd, J = 7.1, 1.2 Hz, 2 H, OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_1$), 4.21 (qd, J = 7.2, 1.0 Hz, 2 H, OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_2$), 9.58 (d, J = 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 6-H$_2$D$_2$), 9.60 (d, J = 2.8 Hz, 1 H, 6-H$_2$D$_2$).

**1H NMR (126 MHz, CDCl$_3$):** δ = 14.0 (OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_1$), 14.1 (OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_2$), 12.8 (C-10), 25.0 (C-20), 27.3 (C-30), 27.8 (C-40), 29.3 (C-90), 30.9 (C-40), 31.4 (C-40), 38.8 (C-50), 39.1 (C-50), 55.4 (C-100), 55.7 (C-100), 61.6 (OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_1$), 61.7 (OCH$_2$CH$_2$D$_2$), 64.3 (C-70), 64.6 (C-70), 168.8 (C-100), 168.8 (C-100), 202.2 (C-80), 202.5 (C-80), 202.6 (C-80).
under reduced pressure. Sat. aq NaHCO₃ was added to the residue (under ice cooling), and the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 30 mL). The combined organic layers were dried (MgSO₄) and the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. To the yellow residue in anhyd CH₂Cl₂ (13 mL) were added NEt₃ (1.2 mL, 9.56 mmol, 3.5 equiv) and DMAP (32.9 mg, 270 µmol, 0.1 equiv) and the mixture was cooled to 0 °C. Then MsCl (464 mg, 4.05 mmol, 1.5 equiv) was added dropwise and the mixture stirred for 17 h at r.t. After the addition of H₂O (20 mL), the mixture was washed with sat. aq NH₄Cl, the residue (un-dissolved materials) was collected by filtration and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified by chromatography on SiO₂ with hexanes/EtOAc (30:1) to give 9a as a yellow oil; yield: 184 mg (1.35 mmol, 50%); Rf = 0.35 (hexanes/EtOAc 10:1).

 FT-IR: 3025 (w), 2951 (w), 2871 (w), 1736 (w), 1673 (s), 1604 (w), 1456 (w), 1415 (w), 1386 (w), 1356 (w), 1298 (w), 1244 (w), 1204 (w), 1199 (w), 1152 (w), 1117 (w), 1043 (w), 895 (w), 817 (w), 756 (w), 556 (w), 510 (w), 452 cm⁻¹ (w).

 1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 1.26–1.36 (m, 2 H, 1 × 7-H, 1 × 9-H), 1.68–1.76 (m, 2 H, 8-H), 1.74–1.85 (m, 2 H, 2-H, 1 × 9-H), 1.95 (ddd, J = 11.9, 7.1, 7.1, 4.4 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 3-H), 2.05–2.15 (m, 1 H, 1-H), 2.09 (dd, J = 16.7, 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 3-H), 2.68 (dd, J = 16.7, 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 3-H), 5.91 (ddd, J = 9.9, 2.9, 1.0 Hz, 1 H, 6-H). 7.04 (dd, J = 9.9, 1.9 Hz, 1 H, 5-H).

 MS (ESI): m/z 316 (100) [M⁺], 81 (75), 68 (80), 55 (45).


(3aR,4S,7aS)-4-Acetyl-1,2,3,3a,4,7a-hexahydro-5H-inden-5-one (9a)

A solution of (1R,2R)-10a (100 mg, 509 µmol, 1 equiv) and CSA (118 mg, 509 µmol, 1 equiv) in toluene (17 mL) was heated for 65 h under reflux. After cooling to r.t., the solution was washed with sat. aq NaHCO₃ (30 mL), dried (MgSO₄), and the solvent removed under reduced pressure. The residue was chromatographed on SiO₂ with hexanes/EtOAc (20:1) to give 7 as a yellow oil; yield: 184 mg (1.35 mmol, 50%); Rf = 0.35 (hexanes/EtOAc 10:1).

 FT-IR: 3025 (w), 2951 (w), 2871 (w), 1736 (w), 1673 (s), 1604 (w), 1456 (w), 1415 (w), 1386 (w), 1356 (w), 1298 (w), 1244 (w), 1204 (w), 1199 (w), 1152 (w), 1117 (w), 1043 (w), 895 (w), 817 (w), 756 (w), 556 (w), 510 (w), 452 cm⁻¹ (w).

 1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 1.26–1.36 (m, 2 H, 1 × 7-H, 1 × 9-H), 1.68–1.76 (m, 2 H, 8-H), 1.74–1.85 (m, 2 H, 2-H, 1 × 9-H), 1.95 (ddd, J = 11.9, 7.1, 7.1, 4.4 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 3-H), 2.05–2.15 (m, 1 H, 1-H), 2.09 (dd, J = 16.7, 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 3-H), 5.91 (ddd, J = 9.9, 2.9, 1.0 Hz, 1 H, 6-H). 7.04 (dd, J = 9.9, 1.9 Hz, 1 H, 5-H).

 MS (ESI): m/z 316 (100) [M⁺], 81 (75), 68 (80), 55 (45).


\[(3aR,4R,5aR,6S,9aS,9bR)-4-Acetyl-1,2,3,4,5a,6,9,9a,9b-decahydro-5H,6H-methanocyclopenta[a]naphthalene-5-one (keto-18) and 1-[3aR,5aR,6S,9aR,9bS]-5-Hydroxy-2,3,3a,5a,6,9,9a,9b-octahydro-1H-6,9-methanocyclopenta[a]naphthalene-4-yl]ethanone (enol-18)\]

**Method B**: To a solution of (3aR,4R,7aS)-9a (127 mg, 713 µmol, 1 equiv) in anhyd toluene (3.6 mL) under N2 atmosphere at –100 °C (120 µL, 94.2 mg, 1.43 mmol, 2 equiv). The reaction mixture was warmed to –75 °C and stirred for 12 h. After the addition of NEt3 (0.3 mL), the mixture was warmed to r.t. and the solvent removed under reduced pressure. Then H2O (5 mL) was added and the solution purified by chromatography on SiO2 with hexanes/EtOAc (10:1) to give a mixture of keto-18/enol-18 = 43:57 as a yellow oil; yield: 61.0 mg (250 µmol, 35%; 40% referred to reisolated 9a (160 mg, 89.7 µmol)).

Both derivatives were characterized as mixture. For clarity the signals were listed separately.

**Enol-18**

1H NMR (700 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 1.13–1.20 (m, 1 H, 1 × 9-H), 1.40 (ddd, J = 8.2, 1.6, 1.6 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 16-H), 1.43 (m, 1 H, 1 × 7-H), 1.50 (ddd, J = 8.2, 1.9, 1.9 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 16-H), 1.63–1.72 (m, 1 H, 1-H), 1.72–1.76 (m, 2 H, 8-H), 1.89–1.94 (m, 1 H, 1 × 7-H), 2.04–2.10 (m, 2 H, 2-H, 1 × 9-H), 2.12 (s, 3 H, 11-H), 2.64 (ddd, J = 9.2, 5.9, 3.2 Hz, 1 H, 6-H), 3.00 (dd, J = 9.2, 4.4 Hz, 1 H, 5-H), 3.01 (m, 1 H, 15-H), 3.17 (m, 1 H, 12-H), 5.94 (dd, J = 5.7, 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 13-H), 6.05 (dd, J = 5.7, 3.0 Hz, 1 H, 14-H), 16.67 (s, 1 H, OH).

13C NMR (176 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 22.5 (C-8), 27.2 (C-7), 27.9 (C-11), 32.0 (C-9), 38.7 (C-2), 40.3 (C-16), 46.5 (C-15), 46.7 (C-5), 50.3 (C-16), 51.8 (C-5), 70.3 (C-3), 135.9 (C-13), 137.3 (C-14), 189.9, 196.0 (C-4, C-10).

**Keto-18**

FT-IR: 3057 (w), 2960 (w), 2859 (w), 1716 (s), 1687 (s), 1570 (w), 1453 (w), 1418 (w), 1358 (w), 1309 (w), 1252 (w), 1211 (w), 1146 (w), 1050 (w), 978 (w), 933 (w), 912 (w), 865 (w), 834 (w), 753 (w), 741 (w), 695 (w), 674 (w), 652 (w), 529 (w), 462 cm–1 (w).

1H NMR (700 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 0.92–0.99 (m, 1 H, 1 × 9-H), 1.33 (ddd, J = 8.4, 1.6, 1.6 Hz, 1 H, 1 × 16-H), 1.43 (m, 2 H, 1 × 7-H, 1 × 16-H), 1.65–1.71 (m, 1 H, 1 × 9-H), 1.72–1.77 (m, 3 H, 3 × 7-H, 8-H), 1.86 (ddd, J = 12.4, 12.4, 12.4, 7.1 Hz, 1 H, 1-H), 1.98 (dd, J = 12.4, 12.4, 7.1 Hz, 1 H, 1-H), 2.11 (s, 3 H, 11-H), 2.71 (dd, J = 9.2, 7.1, 3.2 Hz, 1 H, 6-H), 2.86 (d, J = 12.4 Hz, 1 H, 3-H), 2.91 (dd, J = 9.2, 4.4 Hz, 1 H, 5-H), 3.03–3.05 (m, 1 H, 15-H), 3.39 (dd, J = 4.4, 2.9, 1.6 Hz, 1 H, 12-H), 6.08 (dd, J = 5.7, 2.9 Hz, 1 H, 13-H), 6.18 (dd, J = 5.7, 2.9 Hz, 1 H, 14-H).

**References**


(z) (a) CDCI 1788438 contains supplementary crystallographic data for the structure (3aR,4R,7aS)-9a. The data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/gets Structures. (b) Formula C19H28O5; size 0.570 × 0.104 × 0.096 mm; crystal system: orthorhombic; space group: P212121; unit cell dimensions: α = 5.3640(4) Å, β = 8.0159(6) Å, c = 22.3538(14) Å; α = β = γ = 90°.


