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ABSTRACT

The intermolecular ruthenium hydride catalyzed coupling of internal alkynes with subsequent insertion of olefin acceptors is described. This approach utilizes a vinyl silicon tether to provide complete regiocontrol, a stereoselective anti-exo-dig cyclization which affords a tetrasubstituted olefin with a new vinylsilane, and a highly functionalized Z,E diene motif. Subsequent studies for a highly selective intramolecular trans-silylvinylation of internal alkynes catalyzed by RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) is reported. The use of methyl vinyl ketone as an additive increased the efficiency of this transformation. This process was expanded upon using ethylene gas as an additive and provides a net 5-exo-dig trans-silylvinylation of internal alkynes. Ethylene decreased reaction times and promoted altered selectivity at increased pressure. Furthermore, the chemoselectivity was attenuated when alkyl substituted alkynes afforded silylvinylation at 80 psi of ethylene. Terminal alkynes were utilized in this transformation at increased ethylene pressure and produced syn-silylvinylation products.
Imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines were synthesized in three steps utilizing a palladium catalyzed amidation-cyclization strategy. N-Aryl substrates were synthesized using copper catalyzed amidation of 3-amino-N-Boc-4-chloropyridine. Complementary protocols for the selective chlorination of imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines at C2 and C7 positions were also developed. An improved protocol for the synthesis of imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines and pyrazines using palladium catalyzed amidation of 2-chloro-3-aminopyridines is described. The process utilizes Xantphos and a binary solvent system comprised of 1,4-dioxane and tert-amyl alcohol. The improved conditions were extended to provide a method for the regioselective coupling of polychlorinated aminopyridines.
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1.0 RUTHENIUM HYDRIDE CATALYZED S ILYLVINYLATION OF ALKYNES:

INTRODUCTION

Transition metal catalyzed reactions have become some of the most valuable tools in organic synthesis. Organometallic complexes are frequently used in cross-coupling reactions to form new bonds that are described as efficient and selective. The protocols for metal catalyzed coupling reactions have been developed extensively and are based on the work of several pioneers including the 2010 Nobel Laureates Richard Heck, Akira Suzuki, and Ei-ichi Negishi. Several well known cross coupling methods used to form new carbon-carbon bonds include: Suzuki–Miyaura,¹ Heck,² Negishi,³ Stille,⁴ Kumada,⁵ Sonogashira,⁶ and Hiyama (Figure 1).⁷ These modern cross coupling techniques often require each component to contain a functional group that can participate readily in the cross coupling. The participating partners are generally halides or pseudo-halides which are matched with an organometallic species.⁸ In most cases alkynes are transformed into an activated alkene species when functionalized dienes are desired. Well defined functionalized conjugated dienes are prevalent in natural products (Figure 2). The palladium cross-coupling methods used to generate these moieties often have toxic byproducts such as tin.
General cross-coupling to form dienes

\[ \text{R} - \text{M} + \text{X} \rightarrow \text{R} - \text{R}^1 \]

[M] = metal/metalloid
i.e. SnR₂, SiR₃, B(OR)₂
X = I, Br, Cl, OTf, OTs

**Suzuki-Miyaura**

\[ \text{R} - \text{B(OH)}₂ + \text{R} - \text{Br} \rightarrow \text{R} - \text{R} \]

\[ \text{Pd(PPh₃)}₃ \rightarrow \text{K₂CO₃, H₂O} \]

**Heck**

\[ \text{R} - \text{Br} + \text{OMe} \rightarrow \text{OMe} \]

\[ \text{Pd(OAc)}₂ \rightarrow \text{K₂CO₃} \]

**Negishi**

\[ \text{R} - \text{Br} + \text{BrZn} \rightarrow \text{R} \]

\[ \text{Pd(OAc)}₂ \rightarrow \text{THF} \]

**Stille**

\[ \text{R} - \text{Br} + \text{Bu₃Sn} \rightarrow \text{R} \]

\[ \text{Pd(OAc)}₂ \rightarrow \text{Dabco, TBAF} \]

**Figure 1:** Examples of Cross-Coupling Reactions to Form Conjugated Dienes

**Figure 2:** Natural products that contain diene motif
Ruthenium catalyzed coupling reactions on the other hand, have become a reliable method for the construction of new carbon-carbon bonds.\(^9\) One major advantage of ruthenium catalysis is that no pre-activation of either coupling partner is required. Ruthenium catalyzed cross coupling reactions frequently convert alkynes and alkenes into dienes. The formation of conjugated dienes by ruthenium catalysis can proceed through several different mechanisms. Watanabe\(^{10}\) and Trost\(^8\), \(^9\) have have developed ruthenium catalyzed reactions which proceed through metallacycle intermediates (Scheme 1, Equation 1), while Grubbs,\(^11\) Diver\(^{12, 13}\) and many others have demonstrated the effectiveness of ruthenium vinyl carbenes (Scheme 1, Equation 2).\(^{12-18}\) Moreover, Murai revealed the use of a ruthenium dihydrido complex in C-H functionalization chemistry (Scheme 1, Equation 3).\(^{19}\) These methods have been thoroughly explored and continue to evolve. Alternative ruthenium hydride methods\(^{20}\) that do not require a directing group have not been as extensively examined for the synthesis of dienes. Ruthenium hydride catalyzed coupling of alkynes and alkenes can lead to highly substituted dienes of great synthetic value.\(^{21}\)

**Scheme 1:** Ruthenium Catalyzed Formation of Conjugated Dienes

![Scheme 1](image-url)
Examples of intramolecular transformations to form conjugated dienes using ruthenium hydrides were reported by Mori. In the presence of catalytic amounts of RuHCl(CO)(PPh₃)₃, Mori demonstrated the intramolecular transformation of enynes to dienes. Mechanistically, Mori proposed a three step sequence which proceeds via 1) hydrometallation of the alkyne, 2) carbometallation of the alkene and 3) subsequent β-hydride elimination (Scheme 2). Mori demonstrated the utility of this transformation in the synthesis of carbapenem skeletons. This process showed excellent functional group compatibility.

Scheme 2: Mori’s Examples of Intramolecular Transformations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Examples</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R₁</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>(CH₃)₃Ph</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-MeO-Ph</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-Me-Ph</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-CF₃-Ph</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other groups have produced 1,3 dienes utilizing ruthenium hydride catalysts through intermolecular transformations of alkynes with alkenes. Yi reported a hydrovinylation of alkynes using [(PCy₃)₂(CO)(Cl)Ru=CHCH=C(CH₃)₂]⁺BF₄⁻ (1.14) and ethylene gas (Scheme 3). The substrate compatibility for Yi’s hydrovinylation was limited to symmetrical internal alkynes.
When terminal alkynes were subjected to these conditions chemoselectivity was an issue and a mixture of products 1.16 and 1.17 were observed.

**Scheme 3: Hydrovinylation Reaction with Selected Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R₁</th>
<th>Ratio (1.16:1.17)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>98:2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n-Pr</td>
<td>n-Pr</td>
<td>98:2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>p-Tol</td>
<td>74:26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SiEt₃</td>
<td>94:6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₂CH₂OH</td>
<td>92:8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When electron deficient internal alkynes (1.18) were subjected a [2+2] reaction predominated and compound 1.19 was isolated in 70% yield (Scheme 4). The reaction with norbornene also produced a cyclobutene ring 1.20 under similar conditions. Yi hypothesized the formation of the hydrovinylation products 1.16 or 1.17 can occur via sequential insertion of alkyne and ethylene to metal-hydride and metal-vinyl species. The hypothesis was tested using ruthenium-vinyl species 1.21 and ruthenium-hydride 1.23.

**Scheme 4: Yi’s [2+2] Reaction with Electron Deficient Alkynes**

The reaction of 1.21 and ethylene in C₆D₆ produced a 1:1 mixture of 1.22 and 1.23(Scheme 5). This suggests that these three ruthenium complexes (1.14, 1.21 and 1.23) proceed through a common intermediate (1.24) in the hydrovinylation reaction.
Scheme 5: Evidence for Ruthenium Hydride Mechanism in Yi’s Hydrovinylation

Yi’s hydrovinylation of symmetrical internal alkynes using ruthenium hydride 1.23 provides excellent reactivity but chemoselectivity was an issue. Furthermore, there were no unsymmetrical internal alkynes tested lending the reader to believe they were not compatible or provided a mixture of regioisomers.

Marciniec utilized ruthenium hydride 1.23 to couple terminal alkynes with vinyl boronates (Scheme 6). Marciniec also observed a selectivity issue. The reaction proceeded to deliver a mixture of stereoisomers (1.27, 1.28) along with boronate (1.29) and alkyne dimerization (1.30) as byproducts. Internal alkynes were not investigated leaving room for improvement in this area. However, the products obtained were interesting and possessed dual functionality at the 1 and 4 positions of the 1,3-diene motif.

Scheme 6: Marciniec’s Vinyl Boronate Coupling with Selected Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ratio (E:Z:1.29:1.30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SiEt3</td>
<td>83:14:0:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>40:5:0:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SiMe2Ph</td>
<td>75:25:0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GeEt3</td>
<td>44:14:23:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cy</td>
<td>82:18:0:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plietker investigated the coupling of alkynes with acrylates and acrylamides \( \text{(Scheme 7)} \).\(^{26}\) The reaction was stereo and regioselective when using terminal alkynes resulting in \( \text{(Z)} \)-A with a 57\% isolated yield. When symmetrical internal alkynes were subjected to these conditions stereoselectivity was reduced. When unsymmetrical internal alkynes were examined the regioselectivity also became an issue.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Scheme 7: Plietker’s Ruthenium Hydride Coupling}
\end{center}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>( R_1 )</th>
<th>( R_2 )</th>
<th>A:B</th>
<th>Z:E</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>99:1</td>
<td>98:2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91:9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( \text{C}<em>5\text{H}</em>{11} )</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>91:9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>( \text{C}_3\text{H}_7 )</td>
<td>11:89</td>
<td>98:2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ruthenium hydrides show promise as catalysts in the synthesis of dienes, however, they do not seem to be broadly applicable in the transformation of unsymmetrical internal alkynes. Plietker reported a single example that showed high levels of regiocontrol \( \text{(Scheme 8)} \). In this case the presence of the propargylic benzyl ether provided a possible coordination to the metal that could facilitate a regioselective delivery of the hydride. Despite excellent regiocontrol, stereoselectivity was still poor with \( \text{1.31} \) obtained as a 2:1, \( Z:E \) ratio and regioisomer \( \text{1.32} \) was not formed in this reaction.
The limitations in selectivity with unsymmetrical internal alkynes suggested a deficit in these methods. However, as demonstrated in the example above, selectivity can be improved by preorganizing substrates. Connecting a linker or temporary silicon tether to an alcohol at the homopropargylic position was envisioned to provide a solution to control both regio and stereoselectivity.²⁷
1.1 INTERMOLECULAR RUTHENIUM HYDRIDE CATALYZED COUPLINGS

1.2.1 Ruthenium Hydride Coupling of Alkynes and Acrylates

Initial investigations using ruthenium hydride catalysis from the Clark group were conducted by Dr. Shasha Liu and Dr. Jinbo Zhao.\textsuperscript{28} It was discovered that a vinyl silicon moiety attached to an alcohol at the homo-propargyl position could assist the delivery of ruthenium across an alkyne $\pi$ system (Figure 3). Mechanistically, the ruthenium hydride is delivered across the vinyl moiety followed by the loss of ethylene (Figure 4). The initial hypothesis for addition to the alkyne was a \textit{syn} addition of a silyl ruthenium intermediate (\textit{Id}). Contrary to the hypothesis the product observed showed an interesting \textit{anti-exo-dig}-addition to the alkyne (\textit{Ie}). The \textit{anti} isomer obtained was verified by 1D and 2D experiments conducted by Liu \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{silicon_coupling.png}
\caption{Silicon Tethered Coupling Approach}
\end{figure}
The observed anti addition process was unpredicted due to the rarity of a direct trans addition to alkynes. Other groups have observed trans addition to alkynes (Scheme 9). Trost, Denmark, and Chang have observed anti-hydrosilylation products using some ruthenium catalysts. Direct trans-addition across alkynes has also been observed by Fu and Mori using rhodium, and Murakami using gold. Lastly, Yamamoto observed a trans-carbosilylation using Lewis acid catalysts.
The initial work conducted by the Clark group utilized ruthenium hydride catalysts to couple unsymmetrical internal alkynes with alkenes (Figure 5). The reaction was found to work well with acrylates and on large scale. A screen of acrylates revealed bulkier acrylates such as L-menthol acrylate produced the highest yields in this reaction. This could be a result of varying volatility with the smaller acrylates such as methyl and ethyl acrylate. The reaction conditions were amenable to the use of various aryl substituted alkynes, while alkyl substituted alkynes proved to be a bit more sensitive. Alkyl alkynes provided lower yields and produced a mixture of stereoisomers. The alkyl alkynes required a large excess of acrylates for full conversion to dienes, and so lower boiling acrylates were used to facilitate the isolation of product. Several olefin coupling partners were examined under these conditions but only acrylates worked well (Figure 5).
While screening catalysts for the acrylate coupling, specifically RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃), 1.35 (Scheme 10, \textit{i.e.} ethylene transfer) was discovered as a byproduct. New endeavors were undertaken to selectively produce the ethylene transfer reaction. Unreactive olefin coupling partners from previous studies were also desired. Conditions were examined in an attempt to couple acrylamides. As aforementioned, the acrylate coupling was optimized and the reaction performed the best at 85°C. Since the standard conditions did not work for acrylamides the more reactive complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) was examined. This complex promoted partial coupling with acrylamides along with some ethylene transfer (Scheme 10). Increasing the reaction temperature to 110 °C in toluene allowed for full conversion of 1.33
and provided a 3:1 mixture of acrylate incorporated (1.34) to vinylated ene (1.35) products. In an effort to reduce the byproduct formation some additives were examined. Lewis acid additives were believed to coordinate to the acrylamide lowering the LUMO and making the requisite conjugate addition easier. Lewis acid additives could also prevent the amide carbonyl from coordinating to the ruthenium. However, additives such as MgCl₂, AlCl₃ and CuCl did not improve the reaction; in fact, they were deleterious and shut down reactivity.

**Scheme 10: Acrylamide Coupling Example**

While there were many other possibilities and combinations that could be attempted in order to improve this reaction, no further work was conducted. Instead the acrylamide coupling reaction protocol was implemented to couple acrylates with difficult alkynes (Scheme 11). Alkynes that were previously unreactive or demonstrated poor conversion were deemed difficult substrates. The methyl substitution pattern of alkyne 1.36 made for a surprisingly low yielding (<10%) reaction with RuHCl(CO)(PCy₃)₂ (Scheme 11). However, using RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) the product (1.37) was delivered in 52% yield and could be readily separated from the vinylated byproduct (1.38).
At the outset of this project several coupling partners were desired that could produce bifunctional dienes. A selective coupling between vinyl silicon tethered alkynes and other vinyl metalloid (germanes, silanes, boronates and tin) species was envisioned. Additional investigations into coupling vinyl boronates and in selectively achieving an intramolecular vinyl transfer reaction will be discussed in the following chapters of this thesis.
1.2.2 Stereo- and Regioselective Formation of Silyl-Dienyl Boronates

Vinyl boronates\textsuperscript{38-40} and vinyl silanes\textsuperscript{41} are considered valuable reagents and are often used as synthetic intermediates in catalytic transformations.\textsuperscript{25, 42} The Suzuki-Miyaura cross-coupling with organoboranes is perhaps the most utilized transition metal catalyzed C-C bond forming reaction.\textsuperscript{43, 44} Alternatively, organosilanes have been utilized efficiently in Fleming-Tamao oxidations\textsuperscript{45} and Hiyama couplings.\textsuperscript{46} Given the significant use of vinyl boronates and vinyl silanes, a great deal of effort has been applied to incorporate these functionalities into complex molecules. Methods used to prepare vinyl silanes and vinyl boronic esters include hydroboration\textsuperscript{47} or hydrosilylation\textsuperscript{29} of alkynes, metal catalyzed addition of diboron reagents,\textsuperscript{48-50} olefin metathesis with vinyl boronates\textsuperscript{11, 51, 52} and silaboration chemistry (Scheme 12).\textsuperscript{53-56}

\textbf{Scheme 12: Known Preparations of Vinyl Boronates and Vinyl Silanes}

The successful application of the ruthenium hydride methodology, recently developed in the Clark lab,\textsuperscript{28} to the coupling of unsymmetrical internal alkynes and vinyl boronates would diversify this category of valuable intermediates. The coupling would deliver regio- and stereodefined silyl-dienylboronates with varied functional handles at the 1 and 4 position of a diene
scaffold (Scheme 12, 1.40). Marciniec has previously prepared bifunctional dienes of a similar nature from silyl-acetylenes and vinyl boronates; however, a mixture of stereoisomers and alkyne dimerization was obtained (Scheme 12).\(^{25}\) In addition to complex vinyl silanes and boronates this approach would also produce tetra-substituted olefins and \(Z,E\) diene systems. Tetra-substituted olefins are valuable intermediates which are a considerable challenge to obtain stereo and regioselectively.\(^{57}\) Despite their prevalence in natural product scaffolds, \(Z, E\) diene motifs are also quite difficult to obtain.\(^{58-60}\) This coupling method provides a straightforward solution to both challenges.

**Scheme 13:** Vinyl Boronate Coupling with Alkynes

This study began by examining alkyne 1.33 and vinyl boronate 1.39a using the standard conditions from the acrylate coupling methodology.\(^{28}\) Ruthenium hydride catalysts were evaluated and RuHCl(CO)(PCy\(_3\))\(_2\) was chosen due to the highest crude yield and minimal byproduct (1.41a) formation (Table 1).
Table 1: Initial Catalyst Screen for Vinyl Boronate 1.39a Coupling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Crude Yield 1.40 (%)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Crude Yield 1.41a(%)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;c,d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;b,d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pt-P&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;Pr&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pt-Bu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Me)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pt-BuAd&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuH(OSiPh&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)(CO)(Pt-Bu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Me)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Determined by <sup>1</sup>H NMR vs. mesitylene internal standard. <sup>b</sup> Starting material observed after 9 hours. <sup>c</sup> Reaction complete after 2 hours. <sup>d</sup> Reaction run by Lauren Kaminsky.

A solvent screen with varying temperatures was also performed (Table 2). Toluene and 1,4-dioxane were suitable solvents for this reaction at 85°C providing crude yields of 72% and 78% respectively (entries 7, 8). When DCE was used as the solvent at 85°C the reaction was complete in 9 h and produced the highest crude yield of 87% (entry 6). Lowering the reaction temperature required longer reaction times and produced lower yields (entries 1-5). However, at reduced temperature the amount of dimer byproduct (1.41a) was reduced. In DCE at 85°C the vinyl boronate to alkyne ratio was examined (entries 11, 12). This ratio played a crucial role in the reaction. With 1.2, 1.5 and 2.0 equivalents of boronate the crude yields by <sup>1</sup>H NMR were 62, 65 and 87 percent respectively. This effect is presumably due to dimerization (1.41a) of the vinyl boronate which consumes the boronate prior to the desired coupling.
Table 2: Solvent and Equivalents Screen with 1.39a

![Chemical reaction diagram]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Equiv. 1.39a</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Crude Yield 1.40 (%)&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Crude Yield 1.41a (%)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>72 (53)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,4-dioxane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>78 (59)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>PhCF&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Determined by <sup>1</sup>H NMR vs. mesitylene internal standard. <sup>b</sup> Starting material observed after designated reaction time. <sup>c</sup> Reaction run by Lauren Kaminsky. <sup>d</sup> Isolated yield reported in parenthesis.

Product isolation was difficult with nearly 20 percent loss from the observed crude yields (Table 2, entries 7, 8). This result was most probably due to boronate hydrolysis upon exposure to silica gel. Attempting to deactivate the silica gel with triethylamine, trimethylchlorosilane, or boric acid<sup>61</sup> showed no increase in isolated yield. Using neutral alumina provided similar results to silica gel. Several additional vinyl boronates were explored in an attempt to improve product isolation (Table 3). Careful examination of the literature revealed several promising candidates that were commercially available or readily prepared (Scheme 14).
Table 3: Vinyl Boronate Screen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Boronate</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Crude yield (%)</th>
<th>Isolated Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39a</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.39c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.39d</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.39e</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pinacol boronate 1.39c was easily prepared but highly volatile with a tendency to polymerize. Standard reaction conditions using 1.39c and alkyne substrate 1.33 delivered a crude $^{1}H$ NMR yield of 70%, which was lower than observed with the neopentyl boronate 1.39a. Burke and coworkers introduced MIDA compound 1.39d, while Molander and coworkers produced compound 1.39e. These are both air stable solids that have repeatedly demonstrated their usefulness in cross coupling chemistry; however, these two reagents did not function in the desired reaction. We found that the most successful boronate was the hexylene glycol derived 1.39b. Compound 1.39b was easily prepared from readily available materials in multigram quantities following the procedure of Whiting.
The ruthenium hydride catalyzed coupling reaction was conducted using alkyne 1.33 and boronate 1.39b. Boronate dimer 1.41b was found to co-elute with the products during isolation and some fractions had to be discarded. In order to minimize the formation of boronate dimer, solvent and temperature were once again evaluated (Table 4). Toluene, DCE and 1,4-dioxane performed well at 85 °C (entries 1-3). Refluxing THF (entry 4) gave no dimer but required a longer reaction time with compromised (58%) product yield. No reactivity was observed in refluxing acetonitrile (entry 5) presumably due to solvent coordination to the ruthenium. Additional temperatures were also explored with toluene. Lowering the temperature lead to longer reaction times and decreased the amounts of both dimer and product being formed (entry 6). Increasing the temperature to 100 °C gave a 78% crude yield of 1.42 but also increased the amount of dimer 1.41b (entry 7). Toluene at 85 °C proved optimal for the reaction (entry 2) with regard to both reaction time and amount of dimer formation. Dimer 1.41b was independently synthesized using these optimized reaction conditions to verify its structure (Scheme 15). Once again two equivalents of vinyl boronate to alkyne were observed to be the most beneficial ratio of reactants for the reaction.
### Table 4: Solvent and Equivalents Screen With 1.39b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>solvent</th>
<th>equiv. 1.39b</th>
<th>temp (°C)</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>yield 1.42 (1.41b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 b</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>75 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 b</td>
<td>1,4-dioxane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 b</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 b</td>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a percent yield determined by crude 1H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard  b reaction run by Lauren Kaminsky

### Scheme 16: Independent Synthesis of Boronate Dimer 1.41b

A catalyst screen was conducted in an attempt to impede the formation of 1.41b while potentially increasing the amount of 1.42 (Table 5). The overall goals for the proper catalyst were to retain reactivity with appropriate selectivity and short reaction time. Ruthenium-phosphine complexes with various steric and electronic properties were prepared and tested. Ruthenium
hydride complex RuHCl(CO)(PCy$_3$)$_2$ was shown to be superior to analogous hydride catalysts (entry 1). RuHCl(CO)(Pi-Pr)$_3$$_2$ demonstrated good yield of product (72 %) but required longer reaction times. The remaining electron rich bisphosphine complexes (Table 5, entries 3-5) catalyzed the reaction with reasonable times but at compromised yield and increased dimer formation. RuHCl(CO)[Pr-Pr$_2$(3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)]$_2$ with electron deficient phosphine ligands, exhibited poor catalytic activity in the coupling. After significant development, standard reaction conditions were implemented and used in a substrate scope. The standard conditions were as follows; 5 mol % RuHCl(CO)(PCy$_3$)$_2$ with 2 equivalents of 1.39b in toluene (0.5M in alkyne) at 85 °C.

![Reaction Scheme]

**Table 5:** Ruthenium Hydride Catalyst Screen with 1.39b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>catalyst</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>yield 1.42 (%)$^a$</th>
<th>dimer (1.41b)$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1$^b$</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2$^b$</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pi-Pr)$_3$$_2$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu$_2$Me)$_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4$^b$</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu$_2$Cy)$_2$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5$^b$</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy$_2$-Bu)$_2$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6$^c$</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PR)$_3$$_2$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ percent yield determined by crude $^1$H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard. $^b$ reaction run by Lauren Kaminsky. $^c$ PR3 = (3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)diisopropylphosphine

Mechanistically (Figure 6), the hypothesis is that dissociation of one phosphine ligand from RuHCl(CO)(PCy$_3$)$_2$ reveals a 14-electron ruthenium species (I). Once the active catalytic species is produced, substrate coordination, hydroruthenation of the vinyl silane (II) and $\beta$-silyl transfer occur to deliver silyl ruthenium intermediate (III). Considering the presence of two vinyl metalloid
species in the reaction (vinyl boronate and tethered vinyl silicon), it is assumed that since dimer formation can be inhibited by changes in reaction conditions that the vinyl silicon is more reactive than the vinyl boron leading to preferential hydoruthenation of the vinyl silicon tethered alkyne substrate. At this stage an intramolecular silyl-ruthenation of the alkyne provides vinyl ruthenium (IV). In view of the trans addition product obtained, the silyl-ruthenation of the alkyne can occur from a direct trans-addition\textsuperscript{29, 30} or cis-addition followed by isomerization.\textsuperscript{28} The isomerization can occur through a polarization of the olefinic bond and formation of a zwitterionic species. At the zwitterionic stage free rotation allows for the trans orientation to be attained. Intermolecular insertion of the vinyl boronate and β-hydride elimination liberates the product and regenerates the active hydride catalyst. A similar mechanistic possibility is depicted to show the formation of boronate dimer (1.41).
With optimized conditions in hand, a study of substrate scope was conducted, and the reaction worked well with various alkyne substrates (Table 6). Racemic alkyne substrates were prepared in one of two ways: propargyl Grignard addition to aldehydes or ketones, or anionic acetylide epoxide openings. These two methods produced homopropargyl alcohols which were silylated using chloro dimethyl vinyl silane in the presence of imidazole and DMAP at 0 °C. The substrate scope began with altering alkyl functionality at R_1 and maintaining a phenyl ring at the alkyne terminus. Homopropargylic alkyl functionality was well tolerated with methyl (1.42, 55%),
$n$-heptyl (1.57, 60%), cyclohexyl (1.58, 60%) and dihydrocinnamyl (1.59, 58%) providing dienes 1.42, 1.57-1.59 in good yields. Tertiary homopropargylic tethered alcohols also performed well generating dienes 1.60 (65%) and 1.61 (55%) efficiently. Aryl substituents at the homopropargyl position, phenyl (1.62, 54% and 1.63, 63%), biphenyl (1.64, 57%) and para-nitro (1.65, 60%) also worked well. Next, aryl substitution on the pendant alkyne was examined. It was observed that ortho substitution (i.e. 2-chlorophenyl-) did not participate in the reaction, presumably due to steric crowding. Fortunately, aryl substituents bearing meta substitution worked well and gave 3,5-xylyl substrate 1.66 in 57% yield. Altering the electronic structure of the aryl group at the para position it was observed that methyl (1.67, 55%) and the electron donating methoxy group (1.68, 68%) provided higher yields than an electron withdrawing acetyl group (1.70, 45%). Fluorine substitution was also compatible and diene 1.69 was obtained in 59% yield. Dienes 1.62 and 1.64 were synthesized on a 2 mmol scale and the isolated yields obtained were within ± 3% of those conducted at 0.3 mmol.
Table 6: Silyl Dienylboronate Substrates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* reactions conducted by Lauren Kaminsky

With the isolated yields of dienes 1.42, and 1.57-1.70 under 70% a few substrates with the pinacol boronate 1.39c were inspected (Table 7). These substrates produced a lower crude yield but the dienes proved more stable to isolation with minimal product loss during chromatography.
Going back to the drawing board ruthenium catalysts were investigated in order to identify, solvents and temperature then finally vinylboronate 1.39c equivalents that could provide the best results.

As previously observed with boronates 1.39a and 1.39b, ruthenium catalyst RuHCl(CO)(PCy₃) performed the best compared to the other ruthenium hydride sources examined. RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu₂Me)₂ provided very similar results but greater amounts of dimer (1.41c) were observed and this hydride source was disregarded. It was decided that 5 mol % RuHCl(CO)(PCy₃)₂ would be used for the remainder of the evaluation.

**Table 7: Catalyst Screen for Vinyl Boronate Coupling with 1.39c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>catalyst</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>yield 1.71 (%)</th>
<th>dimer (1.41c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy₃)₂</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Pr₃)₂</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu₂Me)₂</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu₃Cy)₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PPh₃)₃</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* percent yield determined by crude ¹H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard

As seen in Table 8, lower temperatures required longer reaction times and diminished yields were observed (Table 8, entries 1-4). The reaction in DCE heated to 85 °C was superior to other solvents at the same temperature, and this solvent was chosen along with two equivalents of 1.39c as the standard conditions. Attempting the reaction using vinyl boronate 1.39c as solvent
(1.0M in alkyne) proved unsuccessful, as the dimerization product 1.41c was observed in a nearly equal ratio to the desired product 1.71 (entry 10).

**Table 8:** Solvent, Temperature and Equivalents Screen with 1.39c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>solvent</th>
<th>equiv. 1.39c</th>
<th>temp (°C)</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>yield 1.71 (1.41c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DCE:THF (1:1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4-dioxane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neat (1.0M)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,4-dioxane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* percent yield determined by crude $^1$H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard. *b* 1.39c and alkyne 1.33 were added as a 0.5M solution in DCE to reaction via syringe pump over 1 h.

In regard to Scheme 17, the isolated yield of diene 1.71 using the pinacol boronate 1.39c was consistent with diene 1.42 using the hexylene glycol boronate 1.39b; however, dienes 1.72-1.74 displayed increased isolated yields of 7-18% when compared to 1.60-1.62, respectively.
The silyl-dienyl boronates obtained from these reactions could be further manipulated into more diverse molecules by the use of various metal-catalyzed coupling methods (Scheme 18). Suzuki coupling with diene 1.62 or 1.74 and iodobenzene produced 1.75 in comparable yields with retention of configuration. Iodo-deboration of the same dienes provided silyl-dienyl iodide 1.76 in 60% and 66% isolated yields, respectively. Iodide 1.76 was subsequently used as a coupling partner under Sonogashira conditions to afford dienyne 1.77 in 88% yield.
Scheme 18: Synthetic Derivatization of Silyl-dienyl Boronates

After significant examination, suitable conditions$^{67}$ were established for the tandem silyl-boration of alkyne 1.33 and in-situ Suzuki coupling of diene 1.62 with 4-iodotoluene (Scheme 19). This protocol provided diene 1.78 in 54% isolated yield over two steps. With identical conditions and diene 1.74 Suzuki coupled product 1.78 was obtained in a 55% isolated yield over two steps.
Attempts to form the Z,Z dienyl bromide\(^{52}\) from diene \(\text{1.62}\) were not successful and gave a complex mixture with mostly proto-desilylation. Several other reactions were attempted for derivatization that resulted in undesired transformations. For example, diene \(\text{1.74}\) was treated with methyl lithium in an attempt to form the borate complex \textit{in situ} (Scheme 20).\(^6\) Once the borate complex is formed the addition of iodine should induce a migratory insertion of the methyl group, followed by NaOH mediated deiodoboration. However, when this protocol was subjected to silyldienyl-boronate \(\text{1.74}\), methyl lithium was selective for the vinyl silicon moiety and we observed a new vinyl trimethyl silane by proton NMR.

The formation of silyl-dienyl boronates by a \textit{trans}-silylation protocol with internal alkynes and vinyl boronates has been successfully demonstrated. Highly substituted dienes were formed in a single step and were transformed into more complex diene products by Suzuki couplings and
iodo-deboration. The vinyl iodide was transformed under Sonagashira coupling conditions to produce a diene-yne. The silyl-dienylboronate motif will be explored further toward the synthesis of more complex molecules and natural products.

Our initial reports of intermolecular ruthenium hydride catalyzed couplings using alkynes and olefin acceptors was rewarding. We developed a stereo and regioselective approach toward conjugated dienes through an \textit{anti-exo-dig} cyclization. The products have an exocyclic diene with a tetrasubstituted double bond containing four different substituents. Other similar protocols used to form tetrasubstituted olefins from alkynes have been reported in the literature.\textsuperscript{69-72} However, processes like silylformylation occur via \textit{syn} addition to the alkyne.\textsuperscript{73,74-77} There are a select few examples that provide \textit{anti} addition products to alkynes and the silylvinylation of internal alkynes using ruthenium hydrides now fits in this category.\textsuperscript{29,78,79}
1.2 ETHYLENE TRANSFER

1.3.1 Intramolecular Silylvinylation

The unexpected discovery of an ethylene transfer reaction occurred during the preliminary screening of ruthenium hydride catalysts (Scheme 21). A terminal diene 1.35 was observed in a nearly 1:1 ratio with acrylate incorporation when RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)PPh₃ was used as the hydride source. Given the novelty and atom economy of the process we sought to optimize conditions to obtain vinylated product (1.35).

**Scheme 21**: Reaction Discovery and Proposed Ethylene Transposition

We anticipated that the exclusion of a coupling partner in a sealed environment would produce a smooth intramolecular ethylene transfer. The reaction was stirred for 14 h at 85 °C in a sealed tube using DCE as solvent and only 70 percent conversion of alkyne was observed (Scheme 22). Under these conditions we observed for the first time a cycloisomerization byproduct (1.79) along with desired diene product (Z-1.35). The cycloisomerization of substituted enynes was unanticipated; however, the process has been reported previously using ruthenium hydrides. The byproducts were easily separated by column chromatography and independently characterized.
In retrospect, the intermolecular couplings were complete in less than 9 hours. Taking this into consideration led us to the assumption that olefin additives may be required for this reaction to go to completion (Table 9). We chose to screen primarily electron deficient olefin additives due to the inherent lack of reactivity that we had previously observed in the intermolecular coupling. As shown in Table 9, using no additive (entry 1) produced better results than many other additives. Acrylamides and acyclic vinyl ketones afforded full conversion and high yield of the product with an excellent ratio of (Z)-1.35 to 1.79 (entry 7-8). The use of cyclohexanone as an additive suggests that η-4-coordination to the ruthenium may not be a requirement (entry 9). We also examined using ethylene (entry 10), however, a mixture of inseparable stereoisomers of 1.35 were obtained. Methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) was chosen as the additive as it provided the highest ratio of (Z)-1.35 to 1.79, and its volatility facilitated its removal from the reaction mixture.
Table 9: Screen of Additives for Ethylene Transposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Crude yield&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (%)</th>
<th>Ratio&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (Z:1.79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CO₂Me</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SO₂Ph</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PO(OEt)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CONMe₂</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONH₂-glu</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CONMe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>cyclohexenone</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>C₂H₄(g) 1 atm</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Yield based on remaining 1.33 by <sup>1</sup>H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard. Reactions conducted by Jinbo Zhao and Shasha Liu.<sup>b</sup>Ratio of (Z)-1.35 and 1.79 was determined by <sup>1</sup>H NMR versus mesitylene as an internal standard.<sup>c</sup> 1.35 was obtained as a mixture of isomers (10:1, Z:E) as observed by <sup>1</sup>H NMR. Reaction conducted by Robert J Wilson

The initial catalyst screen during the acrylate study revealed ruthenium hydride complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) bearing an NHC ligand to be the only complex to provide vinylated product (Z)-1.35. With this complex in the presence of MVK, alkyne 1.33 was successfully transformed and (Z)-1.35 and 1.79 were observed in an 85:15 ratio (Table 10, entry 1). Altering this complex by one degree of unsaturation to the NHC backbone [RuHCl(CO)(IMes)(PPh₃), entry 2] or phosphine exchange [RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PCy₃), entry 3] offered little improvement in conversion and yield for this reaction. Attempts to generate the active NHC complex in situ from commercially available RuHCl(CO)(PPh₃)₃ and SIMesHCl did not provide any reaction. Assessment of catalyst loading and MVK concentration was also investigated to further optimize this reaction. In a 1:1 ratio of MVK to RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃), 83% conversion was attained in only 5 hours. Addition of 10 mol % MVK (2:1 ratio, MVK:RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃))
provided the best results for both yield and product ratio (\((Z)-1.35:1.79\)). Interestingly, it was found that the loading of complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) could be decreased when a high concentration of MVK was maintained. This came at the expense of reaction time and the possibility of less than full conversion. The current hypothesis is that the additive protects the ruthenium catalyst from decomposition.⁸⁰, ⁸¹ Several solvents worked well in this reaction including toluene and 1,2-dichloroethane (DCE). Unfortunately a full solvent screen was not conducted. DCE was used first and excellent yields were obtained. Later on it was discovered that 1,4-dioxane could be used as a chelating solvent that also worked as the additive with many of the substrates.

Table 10: Catalyst Screen for Ethylene Transpostion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>RuH (5 mol %)</th>
<th>MVK (mol %)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Conv. (%)</th>
<th>ratio (((Z)-1.35:1.79))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(IMes)(PPh₃)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PCy₃)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-BuMe)₂</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PPh₃)₃</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No reaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substrate scope of this reaction was also examined (Table 11) using 5 mol % catalyst RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃), and 10 mol % MVK. Alkynes bearing a phenyl group at the terminus were examined first. Dienes \(Z-1.35\) and \(Z-1.88-1.92\) were produced from the corresponding phenyl alkynes. These substrates performed very well, delivering products in good yields (64-80%) with ratios of ethylene transfer to cycloisomerization consistently around 5:1 and 10:1 (ratios in parenthesis). Both electron rich functionality \(Z-1.93\) and electron withdrawing functionality \(Z-1.95\) and \(Z-1.96\) were well tolerated. Compound \(Z-1.96\) was crystallized and the structure as
depicted was verified through X-ray diffraction. All other structures have been determined through NOESY experiments or by analogy. Compound Z-1.94 which bears a fluorine moiety was prepared in 71% yield. A 3,5-xylyl moiety at the alkyne provided diene Z-1.97 in 73% yield. Bulky ortho substituents such as chlorine and 1-naphthyl were well tolerated and afforded Z-1.98 in 73% yield and Z-1.99 in 63% yield respectively. These structures (Z-1.98 and Z-1.99) appear as mixtures of atropisomers by proton NMR. Alkynes 1.84 and 1.85 which possess both propargylic and homopropargylic functionality provided >30:1 ratios of products Z-1.101 and Z-1.102 in 64% and 65% yield, respectively. Compound Z-1.38, which represents a trans relationship at the propargyl and homopropargyl positions also provided an excellent ratio of 15:1 in 61% yield. Six-membered oxo-silylcycles could also be formed efficiently regardless of Thorpe-Ingold factors. Compounds Z-1.103 and Z-1.104 were obtained in 59% and 74% yields, respectively. Of note, seven-membered ring product Z-1.105 was formed in 53% yield using this methodology. Ojima et al. have observed that forming seven-membered rings using rhodium catalyzed silylformylation proceeds to give a mixture of products with only trace amounts of the desired product observable by $^1$H NMR and GC-MS. In our case, the corresponding eight-membered ring was not observed in the $^1$H NMR of the crude reaction mixture.
Table 11: Scope of Silylvinylation Using MVK with Aryl-Substituted Alkynes$^{a,b}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-1.35</th>
<th>80% (5:1)</th>
<th>Z-1.88</th>
<th>78% (7:1)</th>
<th>Z-1.89</th>
<th>77% (6:1)</th>
<th>Z-1.90</th>
<th>64% (7:1)</th>
<th>Z-1.91</th>
<th>75% (8:1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-1.92</td>
<td>73% (10:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.93</td>
<td>59% (8:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.94</td>
<td>71% (7:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.95</td>
<td>70% (6:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.96</td>
<td>55% (4:1)$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-1.97</td>
<td>73% (9:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.98</td>
<td>73% (13:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.99</td>
<td>63% (20:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.100</td>
<td>80% (5:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.101</td>
<td>64% (&gt;30:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-1.102</td>
<td>65% (&gt;30:1)$^d$</td>
<td>Z-1.38</td>
<td>61% (15:1)$^d$</td>
<td>Z-1.103</td>
<td>60% (7:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.104</td>
<td>74% (7:1)</td>
<td>Z-1.105</td>
<td>53% (1:0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Yields represent only isolated vinylation products Z. $^b$Ratios in parenthesis represent the ratio of vinylation product Z to cycloisomerization product as determined by $^1$H NMR of the crude reaction mixture. $^c$Structure verified by Dr. Nadia Marino via X-ray crystallography. $^d$Reactions conducted by Robert J Wilson, all others conducted by Shasha Liu and Jinbo Zhao.

A primary goal of the silylvinylation project was to attain stereo, regio and chemoselectivity for alkynes bearing alkyl groups. Alkyl groups appended to diene motifs are more prevalent than aryl moieties in natural products. Our efforts to convert alkyl bearing alkyne substrates with these transposition conditions formed only cycloisomerization products (Table 12).
Cycloisomerization was the only outcome regardless of the alkyl substituent attached to the alkyne (1.129-1.132).

**Table 12: Diene Formation with Alkyl-Substituted Alkynes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction Conditions</th>
<th>Product Structure</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 mol % Ph₃P, 10 mol % MVK, DCE, 85 °C sealed tube</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Reaction Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="" alt="Conversion Values" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* reactions conducted by Shasha Liu and Jinbo Zhao

The undesired cycloisomerization proved troublesome and a new method was required to avoid this result. Since the concentration and ratio of additive to catalyst played a favorable role in this ethylene transposition we sought to compare these results with the use of ethylene gas. Previously, an isomeric olefin mixture was observed when ethylene gas was utilized as an additive. This was originally observed as a deleterious effect and ethylene was disregarded as the additive of choice. It was predicted that increasing the amount of additive to exponentially greater quantities would produce more efficient catalytic turnover and possibly reduce or eradicate the cycloisomerization byproduct.
1.3.2 Silylvinylation Using Ethylene Gas as an Additive

Alkenes are one of the most useful functional groups because they are tolerant to many conditions and known to undergo a variety of transformations. Ethylene is the simplest alkene that is made in enormous quantities with nearly 150 million lbs produced daily. It is also an economical resource ideal for vinylation chemistry as only one hydrogen atom is lost during the process. Ethylene has been utilized in numerous organic transformations including Mizoroki–Heck reactions, enyne metathesis and hydrovinylation (Scheme 23). Our previous screen of additives for silylvinylation revealed ethylene as an interesting choice. As a gas the excess additive quickly dissipates and is no longer a concern in the reaction mixture. The use of ethylene gas as an additive provided us with more rapid conversion to product but at the expense of stereocontrol. Using ethylene warranted a more thorough investigation for the silylvinylation of alkynes. The silylvinylation of internal alkynes delivers a well-defined tetra-substituted olefin, a new vinyl group and vinylsilane of significantly increased complexity. Vinyl silicon species are of particular interest due to their use in carbon-carbon bond forming reactions allowing for further synthetic manipulations.

**Scheme 23:** Examples of Ethylene used in Organic Transformations

**a) Heck Reaction**

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Br} + \text{CH}_2= & \xrightarrow{\text{Pd(OAc)}_2 (1 \text{ mol } \%)} \text{II} \\
& \text{P(o-tol)}_2 (2 \text{ mol } \%) \\
& \text{Et}_3\text{N} \xrightarrow{\text{CH}_3\text{CN}} \text{125°C, 18-20 h}
\end{align*}$$

**b) Enyne Metathesis**

$$\begin{align*}
\text{R} + \xrightarrow{\text{Grubbs Gen I}} \text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2, \text{RT}
\end{align*}$$

**c) Hydrovinylation**

$$\begin{align*}
[\text{Ni}(\text{allyl})\text{Cl}_3] \text{ (cat.)} \\
\text{P}R_3 \text{ (3.8:1 P/Ni)} \\
\text{Et}_3\text{AlCl}_3 \text{ (2.5:1 Al/Ni)} \\
\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2, \text{0°C, C}_2\text{H}_4 \text{ (1 atm)} \\
\text{R}_3 = (-)-\text{dimethylmethyl}
\end{align*}$$
Our main goal for this study was to improve the ethylene insertion process and to expand our repertoire of alkynes to include alkyl substituted substrates. Secondary goals included eradication of cycloisomerization byproducts (i.e. 1.79), reduction of catalyst loading and decreasing reaction times.

Based on the product formation observed previously, we suggest a mechanism which can illustrate the ruthenium hydride catalyzed vinylation of internal alkynes (Figure 7). Phosphine dissociation from complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) provides ruthenium complex A which undergoes olefin insertion to provide alkyl-ruthenium B. Silane B liberates ethylene while the silicon transfers to ruthenium to give silyl-ruthenium intermediate C. Although we do not favor a direct trans-addition across the alkyne π-system, the process has been observed by others (vida supra, section 1.2.1). Our mechanistic proposal suggests that cis-metallation (C to D) is followed by isomerization (D to E) and is supported by empirical data (vida infra). Subsequent insertion of ethylene into vinyl ruthenium E and beta-hydride elimination of F liberates the product and regenerates ruthenium hydride A to complete the catalytic cycle. We anticipated that the addition of ethylene to the reaction would increase the conversion of alkyne by silylvinylation in preference to the undesired cycloisomerization. Additionally, the use of ethylene could provide some understanding of the mechanism of this reaction; our hypothesis being that increasing the amount of ethylene in the reaction would trap proposed cis-isomer D prior to isomerization to trans-isomer E. Using ethylene-d₄ we observed incorporation of exogenous ethylene into the product (Scheme 24). This outcome affirms that the ethylene being added to the system can be incorporated into the product. Another aspect of this study was to obtain silylvinylation of internal alkyl substituted alkynes. Previously, ethylene transposition of these alkynes provided solely cycloisomerization products presumably through intermediates G and H (Figure 7).
Figure 7: Mechanistic Hypothesis for Ethylene Addition to Alkynes

Scheme 24: Isotopic Labeling Experiment

Table 13: Catalyst Screen for Silylvinylation under 1 Atmosphere Ethylene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>catalyst</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Z:1.79:E</th>
<th>yield Z-1.35 (%)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18:1:2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55:4:1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Bu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cy)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1:0:0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Bu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Me)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6:1:0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)PR&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1:0:0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Yield determined by <sup>1</sup>H NMR vs mesitylene internal standard. <sup>*</sup>5 mol % catalyst was used.

<sup>c</sup>PR<sub>3</sub> = (3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)diisopropylphosphine.
This investigation began by reacting alkyne 1.33 with 1 mol% of RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) under an atmosphere (balloon) of ethylene in 1,2-dichloroethane (DCE) at 80 °C. A rapid (1 h) reaction was observed that produced silylvinylation product 1.35 as a 9:1 mixture of Z and E isomers (Table 13, entry 1). The observed result supports the claim that syn-metallation (i.e. formation of D) followed by isomerization occurs to give E which proceeds to the silylvinylation products observed. Further examination of catalysts revealed that complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) was the optimum ruthenium hydride catalyst and in many cases 1 mol % was sufficient to provide the desired products. Alternatively, ruthenium hydride complexes that bear two large phosphine ligands instead of the NHC, do provide some of the silylvinylation products. These complexes (Table 13, entries 2-5) required higher catalytic loadings and longer reaction times. It was observed that the more electron rich complexes afforded higher conversion and larger quantities of product (Table 13). Presumably RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) is superior due to the greater donating ability of the NHC⁹¹ and the enhanced lability of the less basic PPh₃ ligand.⁹² The bis phosphine complexes also provided less desired product than RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃). Other solvents such as toluene and 1,4-dioxane were also found to be suitable for this reaction at 80 °C.
Scheme 25: Substrate Scope for Silylvinylation Using Ethylene Gas

The substrate scope was examined using complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) in DCE at 80 °C (Scheme 25). The substrates were developed by keeping the aryl group constant and altering groups at the homo-propargyl and propargyl positions. The reaction tolerated methyl and cyclohexyl groups at the homo-propargyl position and gave 1.135 and 1.136 in 80% and 70% yield, respectively. Aryl groups were also well tolerated and 1.137 was formed in 65% yield.
Multiple substitutions at the homopropargyl position afforded 1.138 in 69% and 1.139 in 76% yield. Previously, using MVK as an additive, only partial conversion to diene 1.140 was observed; here 1.140 was rapidly produced in 67% yield. Products 1.141 (78%) and 1.142 (70%) demonstrate that the reaction works well with substitution in the syn or anti relationship at the propargyl and homopropargyl locants. Next, variation of the aryl moiety at the alkyne terminus was examined. As anticipated, para-substitution was well tolerated with the 4-fluorophenyl providing 1.143 in 69% yield as essentially a single isomer. Chlorines were also amenable to these reaction conditions giving 1.144 in 70% yield. The ortho-chloro substituent did not hamper the efficiency of the reaction, nor did ortho-substituted groups like 1-naphthyl which gave 1.145 in 71% yield. The 3,5-xylyl moiety afforded 1.146 in 74% yield without difficulty. Electronics of the aryl group was also examined using 4-anisole and 4-acetophenone derivatives which provided 1.147 in 73% yield and 1.148 in 64% yield. Interestingly, although the yields are comparable, the ratio of isomers was substantially different in these cases. Finally, six membered oxasilacycle 1.149 was formed in 82% yield under these conditions.

The aryl substrates provided excellent selectivity for silylvinylation versus cycloisomerization (≥20:1) compared to previous results (5-8:1, section 1.3.1). With these results it was envisioned that higher concentration of ethylene (increased pressure) would further reduce or eliminate the cycloisomerization byproducts. Using alkyne 1.33 the amount of ethylene was systematically increased by 20 psi. The amount of the (E) isomer (syn-addition product) observed increased as a function of pressure. As speculated, the cycloisomerization byproduct was not observed over the pressure range studied (Table 14). To ascertain whether the pressure or concentration was influencing the outcome, a control experiment with increased argon pressure
was conducted. At 80 psi of argon the reaction was retarded and approximately 23% conversion with only 11% of the (Z) isomer observed by $^1$H NMR. This supports the hypothesis that increased ethylene concentration thwarts isomerization and produces greater quantities of syn-silylvinylation or the (E) isomer. To the best of our knowledge increased ethylene pressure has not been shown to overcome inherent selectivity of a substrate for stereocontrol.

**Table 14:** Sequential Increase of Ethylene Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>pressure $^d$</th>
<th>ratio (Z:E)$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>balloon</td>
<td>9:1$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 psi</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 psi</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60 psi</td>
<td>1:1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80 psi</td>
<td>1:1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80 psi (Ar$_{g}$)</td>
<td>1:0$^d$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Reactions were pressurized at room temperature prior to heating. $^b$Determined by $^1$H NMR. $^c$Cycloisomerization was observed for the standard reaction. $^d$23% conversion and 11% Z observed.

The silylvinylation pressure study also revealed an interesting electronic trend. The E:Z ratio of silylvinylation products was influenced by the electronics of the alkyne (Table 15). Electronic neutral and weakly withdrawing alkynes gave ~1:2 ratio of Z:E (entry 1 and 2 respectively). Electron rich alkynes (entry 3) produce the Z isomer as the major product, while electron deficient alkynes provide the E isomer (entry 4). Increasing the ring size from five to six surprisingly yielded a 25:1 ratio of Z:E (entry 5). These preliminary results warrant further examination i.e. higher pressures and increased reaction times, to determine the intrinsic electronic preference.
Table 15: Electronic Differentiation of Alkyne Terminus at 80 psi Ethylene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>substrate</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>conv. (%)</th>
<th>ratio (Z:E)</th>
<th>yield (%)^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ar = Ph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1:1.7</td>
<td>(99)^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ar = 4-F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1:1.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ar = 4-OMe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ar = 4-Ac</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ar = Ph, n= 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25:1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Yield in parenthesis determined by ^1^H NMR with mesitylene as an internal standard. ^b Reaction by Lauren Kaminsky.

The study continued by examining substrates that had previously proceeded \textit{via} cycloisomerization \textit{(i.e.} alkyl-substituted alkynes, section 1.3.1) or were aberrant at lower ethylene pressure. To our delight, excellent results were obtained when alkyl-substituted alkynes were employed in this reaction (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Reactions of internal alkyl alkynes at 80 psi. Structures are depicted as the major isomer. Ratio (Z:E) determined by ^1^H NMR and confirmed by nOe or NOESY experiments.

Methyl substituted dienes 1.150 and 1.151 were formed in 84% yield, both favoring the \textit{syn}-addition as the major product. Increasing the alkyl chain by one carbon to ethyl gave 1.152 in 79% yield; adding three carbons gave \textit{n}-butyl 1.153 in 69% yield, and further extension to \textit{n}-hexyl provided 1.154 in 83% yield. In the later three cases, \textit{anti}-addition products were the predominantly observed. Given the similar steric environment existing around these alkyl groups,
we suggest that the observed product ratios are due to the subtle increase in electron donating ability of these substrates.

Scheme 26: Synthetic Elaboration of Dienes

It was considered essential to demonstrate the synthetic utility of these systems. Fleming–Tamao oxidation under neutral conditions provided only slow decomposition of diene 1.137. Utilizing basic conditions (Scheme 26, eq. 1) afforded α,β-epoxy ketone 1.155 in 70% yield. Presumably, the excess basic peroxide facilitates a Michael addition into the newly formed α,β-unsaturated ketone (i.e. 1.156). In order to avoid this undesired Michael addition acidic conditions were explored. Propionic anhydride, KHF$_2$, and peroxide were added to the silane in DMF, and enone 1.156 was obtained in 85% isolated yield as a single isomer (eq. 2). These complementary methods provided access to β'-hydroxy-ketones in good yield. Several attempts to utilize the vinyl silyl moiety in Hiyama–Denmark chemistry resulted in undesired reactions. It was discovered that one of the undesired products was in fact a Heck product (1.157). When diene 1.137 was
subjected to the palladium catalyzed conditions using [(C$_3$H$_5$)PdCl]$_2$, CuI, KF·2H$_2$O, and 4-iodotoluene in DMF at room temperature compound 1.157 was observed in low yield. After some experimentation the reaction of diene 1.137 with Pd(OAc)$_2$, K$_2$CO$_3$, and 4-iodotoluene in DMF at 80 °C afforded 1.157 in 64% yield (eq. 3). We are currently exploring conditions that will selectively couple the silicon with Aryl halides to directly access all carbon tetrasubstituted olefins. Additionally, Tamao oxidation was particularly useful with compound 1.150 which was successfully converted into enone 1.158 (eq. 4). In fact, introducing an $E/Z$ olefin mixture into the reaction was of no consequence as compound 1.158 was isolated in 73% yield as a single double bond isomer.

Other transformations were conducted which provided diene decomposition or less than optimal yields. Reactions such as cyclopropanation and ozonolysis quickly destroyed the diene and no discernable products were obtained. Other chemical transformations such as Wacker oxidations$^{94}$, Pauson–Khand reactions$^{95}$ and Hiyama-Denmark$^{46,96,97}$ reactions either provided no reaction, slow decomposition or small quantities of undesired products (Scheme 27).
Olefin cross metathesis was attempted with a few Grubbs type catalysts and several olefins including acrylic acid, acrylates, acrylamides, N-hydroxy-acrylamides, allyl alcohol and vinyl boronates. All attempts were negative using these alkenes (Scheme 28). Previously, using alkyne 1.33 and 1-hexene the reaction succeeded and could be conducted in tandem with the silylvinylation reaction (conducted by Jinbo Zhao\textsuperscript{65}).
A few general reactions were successful but formed low yields of products. Several epoxidation reactions were conducted, and it is theorized that most of the reagents used for this transformation (\(m\)-CPBA\(^98\), DMDO\(^99\), Davis oxaziridine\(^100\), and Payne oxidation\(^{101}\)) are not selective for the terminal olefin (Scheme 29). In some cases the vinyl silicon was destroyed or Tamao products were observed by \(^1\)H NMR, along with some epoxide formation.

**Scheme 29:** Epoxidation Reagents

![Epoxidation Reagents](image)

Nevertheless, using \(m\)-CPBA in DCM provided racemic epoxide 1.159 in a 38% yield (Scheme 30). The hydroboration/oxidation provided alcohol 1.160 with minor impurities after isolation. Dihydroxylation followed by cleavage of the terminal olefin would be an extremely useful transformation. It would generate a novel *anti-*“silylformylation” product that is difficult to obtain. The dihydroxylation reaction was discovered to work in moderate yield using acidic conditions developed by Plietker *et al.*\(^{102} \), \(^{103}\) The oxidative cleavage of diol 1.161 requires future investigation.

**Scheme 30:** Un-optimized Derivatization of Diene

![Un-optimized Derivatization of Diene](image)
Ethylene gas was successfully utilized in the ruthenium hydride catalyzed silylvinylation of internal alkynes. It was demonstrated that this protocol was useful for the synthesis of highly substituted conjugated dienes. When the reaction was conducted at increased pressure of ethylene (80 psi) competing cycloisomerization of the starting enyne was inhibited and not observed. Additionally, it was demonstrated that alkyl substituted alkynes produced silylvinylation products in excellent yield. The resulting dienes were transformed into epoxy-ketones and enones using complementary oxidation conditions. Finally, a regio- and stereoselective Heck coupling was reported which further enhances the scope of this chemistry beyond simple vinyl moieties.
1.3.3 Silylvinylation of Terminal Alkynes

Alkynes are key functional groups used in the preparation of many organic molecules. Transformations of alkynes often include the production of alkenes. Catalytic transformations of terminal alkynes that provide chemists with reliable functional handles appended to the resultant alkene are perpetually in demand. Some of the most useful transformations include hydrosilylation\textsuperscript{30, 104-106} and silylformylation.\textsuperscript{69, 75, 77, 107, 108} Transition metal-catalyzed hydrosilylation of terminal alkynes are highly predictable resulting in well defined vinylsilanes.\textsuperscript{109} Intermolecular hydrosilylation of terminal alkynes can produce three isomers, the \textit{trans-β}, the \textit{cis-β} or the \textit{α} adducts. This of course can be attenuated depending on factors including temperature and catalyst.\textsuperscript{104} Transitioning an intermolecular reaction into an intramolecular reaction using temporary silicon tethers helps to define a more robust system with added predictability.\textsuperscript{27} In addition to being highly selective, these reactions create complex silanes which offer a versatile functional handle for further manipulation.\textsuperscript{110} For example, intramolecular hydrosilylation of terminal alkynes is in most cases regio and stereo specific. Silylformylation is a remarkably efficient intramolecular transformation of terminal alkynes.\textsuperscript{71, 84} Included in this regime of chemistry are several tandem processes that produce very diversely functionalized molecules. Denmark has consistently improved and utilized silylation chemistry followed by palladium catalyzed coupling of the activated silicon species.\textsuperscript{41, 111} While in another realm, Leighton elegantly provided the community with silylformylation/allyl and crotylsilylation methods to produce polyols.\textsuperscript{108, 112}
Intramolecular ruthenium catalyzed transformations of terminal alkynes consist mainly of
cycloisomerization,\textsuperscript{9, 113, 114} enyne metathesis\textsuperscript{17, 115, 116} and hydrosilylation.\textsuperscript{29, 30, 117, 118} We have
recently developed a regiospecific ruthenium hydride catalyzed silylvinylation of internal alkynes
for the synthesis of conjugated dienes.\textsuperscript{28, 65, 119} These methods produce oxasilacycles via \textit{trans-exo-dig} cyclizations. The catalytic \textit{trans} addition to alkynes is rare but not unprecedented.\textsuperscript{29-31, 33-35} However, the empirical data gathered in these laboratories does not favor a direct \textit{trans} addition
in the silylvinylation of alkynes.\textsuperscript{28, 65} In previous studies with increased concentration of ethylene
gas we observed higher chemoselectivity for vinylation over cycloisomerization with the sacrifice
of stereochemistry. Presumably a traditional \textit{syn} addition to the alkyne followed by an
isomerization affords the observed products. It is believed that the isomerization is only partially
observed due to the rapid incorporation of exogenous ethylene. Given the utility of this
transformation, development of a complementary route toward the selective \textit{syn} silylvinylation of
alkynes was desired. Herein the execution of this protocol using vinyl siloxy tethered terminal
alkynes is reported.
Figure 10: Ruthenium Hydride Catalyzed Silylvinylation of Terminal Alkynes (This Work)

It was initially observed that higher concentrations of ethylene gas promote a more smooth transition to silylvinylation products, albeit as a mixture of stereoisomers (section 1.3.2). This study began with a solvent and temperature screen utilizing RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh3) at 80 psi of ethylene gas. Complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh3) had previously out performed other hydride catalysts [RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2, RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu2Me)2, RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu2Cy)2, and RuHCl(CO)(PCy2f-Bu)2] bearing two phosphine ligands with ethylene transposition (section 1.3.1), and with silylvinylation at 1 atmosphere of ethylene (section 1.3.2). Alkyne silylvinylation at increased pressure of ethylene had previously performed well in toluene at 80 °C. Extrapolation of these conditions with terminal alkynes for 24 hours (table 16, entry 1) consumed the starting material with only 40 % crude yield of product. Considering the high temperature and pressure it was thought that the ene-yne (i.e. 1.162) is transformed to a diene based on the proposed mechanism (Figure 7, section 1.3.2) followed by possible polymerization, isomerization or decomposition. Ruthenium hydrides are known to polymerize olefins and
isomerize 1,3-dienes at high temperature\textsuperscript{121}. The reaction time and temperature were gradually decreased and revealed a positive trend. At 60°C after 3 hours the reaction was complete and a crude yield of 68% was obtained. Seeking to further increase the yield of this reaction we set out to elucidate the ideal conditions to avoid the possible deleterious pathways. Previously, non-polar solvents such as toluene and DCE performed well (Table 16).

**Table 16: Solvent and Temperature Screen for Silylvinylation of Terminal Alkynes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Conversion (%)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
<th>Other Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>CPME\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>PhMe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>MeTHF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>CPME</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>CPME</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>MeTHF</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17\textsuperscript{cd}</td>
<td>CPME</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18\textsuperscript{cd}</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19\textsuperscript{cd}</td>
<td>CPME</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20\textsuperscript{cd}</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} reaction conditions: Alkyne (0.3 mmol), RuH (2 mol %), solvent (0.2M). \textsuperscript{b}RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.05M). \textsuperscript{c}RuH (5 mol %), solvent (0.1M). \textsuperscript{d} Reaction conducted by Alex Dixon. \textsuperscript{e}CPME = cyclopentyl methyl ether. \textsuperscript{f}determined by \textsuperscript{1}H NMR using mesitylene as an internal standard.

Along with toluene and DCE we chose other conventional solvents used in organometallic reactions. Ethereal solvents like THF and 1,4-dioxane required longer reaction times at 60°C but
produced 1.163 in 60% crude yield. However, using 1,4-dioxane under these conditions did not fully consume alkyne 1.162. At 60°C in toluene the reaction was not complete after 2h. Increased temperatures have the benefit of decreasing the reaction time so we conducted the reaction in high dilution THF (0.05M) at 120°C for 1h. To our surprise the crude yield was 60%, only 2% lower than the 24h reaction at 60°C. When 1,4-dioxane was examined at increased temperature diene 1.163 was produced in 67% crude yield with no other discernable byproducts in just 30 minutes. Two other ethereal solvents, 2-methyl-THF and cyclopentyl methyl ether (CPME), are green alternatives to the customary ethers (Et₂O, THF, 1,4-dioxane and MTBE).  At 120 °C in CPME the reaction afforded the desired product 1.163 in 65% crude yield. Lowering the temperature to 100 °C in both CPME and 1,4-dioxane gave full conversion and 73% and 75% crude yields, respectively. With only a two percent difference in crude yield of 1.163, CPME was deemed a suitable replacement for the more hazardous choices.

Seeking to enhance the formation of product 1.163 a catalyst screen was performed. Previous results with bis-phosphine ruthenium hydrides indicated little improvement from RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (section 1.3.2). However, bis-phosphine ruthenium hydrides were examined (Table 17, Entries 2-5) and compared to complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃). Surprisingly, complex RuHCl(CO)(PCy₃)₂ reacted with alkyne 1.162 but only produced 21% of the desired diene 1.163. The remainder of the catalysts performed admirably specifically RuHCl(CO)(PCy₂t-Bu)₂. The dicyclohexyl-tert-butyl phosphine ligand appears to exhibit similar properties as the SIMes (NHC) ligand associated with RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃).
Table 17: Catalyst Screen in CPME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>catalyst</th>
<th>time (h)</th>
<th>conv. (%)</th>
<th>yield 1.163 (%)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-Bu&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Me)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(Pr-BuCy)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RuHCl(CO)(PCy&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Pr-Bu)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Crude yield determined by <sup>1</sup>H NMR using mesitylene as an internal standard

Unfortunately, the current equipment does not safely allow for greater than 80 psi of ethylene gas. However, with the results obtained four alkynes were subjected to the conditions previously established (Scheme 31). In toluene at 80 °C, four alkynes were reacted with RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh<sub>3</sub>) and dienes 1.163-1.166 were obtained in good yields. The methyl group appended to the propargylic position appears to be a stabilizing factor due to the increased yields of 1.165 and 1.166.

Scheme 31: Silylvinylation Substrate Scope of Terminal Alkynes

Further analysis of reaction conditions is being investigated. The analysis includes temperature, time and catalyst loading. A thorough substrate survey is underway which may
include terminal alkynes with a variety of vinyl silicon tethers, homopropargyl substituents and variation at the propargylic position.

In conclusion, we have developed a syn-selective silylvinylation of terminal alkynes. The reaction provides exocyclic conjugated dienes in good yields. The reaction proceeds rapidly (0.5 h) with 5 mol % loading of RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)PPh₃ at 110 °C in several solvents, and especially well with cyclopentyl methyl ether. The catalyst loading can be lowered at the expense of reaction time. Alkyl substitution at the propargylic position appears to be beneficial to the stability of the diene products. Further synthetic elaboration of the diene products to deliver other useful organic building blocks will be presented in due course.
2.0 SYNTHESIS OF IMIDAZOPYRIDINES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Heterocyclic structures, specifically those containing nitrogen, are prevalent in pharmaceutical drugs and are used to treat many diseases. Nitrogenous heterocycles are also frequently utilized in several other useful areas including structural modifications in medicinal chemistry research, natural product synthesis and pesticides manufacturing (Figure 11).

![Common Nitrogen Based Heterocycles](image)

**Figure 11:** Common Nitrogen Based Heterocycles

![Imidazopyridine Nomenclature](image)

**Figure 12:** Imidazopyridine Nomenclature
One class of heterocycle of particular interest is the imidazopyridines (Figure 12). Imidazopyridines are biologically relevant structures commonly utilized in pharmaceuticals. These molecules possess many beneficial qualities that medicinal chemists seek, including solubility and the capacity for hydrogen bonding. These structures appear as building blocks in many drug-like molecules and central scaffolds in natural products (Figure 13). The imidazopyridine scaffold represents a diverse group of nitrogenous heterocycles. There are several classes of imidazopyridines depending on the location of the pyridine and imidazole ring fusion. The deazapurines or imidazo[4,5-(b/c)]pyridines are often scaffolds utilized in drug candidates because they are isosteric with the nucleotide purine bases, adenine and guanine. Imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines and imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines have been thoroughly investigated and several
pharmacological properties have been noted. For example, Ageladine A (Figure 13), is an anti-
cancer natural product isolated from marine sponge.\(^{149}\) One specific natural product, pentosidine,
was a molecule of interest for its potential use as a biochemical marker.\(^{150}\) Access to pentosidine
required an efficient approach to the imidazopyridine core in a regiodefined method. A simple
protection or N-alkylation of commercially available imidazo[4,5-\(b\)]pyridine cannot be controlled
regiospecifically and results in a mixture of three isomers (Scheme 32). Therefore a more specific
and straightforward approach to the imidazopyridine core was needed in order to synthesize
pentosidine.

**Scheme 32: N-Alkylation of Imidazo[4,5-\(b\)]pyridine**

\[
\text{imidazo[4,5-\(b\)]pyridine} + \text{alkyl bromide} \xrightarrow{\text{NaH, DMF}} \text{imidazo[4,5-\(b\)]pyridine N-alkylated products}
\]

In general, the most current methods for the production of imidazo[4,5-\(b\)]pyridines in a
regiospecific fashion require multiple synthetic steps.\(^{133, 151-158}\) For example, Senanayake
developed a three step sequence to produce a modest selection of alkyl substituted
imidazopyridines. The sequence began with the condensation of 1,3-dicarbonyl derivatives and
malonamidines with subsequent Hofmann rearrangement mediated by PhI(OAc)\(_2\) to provide cyclic
urea derivatives. Finally, the urea carbonyl was activated with magnesium and condensed with
carboxylic acids to provide substitution at the 2-position of the imidazole core (Scheme 33).
However, this elegant procedure suffered from the lack of N-substitution.
In other classical syntheses, imidazopyridines are built from ortho-diaminopyridines, often requiring harsh conditions (Scheme 34).\textsuperscript{159} This approach to the imidazopyridine scaffold also lacks regioselective N-substitution or requires tedious synthetic sequences to access them. For instance, a more recent and divergent approach utilizes a solid-supported synthesis of 1- and 3-deazapurines (Scheme 35).\textsuperscript{160} This method requires five or more steps with overall yields ranging from 20-70\% and 40-80\% purity. Also, because the starting pyridine contains a 3-nitro group access to substitution at the 3-position was not accomplished.
A new straightforward approach to the imidazo[4,5-b]pyridine scaffold in an efficient and regioselective manner was in demand. Previous syntheses of imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines by the Buchwald and Ma groups, utilized 2-halo-3-acylaminoypyridines coupled with amines to give N-3-substituted products (Scheme 36). However, these approaches did not permit N-1 substitution. In 2012 Clark et al. developed a strategy utilizing a palladium catalyzed amide coupling reaction with a successive dehydration to form N-1 substituted imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines regioselectively (Scheme 37).\(^\text{157}\) The strategy utilized readily available 2-chloro-3-aminopyridines that were substituted with various functionality at the 3-amino group. Since then the method was utilized to synthesize the core imidazopyridine of pentosidine. The total synthesis of pentosidine was accomplished in six steps beginning with a reductive amination to protect the 3-amino group followed by the formation of the imidazopyridine core. The remaining steps included regioselective chlorination at the 2-position followed by a nucleophilic aromatic substitution and pyridine-N-alkylation. The final step required a global deprotection in TFA and provided pentosidine in a remarkable overall yield of 30% (Scheme 37).
**Scheme 36:** Previous approaches to imidazopyridines using 2-halo-pyridines

*Buchwald and Ma’s approach:*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{R}^1 \text{O} & \\
\text{N} & \\
\text{X} = \text{Cl}, \text{Br} & \\
\text{cat. Pd or Cu} & \\
\text{Ligand, R}^2 \text{NH}_2 & \\
\rightarrow & \\
\text{R}^1 & \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Scheme 37:** Palladium Catalyzed Amidation-Dehydration Strategy

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{R} & \\
\text{NH} & \\
\text{Cl} & \\
\text{R} = \text{Alkyl, Aryl, Benzyl} & \\
\text{R}^* = \text{H, Me, Ph} & \\
\frac{1}{2} \text{Pd}_2(\text{dba})_3 \cdot \text{CHCl}_3 & \\
\frac{5}{5} \text{Me}_2\text{Bu-XPhos} & \\
\text{R'}\text{CONH}_2, \text{K}_3\text{PO}_4 & \\
\text{tBuOH (0.2M), 110°C} & \\
\Rightarrow & \\
\text{R} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

*22 examples*  
51-99%

---

**Synthetic Route to Pentosidine**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NH}_{\text{DMB}} & \\
\text{Cl} & \\
\text{DMB} & \\
\text{H}_2\text{N} & \\
\text{NH}_{\text{Boc}} & \\
\text{CO}_2\text{Bu} & \\
\text{DIPEA, n-BuOH} & \\
\text{reflux} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

pentosidine
2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CONDITIONS USING XANTPHOS AND A MIXED SOLVENT SYSTEM

The synthesis of pentosidine demonstrated the power and utility of an amide coupling-dehydration strategy. This work had established that bulky biaryl phosphine ligands were necessary to facilitate the amide coupling. Due to the high cost of these ligands, the use of alternate phosphine based ligands which were more economically viable was pursued. Since the inception of this project it was sought to improve the generality and practicality of this process. Also, a more diverse substrate scope with regard to chloro-pyridines and amide coupling partners was envisioned. In particular, the use of electron deficient benzyl moieties was ineffective using our previous protocol. Substrates that had unhindered chlorides (i.e. 4-chlorobenzyl) were also not compatible with our previous method.

In our previous study we observed no reaction when Xantphos was used in tert-butanol. However, others had previously achieved Pd-catalyzed amide couplings using xantphos in aprotic solvents.\textsuperscript{163-165} Xantphos was re-evaluated using aprotic solvents and the desired imidazopyridine was obtained along with a minor amount of dehalogenated pyridine. It was hypothesized that the dehalogenation reaction could be attenuated by using a protic co-solvent such as tert-butanol used in the previous study. After a great deal of optimization, it was found that using Xantphos as a ligand in a mixed solvent system (1,4-dioxane and tert-amyl alcohol) gave imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines in excellent yield (Table 18).\textsuperscript{166}
Table 18: Substrate scope utilizing Xantphos and a mixed solvent system

**New Conditions:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Entry} & \quad \text{R} & \quad \text{Yield} (\%)^b & \quad \text{Product} \\
1 & 1\text{a} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-OMeC}_6\text{H}_4) & 93 & 2\text{a} \\
2 & 1\text{b} & \text{CH}_2(2,4\text{-OMeC}_6\text{H}_3) & 81 & 2\text{b} \\
3 & 1\text{c} & \text{CH}_2(2,5\text{-OMeC}_6\text{H}_3) & 85 & 2\text{c} \\
4 & 1\text{d} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-MeC}_6\text{H}_4) & 94 & 2\text{d} \\
5 & 1\text{e} & \text{CH}_2(3\text{-FC}_6\text{H}_4) & 94 & 2\text{e} \\
6 & 1\text{f} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-FC}_6\text{H}_4) & 96 & 2\text{f} \\
7 & 1\text{g} & \text{CH}_2(2\text{-ClC}_6\text{H}_4) & 79 & 2\text{g} \\
8 & 1\text{h} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-ClC}_6\text{H}_4) & 94 & 2\text{h} \\
9 & 1\text{i} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-PhC}_6\text{H}_4) & 70 & 2\text{i} \\
10 & 1\text{j} & \text{CH}_2\text{Ph} & 85 & 2\text{j} \\
11 & 1\text{k} & (R)\text{-CH(CH}_3\text{)}\text{Ph} & 96 & 2\text{k} \\
12 & 1\text{l} & \text{CH}_2(3,5\text{-OMeC}_6\text{H}_3) & 71 & 2\text{l} \\
13 & 1\text{m} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-CF}_3\text{C}_6\text{H}_4) & 95 & 2\text{m} \\
14 & 1\text{n} & \text{CH}_2(3\text{-NO}_2\text{C}_6\text{H}_4) & 57 & 2\text{n} \\
15 & 1\text{o} & \text{CH}_2(4\text{-CNC}_6\text{H}_4) & 70 & 2\text{o} \\
16 & 1\text{p} & \text{Ph} & 94 & 2\text{p} \\
17 & 1\text{q} & \text{CH}_2(\text{C}_6\text{H}_{11}) & 77 & 2\text{q} \\
18 & 1\text{r} & \text{Cy} & 63 & 2\text{r} \\
19 & 1\text{s} & \text{Cyp} & 85 & 2\text{s} \\
20 & 1\text{t} & i\text{-Pr} & 91 & 2\text{t} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[^a\text{Reaction Conditions:}\; 1\text{ (0.4 mmol), Pd}_2(\text{dba})_3\text{·CHCl}_3\text{ (0.004 mmol, 1 mol %), XantPhos (0.02 mmol, 5 mol %), formamide (0.6 mmol), K}_3\text{PO}_4\text{ (0.6 mmol), solvent (0.2 M), 110°C, 6.5h.}\]

\[^b\text{Isolated Yields}\]

\[^c\text{90\% conversion based on crude }^1\text{H NMR using mesitylene as an internal standard.}\]

\[^d\text{2 mol\% Pd}_2(\text{dba})_3\text{·CHCl}_3\text{ and 10 mol\% XantPhos.}\]

\[^e\text{65\% conversion based on crude }^1\text{H NMR using mesitylene as an internal standard.}\]

\[^f\text{reaction conducted by RJW}\]

Indeed, the new approach displayed an expanded substrate scope compared to the previous conditions which utilized the biaryl ligand set. Electron-donating substituents (Table 18, entries 1-4), as well as halogenated substrates (Table 18, entries 5-8) performed well, giving 79-94% yields. Notably, using our previous conditions, the o-chlorobenzyl substrate 1g provided 2g in 51% yield;
this new protocol provided a much improved 79% yield of 2g (Table 18, entry 7). The p-chlorobenzyl substrate 1h was not amenable to our previous conditions and resulted in multiple coupling events followed by decomposition of 1h. Under the current conditions 2h was formed in 94% yield (Table 18, entry 8). Benzyl and 4-biphenylbenzyl substrates were also well tolerated under the reaction conditions (Table 18, entries 9 and 10). As anticipated, chiral substrate 1k showed no racemization and provided 2k in excellent 96% yield (Table 18, entry 11). Additionally, the new reaction conditions showed superiority when electron deficient benzyl were subjected to the protocol. Compound 1l bearing inductively withdrawing methoxy groups provided 2l in 71% yield. Pyridine 1m bearing a trifluoromethyl group afforded 95% yield of 2m (entry 13). In addition, m-nitrobenzyl 1n and p-cyano 1o gave 2n and 2o in 57% (65% conversion by 1H NMR) and 70% (90% conversion by 1H NMR) yields, respectively (Table 18, entries 14 and 15). Nitro groups previously proved detrimental to the reaction and substantial decomposition of the starting material and poor yields were observed for 2n. Aryl subsituents continue to perform well, with 1p giving a 94% yield of 2p (Table 18, entry 16). N-Alkyl substrates were again well tolerated. Substrate 1q with the sterically encumbered cyclohexylmethyl and cyclohexyl 1r gave 2q and 2r in 77% and 63% yields, respectively (Table 18, entries 17 and 18). Pyridines 1s and 1t bearing cyclopentyl and isopropyl moieties afforded 2s in 85% and 2t in 91% yield (Table 18, entries 19 and 20).

A more diverse series of amides were also compatible (Scheme 38). Benzamide and acetamide previously produced yields in the low 60%, and here these amides provided yields of 78% and 83% respectively. Previously no reaction was observed using the remaining amides. Under the improved protocol trans-cinnamamide (96%), cyclohexane carboxamide (79%) and furanamide (97%) all provided the respective substituted imidazopyridines.
Scheme 38: Extended amide scope using the improved protocol

Reaction Conditions: pyridine (0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (0.004 mmol, 1 mol %), Xantphos (0.02 mmol, 5 mol %), Amide (0.6 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (0.6 mmol), solvent (0.2 M), 110 °C. All yields are isolated. \(^b\) Amide used as limiting reagent, conducted by RJW.

This protocol using less expensive bidentate ligand xantphos and a mixed solvent system greatly enhanced the access to functionalized imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines. Further studies utilizing this protocol will be discussed in the subsequent chapters.
2.3 SYNTHESIS OF IMIDAZO[4,5-C]PYRIDINES

The construction of imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines previously discussed showed the utility and control that can be achieved with these systems. It was easy to target the more rare imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine using the protocol. Imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines are currently being investigated for the inhibition of hepatitis C virus replication,\textsuperscript{167, 168} cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitors (\textit{i.e.} grossularine 1 and 2)\textsuperscript{169} and other biologically relevant targets.\textsuperscript{140, 170-178} Suffering from the same problems as imidazo[4,5-b]pyridines, substituted imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines are also difficult to obtain selectively.\textsuperscript{171} However, these recent endeavors provided a means to obtain these medicinally relevant targets with ease.

To begin with the appropriately substituted 3-amino-4-chloropyridines, a short synthesis was required in order to explore a cross coupling route. Previously, the method used for substitution of the N-3 nitrogen of the analogous 3-amino-2-chloropyridine utilized reductive amination,\textsuperscript{179} or Chan-Lam coupling.\textsuperscript{180, 181} Attempts to substitute the 3-amino-4-chloropyridines using these techniques did not lead to preparative yields. Due to these unforeseen difficulties an alternative route to these systems was desired. The known material, 4-chloro-3-N-Boc-pyridine 34,\textsuperscript{182} was produced from the corresponding 3-N-Boc-pyridine via directed metallation and chlorination.\textsuperscript{183-188} This method provided a more stable precursor as an entry into N-substituted pyridines (Scheme 39). Compound 34 was easily prepared and utilized readily accessible materials that were air and moisture stable. Another reason to manufacture 34 was due to the instability of commercially available 3-amino-4-chloropyridine which decomposes readily even after recrystallization. Starting from 3-aminopyridine, Boc protection in aqueous isopropanol gave compound 33 in 87\% yield.\textsuperscript{189} Treating compound 33 with \textit{n}-BuLi in the presence of TMEDA at
-78 °C followed by chlorination gave compound 34 in 65% yield. The directed mettallation is currently being investigated in our laboratory utilizing 1,2-dimethoxy ethane as a replacement solvent which does not require the addition of TMEDA to facilitate this reaction.

**Scheme 39:** Production of 4-chloro-3-N-Boc-pyridine 34

With ample amounts of 34 in hand, various N-3 substituted 4-chloro-3-N-Boc-pyridines were produced. Base mediated alkylation of the carbamate nitrogen provided N-alkyl and N-benzyl products from the corresponding alkyl or benzyl halides; and removal of the Boc group was accomplished by TFA in DCM (Scheme 40).

**Scheme 40:** Alkylation and Deprotection of 34

Substituting aryl and heteroaryl functionality by this strategy was not practical. A metal catalyzed coupling would suffice for these substitutions. Palladium catalysis was disregarded because of the activated aryl chlorine present in 34. Palladium in this case could produce
competitive couplings or dehalogenation that would likely limit the substrate scope. Copper was envisioned as an ideal catalyst for the N-C coupling of an aryl halide and the carbamate nitrogen. Copper catalyzed amidation chemistry dates back to the early 1900’s and recently has become a reliable method for nitrogen substitution. Basic pyridines are known to interfere with copper catalyzed reactions, and pyridine itself is occasionally used as a ligand. Nevertheless, copper catalyzed conditions were investigated to deliver the desired N-3 aryl substituted pyridine products.

Studies commenced with copper (I) iodide and diamine ligands previously used for copper-catalyzed amidation (Table 19). None of the desired product (35h) was observed using \(N,N'\)-Dimethylethylenediamine (DMEDA) as a ligand in either DMF or toluene; although 79\% conversion and 43\% yield of 35h was obtained in 1,4-dioxane (entries 1-3). Ethylenediamine (EDA), a less encumbered ligand, gave 71\% conversion and an increased 59\% yield of 35h (entry 4). The more rigid trans-1,2-diaminocyclohexane gave similar results when the reaction was carried out in toluene (entry 5); when 1,4-dioxane was utilized complete conversion and 96\% isolated yield of 35h was obtained (entry 6). The more electron-rich \(N,N'\)-dimethyl analog L2 gave moderate conversion (72\%) but only trace 35h (entry 7). These results coinicide with the underlying hypothesis described by Buchwald. The unencumbered diamine ligands aid the coupling of bulky secondary amides.
Table 19: Copper-Catalyzed Amidation Optimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Conversion (%)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DMEDA</td>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DMEDA</td>
<td>Tol</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DMEDA</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDA</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Tol</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactions conducted by Adam Rosenberg. Reaction Conditions: 10 mol% CuI, 20 mol% Ligand, 2 Eq. Base, 0.5 M. Using mesitylene as an internal standard. Isolated yield.

With optimized copper-amidation conditions elucidated, the substrate scope of the C-N coupling reaction followed by TFA mediated carbamate deprotection was explored (Table 20). As shown previously, iodobenzene gave 96% yield of 35h and Boc deprotection under acidic conditions then provided 36h in 97% yield (entry 1). Analogous conditions using 4-iodotoluene gave 35i in 76% yield and 36i in 92% yield (entry 2). Aryl bromides were also effective substrates for the copper catalyzed amidation conditions. Electron-poor 4'-bromoacetophenone and 4-bromo-trifluorotoluene gave 35j in 90% and 35k in 79%, respectively (entries 3 and 4). Electron-rich arylbromides 4-bromoanisole (entry 5) and 3,5-dimethylbromobenzene (entry 6) gave partial conversion for the amidation and the crude reaction mixtures were deprotected for ease of isolation to give 36l and 36m in 47% and 66% yield respectively, over two steps. The use of halopyridines
as coupling partners did not adversely affect the amidation or deprotection reactions as 3-bromopyridine gave 35n in 88% and Boc deprotection afforded 36n in 89% yield (entry 8).

Table 20: Copper-Catalyzed Amidation Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>ArX</th>
<th>yield of amidationb (%)</th>
<th>yield of deprotectionb (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>R=H</td>
<td>96 (35h)</td>
<td>97 (36h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R=Me</td>
<td>76 (35i)</td>
<td>92 (36i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R=Acetyl</td>
<td>90 (35j)</td>
<td>89 (36j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R=CF3</td>
<td>79 (35k)</td>
<td>89 (36k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R=OMe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47 (36l)c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66 (36m)c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88 (35n)</td>
<td>89 (36n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a reaction conditions: 1) 1 equiv. 34, 1.1 equiv. ArX, 10 mol% CuI, 20 mol% L1, 2 equiv. K3PO4, 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M); 2) 25% TFA in CH2Cl2. b isolated yield c yield over two steps. d reaction conducted by Adam Rosenberg

With the desired N-substituted 3-amino-4-chloropyridine substrates in hand, investigations into the palladium catalyzed formation of the desired imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines began. Substrate 36h (3-amino-N-phenyl-4-chloropyridine) was chosen to evaluate conditions for the synthesis of imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine 37h (Figure 14, Table 21). The newly developed Me3(OMe)t-BuXPhos ligand was utilized in place of the Me4t-BuXPhos or t-BuBrettPhos ligands previously employed. This ligand performed well giving the desired product 37h in 90% yield. The
cBRIDP\textsuperscript{196} ligand developed by Takasago afforded 81\% yield, and Singer’s BippyPhos\textsuperscript{197} gave 87\% yield of product 37h. TrippyPhos\textsuperscript{198} furnished only trace amounts of 37h. No product was observed for other ligands, for example: RuPhos, tri-\textit{tert}-butylphosphine, tricyclohexylphosphine, and Xantphos.

![Ligand Structures](image)

**Figure 14:** Ligand Structures Used in Palladium Catalyzed Amidation

**Table 21:** Ligand Screen for Palladium Catalyzed Amidation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>Conversion (%)\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>Yield(%)\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>Me\textsubscript{3}(OMe)-t-BuXPhos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>cBRIDP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>BippyPhos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TrippyPhos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RuPhos</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>(t-BuPH)BF\textsubscript{4}</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>(Cy\textsubscript{3}PH)BF\textsubscript{4}</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td>Xantphos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Reaction Conditions: 36h, Pd (1 mol \%), ligand (5 mol \%), 1.5 eq. Formamide, 0.2 M t-BuOH, 110 °C, 4 h. \textsuperscript{b} Using mesitylene as an internal standard. \textsuperscript{c} Isolated yield. \textsuperscript{d} Reaction carried out by Adam Rosenberg. \textsuperscript{e} Reaction carried out by Lauren Kaminsky.
With useful palladium-catalyzed amidation conditions in hand, attention turned to examining the reaction scope. As illustrated in Table 22, benzyl derivatives 36a-36e performed well in this reaction (52-85% yield); with electron-donating, electron-withdrawing, aryl and fluorine substitution all being tolerated (entries 1-5). Methyl (36f) and n-propyl (36g) substitution gave 37f in 58% and 37g 85% yields, respectively (entries 6 and 7). The aryl substituted derivatives provided the cyclized products 37h-37m in excellent 80–91% yields, with both electron-poor and electron-rich systems performing admirably (entries 8-13). Additionally, bis-pyridine moiety 36n was well tolerated under the reaction conditions giving 37n in 86% yield (entry 14).

Table 22: Palladium Catalyzed Amidation/Cyclization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>yield (%)</th>
<th>product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>36a C6H5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>36b CH2(2,5-OMe-C6H3)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>36c CH2(3,5-OMe-C6H3)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36d CH2(4-F-C6H4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36e CH2(4-Ph-C6H4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36f Me</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>36g n-Pr</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>36h Ph</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36i 4-Me-Ph</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36j 4-Ac-Ph</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>36k 4-CF3-Ph</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36l 4-OMe-Ph</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36m 3,5-Xylyl</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36n 3-Pyridine</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>yield (%)</th>
<th>product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>36a C6H5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>36b CH2(2,5-OMe-C6H3)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>36c CH2(3,5-OMe-C6H3)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36d CH2(4-F-C6H4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36e CH2(4-Ph-C6H4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36f Me</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>36g n-Pr</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>36h Ph</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36i 4-Me-Ph</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36j 4-Ac-Ph</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>36k 4-CF3-Ph</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36l 4-OMe-Ph</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36m 3,5-Xylyl</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36n 3-Pyridine</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* reaction conditions: 1 equiv. 36, Pd (1 mol %), ligand (5 mol %), 1.5 equiv. formamide, 1.5 equiv. K3PO4, 0.2 M t-BuOH, 110 °C, 4 h. * isolated yield. * reaction conducted by Adam Rosenberg. * reaction conducted by Lauren Kaminsky

The use of substituted amides under conditions optimized for formamide only lead to the formation of dimer 38 (Scheme 41). Since amides are less nucleophilic than anilines, 199 substrate...
36h must out-compete the amide for binding to palladium, leading to a facile dimerization. In the absence of amide under otherwise identical reaction conditions the formation of 38 was also observed. This unwanted dimerization could be thwarted by increasing the amount of amide from 1.5 to ≥ 5 equivalents. Using these slightly modified conditions C2-substituted imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines 39 and 40 could be obtained in 61% and 51% yields, respectively.

**Scheme 41:** Amide Coupling Partner Scope

![Scheme 41](image)

conditions: 1 equiv. 36h, Pd (2 mol %), ligand (10 mol %), 2 equiv. K$_3$PO$_4$, a 10 equiv. acetamide, b 5 equiv. furanamide, 0.2 M t-BuOH, 110 °C, 4 h.

In order to demonstrate the utility of the imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine system further synthetic elaboration of the reaction products was explored (Scheme 42). Selective-deprotonation of 37h at C2 with LDA and quenching the resulting lithiate with hexachloroethane produced compound 41 in 85% yield. Alternatively, mCPBA can be used to oxidize 37h to pyridine-N-oxide 42 in 89% yield. Pyridine-N-oxide 42 was subsequently treated with POCl$_3$ at 100°C for 2 hours to form aryl chloride 43 regioselectively in 84% yield. Thus, we have demonstrated complementary regioselective chlorination protocols to obtain functionalized chloro-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines 41.
and 43. Additionally, treatment of 42 with TMSCN and triethylamine in acetonitrile\textsuperscript{201} gave the Reissert-Henze product 44 in 89\% yield as a single regioisomer.
In summary, copper-catalyzed conditions for the arylation of 3-amino-4-chloropyridine 34 with aryl and heteroaryl halides, providing a high-yielding and direct route to monoarylated 3-amino-4-chloropyridines were developed. Subsequent palladium catalyzed amidation produced imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines in excellent yields using amide coupling partners. Further functionalization of the imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines by halogenation and cyanation was demonstrated yielding diverse imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine scaffolds primed for further manipulation.
2.4 DEVELOPMENT OF A REGIOSELECTIVE AMIDE COUPLING

It was envisioned that the xantphos improved protocol would be applicable to a regioselective amide coupling of polychlorinated pyridines. The process would yield imidazopyridines with an additional chloride for further synthetic elaboration. N-substituted 3-aminopyridines that contain chlorine entities at the 2-position along with the 4, 5 or 6 positions were considered and based on previous studies the amide coupling is hypothesized to be selective for the 2-position (Scheme 43).

**Scheme 43**: Regioselective Coupling Hypothesis

![Scheme 43](image)

Regiospecific palladium catalyzed methodologies using polychloro heterocyclic systems have been reported by other groups. In 2000, scientists at Amgen demonstrated a selective Sonogashira coupling at the 2-position of 2,4-dichlor-3-amino-6-methylpyridine (Scheme 44, eq 1).\(^{202}\) Similarly, Delvare and co-workers developed an amide coupling that was also selective for the 2-position of 2,4-dichloropyridines (Scheme 44, eq 2).\(^{203}\) Altering the substrate to a 2,5-dichloropyridine, Castanet *et al.* performed a carbonylative Suzuki coupling that provided a good yield of the desired products (Scheme 44, eq 3).\(^{204}\)
Another example of a regiospecific coupling using Suzuki chemistry with 2,6-dichloropyridine system was discovered. In 2003, Yang and co-workers attempted to produce 6-amino-2-arylnicotinamides from the 2,6-dichloronicotinic acid precursor (Scheme 45, eq 1). When the carbonyl moiety was substituted as an ester, the reaction in methanol favored a coupling at the 2-position in a 2.5 to 1 ratio. This result was attributed to the ester selectively chelating with the palladium. When the ester was exchanged with a stronger chelating amide the selectivity improved favoring coupling at the 2-position in a 15:1 ratio. More recently, Langer and co-workers conducted Suzuki reactions with 2,6-dichloropyridines. Langer found that by using the boronic acid as the limiting reagent selective coupling at the 2-position of 2,6-dichloro-3-trifluoromethylpyridine was observed (Scheme 45, eq 2).
From our studies it was gathered that bidentate ligands were un-cooperative in the synthesis of imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines leaving the activated chlorine at the 4 position intact. It was also discovered that regioselective amidation could be attained under the Xantphos conditions and it was demonstrated with 2-chloro-N-(4-chlorobenzyl)pyridin-3-amine. There were a few concerns for the regioselective coupling under the new Xantphos mixed solvent conditions. With multiple chlorides on the pyridine ring there certainly could be some reduction products or over coupling. Pyridine 47 was examined with the standard Xantphos conditions previously elucidated (Section 2.2). After eleven hours a 77% conversion with a 44% crude yield was observed. Direct comparison with DPEPhos under identical conditions after only four hours there was a 95% conversion with 64% crude yield observed (Table 22).
With excellent conversion but relative low yield a combination of conditions were examined. Increasing the amount of \(t\)-amy1-OH beyond a ratio of 4:1 was detrimental to the crude yield of product (Table 24, entries 1 and 2). Changing from potassium phosphate to cesium carbonate, another inorganic base commonly used in catalysis, had a dramatic increase in yield (Table 24, entry 3). Increasing the amount of base used to 5 equivalents reduced the reaction time to 4 h and provided 48 in a 70% crude yield. At this point it was noticed that further reducing the amount of alcohol co-solvent had no change. The co-solvent was eliminated and the reaction was found to be identical to entries 7 and 8 using 5 equivalents of cesium carbonate. With this much base the reaction needed to be stirred vigorously for good mixing.

**Table 24: Base and Solvent Screen for Regioselective Coupling Using DPE Phos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Base (equiv.)</th>
<th>Solvent*</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Conv. (%)</th>
<th>Yield 48 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(K_3)PO_4 (1.5)</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(K_3)PO_4 (2)</td>
<td>1:0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (2)</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (2)</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (2)</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (2)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (5)</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (5)</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cs_2CO_3 (5)</td>
<td>1:0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Solvent ratio represents 1,4-dioxane: \(t\)-amy1 alcohol
Table 25: Palladium and Ligand Screen for Regioselective Coupling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Pd Source(^{a})</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>Bite Angle (L)</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Conv.(%)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pd(_2)(dba)_3 CHCl(_3)</td>
<td>L(_1)</td>
<td>108°</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pd(_2)(dba)_3 CHCl(_3)</td>
<td>L(_2)</td>
<td>107°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PdCl(_2)</td>
<td>L(_2)</td>
<td>107°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_2)</td>
<td>107°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pd(TFA)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_2)</td>
<td>107°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Pd(allyl)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>L(_2)</td>
<td>107°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_3)</td>
<td>111°</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_4)</td>
<td>113°</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_5)</td>
<td>97°</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)(_2)</td>
<td>L(_6)</td>
<td>87°</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Standard conditions: 4 mol % Pd (2 mol % for dinuclear sources), 10 mol % L.

Figure 15: Bidentate Ligands Examined for Regioselective Palladium Catalyzed Amidation

To evaluate the activity of certain combinations of catalysts and ligands the model reaction conditions contain \(47\), 1.5 equivalents of formamide and 5 equivalents of cesium carbonate in 1,4-dioxane an 110 °C (Table 25). The combination of Pd\(_2\)(dba)_3 CHCl\(_3\) and DPE Phos L\(_2\) provided excellent conversion and good yield (entry 2). Altering the palladium source can impact the formation of the active catalyst species, however, this had a minimal effect over the sources that were screened and PdCl\(_2\) did not work (entry 3). Presumably the active catalyst was not formed in
this example. Palladium acetate provided a clean reaction with barely any discerable impurities in the crude $^1$H NMR and it was utilized for the ligand screen (entries 4, 7-10). Bi-dentate ligands with similar characteristics were examined. When Xantphos ($\text{L1}$) and DPE Phos ($\text{L2}$) are bound to metals they have similar bite angles of 108° and 107° respectively. Although bite angles are flexible in organometallic complexes, it is believed that this was playing a crucial role in the reaction. These two ($\text{L1}$ and $\text{L2}$) performed similarly in previous experiments; however, mono-dentate ligands ($\text{PCy}_3$, $\text{P(o-Tol)}_3$ and $\text{P(2-Furyl)}_3$) and ligands with smaller bite angles ($\text{L5}$, 97° and $\text{L6}$, 87°) delivered no product in this reaction. The Floriani ligand ($\text{L3}$), 207, 208 and DPBP ($\text{L4}$), 209-211 were examined for the small differences to $\text{L1}$ and $\text{L2}$. The Floriani ligand $\text{L3}$ lacks the oxygen hetero atom which may have a weak interaction with the palladium in the transition state.\textsuperscript{212} The reaction with $\text{L3}$ was much slower than with $\text{L2}$ and only delivered 46% crude yield of 48. It is theorized that the weak interaction with the heteroatom may be beneficial to the reductive elimination step of the elementary catalytic process. The DPBP ($\text{L4}$) ligand possessing a carbonyl functional group was analyzed. The carbonyl should have a stronger interaction with the metal than an ethereal moiety. The reaction using $\text{L4}$ was slower than previous ligands but at only 52% conversion of 47 we observed 44% crude yield of 48. It is speculated that a longer reaction time with $\text{L4}$ would produce the greatest quantity of 48.

In summary, we have discovered reaction conditions for the regioselective amidation of 2,6-dichloro-3-aminopyridine 47 to provide the chlorinated imidazopyridine 48. Further exploration of the reaction conditions (reaction time, temperature, catalyst/ligand ratio) and substrate scope will be carried out to improve this reaction. Additional work will be required for the production of 2,4-dichloro-3-aminopyridines and subsequent evaluation of these moieties.
3.0 APPENDIX I: EXPERIMENTALS

3.1 GENERAL EXPERIMENTAL

3.1.1 General Procedures: Unless otherwise indicated, all reactions were conducted in oven (140°C) or flame-dried glassware using distilled and degassed solvents under positive pressure of dry argon with standard Schlenk techniques. All air-sensitive reagents were stored in an MBraun labmaster glovebox containing dry argon gas. Dry tetrahydrofuran (THF), toluene, acetonitrile (CH₃CN), diethyl ether (Et₂O) and methylene chloride (DCM) were obtained by passing commercially available pre-dried, oxygen-free formulations through two activated alumina columns using an MBraun MB-SPS solvent purification system. Stainless steel syringes or cannulae that had been oven-dried (140°C) and cooled under an argon atmosphere or in a desiccator were used to transfer air- and moisture-sensitive liquids. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically (¹H NMR) homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated. Reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography (TLC) carried out on pre-coated glass plates of silica gel (0.25 mm) 60 F₂₅₄ from EMD Chemicals Inc. using the indicated solvent system. Visualization was accomplished with ultraviolet light (UV 254 nm), or by shaking the plate in a sealed jar containing silica gel and Iodine. Alternatively, plates were treated with one of the following solutions (this was accomplished by holding the edge of the TLC plate with forceps or tweezers and immersing the plate into a wide-mouth jar containing the desired staining solution) and carefully heating with a hot-air gun (450°C) for approximately 1-2 min (NOTE: excess stain was removed by resting the TLC on a paper towel prior to heating): 10% phosphomolybdic acid in ethanol, 1% potassium permanganate/7% potassium carbonate/0.5% sodium hydroxide aqueous solution, and/or anisaldehyde in ethanol with 10% sulfuric acid. Flash column chromatography was performed using Silia Flash® P60 silica gel (40-63 µm) from Silicycle. All work-up and purification procedures were carried out with reagent grades solvents (purchased from VWR) in air.
3.1.2 Instrumentation: Infrared (IR) spectra were recorded on a Thermo Nicolet IR-100 spectrometer, $\nu_{\text{max}}$ in cm$^{-1}$, and were obtained from samples prepared as thin films between NaCl plates. $^1$H NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Avance DPX-300 (300 MHz) spectrometer and Bruker Avance III HD (400 MHz) spectrometer with CryoProbe Prodigy. Chemical shifts are reported in parts per million (ppm) and are calibrated using residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference (CDCl$_3$: $\delta$ 7.26 ppm; CD$_3$OD: $\delta$ 3.31 ppm). Data are reported as follows: chemical shift, multiplicity, coupling constants (Hz), and integration. The following abbreviations or combinations thereof were used to explain the multiplicities: s = singlet, d = doublet, t = triplet, q = quartet, pent = pentet, sext = sextet, sept = septet, m = multiplet, br = broad. $^{13}$C NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Avance DPX-300 (75 MHz) spectrometer and Bruker Avance III HD (100 MHz) spectrometer with CryoProbe Prodigy with complete proton decoupling. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm and are calibrated using residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference (CDCl$_3$: $\delta$ 77.16 ppm; CD$_3$OD: $\delta$ 49.00 ppm). $^{19}$F NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker Avance DPX-300 (282.4 MHz) spectrometer. Chemical shifts are reported in ppm and are calibrated using solvent as an external reference (CFCl$_3$: $\delta$ 0.00 ppm). Melting points (m.p.) are uncorrected and were recorded using an Electrothermal Mel-Temp® melting point apparatus. Elemental Analyses were performed on a Costech ECS 4010 elemental analyzer with a thermal conductivity detector and 2 meter GC column maintained at 65°C.
3.2 SYNTHESIS OF VINYL SILICON TETHERED ALKynes

**Reagents and Catalysts:** Reagents and ligands were purchased at the highest commercial quality and used without further purification, unless otherwise stated.

Alkynes not listed were prepared according to the literature procedure.\(^{28, 65}\)

\[
\text{O} + \text{Ph} \xrightarrow{nBuLi, AlMe_3, BF_3 \text{OEt}_2} \text{OH} \xrightarrow{\text{Cl-Si\text{Imidazole, DMAP}}} \text{DCM, 0°C-rt} \xrightarrow{\text{NH}_4\text{Cl(aq)}} \text{1.36}
\]

To a solution of phenylacetylene (2.6 mL, 24 mmol) in Et\(_2\)O (100 mL) at \(-78°C\) was added \(nBuLi\) (2.5 M in hexane, 9.6 mL, 24 mmol) over 20 min. After stirring at \(-78°C\) for an additional 20 min, trimethylaluminum (2.0 M in hexane, 12 mL, 24 mmol) was added via addition funnel over 5 min. The reaction was stirred at \(-78°C\) for 30 min, \(-45°C\) for 30 min, and then cooled to \(-78°C\), whereupon \(cis\)-2,3-epoxybutane (20 mmol) in Et\(_2\)O (11 mL) was added over 10 min. After stirring for 15 min, boron trifluoride diethyl etherate (2.8 mL, 22 mmol) in Et\(_2\)O (11 mL) was added slowly over 15 min and stirred at \(-78°C\) for 1 h. Methanol (36 mL) was added dropwise via addition funnel over 10 min, then the reaction was allowed to warm to rt over 25 min before sat. \(\text{NH}_4\text{Cl(aq)}\) (36 mL) was added. After stirring at rt for an additional 30 min, the reaction mixture was diluted with water (150 mL), extracted with Et\(_2\)O (3 x 100 mL), dried over Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), filtered, and concentrated \textit{in vacuo}. The residue was purified by flash column chromatography (hexane:Et\(_2\)O = 5:1) on silica gel to give the alcohol (1.36 g, 39\%) as an orange oil. The reaction of the alcohol (508 mg, 2.9 mmol), imidazole (395 mg, 5.8 mmol), DMAP (71 mg, 0.58 mmol)
and vinyldimethylchlorosilane (0.6 mL, 4.35 mmol) in DCM (20 mL) afforded the silyl ether 1.36 (660 mg, 88%) as a colorless oil.

**TLC** (hexanes:Et₂O = 10:1): \( R_f = 0.83 \)

**\(^1H\) NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.41-7.37 (m, 2 H), 7.30-7.24 (m, 3 H), 6.18 (dd, \( J = 20.1, 14.7 \) Hz, 1H), 6.01 (dd, \( J = 14.7, 3.9 \) Hz, 1H), 5.79 (dd, \( J = 20.2, 3.9 \) Hz, 1H), 3.96-3.89 (m, 1H), 2.75-2.68 (m, 1H), 1.23 (d, \( J = 6.2 \) Hz, 3H), 1.21(d, \( J = 7.0 \) Hz, 3H), 0.21 (s, 6H)

**\(^13C\) NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 138.1, 133.1, 131.7, 128.2, 127.6, 124.1, 92.6, 81.9, 71.0, 34.5, 20.1, 15.5, -1.2, -1.3

**IR** (film): 3082, 2977, 2879, 2233, 1573, 1252, 1155, 915

**Anal.** calcd for C\(_{16}\)H\(_{22}\)OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.08, H 8.67.
**Dimethyl((2-methyl-4-phenylbut-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.140a):** To a flame dried 50 mL round bottom flask with a magnetic stir bar was added alcohol S1 (1.08 g, 6.75 mmol), DCM (20 mL), DMAP (165 mg, 1.35 mmol) and imidazole (919 mg, 13.5 mmol). Vinyldimethylchlorosilane was added dropwise (1.39 mL, 10.125 mmol) to the resulting solution and the reaction stirred at RT for 2 h. The reaction mixture was poured into sat. NH₄Cl (aq.) (30 mL), extracted with DCM (2 x 20 mL), dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated *in vacuo* to give a yellow residue. The yellow residue was purified via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) to yield 1.140a as a clear oil (1.37 g, 84%).

**Rr = 0.72** (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.40-7.38 (m, 2H), 7.28-7.25 (m, 3H), 6.15 (dd, J = 20.0, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 6.03 (dd, J = 14.8, 4.0 Hz, 1H), 5.81 (dd, J = 20.0, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 3.76 (dd, J = 9.8, 6.0 Hz, 1H), 3.53 (dd, J = 9.8, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.81 (sext., J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 1.25 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.22 (s, 6H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 137.4, 133.5, 131.7, 128.3, 127.7, 123.8, 92.1, 81.6, 67.1, 29.7, 17.5, -1.9

**IR** (film): ν = 3053, 2967, 2909, 1596, 1490, 1253, 1086, 837 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₁₅H₂₀OSi: C 73.71, H 8.25; found: C 73.83, H 8.19
**Dimethyl((1-phenylhex-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.152a):** To a flame dried 250 mL 3-neck round bottom flask equipped with a pressure equalizing addition funnel, large magnetic stir bar and freshly prepared propargyl magnesium bromide (0.63M in Et₂O, 145 mmol) at -40°C was added benzaldehyde (9.9 mL, 97 mmol) dropwise. The reaction stirred at RT for 4 h, then poured into 1M HCl (200 mL). The layers were separated and the organics were dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated *in vacuo* to give a yellow oil (13.7 g). To a flame dried 500 mL round bottom flask with magnetic stir bar was added the resulting crude alcohol (13.7 g, 94 mmol), DCM (235 mL) and PPTS (2.36 g, 9.39 mmol). The yellow solution was cooled to 0°C (ice/H₂O bath) and DHP (17.1 mL, 188 mmol) was added dropwise. The reaction mixture stirred at RT for 4 hours and then was quenched by sat. NaHCO₃(aq) (100 mL). The layers were separated and the organics were dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated *in vacuo* to give a yellow oil (22.4 g). To a flame dried 500 mL 3-neck round bottom flask equipped with a pressure equalizing addition funnel and large magnetic stir bar was added the resulting crude alkyne (5.0 g, 21.7 mmol) and THF (130 mL). The yellow solution was cooled to -78°C (dry ice/acetone bath) and nBuLi (10.4 mL, 2.5M, 26.0 mmol) was added dropwise. After stirring for 1 h, bromoethane (7.3 mL, 98 mmol) was added dropwise then the solution was warmed to RT and stirred overnight. The reaction mixture was quenched by the addition of sat. NH₄Cl(aq) (100 mL) at -78°C (dry ice/acetone bath). The layers were separated and the aqueous was extracted with Et₂O (2 x 50 mL). The combined organics were
dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a orange oil (5.36 g). To an oven dried 100 mL round bottom flask with magnetic stir bar was added the resulting orange oil (5.36 g, 21 mmol), EtOH (50 mL) and PPTS (1.56 g, 6.2 mmol). The orange solution stirred at 50°C for 4 h, then was cooled to RT and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was dissolved in DCM and washed with brine (2 x 50 mL). The organics were dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a brown oil. Purification via flash column chromatography (gradient elution with 5-10% EtOAc/hexanes) gave alcohol as a yellow oil (1.48 g, 41% over 3 steps). To an oven dried 100 mL round bottom flask with magnetic stir bar was added alcohol (1.48 g, 8.5 mmol), DCM (45 mL), imidazole (1.16 g, 17 mmol) and DMAP (208 mg, 1.7 mmol). The solution was cooled to 0°C (ice/H₂O bath) and vinyldimethylchlorosilane (1.8 mL, 12.7 mmol) was added dropwise. The resulting yellow suspension stirred at RT overnight. The reaction was quenched with sat. NH₄Cl(aq) (50 mL) and the organics were dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow residue. Purification via flash column chromatography (gradient elution with 1-3% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave alkyne 1.152a as a pale yellow oil (1.39 g, 63%).

Rᵣ = 0.59 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.30 (m, 5H), 6.09 (dd, J = 20.0, 14.8 Hz, 1H), 5.97 (dd, J = 4.0, 14.8 Hz, 1H), 5.74 (dd, J = 4.0, 20.0 Hz, 1H), 4.78 (dd, J = 6.0, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.51 (m, 2H), 2.14 (qt, J = 10.0, 2.4 Hz, 2H), 1.09 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 3H), 0.17 (s, 3H), 0.12 (s, 3H)

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 144.2, 137.9, 133.3, 128.2, 127.5, 126.2, 83.7, 76.8, 74.5, 31.2, 14.3, 12.7, -1.3, -1.4

IR (film): ν = 3051, 2973, 2373, 1438, 1252, 1070 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.31, H 8.58
Dimethyl((1-phenyloct-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.153a): To a flame dried 250 mL 3-neck round bottom flask with a pressure equalizing addition funnel and magnetic stir bar was added 1-hexyne (4.1 g, 49.9 mmol) and THF (50 mL). The solution was cooled to -78°C (dry ice/acetone bath) and nBuLi (30 mL, 1.66M, 49.9 mmol) was added dropwise via addition funnel. After stirring at -78°C for 1 h, a solution of styrene oxide (5 g, 41.6 mmol) in HMPA (10.9 mL, 62.4 mmol) was added dropwise via addition funnel. After 10 minutes, the reaction mixture was allowed to warm to RT. The reaction was poured into 100 mL water and extracted with diethyl ether. The organic layer was washed with 1M HCl and brine, dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated *in vacuo* to afford a yellow oil (1.57 g, 18%). To a flame-dried 250 mL round bottom flask with stir bar was added the crude alcohol (1.57 g, 7.76 mmol) and DCM (50 mL). To the yellow solution was sequentially added imidazole (1.06 g, 15.52 mmol) and DMAP (0.2 equiv.). The resulting mixture was cooled to 0°C (ice/H₂O bath) and vinylidimethylchlorosilane was added dropwise. After stirring at 0°C for 10 minutes, the resulting suspension was allowed to warm to RT. After 4 h, the reaction was quenched with sat. NH₄Cl (aq) (30 mL) and extracted with DCM (3 x 30 mL). The combined organics were washed with brine (2 x 50 mL), dried with MgSO₄(s), filtered and concentrated to yield a yellow oil. The oil was purified via flash column chromatography (2% diethyl ether/hexanes) to yield 1.153a as a clear oil (1.73 g, 78%).
$R_f = 0.64$ (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

$^1H$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 7.35-7.22$ (m, 5H), 6.08 (dd, 1H, $J = 20.0$, 14.8 Hz), 5.96 (dd, 1H, $J = 14.8$, 4.2 Hz), 5.74 (dd, 1H, $J =20.0$, 4.2 Hz), 4.77 (t, 1H, $J = 6.3$ Hz), 2.61-2.44 (m, 2H), 2.12 (tt, 2H, $J = 9.2$, 6.8, 2.4 Hz), 1.47-1.32 (m, 4H), 0.88 (t, 3H, $J = 7.2$ Hz), 0.16 (s, 3H), 0.11 (s, 3H)

$^{13}C$ NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 144.1$, 137.8, 133.2, 128.1, 127.4, 126.1, 82.2, 74.4, 31.1, 31.1, 22.0, 18.6, 13.8, -1.3, -1.5

IR (film): $\nu = 3030, 2957, 2931, 2871$ cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{18}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 75.46, H 9.15; found: C 75.29, H 9.05
**Dimethyl((1-phenyldec-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.154a):** Prepared following the procedure for 20a: 1-octyne (3.5 mL, 24 mmol), nBuLi (9.6 mL, 2.5M, 24 mmol), styrene oxide (2.28 mL, 20 mmol) in HMPA (5.2 mL, 30 mmol). The reaction was poured into 100 mL water and extracted with diethyl ether. The organic layer was washed with 1M HCl and brine, dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to afford a yellow oil (2.74g, 59%). To a flame dried 100 mL round bottom flask was added the crude alcohol (1.39 g, 6.04 mmol), DCM (20 mL), DMAP (147 mg, 1.21 mmol) and imidazole (822 mg, 12.08 mmol). Vinylidimethylchlorosilane (1.25 mL, 9.06 mmol) was added dropwise to the yellow solution and the resulting suspension stirred overnight. The reaction mixture was poured into sat. NH₄Cl (aq.) (30mL), extracted with DCM (2 x 20 mL), dried with MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow residue. Purification via column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) to yield 1.154a as a clear oil (1.21 g, 64%).

R_f = 0.37 (2% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.35-7.28 (m, 3H), 7.25-7.22 (m, 2H), 6.08 (dd, J = 20.0, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 5.96 (dd, J = 14.8, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 5.81 (dd, J = 20.2, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 4.77 (t, J = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 2.60-2.44 (m, 2H), 2.13-2.08 (m, 2H), 1.47-1.23 (m, 8H), 0.89 (t, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.16 (s, 3H), 0.11 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 144.1, 137.7, 133.2, 128.1, 127.4, 126.1, 82.2, 74.3, 31.5, 31.1, 29.0, 28.7, 22.7, 18.2, 14.2, -1.3, -1.5

**IR** (film): ν = 2932, 2859, 1594, 1454, 1252, 1090, 836 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₂₀H₃₀OSi: C 76.37, H 9.61; found: C 76.21, H 9.56
To a flame-dried 100 mL round bottom flask was added imidazole (1.00 g, 14.76 mmol) and DMAP (0.181 g, 1.48 mmol), dichloromethane (40 mL), and alcohol (1.30 g, 7.38 mmol). The mixture was allowed to stir until complete dissolution and then cooled to 0 °C in an ice-water bath. vinyl dimethyl chlorosilane (0.93 mL, 6.71 mmol) was then added dropwise. After addition, the reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature. After 7 h, the reaction was complete as judged by TLC analysis and quenched with the addition of sat. 40 mL aq NH₄Cl. The organic layer was dried with Na₂SO₄ and concentrated in vacuo to yield a yellow oil. The crude product was purified on a silica gel column using 250 mL of 10:1 hexanes:ether to give the product (1.63 g, 79%) as a yellow oil.

**TLC Rf** (10% EtOAc / Hexanes): 0.39

**¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.47 (m, 10 H), 6.11 (dd, J = 20 Hz, 14.8 Hz, 1H), 5.99 (dd, J = 4.4 Hz, 14.8 Hz, 1 H), 5.77 (dd, J = 4.4 Hz, 20 Hz, 1 H), 4.88 (t, J = 6.4 Hz, 1 H), 2.62 (ddd, J = 2.8 Hz, 6.8 Hz, 16.4 Hz, 2H), 1.99 (t, J = 2.8 Hz, 1 H), 0.20 (s, 3 H), 0.15 (s, 3 H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 142.7, 141.0, 140.5, 137.6, 133.6, 128.9, 127.3, 127.2, 127.0, 126.5, 81.6, 73.5, 70.3, 30.7, -1.32, -1.48

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3305, 2121 cm⁻¹.

**Anal. Calc. for C₂₀H₂₂OSi:** C, 78.38; H, 7.24; Found: C, 78.36; H, 7.14
**Dimethyl((1-prop-2-yn-1-yl)cyclohexyl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.164a)**: To a flame-dried 100 mL round bottom flask was added imidazole (1.00 g, 14.76 mmol) and DMAP (0.181 g, 1.48 mmol), dichloromethane (40 mL), and alcohol (1.02 g, 7.38 mmol). The mixture was allowed to stir until complete dissolution and then cooled to 0 °C in an ice-water bath. Vinyl dimethyl chlorosilane (0.93 mL, 6.71 mmol) was then added neat, via syringe, dropwise. After addition, the reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature. After 25 h, the reaction was complete as judged by TLC analysis and quenched with the addition of 40 mL sat. aq NH₄Cl. The organic layer was dried with Na₂SO₄ and concentrated *in vacuo* to yield a colorless oil. The crude product was purified on a silica gel column using 250 mL of 20:1 hexanes:ether to give the product (1.26 g, 85%) as a colorless oil.

**TLC Rf** (5% EtOAc / Hexanes): 0.61

**¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 6.22 (dd, J = 20.4 Hz, 14.8 Hz, 1H), 5.93 (dd, J = 4 Hz, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.76 (dd, J = 14.4 Hz, 3.6 Hz, 1H), 2.39 (d, J = 2.8 Hz), 2.01 (t, J = 2.8 Hz), 1.44 (m, 10H), 0.22 (s, 6H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 140.2, 131.7, 81.8, 75.0, 70.8, 37.6, 33.0, 25.7, 22.4, 0.9

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3313, 2121 cm⁻¹.

**Anal. Calc. for C₁₃H₂₂OSi:** C, 70.21; H, 9.97; Found: C, 70.35; H, 10.20
**Syn-Aldol adduct S3:** To a 1 L round bottom flask (3-neck) equipped with an addition funnel was added oxazolidinone S2 (10.00 g, 42.9 mmol) and dichloromethane (430 mL). The solution was cooled to -15 °C in an ice-brine bath. To the solution was added TiCl$_4$ (4.9 mL, 45 mmol), dropwise and the reaction mixture is allowed to stir for 20 minutes. Diisopropylethylamine (8.2 mL, 47.2 mmol) is then added dropwise over a period of 10 minutes, and the resulting solution is allowed to stir for 1 hour, before adding N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (4.1 mL, 42.9 mmol) dropwise, and stirring for an additional 15 minutes. Benzaldehyde (4.8 mL, 47.2 mmol) is then added dropwise. After 1.5 h, the reaction is complete as judged by TLC analysis. The reaction mixture is quenched with saturated aqueous NH$_4$Cl (400 mL) and the aqueous phase extracted with dichloromethane (3 x 100 mL). The combined organics were dried with MgSO$_4$ and concentrated in vacuo to give an oily solid (13.18 g, 90%). Spectral data matches that in the literature. The crude product was carried on without further purification.

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 7.28 (m, 10H), 5.10 (d, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 1H), 4.60 (m, 1H), 4.11 (m, 4H), 3.25 (dd, $J = 4.4$, 17.6 Hz, 1H), 3.05 (bs, 1H), 2.78 (dd, $J = 12.4$, 17.6 Hz, 1H), 2.04 (s, 1H), 1.23 (d, $J = 9.2$ Hz, 3H)
Weinreb Amide (S4): Made by Daniel Nguyen

To an oven-dried 3-neck 500 mL RBF equipped with magnetic stir bar and pressure equalizing addition funnel under Ar\(_{(g)}\) was added Weinreb salt (10.4 g, 106 mmol, 3 equiv) and THF (55 mL). The suspension was cooled to 0°C (ice/H\(_2\)O bath) and AlMe\(_3\) (54 mL, 107 mmol, 3.02 equiv) was added dropwise over 30 min. (Caution: Vigorous gas evolution!) Once the addition was complete the cooling bath was removed and the cloudy solution stirred at rt for 30 min. The solution was re-cooled to -15°C (salt/ice/H\(_2\)O bath) and a solution of aldol adduct S3 (12.0 g, 35.4 mmol, 1 equiv) in THF (55 mL) was added dropwise. (Caution: Vigorous gas evolution!) The reaction mixture stirred for 45 min then was quenched by cannula transfer into a 2 L RBF cooled at 0°C (ice/H\(_2\)O bath) containing 1:2 DCM/1N HCl\(_{(aq)}\) (780 mL). (Caution: Vigorous gas evolution!) After stirring for 30 min the layers were separated and the aqueous was extracted with DCM (3 x 250 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried over Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow oil. To the oil was added DMF (55 mL), imidazole (4.8 g, 71 mmol, 2 equiv) and TBSCl (5.9 g, 39 mmol, 1.1 equiv). The yellow solution stirred at rt overnight then poured into H\(_2\)O (200 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3 x 200 mL). The organic layers were washed with brine, dried over Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow oil. Purification via column chromatography (silica gel 4.5 x 10 cm; gradient elution with 10%-30% EtOAc/hexanes) gave S4 as a clear oil (10.5g, 88% over two steps). 

R\(_f\) (30% EtOAc/hexanes) = 0.56

\([\alpha]D\)\(_{24}^\circ\) = -2.1° (c = 1.030 in CHCl\(_3\))

\(^1\text{H NMR}\) (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 7.34-7.17\) (m, 5H), 4.80 (d, 1H, \(J = 8.6\) Hz), 3.26 (s, 3H), 3.16 (bs, 1H), 2.95 (s, 3H), 1.27 (d, 3H, \(J = 6.8\) Hz), 0.87 (s, 9H), 0.04 (s, 3H), -0.22 (s, 3H)

\(^{13}\text{C NMR}\) (100 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 175.6, 144.3, 128.0, 127.4, 127.0, 76.6, 61.3, 45.5, 31.9, 26.0, 18.4, 15.0, -4.4, -4.8

\(\text{FT-IR (NaCl, thin film)}\) \(\nu = 3499, 3032, 2959, 1660, 1462, 1256\) cm\(^{-1}\)

**Anal. calcd for C\(_{18}\)H\(_{31}\)NO\(_2\)Si: C 64.05, H 9.26, N 4.15; found: C 63.99, H 9.33, N 4.07.**
Methyl Ketone (S5): Made by Daniel Nguyen

To a flame-dried 25 mL RBF equipped with a magnetic stir bar under Ar(g) was added a solution of Weinreb amide S4 (1.0 g, 3.0 mmol, 1 equiv) in THF (6 mL). The reaction mixture was cooled to 0°C (ice/water bath) and methylmagnesium chloride (2 mL, 6.0 mmol, 2 equiv) was added dropwise. The reaction stirred at 0°C for 5 min then was warmed to rt and stirred for 3 h. The white suspension was poured into 1M HCl (10 mL) and the layers were separated. The aqueous phase was extracted with ether (3 x 10 mL) then the combined organic extracts were dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give a yellow oil. Purification via column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; gradient elution with 1%-4% EtOAc/hexanes) gave S5 as a clear oil (718 mg, 82%).

Rf (15% EtOAc/hexanes) = 0.59

[α]D24 = -16.9° (c = 0.946 in CHCl₃)

¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.33-7.21 (m, 5H), 4.83 (d, 1H, J = 6.8 Hz), 2.86-2.77 (m, 1H), 1.91 (s, 3H), 1.16 (d, 3H, J = 6.9 Hz), 0.88 (s, 9H), 0.03 (s, 3H), -0.22 (s, 3H)

¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 211.2, 143.4, 128.1, 127.5, 126.3, 76.3, 56.0, 30.5, 25.9, 18.2, 12.6, -4.5, -5.1

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2959, 1715, 1454, 1360, 1256 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd for C₁₇H₂₈O₂Si: C 69.81, H 9.65; found C 69.65, H 9.52.
**Enol Triflate (S6):** Made by Daniel Nguyen

To a oven-dried 100 mL RBF equipped with a magnetic stir bar under Ar\(_{\text{g}}\) was added freshly prepared KHMDS (1M in THF, 7.5 mmol, 1.1 equiv). The pale yellow solution was cooled to -78°C (dry ice/acetone bath) and methyl ketone S5 (2.0 g, 6.8 mmol, 1 equiv) in THF (6.8 mL) was added dropwise. Comins' reagent\(^{215}\) (5.3 g, 13.6 mmol, 2 equiv) in THF (6.8 mL) was subsequently added in one portion. The yellow solution stirred at -78°C for 2 h. The reaction mixture was warmed slightly and quenched with H\(_2\)O (15 mL). The layers were separated and the aqueous phase was extracted with DCM (3 x 10 mL). The combined organics were dried over MgSO\(_4\), filtered and concentrated *in vacuo* to give a yellow oil. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel; gradient elution with 1%-2% EtOAc/hexanes) to give S6 as a clear oil (2.35 g, 81%).

**Rt** (10% EtOAc/hexanes) = 0.68

\([\alpha]_D^{24} = +1.4° (c = 0.946 \text{ in CHCl}_3)\)

\(^1\text{H NMR}\) (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 7.34-7.21\) (m, 5H), \(5.17\) (d, 1H, \(J = 3.8\) Hz), \(4.95-4.93\) (m, 2H), \(2.67-2.59\) (m, 1H), \(1.05\) (d, 3H, \(J = 6.9\) Hz), \(0.91\) (s, 9H), \(0.02\) (s, 3H), \(-0.18\) (s, 3H)

\(^{13}\text{C NMR}\) (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 158.6, 142.8, 128.2, 127.6, 126.4, 118.8\) (q, \(J_{\text{C-F}} = 316.4\) Hz), 105.5, 74.0, 47.7, 26.0, 18.5, 11.3, -4.5, -5.3

**Anal.** calcd for C\(_{18}\)H\(_{27}\)F\(_3\)O\(_4\)Si: C 50.92, H 6.41; found C 50.47, H 6.38.

Enol triflate S6 was treated with TBAF to produce alkyne S7 which was taken on crude to the next step.
dimethyl(((1S,2R)-2-methyl-1-phenylbut-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.165a): To a flame-dried 100 mL round bottom flask was added imidazole (.850 g, 12.48 mmol) and DMAP (.153 g, 1.25 mmol), dichloromethane (40 mL), and S7 (1.00 g, 6.24 mmol). The mixture was allowed to stir until complete dissolution and then cooled to 0 °C in an ice-water bath. Vinyl dimethyl chlorosilane (1.3 mL, 9.36 mmol) was then added neat, via syringe, dropwise. After addition the reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature. After 15 minutes, the reaction was complete as judged by TLC analysis and quenched with the addition of 40 mL sat. aq NH$_4$Cl. The aqueous phase was extracted with dichloromethane (3 x 20 mL), and the combined organics were washed with brine (40 mL), dried with MgSO$_4$, concentrated in vacuo to give a slightly colored oil. The crude product was purified on a silica gel column (2.5 x 12 cm) using 100 mL hexanes, 300 mL 99:1 hexanes:ether, 100 mL 30:1 hexanes:ether to give the product (1.28 g, 84%) as a colorless oil.

**TLC R$_f$** (10% Ether / Hexanes): 0.75

**$^1$H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 7.29 (m, 5H), 6.04 (dd, $J$ = 14.8, 19.6 Hz, 2H), 5.95 (dd, $J$ = 4.4, 14.8 Hz, 2H), 5.71 (dd, 4.8, 20 Hz, 2H), 4.59 (d, $J$ = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 2.70 (pd, $J$ = 2.8, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 1.99 (d, $J$ = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 1.19 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 0.12 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H)

**$^{13}$C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 142.9, 137.7, 133.3, 128.0, 127.6, 127.1, 86.8, 78.0, 70.4, 35.4, 16.9, -1.31, -1.48

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) $\nu$ = 3310, 2114 cm$^{-1}$.

[$\alpha$]$_D$$^{23}$λ 589 nm (c 0.51, CHCl$_3$) = -47.3°

**Anal. Calc. for** C$_{15}$H$_{20}$OSi: C, 73.71; H, 8.25; Found: C, 73.74; H, 8.19
(S)-4-benzyl-3-propionyloxazolidin-2-one (S2): Prepared according to the literature procedure by Gage and Evans\textsuperscript{216} to give colorless needles (92%).

**MP:** 44-45°C;

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): $\delta = 7.20-7.37$ (m, 5H), 4.72-4.62 (m, 1H), 4.24-4.15 (m, 2H), 3.31 (dd, $J = 13.5, 3.3$ Hz, 1H), 3.05-2.89 (m, 2H), 2.77 (dd, $J = 13.5, 9.6$ Hz, 1H), 1.21 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 3H).

Prepared from S2 and benzaldehyde according to procedure by Evans et al.\textsuperscript{217} To a flame dried 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a stir bar was added oxazolidinone S2 (7.0g, 30 mmol) and ethyl acetate (100 mL). To the stirred solution was added MgCl\textsubscript{2} (570 mg, 6 mmol), triethylamine (5.7 mL, 45 mmol), and benzaldehyde (3.66 mL, 36 mmol). The reaction was stirred over night then the yellow solution was filtered through a plug of silica (5 cm x 5 cm) with diethyl ether (500 mL). The volatiles were removed \textit{in vacuo} followed by the addition of methanol (50 mL) and 3 drops of trifluoroacetic acid. The solution was stirred for 1 h; a white precipitate formed, was filtered and washed with methanol (50 mL). The white solid was dried to obtain 8.28 g (81%).

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): $\delta = 7.45-7.28$ (m, 8H), 7.17-7.14 (m, 2H), 4.82 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 1H), 4.73-4.65 (m, 1H), 4.39-4.30 (m, 1H), 4.22-4.12 (m, 2H), 3.19 (dd, $J = 13.5, 3.3$ Hz, 1H), 2.67 (dd, $J = 13.5, 9.5$ Hz, 1H), 1.11 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H).
(S8): To a flame dried 250 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and cooled under Ar(g), was added aldol adduct (8.28 g, 24.4 mmol), DCM (100 mL), and 2,6-lutidine (3.4 mL, 29.3 mmol) with stirring. Once homogenous the solution was cooled to -45 °C in a dry ice-acetone bath. TBSOTf (6.75 mL, 29.3 mmol) was added dropwise via syringe and the solution was allowed to warm to r.t. The reaction was stirred for 30 mins and was judged complete by TLC. Hexanes (150 mL) were added and the organic layer was washed with water (2 x 100 mL), and Brine (2 x 25 mL). The organic layer was dried with sodium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude TBS protected product (quant. 11.07 g).

Thioester (S9): To a flame dried 500 mL 3 neck round bottom flask equipped with an addition funnel and a magnetic stir bar was added THF (200 mL) and ethanethiol (6.0 mL, 83 mmol) and cooled to -78 °C in a dry ice-acetone bath. To the cooled solution was added n-BuLi (2.5 M in hexanes, 23 mL, 57.5 mmol) dropwise via addition funnel. After complete addition, the milky white solution was warmed to 0 °C and stirred for 1 h. The crude S8 (11.07 g, 24.4 mmol) was dissolved in THF (50 mL) and added slowly to the stirred solution. The reaction was judged complete by TLC at 2 h and 200 mL of ethylacetate:hexanes (1:1) was added. The organics were washed with 1M NaOH (3 x 100 mL) and brine (3 x 100 mL), dried with MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The sticky solid was dissolved in DCM (20 mL) and hexanes (150 mL) were added to precipitate the oxazolidinone. The solid was filtered and washed with hexanes (100 mL). The hexanes were concentrated to afford the thioester (6.5 g, 79% over 2 steps) which was sufficiently pure to continue to the next step.

TLC Rf (20% ethyl acetate/hexanes) = 0.89

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.38-7.29 (m, 5H), 4.51 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.21 (d, J = 2.5 Hz, 1H), 1.10 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 1H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 141.3, 128.4, 128.1, 126.7, 85.5, 77.5, 71.4, 35.1, 17.4

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3568, 3296, 2979, 2879, 1453, 1173, 701 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C₁₁H₁₂O: C, 82.24; H, 8.63; found C 82.13; H, 8.49
**Aldehyde (S10):** To a 50 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added 5% Pd/C (692 mg, 0.325 mmol) then S9 (1.10 g, 3.25 mmol) in acetone (7 mL). To the stirred solution was added triethylsilane (1.56 mL, 9.75 mmol) dropwise and the mixture was stirred for 7 h. The reaction was filtered through a pad of celite with acetone (60 mL) and the volatiles were removed *in vacuo* to afford a light yellow oil (0.875 g, 96%). Pd(OAc)₂ can be used and the reaction is complete in 0.5 h. Matches the literature data\(^{218}\)

**TLC R\(_f\) (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.54**

**\(^1\)H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta = 9.81 \text{ (d, } J = 2.7 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 7.36-7.25 \text{ (m, 5H)}, 4.76 \text{ (d, } J = 7.6 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 2.68 \text{ (dp, } J = 7.0 \text{ Hz, 2.7 Hz, 1H)}, 0.88 \text{ (d, } J = 6.7 \text{ Hz, 3H)}, 0.84 \text{ (s, 9H)}, 0.01 \text{ (s, 3H)}, -0.25 \text{ (s, 3H)}\)
To a flame dried 100 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar and cooled under Ar(g), was added THF (5 mL) and di-isopropylamine (0.55 mL, 3.86 mmol). The solution was cooled to -78 °C then n-BuLi (2.44M in hexanes, 1.58 mL, 3.86 mmol) was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred for 30 minutes followed by the addition of TMSCH₂N₂ (2.0M in hexanes, 1.93 mL, 3.86 mmol) dropwise. After 30 minutes at -78 °C, S₄ (0.833 g, 3.0 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was added dropwise and stirred for 1h then warmed to rt and quenched with water (30 mL). The aqueous layer was extracted with diethyl ether (3 x 20 mL), dried with MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was applied to a silica gel column (2.5 x 15 cm) and eluted with 5% ethyl ether in hexanes to afford 703 mg (86%) of clear oil.

**TLC Rf** (10% ethyl acetate/hexanes) = 0.94

**¹H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.35-7.25 (m, 5H), 4.60 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 1H), 2.71 (dp, J = 7.0 Hz, 2.4 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (d, J = 2.7 Hz, 1H), 1.01 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H), 0.87 (s, 9H), 0.05 (s, 3H), -0.15 (s, 3H)
(1S,2S)-2-methyl-1-phenylbut-3-yn-1-ol (S11): To a 20 mL scintillation vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added the TBS protected alkyne (400 mg, 1.46 mmol), MeCN (3.0 mL, 0.5M), and KF·2H2O (192 mg, 2.04 mmol). To the stirred suspension was added trimethylchlorosilane (0.28 mL, 2.19 mmol) dropwise and the yellow solution as stirred for 3 h. The reaction was quenched by the dropwise addition of saturated aqueous NaHCO3 (4 mL), extracted with CH2Cl2 (2 x 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with DI H2O (40 mL) and brine (20 mL). The organics were dried with MgSO4, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was applied to a silica gel column (2.5 x 15 cm) and eluted with 25% ethyl acetate in hexanes to afford 161 mg (69%) of clear oil.

TLC Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.15

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 7.38-7.29 (m, 5H), 4.51 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.21 (d, J = 2.5 Hz, 1H), 1.10 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 1H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 141.3, 128.4, 128.1, 126.7, 85.5, 77.5, 71.4, 35.1, 17.4

[α]D^23λ 589 nm (c 0.960, CHCl3) αD = -74.8628

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3568, 3296, 2979, 2879, 1453, 1173, 701 cm^-1

Anal. calcd. for C11H12O: C, 82.24; H, 8.63; found C 82.13; H, 8.49
dimethyl(((1S,2S)-2-methyl-1-phenylbut-3-yn-1-yl)oxy)(vinyl)silane (1.166a): To a flame-dried 50 mL round bottom flask was added imidazole (150 mg, 2.2 mmol) and DMAP (30 mg, 0.22 mmol), dichloromethane (15 mL), and S6 (161 mg, 1.01 mmol). The mixture was allowed to stir until complete dissolution and then cooled to 0 °C in an ice-water bath. Vinyl dimethyl chlorosilane (0.21 mL, 1.51 mmol) was then added neat, via syringe, dropwise. After addition, the reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature. After 3 h, the reaction was complete as judged by TLC analysis and quenched with the addition of 40 mL sat. aq NH₄Cl. The organic layer was dried with MgSO₄ and concentrated in vacuo to yield a yellow oil. The crude product was purified on a silica gel column eluting with 1% ethyl ether in hexanes to afford the product (219 mg, 89%) as a colorless oil.

TLC R<sub>f</sub> (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.79

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.33-7.25 (m, 5H), 6.05 (dd, J = 19.6 Hz, 14.8 Hz, 1H), 5.95 (dd, J = 14.8 Hz, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 5.72 (dd, J = 19.6 Hz, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 4.60 (d, J = 6.4 Hz, 1H), 2.75 (dp, J = 7.0 Hz, 2.4 Hz, 1H), 2.07 (d, J = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 1.02 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.13 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H)

<sup>13</sup>C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 142.1, 137.6, 127.9, 127.6, 127.0, 86.6, 77.8, 70.0, 35.2, 16.8, -1.3, -1.5

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2979, 2879, 1453, 1173, 701 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C₁₅H₂₀OSi: C, 73.71; H, 8.25; found C 73.59; H, 8.07
3.3 INTERMOLECULAR COUPLING DATA

3.3.1 Acrylamides and Acrylates

(2E,4Z)-N-(tert-butyl)-4-phenyl-4-(2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilan-3-ylidene)but-2-enamide (1.34): In a glove box, to a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added ruthenium hydride complex RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (36 mg, 0.05 mmol), tert-butyl acrylamide (63 mg, 0.5 mmol), and alkyne 1a (62 mg, 0.25 mmol) in 1.0 mL toluene. The tube was sealed and brought out of the glove box and placed under an argon atmosphere. The vessel was immersed into a preheated 110 °C oil bath for 2h. The reaction was judged complete by TLC and was filtered through a plug of silica eluting with dichloromethane. The solution was concentrated in vacuo and applied to a SiO₂ column eluting with 10% ethyl acetate in hexanes. The product was obtained as brown oil with unidentified impurities (62 mg, 72\%).

¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.73 (d, J = 15Hz, 1H), 7.36-7.31 (m, 5H), 5.37 (d, J = 15Hz, 1H), 5.22 (bs, NH), 4.21-4.15 (m, 1H), 3.08 (dd, J = 16.5, 5.4 Hz 1H), 2.43 (dd, J = 16.5, 8.1Hz 1H), 1.34 (s, 9H), 1.30 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.09 (s, 3H), -0.20 (s, 3H);

Impurities: 7.12-7.09 (m, 2.4H), 3.77 (s, 0.07H), 3.69 (s, 0.12 H), 3.43 (s, 0.14H), 2.29-2.26 (m, 0.66H);
(2E,4Z)-tert-butyl-4-phenyl-4-(2,2,4,5-tetramethyl-1,2-oxasilolan-3-ylidene)but-2-enoate (1.37): In a glove box, to a 25 mL Schlenk tube was added RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (9 mg, 0.0125 mmol), and 1q (68 mg, 0.25 mmol) in 0.5 mL toluene. The vessel was sealed, removed from the glovebox and placed under an argon atmosphere. Tert-butyl acrylate (0.2 mL, 1.25 mmol) was added via syringe and the reaction vessel was immersed in a preheated 110 °C oil bath. After 45 minutes the reaction was judged complete by TLC and cooled to room temperature. The solution was filtered through a plug of silica gel, eluted with dichloromethane and concentrated in vacuo. The oil obtained was applied to a SiO₂ column and eluted with 1% diethyl ether in hexanes. The fractions obtained were concentrated at reduced pressure to afford clear oil (46 mg, 52%);

Rf (10% ethyl ether/hexanes): 0.24

¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.73 (d, J = 15.6 Hz, 1H), 7.32-7.28 (m, 3H), 7.11-7.08 (m, 2H), 5.46 (d, J = 15.6 Hz, 1H), 4.11 (q, J = 12.6, 6.3 Hz, 1H), 2.97 (q, J = 14.4, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 1.43 (s, 9H), 1.22 (d, J = 7.2Hz, 3H), 1.16 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 3H), 0.14 (s, 3H), -0.44 (s, 3H);

¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 167.0, 157.7, 145.8, 141.0, 141.0, 129.5, 128.2, 127.7, 124.1, 80.5, 19.9, 44.8, 28.2, 24.6, 21.9, 2.1, 0.6;

Anal. calcd. for C₂₁H₃₀O₃Si: C, 70.35; H, 8.43; found C, 70.12; H, 8.45;
3.3.2 Vinyl Boronates

Vinyl Boronate (1.39a): Prepared with an adaptation to the literature procedure. Freshly prepared vinylmagnesium bromide (0.91 M in THF, ~175 mL) was added dropwise over 1 h to a stirred solution of anhydrous trimethylborate (10.2 mL, 180 mmol) in dry THF (100 mL) at -78 °C (dry ice/acetone bath) under Ar(g). The reaction stirred at -78 °C for 1 h then was warmed to rt, followed by addition of 20% HCl (44 mL). After 10 min, a solution of 2,2-dimethylpropane-1,3-diol (11.3 mL, 90 mmol) in Et₂O (9 mL) was added and the reaction stirred for 1 h. The two phases were separated and the aqueous phase extracted with Et₂O (100 mL). The combined organic extracts were washed with sat. NaHCO₃(aq) (2 x 100 mL) and water (2 x 100 mL), dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give the crude product as a yellow oil. Distillation under vacuum (b.p. 19-21 °C at ~0.5 mmHg) gave 1.39a as a clear liquid (43%).

¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 6.07 (dd, 1H, J = 18.9, 4.8 Hz), 5.89-5.85 (m, 1H), 5.77 (dd, 1H, J =18.9, 13.5 Hz), 3.64 (s, 4H), 0.97 (s, 6H)

¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 134.5, 72.1, 31.8, 21.9

¹¹B NMR (96 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 27.8

Anal. calcd for C₇H₁₃BO₂: C 60.06, H 9.36; found: C 59.95, H 9.29
**4,4,6-trimethyl-2-vinyl-1,3,2-dioxaborinane (1.39b):** prepared according to literature procedure and matched spectroscopic data.\(^3\) Distilled under vacuum (34-35°C at ~0.5 mmHg) to yield a clear oil (45%);

\(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 6.04\) (dd, \(J = 18.3, 5.6\) Hz, 1H), 5.89-5.86 (m, 1H), 5.76 (dd, \(J = 18.3, 13.5\) Hz, 1H), 4.27-4.16 (m, 1H), 1.79 (dd, \(J = 14.1, 3.0\) Hz, 1H), 1.50 (dd, \(J = 13.8, 11.7\) Hz, 1H), 1.30 (s, 6H), 1.27 (d, \(J = 6.0\) Hz, 3H);

\(^{11}\)B NMR (96 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 27.7\);

**Vinyl MIDA (1.39d):** prepared according to literature protocol and matched spectroscopic data.\(^6\) Also commercially available from Sigma-Aldrich.

\(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, Acetone-D\(_6\)) \(\delta = 5.97\) (dd, \(J = 18.6, 13.8\) Hz, 1H), 5.70-5.63 (m, 2H), 4.22 (d, \(J = 16.8\) Hz, 2H), 4.02 (d, \(J = 16.8\) Hz, 2H), 3.00 (s, 3H);
**General Procedure for the Vinyl Boronate Coupling**

To an oven-dried 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar in an argon filled glovebox was added ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (0.05 equiv), alkyne (1.0 equiv) in toluene (0.5M) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (2.0 equiv). The sealed reaction vessel was removed from the glovebox and placed under a positive stream of Ar(g), then stirred at 85 °C until TLC analysis indicated complete consumption of the starting material. The orange/brown solution was cooled to rt, filtered through a plug of silica gel (eluted with ether) and concentrated *in vacuo* to give an amber-colored oil. The residue was purified by column chromatography on silica gel.

Diene (1.60): Following the general procedure, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (9 mg, 0.0125 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.46 (75.0 mg, 0.25 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (1.0 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (87 µL, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 6 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 5% ether/hexanes) to give 1.60 as a pale brown oil (69 mg, 65%).

**Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.28**

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 7.43 (d, 1H, J = 17.7 Hz), 7.28-7.22 (m, 3H), 7.08-7.05 (m, 2H), 5.19 (d, 1H, J = 18.0 Hz), 4.30-4.17 (m, 1H), 2.73 (s, 2H), 1.79 (dd, 1H, J = 14.1, 3.0 Hz), 1.70-1.43 (m, 11H), 1.29-1.26 (m, 9H), -0.18 (s, 3H), -0.19 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 148.7, 146.4, 144.7, 142.1, 129.9, 127.8, 127.0, 80.0, 71.0, 64.9, 46.1, 39.7, 34.8, 31.7, 31.3, 28.2, 25.8, 23.3, 23.1, 22.8, 1.2, 1.1

**11B NMR** (96 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 27.6

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2974, 2933, 1522, 1392, 1291, 1207, 1057, 1035 cm⁻¹

**HRMS** (ESI) calc. for (C25H37BO3Si)Na⁺: 447.2497; found 447.2496.
Diene (1.62): Following the general procedure, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (18 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.10 equiv), alkyne 1.48 (76.5 mg, 0.25 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (0.5 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (87 µL, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 5.5 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 10% ether/hexanes) to give 1.62 as a pale brown oil (58 mg, 54%).

Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.23

\[ \text{1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl}_3\text{)} \delta = 7.47-7.27 (m, 9H), 7.13-7.10 (m, 2H), 5.25 (d, 1H, } J = 18.0 \text{ Hz), 5.05 (dd, 1H, } J = 9.6, 5.2 \text{ Hz), 4.24-4.16 (m, 1H), 3.41 (ddd, 1H, } J = 16.4, 5.3, 3.6 \text{ Hz), 2.65 (ddd, 1H, } J = 16.4, 9.6, 2.4 \text{ Hz), 1.77 (dd, 1H, } J = 13.9, 2.9 \text{ Hz), 1.47 (dd, 1H, } J = 13.4, 11.8 \text{ Hz), 1.27 (s, 6H), 1.24 (dd, 3H, } J = 6.2, 1.6 \text{ Hz), 0.08 (s, 1H), 0.07 (s, 1H), -0.19 (s, 1H), -0.21 (s, 1H) \]

\[ \text{13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl}_3\text{)} \delta = 148.5, 145.1, 144.7, 144.5, 141.8, 129.8, 128.5, 127.9, 127.4, 127.2, 125.7, 78.1, 71.0, 64.9, 46.1, 42.2, 31.3, 28.2, 23.3, 0.6, 0.5, -0.5, -0.6 \]

\[ \text{11B NMR (128 MHz, CDCl}_3\text{)} \delta = 27.7 \]

\[ \text{FT-IR (NaCl, thin film)} \nu = 2972, 1582, 1491, 1390, 1302, 1207, 1161, 1030 \text{ cm}^{-1} \]

\[ \text{HRMS (ESI) calc. for (C}_{26}\text{H}_{33}\text{BO}_3\text{Si})\text{Na}^+ \text{: 455.2184; found 455.2183.} \]
Diene (1.63): Following the general procedure, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (8.7 mg, 0.012 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.49 (74.5 mg, 0.24 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (0.5 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (83 µL, 0.48 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 4 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 10% ether/hexanes) to give 1.63 as a pale brown oil (68 mg, 63%).

Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.23

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 7.46-7.26 (m, 9H), 7.12-7.09 (m, 2H), 5.24 (d, 1H, J = 17.7 Hz), 5.04 (dd, 1H, J = 9.6, 5.4 Hz), 4.24-4.14 (m, 1H), 3.40 (ddd, 1H, J = 16.5, 5.4, 2.7 Hz), 2.64 (app dd, 1H, J = 15.3, 9.9 Hz), 1.76 (dd, 1H, J = 13.8, 2.7 Hz), 1.47 (dd, 1H, J = 13.5, 11.7 Hz), 1.27-1.23 (m, 9H), 0.08 (s, 1.5H), 0.06 (s, 1.5H), -0.20 (s, 1.5H), -0.21 (s, 1.5H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 148.5, 145.1, 144.7, 144.5, 141.8, 129.8, 128.5, 127.9, 127.4, 127.2, 125.7, 78.1, 71.0, 64.9, 46.0, 42.2, 31.3, 28.2, 23.2, 0.5, 0.4, -0.6, -0.7

$^{11}$B NMR (96 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 28.1

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2975, 1719, 1599, 1492, 1392, 1304, 1272, 1030 cm$^{-1}$

HRMS (ESI) calc. for (C$_{26}$H$_{33}$BO$_3$Si)Na$: 455.2184; found 455.2183.
**Diene (1.65):** Following the general, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (9.1 mg, 0.0125 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.51 (72.4 mg, 0.25 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (0.5 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (87 µL, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 4 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; gradient elution with 10%-15% ether/hexanes) to give 1.65 as a yellow oil (63.1 mg, 60%).

**Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.14**

**^1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.22 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz), 7.58 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz), 7.39 (dd, 1H, J = 17.7, 2.4 Hz), 7.31-7.27 (m, 3H), 7.11-7.08 (m, 2H), 5.26 (d, 1H, J = 17.7 Hz), 5.14 (dd, 1H, J = 9.6, 5.4 Hz), 4.23-4.17 (m, 1H), 3.46 (ddd, 1H, J = 16.2, 5.1, 3.9 Hz), 2.56 (ddd, 1H, J = 16.2, 9.6, 3.0 Hz), 1.77 (dd, 1H, J = 14.1, 3.0 Hz), 1.49 (app t, 1H, J = 11.7 Hz), 1.30-1.23 (m, 9H), 0.09 (s, 1.5H), 0.07 (s, 1.5H), -0.19 (s, 1.5H), -0.20 (s, 1.5H)

**^13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 152.4, 149.2, 147.2, 144.1, 143.4, 141.6, 129.7, 128.0, 127.4, 126.3, 123.8, 77.1, 71.1, 65.0, 46.0, 41.7, 31.3, 28.2, 23.3, 0.5, 0.4, -0.6, -0.7

**^11B NMR** (96 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 27.8

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3024, 2973, 2933, 2858, 1585, 1390, 1293, 1249 cm⁻¹

**HRMS (ESI)** calc. for (C₂₆H₃₂BNO₅Si)Na⁺: 500.2035; found 500.2033.
Diene (1.68): Following the general, ruthenium hydride 

\[
\text{RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)}_2
\]

(18 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.10 equiv), alkyne 1.54 (69.1 mg, 0.25 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (1.0 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (87 µL, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 3 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 10% ether/hexanes) to give 1.68 as a pale brown oil (68 mg, 68%).

\( R_f \) (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.38

\(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta = 7.41 \) (dd, 1H, \( J = 18.0, 1.8 \) Hz), \( 6.98 \) (d, 2H, \( J = 8.7 \) Hz), \( 6.81 \) (d, 2H, \( J = 8.7 \) Hz), \( 5.21 \) (d, 1H, \( J = 17.7 \) Hz), \( 4.23-4.16 \) (m, 2H), \( 3.79 \) (s, 3H), \( 3.06 \) (ddd, 1H, \( J = 16.5, 5.4, 4.2 \) Hz), \( 2.38 \) (ddd, 1H, \( J = 16.2, 8.1, 4.2 \) Hz), \( 1.77 \) (dd, 1H, \( J = 14.1, 3.0 \) Hz), \( 1.47 \) (dd, 1H, \( J = 13.8, 11.4 \) Hz), \( 1.32 \) (d, 3H, \( J = 6.3 \) Hz), \( 1.29-1.24 \) (m, 9H), \( -0.07 \) (s, 1.5H), \( -0.09 \) (s, 1.5H), \( -0.21 \) (s, 1.5H), \( -0.22 \) (s, 1.5H)

\(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta = 158.7, 148.0, 145.7, 144.9, 134.3, 130.9, 113.2, 72.7, 70.9, 64.9, 55.3, 46.1, 40.7, 31.3, 28.2, 24.1, 23.2, 0.8, 0.7, -0.2, -0.3

\(^{11}\)B NMR (96 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta = 27.9 \)

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) \( \nu = 2972, 2932, 1607, 1510, 1391, 1303, 1272, 1035 \) cm\(^{-1}\)

HRMS (ESI) calc. for \((C_{22}H_{33}BO_4Si)Na^+\): 423.2133; found 423.2132.
Diene (1.69): Following the general, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (9 mg, 0.0125 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.55 (65 mg, 0.25 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (0.5 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (87 µL, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 3 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 5% ether/hexanes) to give 1.69 as a pale brown oil (57.1 mg, 59%).

Rf (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.41

\(^1H\) NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 7.41\) (dd, 1H, \(J = 18.0, 1.5\) Hz), 7.06-6.94 (m, 4H), 5.15 (d, 1H, \(J = 17.7\) Hz), 4.23-4.17 (m, 2H), 3.06 (dd, 1H, \(J = 16.2, 5.4, 4.2\) Hz), 2.39 (ddd, 1H, \(J = 16.2, 8.1, 3.9\)), 1.78 (dd, 1H, \(J = 13.8, 3.0\) Hz), 1.50 (app t, 1H, \(J = 13.8\)), 1.33 (d, 3H, \(J = 6.3\) Hz), 1.28-1.25 (m, 9H), -0.08 (s, 1.5H), -0.09 (s, 1.5H), -0.21 (s, 1.5H), -0.22 (s, 1.5H)

\(^13C\) NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 163.7, 160.5, 147.3, 146.5\) (d, \(J_{C:F} = 1.4\) Hz), 144.7, 137.8 (d, \(J_{C:F} = 3.4\) Hz), 131.4 (d, \(J_{C:F} = 8.0\) Hz), 114.8 (d, \(J_{C:F} = 21.1\) Hz), 72.7, 71.1, 65.0, 40.8, 31.3, 28.2, 24.1, 23.3, 0.7, 0.6, -0.3, -0.4

\(^11B\) NMR (96 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 27.9\)

\(^19F\) NMR (282.3 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = ((-115.9) - (-116.1))\) m

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 2976, 1719, 1602, 1508, 1384, 1304, 1259, 1091 \text{ cm}^{-1}\)

Anal. calcd for C\(_{21}\)H\(_{30}\)BFO\(_3\)Si: C 64.95, H 7.79; found C 65.04, H 7.72.
Diene (1.70): Following the general, ruthenium hydride $\text{RuHCl(CO)(PCy}_3\text{)}_2$ (17.4 mg, 0.024 mmol, 0.10 equiv), alkyne 1.56 (69 mg, 0.24 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in toluene (1.0 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39b (83 µL, 0.48 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 4.5 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 12 cm; eluted with 15\% ethyl acetate/hexanes) to give 1.70 as a pale brown oil (45.0 mg, 45\%).

$R_f$ (20\% ether/hexanes) = 0.14

$^1H$ NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 7.90 (m, 2H), 7.41 (dd, 1H, $J$ = 18.0, 1.5 Hz), 7.20-7.17 (m, 2H), 5.11 (d, 1H, $J$ = 18.0 Hz), 4.24-4.16 (m, 2H), 3.10 (ddd, 1H, $J$ = 16.2, 5.4, 3.9 Hz), 2.61 (s, 3H), 2.42 (ddd, 1H, $J$ = 16.5, 8.1, 3.6 Hz), 1.78 (dd, 1H, $J$ = 14.1, 3.0 Hz), 1.49 (dd, 1H, $J$ = 14.1, 11.7 Hz), 1.34 (d, 3H, $J$ = 6.0 Hz), 1.29-1.25 (m, 9H), -0.08 (s, 1.5H), -0.09 (s, 1.5H), 0.21 (s, 1.5H), -0.23 (s, 1.5H)

$^{13}C$ NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 198.0, 147.3, 147.2, 146.5, 144.1, 136.0, 130.1, 128.1, 72.6, 71.1, 65.0, 46.1, 40.9, 31.3, 28.2, 26.8, 24.1, 23.2, 0.7, 0.6, -0.2, -0.3

$^{11}B$ NMR (96 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 28.8

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2923, 1685, 1601, 1560, 1094 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. caled for C$_{23}$H$_{33}$BO$_4$Si: C 66.98, H 8.07; found C 66.69, H 8.35.
**Diene (1.71):** To an oven-dried 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar in an argon filled glovebox was added ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (20 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.05 equiv) and a solution of alkyne 1.33 (122 mg, 0.5 mmol, 1.0 equiv) and vinyl boronate 1.39c (155 mg, 1.0 mmol, 2.0 equiv) in toluene (1.0 mL). The sealed reaction vessel was removed from the glovebox and placed under a positive stream of Ar(g), then the reaction mixture stirred at 85 °C for 4 h. TLC analysis indicated complete consumption of the starting material. The brown solution was cooled to rt, filtered through a plug of silica gel (eluted with DCM) and concentrated in vacuo to give a brown oil. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 10% ether/hexanes) to give 1.71 as a light brown oil (102 mg, 55%).

**Rf** (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.12

**1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 7.50 (d, 1H, J = 17.8 Hz), 7.28-7.24 (m, 3H), 7.08-7.05 (m, 2H), 5.26 (d, 1H, J = 18.2 Hz), 4.22-4.16 (m, 1H), 3.09 (dd, 1H, J = 16.0, 5.3 Hz), 2.41 (dd, 1H, J = 16.0, 8.0 Hz), 1.32 (d, 3H, J = 6.3 Hz), 1.23 (s, 12H), -0.08 (s, 3H), -0.22 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 148.0, 147.5, 147.3, 141.3, 129.8, 127.9, 127.2, 83.3, 72.6, 40.8, 24.9, 24.8, 24.0, 0.5, -0.4

**11B NMR** (128 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 30.0

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2975, 2928, 1597, 1492, 1344, 1251, 1144, 1060 cm⁻¹

**Anal.** calcd for C21H31BO3Si: C 68.10, H 8.44; found C 67.95, H 8.24.
**Diene (1.72):** Following the general, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (11 mg, 0.015 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.46 (89 mg, 0.3 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in DCE (0.5 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39c (93 mg, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 2.5 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 5% ether/hexanes) to give 1.72 as a pale brown oil (91 mg, 72%).

**Rr (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.25**

**1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 7.66 (d, 1H, J = 17.9 Hz), 7.46-7.40 (m, 3H), 7.24-7.22 (m, 2H), 5.42 (d, 1H, J = 17.9 Hz), 2.91 (s, 2H), 1.85-1.51 (m, 10H), 1.43 (s, 12H), 0.00 (s, 6H)

**13C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 147.3, 147.0, 146.2, 140.4, 128.8, 126.8, 126.1, 82.3, 78.9, 43.0, 38.6, 24.6, 23.8, 21.9, 0.0

**11B NMR** (128 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 30.8

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2978, 2931, 2857, 1597, 1444, 1379, 1249, 970, 828 cm⁻¹

**Anal.** calcd for C25H37BO3Si: C 70.74, H 8.79; found C 71.08, H 8.64.
Diene (1.73): Following the general procedure, ruthenium hydride RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)2 (11 mg, 0.015 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.47 (96 mg, 0.3 mmol, 1.0 equiv), vinyl boronate 1.39c (93 mg, 0.50 mmol, 2.0 equiv) and DCE (0.5 mL) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 2.5 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; gradient elution with 5%-10% ether/hexanes) to give 1.73 as a pale brown oil (89 mg, 67%).

$R_f$ (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.28

$^1H$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 7.60-7.54 (m, 3H), 7.42-7.27 (m, 7H), 7.14-7.12 (m, 2H), 5.34 (d, 1H, $J = 17.9$ Hz), 3.33 (d, 1H, $J = 16.6$ Hz), 3.10 (d, 1H, $J = 16.6$ Hz), 1.61 (s, 3H), 1.32 (s, 12H), 0.00 (s, 3H), -0.09 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 149.4, 148.6, 147.1, 147.1, 141.5, 129.8, 128.2, 128.0, 127.3, 126.6, 124.8, 83.5, 81.7, 46.6, 32.1, 25.0, 24.9, 0.8, 0.8

$^{11}$B NMR (128 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 30.9

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu =$ 3058, 2978, 2929, 1598, 1444, 1379, 1250, 1205, 1144, 1031, 830 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd for C$_{26}$H$_{33}$BO$_3$Si: C 72.64, H 7.90; found C 72.70, H 8.14.
**Diene (1.74):** Following the general procedure, ruthenium hydride \(\text{RuHCl(CO)(PCy}_3\text{)}_2\) (11 mg, 0.015 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne **1.48** (96 mg, 0.31 mmol, 1.0 equiv), vinyl boronate **1.39c** (96 mg, 0.62 mmol, 2.0 equiv) and DCE (0.6 mL) were combined and stirred at 85 °C for 5 h. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 10% ether/hexanes) to give **1.74** as a pale brown oil (90 mg, 67%).

\[ \text{Rf (10\% ether/hexanes) = 0.16} \]

**\(^1\)H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 7.50\) (d, 1H, \(J = 18.1\) Hz), 7.41-7.27 (m, 8H), 7.12-7.09 (m, 2H), 5.29 (d, 1H, \(J = 18.1\) Hz), 5.05 (dd, 1H, \(J = 9.5, 5.4\) Hz), 3.43 (dd, 1H, \(J = 16.4, 9.5\) Hz), 2.65 (dd, 1H, \(J = 16.4, 5.4\) Hz), 1.23 (s, 12H), 0.07 (s, 3H), -0.18 (s, 3H)

**\(^{13}\)C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 148.2, 147.2, 146.8, 144.6, 141.3, 129.8, 128.5, 128.0, 127.4, 127.4, 125.6, 83.4, 78.0, 42.3, 24.9, 0.4, -0.5

**\(^{11}\)B NMR** (128 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 30.3\)

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 2978, 1598, 1492, 1384, 1306, 1251, 1144, 847\) cm\(^{-1}\)

**Anal.** calcd for C\(_{26}\)H\(_{33}\)BO\(_3\)Si: C 72.21, H 7.69; found C 72.29, H 7.39.
Diene (1.75): To an oven-dried 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added silyl boronate 1.74 (50 mg, 0.12 mmol, 1.0 equiv), Pd(OAc)$_2$ (1.3 mg, 0.006 mmol, 0.05 equiv), S-Phos (5.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 0.10 equiv) and K$_3$PO$_4$ (76.4 mg, 0.36 mmol, 3.0 equiv). The vessel was evacuated then placed under Ar$_{(g)}$. To the solids was added degassed H$_2$O (6.5 µL, 0.36 mmol, 3.0 equiv), degassed THF (1.2 mL) and iodobenzene (20 µL, 0.18 mmol, 1.5 equiv). The resulting orange suspension stirred at 50 ºC overnight. TLC analysis indicated complete consumption of the starting material. The orange suspension was cooled to rt, filtered through a plug of silica gel (eluted with ether) and concentrated in vacuo to give an orange oil. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 1.5 x 15 cm; gradient elution with 2%-4% ether/hexanes) to give 1.75 as a yellow solid (33.3 mg, 73%).

R$_f$ (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.35

M.P. = 117-118 ºC

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 7.37-7.09 (m, 16H), 6.13 (d, 1H, $J = 16.0$ Hz), 5.02 (m, 1H), 3.30 (dd, 1H, $J = 16.0$, 6.0 Hz), 2.61 (dd, 1H, $J = 16.0$, 9.3 Hz), 0.00 (s, 3H), -0.22 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 147.3, 144.9, 143.6, 142.1, 137.5, 133.5, 129.9, 128.8, 128.6, 128.2, 128.1, 128.0, 127.6, 127.5, 126.9, 125.6, 78.0, 42.4, 0.6, -0.3

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3059, 3030, 2927, 1599, 1492, 1447, 1249, 1031 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calc'd for C$_{26}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 81.63, H 6.85; found C 81.57, H 6.66.
Vinyl Iodide (1.76): To an oven-dried 50 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar under Ar(g) was added silyl boronate 1.74 (46 mg, 0.11 mmol, 1.0 equiv) and THF (0.24 mL). To the pale yellow solution was added NaOH (5M in H2O, 66 µL, 0.33 mmol, 3.0 equiv) dropwise via syringe. After stirring for 20 min, a solution of I2 (56 mg, 0.22 mmol, 1.5 equiv) in THF (0.3 mL) was added dropwise. The dark red solution stirred at rt for 20 min. TLC analysis indicated complete consumption of the starting material. The reaction was quenched by addition of sat. Na2S2O3(aq) (1 mL). The aqueous layer was extracted with DCM (3 x 1 mL) and the combined organic layers were dried over Na2SO4, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to give 1.76 as a yellow oil (31.3 mg, 66%).

Rf (5% ether/hexanes) = 0.33

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 7.55 (d, 1H, J = 14.5 Hz), 7.40-7.27 (m, 8H), 7.15-7.13 (m, 2H), 6.07 (d, 1H, J = 14.5 Hz), 5.07 (dd, 1H, J = 9.6, 5.6 Hz), 3.23 (dd, 1H, J = 16.4, 5.3 Hz), 2.54 (dd, 1H, J = 16.4, 9.5 Hz), 0.06 (s, 3H), -0.16 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3) δ = 146.7, 144.5, 144.4, 143.8, 140.5, 129.6, 128.6, 128.4, 127.9, 127.5, 125.5, 84.2, 77.7, 42.3, 0.3, -0.5

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3059, 2958, 1491, 1249, 1030, 703 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd for C20H21OSi: C 55.56, H 4.90; found C 55.38, H 4.75.
Alkyne (1.77): To an oven dried 50 mL Schlenk tube equipped with magnetic stir bar was added PdCl$_2$(PPh$_3$)$_2$ (10 mg, 0.014 mmol, 0.05 equiv), CuI (5 mg, 0.028 mmol, 0.10 equiv), phenylacetylene (33 µL, 0.30 mmol, 1.1 equiv) and vinyl iodide 1.76 (120 mg, 0.28 mmol, 1 equiv) in 1:1 NEt$_3$/THF (2.0 mL). The Schlenk tube was capped with a rubber septum and two cycles of freeze/pump/thaw were conducted. The reaction was warmed to rt then heated to 60 °C. After 15 min TLC indicated the reaction was complete. The mixture was filtered through a plug of Celite® (eluted with ether), washed with sat. NH$_4$Cl(aq) and brine then dried over MgSO$_4$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm; eluted with 5% EtOAc/hexanes) to give 1.77 as a yellow oil (100 mg, 88%).

\[ R_f \text{ (20\% EtOAc/hexanes) = 0.74} \]

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 7.45$-7.34 (m, 9H), 7.33-7.28 (m, 4H), 7.22 (d, 1H, $J = 15.8$ Hz), 7.21-7.19 (m, 2H), 5.54 (d, 1H, $J = 15.8$ Hz), 5.13 (dd, 1H, $J = 9.3$, 5.5 Hz), 3.35 (dd, 1H, $J = 16.7$, 5.7 Hz), 2.68 (dd, 1H, $J = 16.5$, 9.3 Hz), 0.10 (s, 3H), -0.11 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 146.5$, 145.9, 144.6, 140.8, 140.0, 131.6, 129.7, 128.5, 128.5, 128.4, 127.8, 127.4, 125.5, 123.5, 112.9, 94.3, 89.3, 77.8, 42.3, 0.4, -0.4

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 3059$, 3030, 2959, 2246, 1600, 1489, 1249, 1054, 860 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd for C$_{28}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 82.71, H 6.45; found C 82.47, H 6.40.
**Diene (1.78):** ruthenium hydride $\text{RuHCl(CO)(PCy3)}_2$ (20 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.05 equiv), alkyne 1.33 (122 mg, 0.5 mmol, 1.0 equiv) in THF (1.0 mL) and vinyl boronate 1.39c (155 mg, 1 mmol, 2 equiv) were combined and stirred at 70 °C overnight. In a separate oven-dried 50 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added Pd(OAc)$_2$ (6.0 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.05 equiv), S-Phos (20 mg, 0.05 mmol, 0.10 equiv), 4-iodotoluene (218 mg, 1.0 mmol, 2.0 equiv), K$_3$PO$_4$ (2M, freshly prepared and degassed prior, 1.5 mmol, 0.75 mL, 3 equiv) and THF (3 mL, degassed). To the resulting solution was added the crude diene reaction mixture then the mixture stirred at 50 °C overnight. TLC analysis indicated complete consumption of the starting material. The solution was cooled to rt, filtered through a plug of silica gel (eluted with DCM) and concentrated *in vacuo*. The residue was purified by column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 12 cm; eluted with 2% ether/hexanes) to give 1.78 (92 mg, 55% over two steps).

$R_f$ (10% ether/hexanes) = 0.18

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 7.39-7.08 (m, 10H), 6.16 (d, 1H, $J$ = 15.9 Hz), 4.30-4.20 (m, 1H), 3.07 (dd, 1H, $J$ = 16.2, 5.1 Hz), 2.43 (dd, 1H, $J$ = 16.2, 8.4 Hz), 2.32 (s, 3H), 1.36 (d, 3H, $J$ = 6.0 Hz), -0.07 (s, 3H), -0.19 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 147.1, 143.4, 142.0, 137.7, 134.6, 132.9, 129.7, 129.3, 127.9, 127.2, 127.1, 126.6, 72.4, 40.8, 24.0, 21.2, 0.5, -0.4

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu$ = 3078, 3026, 2966, 2866, 2241, 1603, 1584, 1510, 1491, 1376, 1249, 1124, 1095 cm$^{-1}$

**Anal.** calcd for C$_{22}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 78.99, H 7.83; found C 78.77, H 7.44.
3.4 ETHYLENE TRANSFER DATA

3.4.1 Intramolecular Ethylene Transfer: MVK

General Experimental for Ethylene Transposition:

In an argon-filled glovebox, a 15 mL sealed tube equipped with a stir bar was charged with RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (0.05 equiv.), the silyl ether (1.0 equiv.), MVK (0.10 equiv.) and dry DCE (0.5 M). The reaction mixture was sealed with a teflon cap, removed from the glovebox and immersed in a preheated 85°C oil bath. After being stirred at 85°C for the allotted time, the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo and purified by flash chromatography on silica gel.
According to the general experimental, the reaction of the silyl ether 1.83 (124 mg, 0.5 mmol), MVK (4 μL, 4 mg, 0.05 mmol) and RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (18 mg, 0.025 mmol) in DCE (1 mL, 0.5 M) afforded the product Z-1.102 (81 mg, 65%) as a colorless oil.

**TLC** (hexanes:Et₂O = 10:1): \( R_f = 0.21 \)

**Flash chromatography** (2.5 cm φ × 15 cm): hexanes:Et₂O = 45:1

**¹H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃): \( \delta = 7.33-7.27 \) (m, 3H), 7.13-7.10 (m, 2H), 6.88 (dd, \( J = 17.4, 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.23 (dd, \( J = 10.8, 1.8 \) Hz, 1H), 4.86 (dd, \( J = 17.4, 1.8 \) Hz, 1H), 4.12-4.08 (m, 1H), 2.98-2.93 (m, 1H), 1.27 (d, \( J = 6.3 \) Hz, 3H), 1.17 (d, \( J = 7.2 \) Hz, 3H), 0.13 (s, 3H), -0.41 (s, 3H)

**¹³C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl₃): \( \delta \) 150.5, 146.6, 141.5, 135.3, 129.8, 127.9, 127.2, 118.6, 74.5, 42.0, 19.1, 14.3, 1.7, -1.2

**IR** (film): 3082, 2967, 2869, 1598, 1491, 1141, 743

**Anal.** calcd for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.44, H, 8.98
According to the general experimental, the reaction of the silyl ether 1.84 (258 mg, 1.0 mmol), MVK (8 µL, 0.10 mmol) and RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (34 mg, 0.05 mmol) in DCE (1.5 mL, 0.67 M) afforded the product Z-1.38 (157 mg, 61%) as a colorless oil.

TLC (hexanes:Et₂O = 10:1): Rₛ = 0.38

Flash chromatography (2.5 cm φ × 15 cm): hexanes:Et₂O = 45:1

¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.33-7.27 (m, 3H), 7.15-7.12 (m, 2H), 6.88 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, J = 10.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.88 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.11-4.06 (m, 1H), 2.86-2.83 (m, 1H), 1.21 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 1.17 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.15 (s, 3H), -0.43 (s, 3H)

¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 148.1, 148.1, 141.8, 135.4, 129.8, 127.9, 127.3, 118.7, 80.0, 44.3, 24.6, 21.3, 2.3, 0.7

IR (film): 3025, 2960, 2867, 1581, 1490, 1250, 842

Anal. calcd for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.34, H 8.89
3.4.2  Silylvinylation Using Ethylene Gas

**General procedure for Silylvinylation at 1 atmosphere ethylene:**

An oven dried 50 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar was brought into an argon filled glove box. To the Schlenk tube was added RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (1-5 mol%) followed by the alkyne substrate (1.0 equivalent) in 1,2-dichloroethane or toluene (0.25M). The Schlenk tube was sealed and removed from the glovebox. The solution was purged with ethylene gas for 1-5 minutes via balloon and steel needle. The needle was removed from the solution and placed 3-4 cm above the solvent, then the apparatus was immersed in an 80°C oil bath. The reaction was stirred until complete consumption of the starting material was visualized by thin layer chromatography. Upon completion, the reaction was filtered through a short plug of silica gel (eluted with dichloromethane) and concentrated *in vacuo*. A crude yield was obtained by $^1$H NMR with mesitylene (0.33 equivalents) as an internal standard. The crude product was purified via flash chromatography on silica gel.
(Z)-2,2,5-trimethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.135)

Following the general procedure, RuH (35 mg, 0.046 mmol) and alkyne 1.33 (1.12 g, 4.6 mmol) in toluene (4.6 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (2-3% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.135 as a clear oil (80% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 10:1:1

Rf = 0.40 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.34-7.28 (m, 3H), 7.13-7.10 (m, 2H), 6.86 (dd, J = 17.4, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (dd, J = 10.8, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, 17.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.16 (m, 1H), 2.96 (dd, J = 15.9, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.32 (dd, J = 15.9, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 1.32 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.07 (s, 3H), -0.20 (s, 3H). Minor isomer diagnostic peaks: δ = 6.52 (dd, J = 16.8, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.75 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 1.20 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 148.2, 147.2, 144.4, 143.5, 141.6, 139.8, 139.8, 135.9, 129.7, 128.9, 128.3, 127.9, 127.3, 126.9, 118.3, 116.4, 72.7, 72.5, 42.8, 40.7, 24.1, 23.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.3, -0.3

IR (film): ν = 3056, 2964, 2873, 1581, 1249, 1035, 832 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C₁₅H₂₀OSi: C 73.71, H 8.25; found: C 73.71, H 8.34
(Z)-5-cyclohexyl-2,2-dimethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.136)

Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.006 mmol) and alkyne 1.44 (78 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via preparative TLC (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.136 as a clear oil (70% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 16:2:1

Rf = 0.80 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 7.34-7.27 (m, 3H), 7.14-7.11 (m, 2H), 6.89 (dd, $J$ = 17.4, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (dd, $J$ = 10.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, $J$ = 17.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 3.80-3.75 (m, 1H), 2.87 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.45 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 8.7 Hz, 1H), 1.96-1.92 (m, 1H), 1.78-1.66 (m, 4H), 1.31-0.98 (m, 6H), -0.08 (s, 3H), -0.22 (s, 3H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks: $\delta$ = 6.52 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (d, $J$ = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.75 (d, $J$ = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 0.40 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 147.0, 143.7, 141.8, 135.9, 129.8, 127.9, 127.2, 118.2, 80.7, 44.8, 36.0, 29.3, 28.7, 26.3, 26.3, 0.4, -0.2

IR (film): $\nu$ = 2925, 2852, 1581, 1449, 1248, 1032 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{20}$H$_{28}$OSi: C 76.86, H 9.03; found: C 76.52, H 8.82
(Z)-2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.137)

Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.48 (77 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via preparative TLC (1:200 diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.137 as a clear oil (65% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 10:1:1

R_f = 0.20 (5% diethyl ether/hexanes)

^1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl_3): δ = 7.44-7.28 (m, 8H), 7.19-7.16 (m, 2H), 6.87 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.26 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (dd, J = 9.5, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 4.92 (d, J = 17.1 Hz, 1H), 3.29 (dd, J = 16.3, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.61 (dd, J = 16.3, 9.5 Hz, 1H), -0.09 (s, 3H), -0.15 (s, 3H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks: δ = 6.58 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.14 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.81 (d, J = 17.1 Hz, 1H), 0.52 (s, 3H), 0.51 (s, 3H)

^13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 147.4, 144.4, 142.9, 141.6, 135.8, 129.8, 128.5, 128.0, 127.4, 127.4, 125.6, 118.8, 77.9, 42.0, 0.5, -0.4

IR (film): ν = 3060, 2961, 2880, 1582, 1420, 1250, 781 cm^{-1}

Anal. calcd. for C_{20}H_{22}OSi: C 78.38, H 7.24; found: C 78.43, H 7.02
(Z)-2,2,5-trimethyl-5-phenyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.138)

Following the general procedure RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.47 (80.1 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via preparative TLC (2% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.138 as a clear oil (70% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 16:2:1

Rf = 0.62 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 7.52-7.49 (m, 2H), 7.38-7.30 (m, 5H), 7.27-7.22 (m, 1H), 7.16-7.12 (m, 2H), 6.92 (dd, J = 17.4, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.27 (dd, J = 10.8, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 4.91 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 3.14 (d, J = 16.2 Hz, 1H), 3.03 (d, J = 16.2 Hz, 1H), 1.58 (s, 3H), -0.07 (s, 3H), -0.10 (s, 3H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks: δ = 6.55 (dd, J = 16.8, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.10 (dd, J = 10.8, 0.9 Hz, 1H), 4.75 (d, J = 17.1 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (d, J = 16.5 Hz, 1H), 2.60 (d, J = 16.5 Hz, 1H), 1.48 (s, 3H), 0.54 (s, 3H), 0.38 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 149.5, 147.6, 143.1, 141.7, 135.8, 129.8, 128.2, 128.0, 127.4, 126.5, 124.8, 118.6, 81.5, 46.5, 32.2, 1.0, 0.8

IR (film): v = 3057, 2965, 2887, 1599, 1582, 1492, 1250, 962 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C21H24OSi: C 78.70, H 7.55; found: C 79.07, H 7.75
Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.46 (74 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 3 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.139 as a clear oil (76% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 16:2:1**

R$_r$ = 0.42 (5% diethyl ether/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 7.34-7.25 (m, 3H), 7.15-7.12 (m, 2H), 6.89 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, $J$ = 10.8, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 2.65 (s, 2H), 1.70-1.41 (m, 10H), -0.16 (s, 6H); **minor isomer diagnostic peaks:** $\delta$ = 6.54 (dd, $J$ = 16.8, 10.2 Hz, 1H), 5.06 (d, $J$ = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 4.71 (d, $J$ = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 2.22 (s, 3H), 0.40 (s, 6H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 146.5, 143.0, 140.8, 134.9, 128.8, 126.9, 126.2, 117.0, 78.8, 42.7, 38.7, 24.7, 22.2, 0.1

IR (film): $\nu$ = 3055, 2931, 2857, 1582, 1443, 1249, 891 cm$^{-1}$

**Anal. calcd.** for C$_{19}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 76.45, H 8.78; found: C 76.29, H 8.47
(Z)-2,2,4-trimethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.140)

Following the general procedure, RuH (9.0 mg, 0.0125 mmol) and alkyne 1.140a (74.6 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1.5 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.140 as a clear oil (67% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 13:1:2**

**Rf** = 0.36 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 7.33-7.25 (m, 3H), 7.14-7.10 (m, 2H), 6.90 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (dd, $J$ = 10.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.00 (dd, $J$ = 9.3, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 3.85 (d, $J$ = 9.6 Hz, 1H), 3.18-3.09 (m, 1H), 1.21 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 0.14 (s, 3H), -0.41 (s, 3H); **minor isomer diagnostic peaks**: $\delta$ = 6.49 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.09 (dd, $J$ = 10.5 , 0.9 Hz, 1H), 4.69 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 2.60-2.52 (m, 1H), 0.85 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 0.46 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 148.3, 147.0, 141.5, 135.3, 129.7, 127.9, 127.3, 118.7, 72.5, 38.2, 21.1, 1.6, -1.2

**IR** (film): $\nu$ = 3025, 2960, 2867, 1581, 1490, 1250, 842 cm$^{-1}$

**Anal. calcd.** for C$_{15}$H$_{20}$OSi: C 73.71, H 8.25; found: C 73.97, H 8.35
**138**

(Z)-2,2,4,5-tetramethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.142)

Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.005 mmol) and alkyne 1.36 (64.5 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.142 as a clear oil (70% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 18:2:1**

Rf = 0.38 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.33-7.27 (m, 3H), 7.15-7.12 (m, 2H), 6.88 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, J = 10.5, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.88 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.11-4.06 (m, 1H), 2.86-2.83 (m, 1H), 1.21 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 1.17 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.15 (s, 3H), -0.43 (s, 3H); **minor isomer diagnostic peaks**: δ = 6.52 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (dd, J = 10.2, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 4.67 (dd, J = 17.1, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 0.44 (s, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 148.1, 148.1, 141.8, 135.4, 129.8, 127.9, 127.3, 118.7, 80.0, 44.3, 24.6, 21.3, 2.3, 0.7

**IR** (film): ν = 3025, 2960, 2867, 1581, 1490, 1250, 842 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.34, H 8.89.
(Z)-3-(1-(4-fluorophenyl)allylidene)-2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane
(1.143)

Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.006 mmol) and alkyne 1.55 (79 mg, 0.3 mmol) in toluene (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via preparative TLC (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.143 as a clear oil (69% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 23:3:1

Rf = 0.27 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 7.11-7.07 (m, 2H), 7.04-6.99 (m, 2H), 6.84 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.82 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.16 (m, 1H), 2.94 (dd, J = 16.1, 5.0 Hz, 1H), 2.31 (dd, J = 16.1, 8.2 Hz, 1H), 1.32 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.06 (s, 3H), -0.18 (s, 3H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks: δ = 6.50 (dd, J = 16.8, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (d, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 4.73 (d, J = 17.1 Hz, 1H), 0.41 (s, 3H), 0.38 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 162.0 (d, Jc-F = 249.7 Hz), 146.2, 144.3, 137.7 (d, Jc-F = 3.4 Hz), 136.0, 131.5 (d, Jc-F = 8.5 Hz), 118.4, 115.1 (d, Jc-F = 22.1 Hz), 72.6, 40.8, 24.2, 0.7, -0.1

19F NMR (376.4 MHz, CDCl3): δ = (-115.2)(-115.2)(m); (-115.6)(-115.7)(m)

IR (film): ν = 3044, 2928, 1507, 1452, 1256, 910 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C15H19FOSi: C 68.66, H 7.30; found: C 68.82, H 7.26
(Z)-3-(1-(2-chlorophenyl)allylidene)-2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.144)

Following the general procedure, RuH (11.0 mg, 0.015 mmol) and alkyne 1.81 (84.0 mg, 0.30 mmol) in 1,4-dioxane (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 100°C for 30 minutes. Purification via preparative TLC (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.144 as a clear oil (70% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 12:1:3

Rf = 0.46 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$, mixture of rotamers): δ = 7.40-7.37 (m, 1H), 7.28-7.23 (m, 2H), 7.13-7.11 (m, 1H), 6.81 (ddd, $J$ = 17.2, 10.5, 2.7 Hz, 1H), 5.20 (d, $J$ = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 4.69 (d, $J$ = 12.9 Hz, 1H) 4.33-4.25 (m, 0.5H), 4.25-4.17 (m, 0.5H), 3.05 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.2 Hz, 0.5H), 2.94 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.7 Hz, 0.5H), 2.47 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 7.1 Hz, 0.5H), 2.30 (dd, $J$ = 16.1, 8.9 Hz, 0.5H), 1.35 (d, $J$ = 6.1 Hz, 1.5H), 1.32 (d, $J$ = 6.1 Hz, 1.5H), 0.00 (s, 1.5H), -0.08 (s, 1.5H), -0.16 (s, 1.5H), -0.25 (s, 1.5H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks: δ = 6.49 (dd, $J$ = 16.8, 10.4 Hz, 1H), 5.07 (d, $J$ = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.60 (d, $J$ = 17.0 Hz, 1H), 4.15-4.12 (m, 1H), 0.44 (s, 3H), 0.41 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ = 144.8, 144.6, 144.2, 140.0, 140.0, 134.7, 134.6, 134.2, 134.1, 132.2, 129.8, 129.6, 129.5, 129.0, 128.6, 126.6, 126.5, 117.6, 117.6, 116.0, 72.8, 72.7, 40.8, 40.3, 24.2, 24.1, 23.9, 1.1, 0.4, -1.1, -1.9

IR (film): ν = 2966, 2926, 2876, 1584, 1471, 1436, 1250, 835 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{15}$H$_{19}$ClOSi: C 64.61, H 6.87; found: C 64.56, H 6.76
(Z)-3-(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)allylidene)-2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane

(1.147): Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.005 mmol) and alkyne 1.54 (82 mg, 0.3 mmol) in DCE (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via preparative TLC (3% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.147 as a clear oil (73%).

**Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 44:3:1**

**Rf = 0.26 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)**

**1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃):** \( \delta = 7.05-7.01 \text{(m, 2H)}, 6.89-6.80 \text{(m, 3H)}, 5.22 \text{(dd, } J = 10.5, 1.5 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 4.88 \text{(dd, } J = 17.1, 1.5 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 4.25-4.14 \text{(m, 1H)}, 3.82 \text{(s, 3H)}, 2.93 \text{(dd, } J = 16.5, 5.4 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 2.30 \text{(dd, } J = 16.5, 8.4 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 1.32 \text{(d, } J = 6.0 \text{ Hz, 3H)}, -0.05 \text{(s, 3H)}, -0.18 \text{(s, 3H)}

**13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃):** \( \delta = 158.9, 146.8, 143.4, 136.1, 134.1, 130.8, 118.1, 113.2, 72.5, 55.3, 40.7, 24.1, 0.7, -0.1 \)

**IR (film):** \( \nu = 3087, 2968, 2835, 1608, 1508, 1458, 1246, 1036 \text{ cm}^{-1} \)

**Anal. calcd.** for C₁₆H₂₂O₂Si: C 70.03, H 8.08; found: C 70.03, H 7.81
(Z)-1-(4-(1-(2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolan-3-ylidene) allyl) phenyl) ethanone (1.148): Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.56 (72 mg, 0.25 mmol) in DCE (1.0 mL) was stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 3 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.148 as a clear oil (64% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 7:1:1**

**Rf** = 0.20 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ = 7.92 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.24 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.85 (dd, $J$ = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (d, $J$ = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.79 (d, $J$ = 18.0 Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.17 (m, 1H), 2.96 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (s, 3H), 2.34 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 8.2 Hz, 1H), 1.32 (d, $J$ = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.07 (s, 3H), -0.19 (s, 3H); **minor isomer diagnostic peaks:** δ = 7.97 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.22 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.51 (dd, $J$ = 16.8, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.11 (d, $J$ = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.70 (d, $J$ = 17.4 Hz, 1H), 4.11-4.04 (m, 1H), 1.20 (d, $J$ = 6.0 Hz, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 198.0, 198.0, 146.9, 146.9, 146.2, 145.5, 145.2, 144.5, 139.2, 136.2, 135.9, 135.6, 130.1, 129.3, 128.6, 128.2, 118.6, 116.8, 72.8, 72.5, 42.8, 41.0, 26.8, 26.8, 24.1, 23.8, 0.7, 0.3, -0.0

**IR** (film): ν = 3087, 2964, 2871, 1684, 1601, 1264, 944 cm$^{-1}$

**Anal. calcd.** for C$_{17}$H$_{22}$O$_2$Si: C 71.28, H 7.74; found: C 70.99, H 7.75
(Z)-2,2,6-trimethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilinane (1.149)

Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.006 mmol) and alkyne 1.86 (77 mg, 0.3 mmol) in DCE (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (1 atm) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.149 as a clear oil (82%).

Crude ratio Z:cyclo:E = 14:1:1

Rf = 0.74 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.30-7.26 (m, 3H), 7.09-7.02 (m, 3H), 5.21 (dd, J = 10.8, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.73 (dd, J = 17.1, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.10-4.03 (m, 1H), 3.08 (ddd, J = 15.9, 5.4, 3.3 Hz, 1H), 2.47 (ddd, J = 15.9, 12.6, 3.3 Hz, 1H), 1.90-1.83 (m, 1H), 1.61-1.51 (m, 1H), 1.21 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 3H), -0.14 (s, 3H), -0.37 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 147.2, 141.6, 140.3, 134.3, 130.6, 127.9, 127.3, 118.7, 70.5, 36.1, 29.1, 24.7, 1.6, 0.2

IR (film): ν = 3080, 2965, 2846, 1558, 1490, 1248, 829 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.39, H 8.69
**General Procedure for high pressure reactions:**

An oven dried Fischer Porter bottle equipped with a magnetic stir bar was brought into an argon filled glove box. To the Fischer Porter bottle was added RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)PPh$_3$ and the alkyne in toluene. The bottle was plugged with a septum and removed from the glove box. The septum was replaced with a Swagelok regulator and the system was purged with ethylene (80 psi) and vented three times, then refilled to 80 psi and heated to 80°C for the allotted time. Upon completion by TLC, the reaction was filtered through a short plug of silica gel (eluted with dichloromethane), concentrated *in vacuo* and a crude yield was obtained by $^1$H NMR with mesitylene (0.33 equivalents) as an internal standard. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography on silica gel.
3-(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)allylidene)-2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane

Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.54 (72 mg, 0.25 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 4 h.

Purification via flash column chromatography (10% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave the diene as a clear oil (91% as a Z/E mixture).

Crude ratio Z:E = 3:1

R_f = 0.26 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): isomer Z: δ = 7.06-7.03 (m, 2H), 6.92-6.80 (m, 3H), 5.21 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, J = 17.1, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.14 (m, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 2.93 (dd, J = 16.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.29 (dd, J = 16.2, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 1.31 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.05 (s, 3H), -0.17 (s, 3H);

isomer E: δ = 7.06-7.03 (m, 2H), 6.92-6.80 (m, 2H), 6.51 (dd, J = 16.8, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.07 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.79 (d, J = 17.1 Hz, 1H), 4.10-4.03 (m, 1H), 3.82 (s, 3H) 2.43 (dd, J = 16.8, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (dd, J = 16.5, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 1.20 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), 0.41 (s, 3H), 0.38 (s, 3H)

^13C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ = 158.7, 158.3, 147.4, 146.7, 143.3, 139.9, 136.0, 133.9, 130.7, 129.9, 118.0, 116.1, 113.5, 113.1, 72.6, 72.4, 55.2, 55.2, 42.8, 40.6, 24.0, 23.7, 0.7, 0.6, 0.2, -0.3;

IR (film): ν = 2963, 2929, 1608, 1509, 1248 cm\(^{-1}\)

Anal. calcd. for C\(_{16}\)H\(_{22}\)O\(_2\)Si: C 70.03, H 8.08; found: C 70.41, H 7.80
3-(1-(4-fluorophenyl)allylidene)-2,2,5-trimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane: Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.55 (65.5 mg, 0.25 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 4 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (10% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave the diene as a clear oil (85% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:E = 1:1.3**

**Rf** = 0.27 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl3): isomer Z: \( \delta = 7.12-6.99 \) (m, 4H), 6.85 (dd, \( J = 17.4, 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, \( J = 10.8, 1.5 \) Hz, 1H), 4.82 (dd, \( J = 17.4, 1.2 \) Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.17 (m, 1H), 2.95 (dd, \( J = 16.2, 5.4 \) Hz, 1H), 2.31 (dd, \( J = 16.2, 8.4 \) Hz, 1H), 1.32 (d, \( J = 6.0 \) Hz, 3H), -0.05 (s, 3H), -0.17 (s, 3H); isomer E: \( \delta = 7.12-6.99 \) (m, 4H), 6.51 (dd, \( J = 17.1, 10.5 \) Hz, 1H), 5.09 (dd, \( J = 10.8, 0.6 \) Hz, 1H), 4.74 (dd, \( J = 17.1, 0.6 \) Hz, 1H), 4.11-4.02 (m, 1H), 2.38 (dd, \( J = 17.4, 5.1 \) Hz, 1H), 2.02 (dd, \( J = 16.8, 8.4 \) Hz, 1H), 1.21 (d, \( J = 6.0 \) Hz, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H);

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl3): \( \delta = 163.7, 163.4, 160.1, 146.9, 146.1, 145.0, 144.1, 139.7, 137.5, 137.5, 135.9, 135.6, 135.5, 131.3, 131.2, 130.5, 130.4, 118.3, 116.4, 115.4, 115.1, 115.0, 114.7, 72.7, 72.5, 42.8, 40.7, 24.0, 23.7, 0.7, 0.6, 0.3, -0.2

**19F NMR** (282.3 MHz, CDCl3): \( \delta = (-115.6)-(-115.7)(m); \delta = (-116.1)-(-116.2)(m) \)

**IR** (film): \( \nu = 2966, 2927, 1601, 1506, 1252 \) cm\(^{-1}\)

**Anal. calcd.** for C\(_{15}\)H\(_{19}\)FOSi: C 68.66, H 7.30; found: C 68.52, H 7.12
Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.56 (72 mg, 0.25 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 24 h.

Purification via flash column chromatography (10% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave the diene as a clear oil (86% as a Z/E mixture).

**Crude ratio Z:E = 1:7**

*Rf* = 0.20 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃): isomer **Z:** δ = 7.92 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.24 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.85 (dd, *J* = 17.1, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (d, *J* = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.79 (d, *J* = 18.0 Hz, 1H), 4.24-4.17 (m, 1H), 2.96 (dd, *J* = 16.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (s, 3H), 1.32 (d, *J* = 6.0 Hz, 3H), -0.07 (s, 3H), -0.19 (s, 3H); isomer **E:** δ = 7.97 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.22 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.51 (dd, *J* = 16.8, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.11 (d, *J* = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.70 (d, *J* = 17.4 Hz, 1H), 4.12-4.02 (m, 1H), 2.62 (s, 3H), 2.34 (dd, *J* = 16.8, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.00 (dd, *J* = 16.8, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 1.19 (d, *J* = 6.0 Hz, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 197.8, 145.8, 145.0, 139.0, 135.7, 129.1, 128.4, 116.6, 72.6, 42.7, 26.6, 23.6, 0.6, 0.1

**IR** (film): ν = 2964, 2925, 1684, 1264 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₁₇H₂₂O₂Si: C 71.28, H 7.74; found: C 71.03, H 7.40
(Z)-2,2,6-trimethyl-3-(1-phenylallylidene)-1,2-oxasilinane: Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.86 (57 mg, 0.22 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) for 24 h. (25:1). Purification via flash column chromatography (10% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave the diene as a clear oil (72%).

Crude ratio $Z:E = 25:1$

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 7.28-7.27$ (m, 3H), 7.09-7.00 (m, 3H), 5.20 (dd, $J = 10.5, 1.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.72 (dd, $J = 17.1, 1.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.11-4.00 (m, 1H), 3.06 (ddd, $J = 16.2, 5.1, 3.3$ Hz, 1H), 2.45 (ddd, $J = 15.9, 12.6, 3.3$ Hz, 1H), 1.90-1.81 (m, 1H), 1.62-1.48 (m, 1H), 1.20 (d, $J = 6.0$ Hz, 3H), -0.15 (s, 3H), -0.38 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 147.1, 141.5, 140.2, 134.1, 130.4, 127.8, 127.2, 118.7, 70.4, 36.0, 29.0, 24.6, 1.5, 0.1$
3-(but-3-en-2-ylidene)-2,2-dimethyl-5-phenethyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.150):

Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.150a (68 mg, 0.25 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 24 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (2% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.150 as a clear oil (84%).

**Crude ratio Z:E = 1:3**

**R**<sub>f</sub> = 0.64 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**<sup>1</sup>H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): **major isomer E:** δ = 7.32-7.16 (m, 5H), 6.35 (dd, J = 16.8, 10.2 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, J = 17.3 Hz, 1H), 5.06 (d, J = 10.7 Hz, 1H), 4.12-4.02 (m, 1H), 2.88-2.67 (m, 4H), 2.27 (dd, J = 16.2, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 1.86 (s, 3H), 0.37 (s, 3H), 0.32 (s, 3H); **minor isomer Z:** δ = 6.70 (dd, J = 17.3, 10.7 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 1.91 (s, 3H), 0.36 (s, 3H), 0.32 (s, 3H)

**<sup>13</sup>C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 142.8, 142.4, 141.7, 140.4, 140.1, 139.4, 136.1, 128.6, 128.4, 125.8, 114.4, 112.5, 76.0, 75.7, 40.2, 40.1, 39.9, 38.4, 32.3, 20.0, 15.3, 0.9, 0.5, 0.4, 0.0

**IR** (film): ν = 2957, 2931, 1585, 1453, 1250, 866 cm<sup>-1</sup>

**Anal. calcd.** for C<sub>17</sub>H<sub>24</sub>OSi: C 74.94, H 8.88; found C 74.88, H 8.99
3-(but-3-en-2-ylidene)-2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.151):

Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.005 mmol) and alkyne 1.151a (80 mg, 0.32 mmol) in toluene (1.3 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 24 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.151 as a clear oil (84%).

Crude ratio Z:E = 1:2

Rf = 0.52 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): major isomer E: δ = 7.39-7.32 (m, 4H), 7.27-7.23 (m, 1H), 6.36 (dd, J = 17.1, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, J = 16.9 Hz, 1H), 5.06 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.05-5.00 (m, 1H), 3.02 (dd, J = 16.8, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 2.50-2.44 (m, 1H), 1.86 (dd, J = 1.6, 0.7 Hz, 3H), 0.41 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H); minor isomer Z: δ = 6.68 (dd, J = 17.3, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (d, J = 17.3 Hz, 1H), 5.15 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H) 3.13 (ddd, J = 16.2, 5.5, 1.0 Hz, 1H), 1.92 (dd, J = 2.2, 1.0 Hz, 3H), 0.40 (s, 3H), 0.38 (s, 3H)

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 144.3, 144.2, 142.2, 141.3, 139.8, 139.6, 139.1, 135.5, 128.0, 126.9, 125.1, 114.3, 112.5, 77.7, 77.3, 42.5, 41.1, 19.6, 14.9, 0.0, 0.0, -0.3, -0.4;

IR (film): ν = 3088, 3029, 2956, 2877, 1588, 1251, 1036, 868 cm⁻¹

Anal. calcd. for C15H20OSi: C 73.71, H 8.21; found C 73.43, H 8.20
2,2-dimethyl-3-(pent-1-en-3-ylidene)-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.152):

Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.005 mmol) and alkyne 1.152a (77 mg, 0.3 mmol) in toluene (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 1 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.152 as a clear oil (79%).

**Crude ratio Z:E = 5:1**

**Rf = 0.63** (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃): *isomer Z*: δ = 7.38-7.31 (m, 4H), 7.25-7.23 (m, 1H), 6.52 (dd, J = 17.7, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.29 (d, J = 17.7 Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.00 (dd, J = 9.0, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 3.10 (dd, J = 16.1, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.49-2.41 (m, 1H), 2.38-2.24 (m, 2H), 1.10 (t, J = 7.8 Hz, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H), 0.37 (s, 3H); *isomer E*: δ = 6.25 (dd, J = 17.3, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (d, J = 17.3 Hz, 1H), 5.06 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 3.01 (dd, J = 16.5, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 1.01 (t, J = 7.8 Hz, 3H)

**13C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 148.2, 146.2, 144.7, 144.7, 141.4, 139.2, 138.8, 134.2, 128.4, 127.3, 125.5, 125.4, 114.9, 112.6, 78.0, 77.8, 42.2, 41.7, 28.2, 22.7, 14.9, 13.0, 0.4, 0.1

**IR** (film): ν = 3088, 2966, 2876, 1586, 1251, 1061, 907 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₁₆H₂₂OSi: C 74.36, H 8.58; found: C 74.55, H 8.74
3-(hept-1-en-3-ylidene)-2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.153):
Following the general procedure, RuH (4 mg, 0.005 mmol) and alkyne 1.153a (86 mg, 0.3 mmol) in toluene (1.2 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 1 h.
Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.153 as a clear oil (69%).

Crude ratio Z:E = 8:1

Rf = 0.36 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): isomer Z: $\delta$ = 7.31-7.24 (m, 4H), 7.19-7.15 (m, 1H), 6.46 (dd, $J$ = 17.6, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.21 (d, $J$ = 17.6 Hz, 1H), 5.09 (d, $J$ = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 4.93 (dd, $J$ = 9.5, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 3.02 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.37 (dd, $J$ = 16.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.25-2.13 (m, 2H), 1.43-1.35 (m, 2H), 1.33-1.24 (m, 2H), 0.86 (t, $J$ = 7.5 Hz, 3H), 0.32 (s, 3H), 0.30 (s, 3H); isomer E: $\delta$ = 6.19 (dd, $J$ = 17.2, 10.4 Hz, 1H), 4.99 (d, $J$ = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 2.93 (dd, $J$ = 16.7, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 0.82 (t, $J$ = 7.1 Hz, 3H), 0.33 (s, 3H), 0.31 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$= 146.8, 145.1, 144.7, 142.0, 139.4, 139.2, 134.7, 128.4, 127.3, 127.3, 125.5, 114.8, 112.7, 78.0, 77.8, 42.5, 41.8, 35.3, 32.6, 30.8, 29.5, 23.3, 23.2, 14.1, 14.1, 0.4, 0.3

IR (film): $\nu$ = 3087, 2957, 2873, 1585, 1250, 1036, 867 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{18}$H$_{26}$OSi: C 75.46, H 9.15; found: C 75.65, H 9.26
Following the general procedure, RuH (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol) and alkyne 1.154a (78.2 mg, 0.25 mmol) in toluene (1.0 mL) stirred under ethylene (80 psi) at 80°C for 24 h. Purification via flash column chromatography (1% diethyl ether/hexanes) gave diene 1.154 as a clear oil (83%).

**Crude ratio Z:E = 7:1**

**Rf** = 0.78 (10% diethyl ether/hexanes)

**1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃): isomer Z: δ = 7.40-7.31 (m, 5H), 6.54 (dd, J = 17.4, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.30 (d, J = 17.4 Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, J = 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.01 (dd, J = 9.6, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 3.11 (dd, J = 16.2, 5.3 Hz, 1H), 2.46 (dd, J = 16.2, 9.6 Hz, 1H), 2.32-2.23 (m, 2H), 1.53-1.43 (m, 2H), 1.40-1.26 (m, 7H), 0.93-0.87 (m, 3H), 0.40 (s, 3H), 0.38 (s, 3H); isomer E: δ = 6.27 (dd, J = 17.4, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.07 (d, J = 10.9 Hz, 1H), 3.00 (dd, J = 16.8, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 0.41 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H)

**13C NMR** (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 145.2, 144.7, 139.4, 134.8, 128.5, 127.3, 125.5, 114.9, 78.0, 41.8, 35.7, 31.9, 30.5, 30.0, 22.8, 14.2, 0.3, 0.3

**IR** (film) ν = 2957, 2931, 1585, 1453, 1250, 866 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calcd.** for C₂₀H₃₀OSi: C 76.37, H 9.61; found C 76.24, H 9.79
**Synthetic Elaboration**

3-hydroxy-1-(3-methyl-2-phenyloxiran-2-yl)-3-phenylpropan-1-one (1.155)

To an oven dried 25 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added diene 1.137 (92 mg, 0.3 mmol) in THF (1.3 mL). To the stirred solution was added sequentially MeOH (2.7 mL), KF dihydrate (282 mg, 3.0 mmol), KHCO$_3$ (300 mg, 3.0 mmol), and H$_2$O$_2$ (2.5 mL, ~23 mmol) dropwise with vigorous stirring. After stirring the cloudy white suspension for 4 h TLC indicated consumption of the starting diene. Na$_2$S$_2$O$_3$ (~1.0 g) was carefully added in small portions to consume remaining peroxides. The reaction was diluted with EtOAc (20 mL) and washed with brine. The organics were dried over MgSO$_4$, filtered and concentrated *in vacuo*. The crude oil was purified via flash column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 15 cm, eluted with 10% EtOAc/hexanes) to give ketone 1.155 as a clear oil (59 mg, 70% as a mixture of diastereoisomers).

$\text{Rf} = 0.25$ (20% EtOAc/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 7.45$-$7.32$ (m, 10H), 5.15 (t, $J = 3.7$ Hz, 0.5H), 5.12 (t, $J = 3.7$ Hz, 1H), 3.50 (q, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 0.5H), 3.43 (q, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 0.5H), 3.08-$2.82$ (m, 3H), 1.06 (d, $J = 5.3$ Hz, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 207.8, 207.8, 142.7, 142.6, 131.8, 128.6, 128.6, 128.5, 128.3, 128.1, 128.1, 127.8, 127.8, 125.8, 125.8, 125.7, 69.9, 69.7, 68.1, 59.1, 58.8, 46.3, 45.9, 14.5, 14.4

IR (film): $\nu = 3511, 3060, 2967, 2926, 1708, 1494, 1022$ cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{18}$H$_{18}$O$_3$: C 76.57, H 6.43; found: C 76.44, H 6.41
(E)-1-hydroxy-1,4-diphenylhex-4-en-3-one (1.156)

To a flame dried 50 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir bar was added diene 1.137 (92 mg, 0.3 mmol, 10:1, Z:E), DMF (15 mL), KHF$_2$ (71 mg, 0.9 mmol), propionic anhydride (0.96 mL, 7.5 mmol), and H$_2$O$_2$ (0.85 mL, 7.5 mmol) sequentially. The reaction was stirred at RT for 14 h then poured into water (15 mL), extracted with Et$_2$O (3 x 15 mL) washed with saturated NaHCO$_3$(aq) (20 mL), dried over MgSO$_4$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was purified via flash column chromatography (silica gel 1.5 x 12 cm, gradient elution with 10-20% EtOAc/hexanes) to afford ketone 1.156 as a clear oil (68 mg, 85%, 13:1 mixture of double bond isomers).

$R_f = 0.22$ (20% EtOAc/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 7.41-7.28 (m, 8H), 7.09-7.07 (m, 2H), 7.04 (q, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 1H), 5.18 (dd, $J = 7.4$, 4.8 Hz, 1H) 3.65 (s, 1H), 2.98 (s, 1H), 2.96 (d, $J = 3.3$ Hz, 1H), 1.73 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H); minor isomer diagnostic peaks $\delta$ = 5.53 (q, $J = 7.4$ Hz, 1H), 1.82 (d, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = 200.7, 143.7, 142.9, 140.2, 135.1, 129.6, 128.4, 128.4, 127.7, 127.5, 125.7, 70.2, 47.8, 15.7

IR (film): $\nu$ = 3412, 3058, 2912, 1773, 1670, 1597, 1137, 700 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. calcd. for C$_{18}$H$_{18}$O$_2$: C 81.17, H 6.81; found: C 81.34, H 6.83
**Z)**-2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-3-((E)-1-phenyl-3-(p-tolyl)allylidene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.157)

To an oven dried 50 mL Schlenk tube equipped with magnetic stir bar was added 4-iodotoluene (164 mg, 0.75 mmol), K$_2$CO$_3$ (138 mg, 1.0 mmol), Pd(OAc)$_2$ (6.0 mg, 0.025 mmol) and diene 1.137 (180 mg, 0.58 mmol) in DMF (5.0 mL). The reaction mixture was evacuated and purged with argon$_{\text{g}}$ three times, then stirred at 80°C for 8 h. Once cooled to RT, the solution was diluted with EtOAc (20 mL), washed with water (2 x 30 mL), dried over MgSO$_4$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The crude oil was purified via flash column chromatography (silica gel 2.5 x 12 cm; 3% EtOAc/hexanes) to afford diene 1.157 as a yellow oil (64%, 126 mg).

R$_f$ = 0.51 (10% EtOAc/hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, C$_6$D$_6$): $\delta$ = 7.44 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz, 2H), 7.40-7.35 (m, 5H), 7.30-7.28 (m, 1H), 7.25-7.21 (m, 5H), 7.08 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 2H), 6.19 (d, $J = 16.0$ Hz, 1H), 5.11 (dd, $J = 9.3, 5.3$ Hz, 1H), 3.38 (dd, $J = 16.3, 5.5$ Hz, 1H), 2.69 (dd, $J = 16.3, 9.5$ Hz, 1H), 2.31 (s, 3H), 0.08 (s, 3H), -0.13 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, C$_6$D$_6$): $\delta$ = 147.3, 144.8, 142.8, 142.0, 137.9, 134.6, 133.4, 129.8, 129.4, 128.5, 128.1, 127.4, 127.4, 127.0, 126.7, 125.5, 77.9, 42.3, 21.3, 0.5, 0.3

IR (film): $\nu = 3027, 2958, 1583, 1249, 1031, 862$ cm$^{-1}$

**Anal. calcd.** for C$_{27}$H$_{28}$O$_2$: C 81.77, H 7.12; found: C 81.52, H 7.18
(E)-2,2,5-trimethyl-3-(oxiran-2-yl(phenyl)methylene)-1,2-oxasilolane (1.159):

To a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirbar was added \textit{m}CPBA (85\%, 120 mg, 0.58 mmol) and 0.5 mL DCM. The reaction vessel was cooled to 0°C then diene 1.135 (94 mg, 0.38 mmol) in 0.8 ml of DCM was added dropwise via syringe. The reaction was warmed to room temperature and after 1.5 h was complete by TLC. The mixture was diluted with 5 mL of DCM and washed with sat. NaHCO$_3$(aq.) (3 x 15 mL). The organic layer was dried with MgSO$_4$, filtered and concentrated \textit{in vacuo}. The crude oil was purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 5% ethylacetate/hexanes to afford 37 mg (38\%) of a clear oil.

\[ R_f = 0.59 \] (20\% EtOAc/hexanes)

\[ ^1\text{H NMR} \ (400 \text{ MHz, CDCl}_3) \ \delta = 7.38-7.31 \ (m, \ 4H), 7.29-7.25 \ (m, \ 1H), 6.16 \ (dd, \ J = 17.0, \ 10.8 \text{ Hz}, \ 1H), 5.37-5.30 \ (m, \ 2H), 4.32-4.24 \ (m, \ 1H), 1.92-1.82 \ (m, \ 2H), 1.31 \ (d, \ J = 6.0 \text{ Hz}, \ 3H), 0.00 \ (s, \ 3H), -0.37 \ (s, \ 3H) \]

\[ ^{13}\text{C NMR} \ (100 \text{ MHz, CDCl}_3) \ \delta = 139.6, 135.8, 128.2, 127.6, 126.6, 119.2, 72.0, 71.6, 66.2, 41.9, 23.8, -1.7, -2.2 \]

\[ \text{FT-IR} \ (\text{NaCl, thin film}) \ \nu = 3030, 2968, 1494, 1251, 1117, 944, 703 \text{ cm}^{-1} \]

\[ \text{Anal. calcd. for} \ C_{15}H_{20}O_2Si; \ C, 69.19; \ H, 7.74; \ \text{found C, 69.44; H, 7.37} \]
(Z)-3-(2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolan-3-ylidene)-3-phenylpropan-1-ol (1.160): To a 25 mL schlenk tube equipped with a stir bar was added diene 1.137 (100 mg, 0.33 mmol) in 2.0 mL Et₂O. The mixture was cooled to 0 °C and BH₃·THF (1.0M in THF, 0.36 mL) was added dropwise and stirred for 2h. NaOH(aq) (3M, 2.0 mL) was added followed by H₂O₂ (30%, 2.0 mL) and stirred for an additional 3h. The reaction was poured into 5 mL Na₂S₂O₃(aq) and extracted with Et₂O (3 x 10 mL). The organic layer was dried with MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to a yellow oil. The oil was applied to a silica gel column (2.5 x 15 cm) eluted with 10% EtOAc in hexanes to afford 68 mg of 1.160.

Rᵣ = 0.11 (20% EtOAc/hexanes)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.40-7.17 (m, 10H), 5.03 (dd, J = 9.4, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 3.63-3.57 (m, 2H), 3.13 (dd, J = 15.6, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.88-2.72 (m, 2H), 2.53 (dd, J = 16.3, 10.0 Hz, 1H), 0.13 (s, 3H), -0.15 (s, 3H)
(E)-3-(2,2-dimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolan-3-ylidene)-3-phenylpropane-1,2-diol (1.161): To a 25 mL RBF equipped with a stir bar was added NaIO₄ (96 mg, 0.45 mmol) and 0.25 mL water followed by H₂SO₄ (1M, 60 uL) and the mixture was cooled to 0 °C. RuCl₃ (0.1M in H₂O, 30 uL) was added and stirred until the solution turned bright yellow. EtOAc (1.0 mL) was added and stirred for 5 min followed by MeCN (1.0 mL) and stirred for 5 minutes. Diene 1.137 (92 mg, 0.3 mmol) in 0.2 mL EtOAc was added then stirred for 1.5h. The solution was poured into a 1:1 mixture of aqueous NaHCO₃:Na₂S₂O₃ (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3 x 10 mL). The organic layer was dried with MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to a yellow oil. Crude ¹H NMR indicated 25% 1.137 remained. The crude oil was applied to a silica gel column (2.5 x 15 cm) and eluted with 30% EtOAc in hexanes to afford 1.161 (43 mg, 56% brsm) as a mixture of diastereomers.

Rᵣ = 0.06 (20% EtOAc/hexanes)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.39-7.14 (m, 10H), 5.08 (dd, J = 8.8, 5.7 Hz, 0.5H), 5.02 (dd, J = 9.8, 5.2 Hz, 0.5H), 4.78 (dd, J = 8.8, 3.8 Hz, 0.5H), 4.71 (dd, J = 8.8, 3.8 Hz, 0.5H), 3.70-3.45 (m, 2H), 3.24 (dd, J = 13.4, 5.7 Hz, 0.5H), 3.20 (dd, J = 12.9, 5.3 Hz, 0.5H), 2.60 (dd, J = 15.7, 8.5 Hz, 0.5H), 2.48 (dd, J = 15.9, 9.8 Hz, 0.5H), 0.12 (s, 1.5H), 0.00 (s, 1.5H), -0.10 (s, 1.5H), -0.22 (s, 1.5H) ;
3.4.3 Silylvinylation of Terminal Alkynes

General procedure for high pressure reactions with terminal alkynes:

An oven dried Fischer Porter bottle equipped with a magnetic stir bar was brought into an argon filled glove box. To the Fischer Porter bottle was added RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)PPh$_3$ and the alkyne in toluene. The bottle was plugged with a septum and removed from the glove box. The septum was replaced with a Swagelok regulator and the system was purged with ethylene (80 psi) and vented three times, then refilled to 80 psi and heated to 80 °C for the allotted time. Upon completion by TLC, the reaction was filtered through a short plug of silica gel (eluted with dichloromethane, ethyl acetate, or diethyl ether), concentrated in vacuo and a crude yield was obtained by $^1$H NMR with mesitylene (0.33 equivalents) as an internal standard. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography on silica gel.
(Z)-5-((1,1'-biphenyl)-4-yl)-3-allylidene-2,2-dimethyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.163): prepared according to the general procedure; RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (2 mg, 0.0025 mmol), alkyne (78 mg, 0.25 mmol) in 1.0 mL toluene, 24h. Flash column chromatography (5% diethylether:hexanes) 58% (45 mg) as a clear oil.

TLC Rₖ = 0.57 (10% diethylether/hexanes);

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ= 7.60-7.56 (m, 4H), 7.45-7.42 (m, 4H), 7.36-7.32 (m, 1H), 6.74 (d, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 6.31 (dt, J = 16.6, 10.4 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, J = 16.6 Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 5.06 (dd, J = 9.5, 5.3 Hz, 1H), 2.96 (dd, J = 15.5, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 2.70-2.63 (m, 1H), 0.43 (s, 3H), 0.42 (s, 3H);

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ= 145.2, 143.0, 140.8, 140.0, 137.7, 137.0, 128.5, 126.9, 126.9, 126.9, 125.7, 117.5, 77.4, 45.6, -0.0, -0.1;

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3028, 2956, 2926, 1592, 1486, 1252, 903 cm⁻¹

Anal. calc. for C₂₀H₂₂OSi, C, 78.38; H, 7.24; found C, 78.30; H, 6.98;
(Z)-3-allylidene-2,2-dimethyl-1-oxa-2-silaspiro[4.5]decane (1.164): prepared according to the general procedure; RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh₃) (2 mg, 0.003 mmol), alkyne (66 mg, 0.3 mmol) in 1.5 mL toluene, 22h. Flash column chromatography (2% diethylether:hexanes, 1.5 x 12 cm) 45% (30 mg) as a clear oil.

**TLC** Rₜ = 0.57 (10% diethylether/hexanes);

**¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 6.65 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 6.26 (dt, J = 16.7, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 5.16 (d, J = 16.7 Hz, 1H), 5.09 (d, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 2.47 (s, 2H), 1.67-1.35 (m, 11H), 0.30 (s, 6H);

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 146.8, 138.0, 137.5, 116.8, 80.1, 48.0, 39.3, 25.7, 23.2, 1.2;

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2932, 2857, 1251, 974, 825 cm⁻¹

**Anal. calc.** for C₁₃H₂₂O₂Si, C, 70.71; H, 9.97; found C, 70.30; H, 9.70;
(4S,5S,Z)-3-allylidene-2,2,4-trimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.165): prepared according to the general procedure; RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh$_3$) (4 mg, 0.006 mmol), alkyne (73 mg, 0.3 mmol) in 1.5 mL toluene, 24h. Flash column chromatography (2% diethylether:hexanes) 82% (60 mg) as a clear oil.

**TLC** $R_f = 0.74$ (10% diethylether/hexanes);

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 7.32$-$7.20$ (m, 5H), 6.68 (d, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 6.32 (dt, $J = 10.1$, 10.1 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (d, $J = 16.6$ Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, $J = 10.1$ Hz, 1H), 5.14 (d, $J = 5.0$ Hz, 1H), 2.88 (m, 1H), 0.64 (d, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 3H), 0.47 (s, 3H), 0.39 (s, 3H);

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta = 152.0$, 141.6, 137.7, 137.4, 128.1, 126.9, 126.0, 117.8, 86.7, 47.3, 16.7, 0.8, 0.2;

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 3026$, 2951, 1590, 1450, 1251, 988 cm$^{-1}$

$[\alpha]_D^{23}$ $\lambda = 589$ nm (c 0.600, CHCl$_3$) = -56.01°

**Anal. calc.** for C$_{15}$H$_{20}$OSi, C, 73.71; H, 8.25; found C, 73.71; H, 8.37;
(4R,5S,Z)-3-allylidene-2,2,4-trimethyl-5-phenyl-1,2-oxasilolane (1.166):
prepared according to the general procedure; RuHCl(CO)(SIMes)(PPh\textsubscript{3}) (4 mg, 0.006 mmol), alkyne (73 mg, 0.3 mmol) in 1.5 mL toluene, 21h. Flash column chromatography (1-2% gradient elution, diethylether:hexanes, 1.5 x 12 cm) 75% (55 mg) as a clear oil.

TLC R\textsubscript{f} = 0.48 (10% diethylether/hexanes);

\textsuperscript{1}H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \(\delta = 7.37\text{-}7.26 \text{ (m, 5H)}, 6.57 \text{ (dd, } J = 10.6, 2.6 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 6.37 \text{ (dt, } J = 16.7, 10.6 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 5.26 \text{ (d, } J = 16.7 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 5.18 \text{ (d, } J = 10.2 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 4.37 \text{ (d, } J = 8.9 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 2.55 \text{ (m, 1H)}, 1.03 \text{ (d, } J = 6.6 \text{ Hz, 3H)}, 0.43 \text{ (s, 3H)}, 0.40 \text{ (s, 3H)};

\textsuperscript{13}C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \(\delta = 149.9, 142.7, 136.9, 136.1, 128.0, 127.4, 126.3, 117.6, 84.9, 48.4, 13.8, 0.0, -0.0;

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 3028, 2956, 2926, 1592, 1486, 1252, 903 \text{ cm}^{-1}

\([\alpha]D^{23} = -139.70^\circ\)

Anal. calc. for C\textsubscript{15}H\textsubscript{20}OSi, C, 73.71; H, 8.25; found C, 73.96; H, 7.99;
3.5 IMIDAZOPYRIDINE DATA

General Experimental A: Copper Coupling

To an oven-dried Schlenk tube equipped with a stir bar was added copper (I) iodide (10 mol %), potassium phosphate (2 eq.), tert-butyl-4-chloropyridin-3-yl carbamate 34 (1 eq), and the haloarene (1.1 eq) [if a solid]. The reaction tube was evacuated and refilled with Ar (g). (+/-)-trans-1,2-diaminocyclohexane (L1) (20 mol %) was added, followed by 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) and the haloarene (1.1 eq) [if a liquid]. The reaction was degassed with three vacuum / Ar (g) purge cycles, equipped with a cold-finger and placed in a pre-heated 110°C oil-bath. The reaction mixture was stirred for the time indicated, cooled to room temperature, and was diluted with EtOAc. The reaction mixture was then filtered through a Celite® plug, concentrated in vacuo and applied to a silica gel column eluted with the indicated solvent mixture(s) to give the N-aryl product.

General Experimental B: Boc Deprotection

To an oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar was added Boc-pyridine 35h-35n (1 eq.) and DCM (0.5 M). The reaction was cooled to 0 °C (ice-water bath) and trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) (0.17 M) was added. The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred until TLC analysis indicated consumption of the starting material (35h-35n). The reaction was then poured into sat. NaHCO₃(aq), diluted with DCM and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with DCM. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate, decanted and concentrated in vacuo to give the desired deprotected product.

General Experimental C: Alkylation/Deprotection

To an oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar was added pyridine 34 (1 eq.) and DMF (0.5 M). The reaction mixture was cooled to 0°C (ice-water bath) and sodium hydride (60 wt% in mineral oil) (1.5 eq.) was added in small portions over a period of ~2 min. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 hour at 0°C, at which time the appropriate benzyl or alkyl halide (1.5 eq.) was added drop-wise as a solution in DMF. The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred until TLC analysis indicated consumption of the starting material. The reaction was quenched by the addition of H₂O and diluted with EtOAc. The layers were separated
and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc. The combined organic layers were washed with H₂O and brine, dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give the crude alkylated product which was used without further purification.

The crude alkylated substrate was dissolved in DCM (0.5M) and added to an oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a stir bar. TFA (0.17-0.25 M) was added drop-wise and the reaction stirred at room temperature until TLC analysis indicated consumption of the starting material. The reaction was quenched with sat. NaHCO₃(aq.) and the layers were separated. The organic layer was dried over Na₂SO₄, concentrated in vacuo and applied to a silica gel column to give the desired product.

**General Experimental D: Palladium Amidation of 3-Amino-4-chloropyridines**

To an oven-dried 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a stir bar was added Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃ (1 mol %), Me₃(OMe)t-BuXPhos (5 mol %), K₃PO₄ (1.5 Eq.) and pyridine 36 (1 eq.). The reaction vessel was evacuated under vacuum and refilled with Ar(g). t-BuOH (0.2 M) and formamide (1.5 eq.) were then added via syringe and the reaction mixture was degassed by three vacuum/Ar(g) purge cycles. The reaction vessel was then equipped with a cold-finger condenser, placed in a pre-heated 110 °C oil-bath and stirred for the specified time. Upon consumption of pyridine 36 (as judged by TLC analysis) the reaction mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature. The reaction mixture was diluted with methanol and passed through a Celite® plug. The crude mixture was concentrated in vacuo and applied to a silica gel column eluted with the indicated solvent mixture(s) to give the desired product.
**tert-butyl 4-chloropyridin-3-yl(p-tolyl)carbamate (35i)**

**Following general experimental A:** Copper (I) Iodide (43 mg, 0.22 mmol), potassium phosphate (955 mg, 4.50 mmol), pyridine 34 (500 mg, 2.18 mmol), diamine L1 (0.06 mL, 0.44 mmol), 4-iodotoluene (539 mg, 2.48 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 22 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 20% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 540 mg of pyridine 35i (76%) as an off-white solid.

\[
\text{R}^r = 0.64 \text{ (30\% EtOAc/Hexanes)}
\]

**^1H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \(\delta = 8.50 \text{ (s, 1H), 8.40 (d, } J = 5.1 \text{ Hz, 1H), 7.40 (d, } J = 5.4 \text{ Hz, 1H), 7.16-7.09 (m, 4H), 2.31 (s, 3H), 1.42 (s, 9H)}\)

**\(^{13}C\text{ NMR}** (75.4 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \(\delta = 153.0, 151.6, 148.8, 142.9, 138.8, 137.5, 129.5, 125.7, 125.0, 82.0, 28.1, 21.0\)

**FT-IR:** (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 3036, 2979, 1715, 1554 \text{ cm}^{-1}\)

**EA:** Calculated: C\textsubscript{17}H\textsubscript{19}ClN\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}; C, 64.05; H, 6.01; N, 8.79; found C, 64.12; H, 6.04; N, 8.99

**MP:** 98-100°C
**tert-butyl 4-chloropyridin-3-yl(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)carbamate (35k)**

**Following general experimental A:** Copper (I) Iodide (43 mg, 0.22 mmol), potassium phosphate (955 mg, 4.5 mmol), pyridine 34 (500 mg, 2.18 mmol), diamine L1 (0.06 mL, 0.45 mmol), 4-trifluoromethylbromobenzene (0.35 mL, 2.48 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 22 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 20% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 640 mg of pyridine 35k (79%) as a yellow oil.

\[ R_f = 0.69 \] (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

**1H NMR** (600 MHz, CDCl$_3$) \( \delta = 8.50 \) (s, 1H), \( 8.48 \) (d, \( J = 5.4 \) Hz, 1H), \( 7.55 \) (d, \( J = 8.4 \) Hz, 2H), \( 7.46 \) (d, \( J = 5.1 \) Hz, 1H), \( 7.36 \) (d, \( J = 8.7 \) Hz, 2H), \( 1.43 \) (s, 9H)

**13C NMR** (150 MHz, CDCl$_3$) \( \delta = 152.3, 151.6, 149.5, 144.3, 143.2, 136.5, 127.4 \) (q, \( J_{C,F} = 32.7 \) Hz), \( 126.0 \) (q, \( J_{C,F} = 3.6 \) Hz), \( 125.1, 124.6, 124.0 \) (q, \( J_{C,F} = 272.8 \) Hz), \( 83.0, 28.0 \)

**19F NMR** (282.3 MHz, CDCl$_3$) \( \delta = -62.8 \)

**FT-IR:** (NaCl, thin film) \( \nu = 2982, 1722, 1615, 1161 \) cm$^{-1}$

**EA:** Calculated: C$_{17}$H$_{16}$ClF$_3$N$_2$O$_2$; C, 54.77; H, 4.33; N, 7.51; found C, 54.69; H, 4.10; N, 7.27
tert-butyl 4-acetylphenyl(4-chloropyridin-3-yl)carbamate (35j)

Following general experimental A: Copper (I) Iodide (42 mg, 0.22 mmol), potassium phosphate (929 mg, 4.38 mmol), pyridine 34 (500 mg, 2.18 mmol), diamine L1 (0.06 mL, 0.44 mmol), 4’-bromoacetophenone (480 mg, 2.41 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 24 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 30% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 686 mg of pyridine 35j (90%) as a yellow oil.

Rr = 0.27 (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

\(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 8.45\) (s, 1H), 8.43 (d, \(J = 5.4\) Hz, 1H), 7.85 (d, \(J = 8.4\) Hz, 2H), 7.41 (d, \(J = 5.4\) Hz, 1H), 7.26 (d, \(J = 8.7\) Hz, 2H), 2.50 (s, 3H), 1.43 (s, 9H)

\(^13\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 196.9, 152.1, 151.6, 149.5, 145.4, 143.1, 136.5, 133.7, 129.1, 125.1, 123.9, 82.9, 28.0, 26.5\)

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 2982, 1722, 1615, 1161\) cm\(^{-1}\)

EA: Calculated: C\(_{18}\)H\(_{19}\)ClN\(_2\)O\(_3\); C, 62.34; H, 5.52; N, 8.08; found C, 61.95; H, 5.28; N, 7.71
**tert-butyl (4-chloropyridin-3-yl)(pyridin-3-yl)carbamate (35n)**

Following general experimental A: Copper (I) Iodide (42 mg, 0.22 mmol), potassium phosphate (929 mg, 4.38 mmol), pyridine 34 (500 mg, 2.18 mmol), diamine L1 (0.06 mL, 0.44 mmol), 3-bromopyridine (0.24 mL, 2.41 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 24 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 35% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 590 mg of pyridine 35n (88%) as a yellow solid.

\[ R_f = 0.14 \text{ (30\% EtOAc/Hexanes)} \]

**¹H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.53 (s, 1H), 8.47 (d, J = 5.4 Hz, 1H), 8.47 (s, 1H), 8.40 (dd, J = 4.7, 1.4 Hz, 1H), 7.66 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.45 (d, J = 5.4 Hz, 1H), 7.27 (dd, J = 8.3, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 1.44 (s, 9H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 152.4, 151.5, 149.5, 146.6, 143.0, 137.9, 136.2, 132.3, 125.0, 123.3, 82.9, 29.9

**FT-IR:** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2980, 1716 cm⁻¹

**EA:** Calculated: C_{15}H_{16}ClN_{3}O_{2}; C, 58.92; H, 5.27; N, 13.74; found C, 58.94; H, 4.98; N, 14.01

**MP:** 55-57°C
4-chloro-N-(4-fluorobenzyl)pyridin-3-amine (36d): Following general experimental C: Pyridine 34 (457 mg, 2 mmol), DMF (4 mL) and sodium hydride (60% wt in mineral oil) (120 mg, 3 mmol) were combined and stirred for 1 h, then 1-(chloromethyl)-4-fluorobenzene \(^2\) (432 mg, 3 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 2 h. Subsequent workup gave the crude alkylated product which was dissolved in DCM (5 mL) and TFA (1 mL) and stirred for 4 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 25% EtOAc/Hexane, gave 236 mg of pyridine 36d (50% over two steps) as a pale yellow solid.

\(R_f = 0.71\) (50% EtOAc/Hexanes)

\(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 7.98\) (s, 1H), 7.90 (d, \(J = 5.1\) Hz, 1H), 7.35-7.31 (m, 2H), 7.20 (d, \(J = 5.1\) Hz, 1H), 7.08-7.02 (m, 2H), 4.61 (s, NH), 4.43 (d, \(J = 5.4\) Hz, 2H)

\(^13\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = 162.3\) (d, \(J_{C,F} = 244.5\) Hz), 140.1, 139.0, 133.7 (d, \(J_{C,F} = 9\) Hz), 133.5, 128.9 (d, \(J_{C,F} = 8.25\) Hz), 127.6, 123.8, 115.7 (d, \(J_{C,F} = 21.75\) Hz), 46.9

\(^19\)F NMR (282.3 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta = \left[(-115.1)-(-115.2)\right]\) (m)

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) \(\nu = 3424, 1603\) cm\(^{-1}\)

EA: Calculated C\(_{12}\)H\(_{10}\)ClF\(_2\); C, 60.90; H, 4.26; N, 11.84; found C, 61.23; H, 4.19; N, 12.02

MP: 78-79°C
N-([1,1’-biphenyl]-4-ylmethyl)-4-chloropyridin-3-amine (36e)

Following general experimental C: Pyridine 34 (457 mg, 2 mmol), DMF (4 mL) and sodium hydride (60% wt in mineral oil) (120 mg, 3 mmol) were combined and stirred for 1 h, then 4-(chloromethyl)-1,1’-biphenyl 4 (606 mg, 3 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 2 h. Subsequent workup gave the crude alkylated product that was dissolved in DCM (7 mL) and TFA (1 mL) and stirred for 4 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 25% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 240 mg of pyridine 36e (45% over two steps) as a pale yellow solid.

R_f = 0.5 (50% EtOAc/Hexanes)

^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 8.06 (s, 1H), 7.91 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.61-7.56 (m, 4H), 7.47-7.41 (m, 4H), 7.38-7.32 (m, 1H), 7.21 (d, J = 4.8 Hz, 1H), 4.67 (t, J = 5.1 Hz, NH), 4.51 (d, J = 5.4 Hz, 2H)

^13C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 140.7, 140.7, 140.3, 139.0, 137.0, 133.9, 128.9, 127.8, 127.7, 127.5, 127.1, 123.8, 47.4

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3417, 1579 cm^-1

EA: Calculated C_{18}H_{15}ClN_{2}; C, 73.34; H, 5.13; N, 9.50; found C, 73.27; H, 4.88; N, 9.18

MP: 99-101°C
4-chloro-N-methylpyridin-3-amine (36f)

Following general experimental C: Pyridine 34 (708 mg, 3.09 mmol), DMF (7 mL) and sodium hydride (60% wt in mineral oil) (223 mg, 5.57 mmol) were combined and stirred for 1 h, then iodomethane (0.58 mL, 9.28 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 2 h. Subsequent workup gave the crude alkylated product that was dissolved in DCM (15 mL) and TFA (5 mL) were combined and stirred for 4 h. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 20% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 174 mg of pyridine 36f (40% over two steps) as a light brown solid.

\[ R_f = 0.42 \text{ (5\% MeOH/DCM)} \]

\[ ^1H \text{ NMR (300 MHz, CDCl}_3\text{)} \delta = 8.02 \text{ (s, 1H)}, 7.89 \text{ (d, } J = 4.8 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 7.17 \text{ (d, } J = 5.1 \text{ Hz, 1H)}, 4.25 \text{ (bs, NH)}, 2.97 \text{ (d, } J = 5.4 \text{ Hz, 3H)} \]

\[ ^1^3C \text{ NMR (75 MHz, CDCl}_3\text{)} \delta = 141.3, 138.5, 132.9, 127.4, 123.6, 30.2 \]

\[ \text{FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) } \nu = 3293, 2914, 1582 \text{ cm}^{-1} \]

\[ \text{EA: Calculated C}_6\text{H}_7\text{ClN}_2\text{; C, 50.54; H, 4.95; N, 19.65; found C, 50.57; H, 5.18; N, 19.45} \]

\[ \text{MP: 54-55°C} \]
4-chloro-N-(p-tolyl)pyridin-3-amine (36i)

Following general experimental B: Pyridine 35i (436 mg, 1.4 mmol), DCM (3 mL) and TFA (1.5 mL) were combined and stirred for 24 h to give 280 mg of pyridine 36i as a yellow solid. (92%)

Rf = 0.39 (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.45 (s, 1H), 7.98 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.25 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.16 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.08 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 5.90 (br s, 1H), 2.34 (s, 3H)

^13C NMR (75.4 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 140.5, 138.2, 137.6, 137.2, 133.7, 130.3, 129.3, 124.3, 121.5, 20.9

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3401, 3233, 3030, 2920, 1571, 1517, 809 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C₁₂H₁₁ClN₂; C, 65.91; H, 5.07; N, 12.81; found C, 65.76; H, 4.71; N, 12.55

MP: 59-60°C
4-chloro-N-(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)pyridin-3-amine (36k)

Following general experimental B: Pyridine 35k (520 mg, 1.4 mmol), DCM (3 mL) and TFA (1.5 mL) were combined and stirred for 24 h to give 340 mg of pyridine 36k as a yellow solid. (89%)

R_f = 0.21 (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

1H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 8.67 (s, 1H), 8.15 (d, J = 4.8 Hz, 1H), 7.55 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.14 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.10 (s, 1H)

13C NMR (150 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 144.5, 143.3, 140.5, 135.9, 132.7, 127 (q, J_C-F = 3.8 Hz), 124.7, 124.3 (q, J_C-F = 271.0 Hz), 124.2 (q, J_C-F = 32.6 Hz), 117.6

19F NMR (282.3 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = -62.2

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3249, 2988, 1616, 1111 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C₁₂H₈ClF₃N₂; C, 52.86; H, 2.96; N, 10.27; found C, 52.88; H, 2.98; N, 10.07

MP: 138-140°C
1-(4-((4-chloropyridin-3-yl)amino)phenyl)ethanone (36j)

Following general experimental B: Pyridine 35j (440 mg, 1.27 mmol), DCM (3 mL) and TFA (1.5 mL) were combined and stirred for 24 h to give 280 mg of pyridine 36j as a yellow solid. (89%)

$R_f = 0.12$ (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 8.72$ (s, 1H), 8.17 (d, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.93 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 7.36 (d, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.11 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.22 (br s, 1H), 2.56 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75.4 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 196.6, 146.0, 143.8, 141.3, 135.5, 133.3, 131.2, 130.7, 124.9, 116.6, 26.5$

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 3247, 3172, 3049, 1667, 1604, 1565, 813$ cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_{11}$ClN$_2$O; C, 63.29; H, 4.49; N, 11.36; found C, 63.31; H, 4.14; N, 11.71

MP: 115-116$^\circ$C
4-chloro-N-(4-methoxyphenyl)pyridin-3-amine (36l)

Following general experimental A: Copper (I) Iodide (20 mg, 0.11 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (465 mg, 2.18 mmol), pyridine 34 (250 mg, 1.09 mmol), diamine L1 (27 µL, 0.22 mmol), 4-bromoanisole (0.15 mL, 1.2 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 29 h, cooled to room temperature, diluted with EtOAc, filtered through a Celite® plug and concentrated in vacuo. The crude mixture was dissolved in DCM (3 mL) and TFA (1.5 mL) and stirred for 24 h. The reaction was poured into sat. NaHCO$_3$(aq), diluted with DCM, and the layers were separated. The aqueous layer was extracted with DCM and the combined organic layers were dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, decanted and concentrated in vacuo to give brown oil. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 20% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 120 mg of pyridine 36l (47% over two steps) as a brown solid.

R$_r$ = 0.24 (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 8.26 (s, 1H), 7.94 (d, $J$ = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.24 (d, $J$ = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 7.16 (d, $J$ = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.92 (d, $J$ = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 5.82 (br s, 1H), 3.82 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75.4 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 157.1, 140.0, 139.3, 136.3, 132.7, 128.4, 124.9, 124.2, 115.1, 55.7

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) $\nu$ = 3234, 3041, 2933, 2835, 1513, 1244 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{12}$H$_{11}$ClN$_2$O; C, 61.41; H, 4.72; N, 11.94; found C, 61.48; H, 4.97; N, 11.67

MP: 59-60°C
**4-chloro-N-(3,5-dimethylphenyl)pyridin-3-amine (36m)**

Following general experimental A: Copper (I) Iodide (20 mg, 0.11 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (465 mg, 2.18 mmol), pyridine 34 (250 mg, 1.09 mmol), diamine L1 (27 µL, 0.22 mmol), 5-bromo-m-xylene (0.17 mL, 1.2 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane (0.5 M) were combined and stirred for 29 h, cooled to room temperature, diluted with EtOAc, filtered through a Celite® plug and concentrated *in vacuo*. The crude mixture was dissolved in DCM (3 mL) and TFA (1.5 mL) and stirred for 24 h. The reaction was poured into sat. NaHCO$_3$ (aq), diluted with DCM, the layers were separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with DCM. The combined organic layers were dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, decanted and concentrated *in vacuo* to give brown oil. Purification via flash column chromatography, eluted with 20% EtOAc/Hexanes, gave 168 mg of pyridine 36m (66% over two steps) as an off-white solid.

$R_f$ = 0.42 (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.01 (s, 1H), 7.27 (d, $J = 3.9$ Hz, 1H), 6.81 (s, 2H), 6.74 (s, 1H), 5.88 (s, 1H), 2.30 (s, 6H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 140.9, 140.3, 139.6, 138.2, 137.7, 129.8, 125.5, 124.4, 118.3, 21.4

**FT-IR**: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3402, 1606, 1571, 1075 cm$^{-1}$

**EA**: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_{13}$ClN$_2$; C, 67.10; H, 5.63; N, 12.04; found C, 67.17; H, 5.88; N, 11.93

**MP**: 127-128°C
**4-chloro-N-(pyridin-3-yl)pyridin-3-amine (36n)**

Following general experimental B: Pyridine 35n (168 mg, 0.55 mmol), DCM (2 mL) and TFA (1 mL) were combined and stirred for 6 h to give 100 mg of pyridine 36n as a yellow solid. (89%)

$R_f = 0.06$ (30% EtOAc/Hexanes)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 8.49$ (s, 1H), 8.46 (d, $J = 2.1$ Hz, 1H), 8.29 (d, $J = 4.5$ Hz, 1H), 8.07 (d, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.48 (d, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.30 (d, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.24 (dd, $J = 8.1$, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 6.28 (br s, 1H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75.4 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 144.3$, 142.4, 142.3, 138.5, 137.5, 136.7, 131.4, 126.4, 124.6, 124.0

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 3172$, 3042, 1588, 1326 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{10}$H$_8$ClN$_3$; C, 58.41; H, 3.92; N, 20.43; found C, 58.36; H, 4.14; N, 20.39

MP: 117-118°C
3-(4-fluorobenzyl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37d)

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36d (95 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)t-butyl-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 4 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 3% MeOH/DCM, to give 68 mg of pyridine 37d (75%) as a pale yellow solid.

$R_f = 0.31$ (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 8.65 (d, $J = 0.6$ Hz, 1H), 8.39 (d, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 1H), 8.00 (s, 1H), 7.66 (dd, $J = 5.7$, 0.9 Hz, 1H), 7.18-7.13 (m, 2H), 7.09-6.96 (m, 2H), 5.34 (s, 2H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ= 162.7 (d, $J_{C-F} = 246.75$ Hz), 149.1, 145.7, 142.2, 133.7, 131.5, 130.4 (d, $J_{C-F} = 3.45$ Hz), 129.2 (d, $J_{C-F} = 7.95$ Hz), 116.3 (d, $J_{C-F} = 21.75$ Hz), 115.1, 48.8

$^{19}$F NMR (282.3 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ= -113.0 (m)

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 1608 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_{10}$FN$_3$; C, 68.71; H, 4.44; N, 18.49; found C, 68.54; H, 4.36; N, 18.32

MP: 107-110°C
3-((1,1'-biphenyl)-4-ylmethyl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37e)

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36e (95 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)t-buty1-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 4.5 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 86 mg of pyridine 37e (75%) as an off-white solid.

$R_f$ = 0.34 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 8.76 (s, 1H), 8.46 (d, $J = 5.7$ Hz, 1H), 8.07 (s, 1H), 7.73 (dd, $J = 5.7$, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 7.58-7.51 (m, 4H), 7.45-7.26 (m, 5H), 5.44 (s, 2H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 149.1, 145.8, 142.2, 141.8, 140.1, 133.9, 133.4, 131.6, 128.9, 127.9, 127.8, 127.7, 127.1, 115.1, 49.2

EA: Calculate: C$_{19}$H$_{15}$N$_3$; C, 79.98; H, 5.30; N, 14.73; found C, 79.96; H, 5.56; N, 14.39

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 1602$ cm$^{-1}$

MP: 189-191°C
Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36f (57 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd\textsubscript{2}(dba)\textsubscript{3}·CHCl\textsubscript{3} (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me\textsubscript{3}(OMe)-t-butyl-XPhos\textsuperscript{195} (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K\textsubscript{3}PO\textsubscript{4} (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL \textit{tert}-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 5 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated \textit{in vacuo} and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 31 mg of pyridine 37f (58%) as a pale yellow solid.

\[ R_f = 0.17 \text{ (5\% MeOH/DCM)} \]

\textbf{\textsuperscript{1}H NMR} (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \( \delta = 8.80 \text{ (d, } \textit{J} = 0.6 \text{ Hz, } 1\text{H}), 8.42 \text{ (d, } \textit{J} = 5.4 \text{ Hz, } 1\text{H}), 7.91 \text{ (s, } 1\text{H}, 7.65 \text{ (dd, } \textit{J} = 5.7 \text{ Hz, } 0.9 \text{ Hz, } 1\text{H}), 3.89 \text{ (s, } 3\text{H})

\textbf{\textsuperscript{13}C NMR} (75 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta = 148.7, 146.2, 142.0, 133.2, 132.3, 114.9, 31.5\)

\textbf{MP: 95-97°C}
3-((p-tolyl))-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37i):

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36i (87 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me₃(OMe)t-butyI-XPhos⁹⁵ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K₃PO₄ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 6 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 72 mg of pyridine 37i (86%) as a light brown solid.

Rᵣ = 0.33(5% MeOH/DCM)

¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.90 (s, 1H), 8.48 (d, J = 5.7 Hz, 1H), 8.17 (s, 1H), 7.74 (dd, J = 5.7 Hz, 0.6 Hz, 1H), 7.40-7.36 (m, 4H), 2.43 (s, 3H)

¹³C NMR (150 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 149.1, 145.0, 142.6, 139.1, 134.3, 133.0, 131.7, 131.0, 123.9, 115.3, 21.2

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3051, 2924, 1518, 1480, 821 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C₁₃H₁₁N₃; C, 74.62; H, 5.30; N, 20.08; found C, 74.66; H, 5.54; N, 19.97

MP: 108-109°C
3-(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37k):

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36k (108 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)-butyl-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 6 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 96 mg of pyridine 37k (91%) as a pale yellow solid.

$R_f$ = 0.30 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 8.97 (s, 1H), 8.52 (d, $J$ = 5.7 Hz, 1H), 8.25 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.76 (d, $J$ = 5.7 Hz, 1H), 7.69 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2H)

$^{13}$C NMR (150 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 149.4, 144.4, 143.1, 138.5, 133.9, 131.0, 130.8 (q, $J_{C-F}$ = 33.3 Hz), 127.8 (q, $J_{C-F}$ = 3.7 Hz), 123.9, 123.5 (q, $J_{C-F}$ = 272.9 Hz), 115.5

$^{19}$F NMR (282.3 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ = -63.0

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu$ = 3056, 1606, 1334, 1106 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_8$F$_3$N$_3$; C, 59.32; H, 3.06; N, 15.96; found C, 59.04; H, 2.77; N, 15.67

MP: 166-167 °C
1-(4-(3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridin-3-yl)phenyl)ethanone (37j)

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36j (98 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)-butyl-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 4 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 83 mg of pyridine 37j (87%) as a pale yellow solid.

R$_f$ = 0.33 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 8.99 (s, 1H), 8.51 (d, $J$ = 5.7 Hz, 1H), 8.26 (s, 1H), 8.18 (d, $J$ = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 7.76 (dd, $J$ = 5.7 Hz, 0.9 Hz, 1H), 7.65 (d, $J$ = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 2.65 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (150 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 196.3, 149.3, 144.3, 143.0, 139.1, 136.8, 134.0, 130.9, 130.5, 123.3, 115.4, 26.6

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 1677, 1601, 1353, 816 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{14}$H$_{11}$N$_3$O; C, 70.87; H, 4.67; N, 17.71; found C, 70.50; H, 4.76; N, 17.43

MP: 199-201°C
3-(4-methoxyphenyl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37l)

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36l (93 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$-CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)-t-butyl-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 6.5 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 3% MeOH/DCM, to give 69 mg of pyridine 37l (77%) as a pale yellow solid.

$R_f = 0.30$ (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 8.86$ (s, 1H), 8.49 (d, $J = 5.7$ Hz, 1H), 8.14 (s, 1H), 7.75 (d, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.42 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 7.08 (d, $J = 9.0$ Hz, 2H), 3.88 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (75.4 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta = 159.9$, 149.0, 145.2, 142.5, 134.3, 132.1, 128.3, 125.7, 115.5, 115.2, 55.8

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu = 2839$, 1517, 1253 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_{11}$N$_3$O; C, 69.32; H, 4.92; N, 18.66; found C, 69.44; H, 5.05; N, 18.75

MP: 105-106°C
3-(3,5-dimethylphenyl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37m):

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36m (93 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)t-butyl-XPhos$^{195}$ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 4 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 80 mg of pyridine 37m (90%) as a pale yellow solid.

$R_f$ = 0.33 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 8.96 (s, 1H), 8.51 (d, $J$ = 5.4 Hz, 1H), 8.19 (s, 1H), 7.77 (d, $J$ = 5.6 Hz, 1H), 7.14 (s, 3H), 2.43 (s, 6H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 149.2, 144.9, 142.6, 140.5, 135.4, 134.6, 131.6, 130.5, 121.7, 115.3, 21.5

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu$ = 3060, 2919, 1602, 1494, 1231 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{14}$H$_{13}$N$_3$; C, 75.31; H, 5.87; N, 18.82; found C, 75.64; H, 5.59; N, 18.66

MP: 144-146°C
3-(pyridin-3-yl)-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (37n)

Following general procedure D: Pyridine 36n (95 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd\(_2\)(dba)\(_3\)·CHCl\(_3\) (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me\(_3\)O(t-buty)-XPhos\(_{195}\) (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K\(_3\)PO\(_4\) (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), formamide (0.024 mL, 0.6 mmol) were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 5 h TLC analysis indicated the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 4% MeOH/DCM, to give 67 mg of pyridine 37n (86%) as a yellow solid.

\( R_f = 0.57 \) (4% MeOH/DCM)

\(^1\text{H NMR}\) (600 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta = 8.94 \) (s, 1H), 8.88 (d, \( J = 2.4 \) Hz, 1H), 8.78 (dd, \( J = 4.8 \) Hz, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 8.55 (d, \( J = 5.4 \) Hz, 1H), 8.23 (s, 1H), 7.91 (ddd, \( J = 8.0 \) Hz, 2.4 Hz, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 7.80 (d, \( J = 5.4 \) Hz, 1H), 7.58 (dd, \( J = 8.0 \) Hz, 4.8 Hz, 1H)

\(^{13}\text{C NMR}\) (150 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta = 150.2, 149.4, 145.3, 144.5, 143.3, 133.8, 132.5, 131.4, 131.4, 124.8, 115.6 \)

\( \text{FT-IR (NaCl, thin film)} \) \( \nu = 3351, 3058, 2928, 1496, 1249 \text{ cm}^{-1} \)

EA: Calculated: C\(_{11}\)H\(_8\)N\(_4\); C, 67.34; H, 4.11; N, 28.55; found C, 67.40; H, 4.15; N, 28.21

MP: 138-140°C
2-methyl-3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (39): To an oven dried 50 mL Schlenk tube was added pyridine 36h (82 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$CHCl$_3$ (8 mg, 0.008 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)$_2$BuXPhos$^6$ (20 mg, 0.04 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (170 mg, 0.8 mmol), and acetamide (236 mg, 4.0 mmol); the reaction vessel was sealed, evacuated under vacuum and purged with Ar$_{1(g)}$. tBuOH (2.0 mL) was added and the reaction mixture was degassed with three vacuum / Ar$_{1(g)}$ purge cycles, equipped with a cold-finger condenser and placed in a pre-heated 110°C oil-bath. After 4 h TLC analysis indicated the complete consumption of pyridine 36h. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 2% MeOH/DCM, to give 51 mg of pyridine 39 (61%) as a yellow solid.

R$_f$ = 0.26 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 8.50 (s, 1H), 8.42 (d, $J = 5.6$ Hz, 1H), 7.63-7.53 (m, 4H), 7.39-7.36 (m, 2H), 2.53 (s, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 155.0, 147.9, 142.6, 135.2, 134.3, 133.3, 130.3, 129.5, 126.8, 113.9, 14.5

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu =$ 3407, 3048, 2926, 1596, 1501, 1392, 822 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{13}$H$_{11}$N$_3$; C, 74.62; H, 5.30; N, 20.08; found C, 74.77; H, 5.32; N, 19.85

MP: 104-107°C
2-(furan-2-yl)-3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (40): To an oven dried 50 mL Schlenk tube was added pyridine 36h (82 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$CHCl$_3$ (8 mg, 0.008 mmol), Me$_3$(OMe)$_2$BuXPhos$^6$ (20 mg, 0.04 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (170 mg, 0.8 mmol), and furanamide (222 mg, 2.0 mmol); the reaction vessel was sealed, evacuated under vacuum and purged with Ar$_{(g)}$. rBuOH (2.0 mL) was added and the reaction mixture was degassed with three vacuum / Ar$_{(g)}$ purge cycles, equipped with a cold-finger condenser and placed in a pre-heated 110°C oil-bath. After 5 h TLC analysis indicated the complete consumption of pyridine 36h. The reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 2% MeOH/DCM, to give 53 mg of pyridine 40 (51%) as a yellow solid.

R$_r$ = 0.21 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 8.47 (s, 1H), 8.47 (d, $J= 5.6$ Hz, 1H), 7.72 (dd, $J= 5.6, 1.2$ Hz, 1H), 7.63-7.59 (m, 3H), 7.50 (dd, $J=1.2, 0.8$ Hz, 1H), 7.45-7.41 (m, 2H), 6.37 (dd, $J= 3.6, 1.6$ Hz, 1H), 6.29 (dd, $J= 3.6, 0.4$ Hz, 1H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta =$ 147.9, 146.6, 145.2, 144.3, 143.7, 142.9, 135.4, 134.7, 133.6, 130.2, 130.0, 127.6, 114.2, 111.8

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) $\nu =$ 3049, 2924, 2222, 1591, 1502, 1416, 1267, 905, 819 cm$^{-1}$

EA: Calculated: C$_{16}$H$_{11}$N$_3$O; C, 73.55; H, 4.24; N, 16.08; found C, 73.48; H, 4.28; N, 15.94

MP: 153-155°C
5,10-diphenyl-5,10-dihydrodipyrido[3,4-b:3′,4′-e]pyrazine (38): Pyridine 36h (82 mg, 0.4 mmol), Pd₂(dba)₃·CHCl₃ (4 mg, 0.004 mmol), Me₃(OMe)t-butyll-XPhos¹⁹₅ (10 mg, 0.02 mmol), K₃PO₄ (128 mg, 0.6 mmol), were combined with 2 mL tert-butanol in a 25 mL Schlenk tube. After 16.5 h the reaction mixture was cooled to RT, filtered through Celite®, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 5% MeOH/DCM, to give 26 mg of pyrazine 38 (39%) as a yellow solid.

Rᵣ = 0.05 (10% iPrOH/DCM)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CD₃OD) δ = 7.68 (d, J= 1.5 Hz, 1H), 7.48 (dd, J= 6.8, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 7.21-7.17 (m, 2H), 7.05-7.02 (m, 2H), 6.86-6.83 (m, 1H), 6.38 (d, J= 6.8 Hz, 1H)

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CD₃OD) δ = 173.0, 143.4, 136.4, 134.9, 130.7, 122.9, 119.8, 119.3, 113.1

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 2928, 2858, 1625, 1590, 1458, 1173, 824 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C₂₂H₁₆N₄; C, 78.55; H, 4.79; N, 16.66; found C, 78.28; H, 4.84; N, 16.75

MP: 168-170°C
2-chloro-3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (41): Chloride 41 was prepared following a literature procedure. To an oven dried 25 mL Schlenk tube was added pyridine 37h (49 mg, 0.25 mmol) and 1.0 mL THF. The reaction mixture was cooled to -78°C (CO₂/acetone bath) and lithium diisopropylamide (2.0M in THF, 0.19 mL) was added drop-wise and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 1 h. Hexachloroethane (89 mg, 0.375 mmol) was added as a solution in THF (0.25 mL) and the reaction mixture was warmed to RT over 45 min. The reaction was quenched by the addition of a saturated aqueous solution of ammonium chloride (4 mL) diluted with 5 mL of water and poured into 10 mL of EtOAc. The layers were separated and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc (3 x 5 mL). The combined organic layers were dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, concentrated in vacuo and purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 5% MeOH/ DCM to afford 48 mg of chloride 41 (84%) as a yellow solid.

Rᵣ = 0.40 (5% MeOH/DCM)

**¹H NMR** (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.52 (d, J= 5.7 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (dd, J = 6.9, 0.9 Hz, 1H), 7.66-7.60 (m, 3H), 7.49-7.45 (m, 2H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 146.8, 144.4, 143.0, 134.1, 133.6, 133.2, 130.1, 130.0, 126.9, 114.0

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 1638, 1498, 1437, 1366, 1285 cm⁻¹

**EA:** Calculated: C₁₂H₈ClN₃; C, 62.76; H, 3.51; N, 18.30; found C, 62.94; H, 3.67; N, 18.66

**MP:** 110°C (decomposition)
3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine 5-oxide (42): To a flame dried 25 mL round bottom flask containing a stir bar was added pyridine 37h (150 mg, 0.77 mmol) and chloroform (16 mL). After complete dissolution, mCPBA (85%, 390 mg, 1.93 mmol) was added as a single portion and the reaction mixture was warmed to 45°C for 2 h. The reaction mixture was cooled to room temp., concentrated in vacuo then purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 10% MeOH/ DCM to afford 145 mg of N-oxide 42 (89%) as a white powder.

R_f = 0.02 (EtOAc)

^1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 8.56 (d, J = 1.0 Hz, 1H), 8.17 (s, 1H), 8.14 (dd, J = 6.9, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.65 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 1H), 7.57-7.52 (m, 2H), 7.50-7.46 (m, 1H) 7.41-7.39 (m, 2H)

^13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl_3) δ = 146.2, 141.9, 135.7, 134.4, 132.1, 130.6, 129.5, 124.6, 123.7, 117.0

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3379, 1506, 1463, 1446, 1204 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C_{12}H_{9}N_{3}O; C, 68.24; H, 4.29; N, 19.89; found C, 67.93; H, 4.50; N, 19.56

MP: 174-175°C
**4-chloro-3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine (43):** To a 25 mL Schlenk tube containing a stir bar was added N-oxide 42 (42mg, 0.2 mmol) and 0.2 mL of POCl₃. The reaction mixture was heated in a 120°C oil bath for 2 h then cooled to RT. The reaction mixture was diluted with 5 mL of H₂O and made basic with 1.5 mL of ammonium hydroxide. The aqueous layer was extracted with DCM (3 x 10 mL) and the combined organic layers were dried over MgSO₄, filtered, concentrated *in vacuo* then purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 10% MeOH/DCM to afford 38 mg of chloride 43 (84%) as an off-white solid.

Rᵥ = 0.50 (5% MeOH/DCM)

**¹H NMR** (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.27 (d, J = 5.5 Hz, 1H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 7.73 (d, J = 5.7 Hz, 1H), 7.57-7.53 (m, 3H), 7.46-7.43 (m, 2H)

**¹³C NMR** (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 150.9, 147.1, 141.5, 134.9, 134.3, 129.7, 129.1, 128.7, 127.7, 115.0

**FT-IR** (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3054, 1605, 1556, 1240, 980, 821 cm⁻¹

**EA:** Calculated: C₁₂H₈ClN₃; C, 62.76; H, 3.51; N, 18.30; found C, 62.54; H, 3.66; N, 18.26

**MP:** 148-151°C
3-phenyl-3H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridine-4-carbonitrile (44): To an oven dried 15 mL pressure tube containing a stir bar was added N-oxide 42 (53 mg, 0.25 mmol), acetonitrile (0.5 mL), Et₃N (0.05 mL, 0.375 mmol), and trimethylsilylcyanide (0.11 mL, 0.9 mmol). The reaction vessel was sealed with a teflon screw cap and heated in an oil bath at 110°C for 12 h. The reaction mixture was cooled to room temp., diluted with 10 mL DCM and washed with 10mL NaHCO₃ (sat. aq.). The organic layer was dried over MgSO₄, filtered, concentrated in vacuo then purified on a silica gel column, eluted with 5% MeOH/ DCM to afford 49 mg of nitrile 44 (89%) as an off-white solid.

Rᵣ = 0.50 (5% MeOH/DCM)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 8.63 (d, J = 5.6 Hz, 1H), 8.24 (s, 1H), 8.02 (d, J = 5.6 Hz, 1H), 7.66-7.63 (m, 3H), 7.52-7.50 (m, 2H)

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 150.1, 147.9, 143.4, 133.5, 133.4, 130.7, 130.0, 127.1, 119.2, 117.4, 114.2

FT-IR (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3115, 3057, 2222, 1595, 1501, 1222 cm⁻¹

EA: Calculated: C₁₃H₈N₄; C, 70.90; H, 3.66; N, 25.44; found C, 70.81; H, 3.59; N, 25.07

MP: 179-181°C
General Procedure E: Reductive Amination

To a flame-dried round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stir-bar was added 3-amino-2-chloropyridine (1 equiv.), ethyl acetate (0.78 M) and the appropriate aldehyde (1.2 equiv.). The mixture was allowed to stir until complete dissolution (about 5 min) at which time trifluoroacetic acid (2.0-3.0 equiv.) was added as a single portion via syringe to afford a yellow solution. After stirring at rt for 2 min sodium triacetoxyborohydride (1.2 equiv.) was added in two equal portions 1 minute apart [CAUTION: vigorous gas evolution]; once the reaction was judged complete by TLC analysis, the reaction was quenched by the addition of 20% NaOH(aq). The pH was adjusted to about 8 by addition of NaOH(s). The layers were separated and the organic layer was washed with brine, dried over MgSO₄, filtered and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude pyridine which was purified as specified.

4-(((2-chloropyridin-3-yl)amino)methyl)benzonitrile (1o): Adapted from general procedure E: 3-amino-2-chloropyridine (1.28 g, 10.0 mmol), ethyl acetate (15 mL), 4-formylbenzonitrile (1.44 g, 11.0 mmol), TFA (2.3 mL, 30.0 mmol) and sodium triacetoxyborohydride (2.6 g, 12.0 mmol) were combined and stirred for 1h. After the standard workup, the crude product was recrystallized with 80 mL of 2:1 hexanes:ethyl acetate to give 1o as colorless prisms (1.48 g, 61%). A second crop was obtained (0.64 g, 26%); total yield of 87%.

Rf = 0.57 (5% MeOH/DCM)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.74 (dd, J = 4.8, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.64 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.44 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2H), 7.01 (dd, J = 8.0, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 4.97 (s, NH), 4.50 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 2H)

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 143.5, 140.0, 137.4, 137.3, 132.8, 127.5, 123.4, 118.7, 117.9, 111.6, 47.0

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3382, 2228, 1585 cm⁻¹

Anal. Calcd. for C₁₃H₁₀ClN₃: C, 64.07; H, 4.14; N, 17.24; found C, 64.03; H, 4.07; N, 17.51

MP: 151-152°C
**General Procedure F: Cyclization of 2-Chloro-3-aminopyridines**

To an oven-dried 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir-bar was added Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (1 mol %), Xantphos (5 mol %), K$_3$PO$_4$ (1.5 equiv.) and the pyridine (1a-1t, 1 equiv.). The reaction vessel was evacuated and refilled with Ar$_{\text{g}}$, 1,4-Dioxane:t-AmOH (10:1, 0.2 M) and formamide (1.5 equiv.) were then added via syringe and the reaction mixture was degassed by three vacuum/Ar$_{\text{g}}$ purge cycles. The reaction vessel was equipped with a cold-finger, placed in a pre-heated 110 °C oil-bath and stirred for the specified time. Upon consumption of the pyridine (as judged by TLC analysis) the reaction was allowed to cool to RT, diluted with methanol, and passed through a Celite© plug. The solvent was removed *in vacuo* to afford the crude imidazopyridine which was purified as specified.

**4-((1H-imidazo[4,5-b]pyridin-1-yl)methyl)benzonitrile (2o)**

*Adapted from general procedure F:* Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (8.0 mg, 0.008 mmol), Xantphos (23 mg, 0.04 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (170 mg, 0.8 mmol), 4-(((2-chloropyridin-3-yl)amino)methyl)benzonitrile (1o) (97 mg, 0.4 mmol), formamide (24 µL, 0.6 mmol) and 1,4-dioxane:t-AmOH (1.85 mL:0.15 mL) were combined and stirred for 19h. The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (2-5% MeOH in CH$_2$Cl$_2$) to yield imidazopyridine 2o as a light yellow powder (66 mg, 70%).

*RF* = 0.12 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 8.52 (dd, J = 4.4 Hz, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 8.14 (s, 1H), 7.58 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.44 (dd, J = 8.0 Hz, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.19 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 5.41 (s, 2H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ = 156.5, 145.6, 145.3, 140.1, 133.1, 127.5, 125.9, 118.6, 118.1, 118.1, 112.8, 48.9

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) ν = 3391, 2228, 1610, 1494 cm$^{-1}$

**Anal. Calcd.** for C$_{14}$H$_{10}$N$_{4}$: C, 71.78; H, 4.30; N, 23.92; found C, 71.63; H, 4.31; N, 23.94

**MP:** 178-180°C
2-cyclohexyl-1-(2,4-dimethoxybenzyl)-1H-imidazo[4,5-b]pyridine (7)

Adapted from general procedure F: Pd$_2$(dba)$_3$·CHCl$_3$ (8.0 mg, 0.008 mmol), Xantphos (23 mg, 0.04 mmol), K$_3$PO$_4$ (170 mg, 0.8 mmol), 2-chloro-N-(2,4-dimethoxybenzyl)pyridin-3-amine$^{157}$ (134 mg, 0.48 mmol), cyclohexanecarboxamide (51 mg, 0.4 mmol, **Limiting reagent**) and 1,4-dioxane:t-AmOH (1.85 mL:0.15 mL) were combined and stirred for 24h.

The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (1% MeOH in CH$_2$Cl$_2$) to yield imidazopyridine 7 as a yellow solid (110 mg, 79%).

R$_f$ = 0.46 (5% MeOH/DCM)

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 8.43 (dd, $J$ = 4.8, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 7.46 (dd, $J$ = 8.0, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 7.03 (dd, $J$ = 8.0, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 6.55 (d, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 6.45 (d, $J$ = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 6.31 (dd, $J$ = 8.4 Hz, 2.4 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (s, 2H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.74 (s, 3H), 2.92-2.85 (m, 1H), 1.86-1.84 (m, 6H), 1.76-1.71 (m, 1H), 1.39-1.32 (m, 3H)

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ = 162.2, 160.8, 157.7, 155.9, 144.1, 128.1, 127.5, 117.6, 117.0, 116.2, 104.1, 98.6, 55.4, 55.4, 42.2, 36.5, 31.7, 26.3, 25.7 (29.7, “grease”)

FT-IR: (NaCl, thin film) v = 3419, 3054, 2997, 2933, 2847, 1610, 1584, 837 cm$^{-1}$

Anal. Calcd. for C$_{21}$H$_{28}$N$_3$O$_2$: C, 71.77; H, 7.17; N, 11.96; found C, 71.81; H, 7.11; N, 11.99

MP: 134-136°C
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5.4 SILYLVINYLATION SPECTRA
RJW-5-145
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NAME  RJW400-5-145
EXPNO  2
PROCNO  1
Date_  20140513
Time  22.59
INSTRUM  spect
PROBNO  5 mm CCPMRO HS
FULLPROG  zg30
TD  65536
SOLVENT  CDCl3
NS  16
DS  2
SMH  8012.820 Hz
FIDRES  8.122266 Hz
AQ  4.0894966 sec
RG  183
DL  62.400 usec
DE  10.000 usec
TE  298.0 K
DI  1.00000000 sec
TD0  1

======== CHANNEL f1 =========
SFQ1  400.1324710 MHz
NUC1  39
P1  12.000 usec
SI  65536
SF  400.1300010 MHz
WDW  EM
SSB  0
LB  0.30 Hz
GB  0
PC  1.00

ppm
$^{19}\text{F NMR (CDCl}_3\text{)}$
PTLC
OMe

RJW-5-032
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NAME: RJW400-5-032
EXPNO: 2
PROCNO: 1
Date: 20140210
Time: 11:22
INSTRUM: spect
PROBSID: 5 mm CPB300 NS
PULPROG: zg30
TD: 65536
SOLVENT: CDCl3
NS: 16
DS: 2
SMH: 8012.820 Hz
FIDRES: 6.122266 Hz
AQ: 4.9994966 sec
RG: 164.26
DM: 62.400 usec
DE: 10.00 usec
TE: 298.0 K
D1: 1.00000000 sec
TD0: 1

-------------- CHANNEL f1 --------------

SP01: 400.1324710 MHz
NUC1: 31
P1: 12.00 usec
SI: 65536
SF: 400.1300005 MHz
WDW: EM
SBR: 0
LB: 0.30 Hz
GB: 0
FC: 1.00
Diene Mixture 1.143
Diene Mixture 1.143
Diene Mixture 1.147
Diene Mixture 1.148
Diene Mixture 1.149
RJW-5-117
nBu
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NAME    RJW400-5-117
EXPNRO  3
PROCNO  1
Date    20140423
Time    19:32
INSTROM  spect
PROBND  5 mm CPMG RO HS
PULPROG  zgppg30
TD      65536
SOLVENT  CDCl3
NS      540
DS      4
SMH     24038.461 Hz
FIDRES  0.366798 Hz
AQ      1.3631988 sec
RG      50.16
DM      20.000 usec
DE      18.000 usec
TE      298.0 K
D1      2.00000000 sec
D11     0.03000000 sec
TD0     1

======== CHANNEL f1 =======
SP01   100.6228293 MHz
NUC1   13C
F1     10.000 usec
SI     32768
SF     100.6127589 MHz
WDX    BN
SSB    0
LB     1.00 Hz
GR     0
FC     1.40

---
O-Si-Ph

Me

(56% $^2$H)

H (52% $^2$H)

$^2$H NMR

1.133
GC-MS of 2b*
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1.133
GC-MS of 2b*

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Me} \\
\text{O} & \text{Si} & \text{Ph} \\
\text{H} & \text{H} & (52\% \, ^2H) \\
(56\% \, ^2H) & H & (52\% \, ^2H)
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]
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NAME    RJW400-4-188
EXPNO   5
PROCNO  1
Date     20131007
Time     15.56
INSTRUM  spect
PROBND   5 mm CPMG N0.5
PULPROG  zg30
TD       65536
SOLVENT  MeOD
NS       16
DS       2
SMH      8012.820 Hz
FDKRES   5.122266 Hz
AQ       4.2994966 sec
RG       164.26
DN       24.000 usec
DE       10.00 usec
TE       298.0 K
D1       0.0000000 sec
TD0      1

CHANNEL f1

SP01    400.1324710 MHz
NUC1    30
P1       12.000 usec
SI       65536
SF       400.1300474 MHz
WDH      EM
5BB      0
LB       0.30 Hz
GB       0
PC       1.00
421

R JW-4-231-C

--------- CHANNEL f1 ---------
SP01  100.6228293 MHz
NUC1  13C
F1    10.00 usec
ST    32768
SF    100.6127566 MHz
MDN   0
SSB   0
LB    1.00 Hz
GR    0
FC    1.40
RJW-4-186-C
recryst
6.0 VITAE
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