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## Preliminary kinetic investigation of the catalytic enantioselective vinylogous Povarov reaction

The kinetics of the reaction between imine $\mathbf{1 a}$ and dienophile 2a was preliminarily studied by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using a reaction progress analysis approach (Scheme S1). ${ }^{1}$


Scheme S1: Vinylogous Povarov reaction between imine 1a and 2a used for kinetic studies.
The kinetic experiments were set up and elaborated as follows:
A Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar was charged with $4 \AA$ molecular sieves ( 70 mg ). The molecular sieves were thermally activated under vacuum. After cooling to RT, the tube was filled with a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere, then charged with the appropriate amount of imine 1a. The appropriate amount of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ (freshly passed through basic alumina) and of a stock 0.012 M solution of catalyst 4 h in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ were then added. Overall, $600 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ were employed in each experiment. The solution was stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for a few minutes. The appropriate amount of dienophile 2a was then added in one portion. After few seconds stirring to homogenise the solution, the whole mixture including the molecular sieves was transferred in a pre-dried, $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled NMR tube by means of a 1 mL syringe equipped with a short and large needle. The tube was placed in a Varian 400 MHz NMR instrument at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, spinned at $16-20 \mathrm{~Hz}$, and after automatic lock and shimming, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra ( $\mathrm{nt}=1$ ) were recorded every minute, using the automatic array pad function, until ca $70-80 \%$ conversion.

From the last ${ }^{1} H$ NMR spectra recorded, it was checked that no significant decomposition of imine 1a, dienophile 2a or product 3a occurred in the time frame of the analysis, nor that the reaction gave significant amounts of by-products. A preliminary control experiment carried out in the absence of catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$, showed that background reactivity is not significant ( $<5 \%$ conversion after 18 h ).
The spectra were collectively elaborated (phased, drift correction), and the relevant peaks integrated after baseline correction, from which the conversion at each time was determined. From the conversion, imine 2a concentration was calculated. The resulting curve of imine vs time was plotted and fitted to a polynomial equation (ninth order) with the OriginPro 7 program. The derivative of this equation, giving the dependence of reaction rate on imine concentration, was employed for the kinetic analysis. As this curve is purely empirical, it could be used only in the range of imine concentration which was effectively employed in the experiment.

The results obtained from these experiments can be summarized as follows:

[^0]1) Reactions at different catalysts concentrations, under otherwise identical reaction conditions, to determine the order of the reaction respect to catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$, by comparing the TOF of the experiments. TOF values were determined by dividing the reaction rate by the initial catalyst concentration used in each experiment (Figure S1).


Figure S1: : $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.10 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.20 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst 4h] $0.0020 \mathrm{M} . ■ \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.10 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.20 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst 4 h ] 0.0030 M .

In the plot, the two curves are roughly superimposable. It is thus possible to conclude that the reaction is approximately first order in catalyst concentration.
2) Reactions with the "same excess". Two reactions were performed by employing the same concentration of catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$, different starting concentration of imine $\mathbf{1 a}$, and same "excess" of dienophile 2a in terms of concentration (Figure S2). In other words, the reaction with lower imine concentration starts exactly under the conditions (concentration of substrates and catalyst) of the other reaction at $25 \%$ conversion. This experiment shows if the activity of the catalyst is the same during the whole reaction course, or if catalyst deactivation/decomposition occurs, influencing the concentration of active catalyst which is part of the rate law.


Figure S2: *: $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.10 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.20 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ ] $0.0020 \mathrm{M} . ■ \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.075 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.175 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst 4h] $0.0020 \mathrm{M} . \Delta \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] 0.075 $\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.175 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ ] $0.0020 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [product 3a] 0.025 M .

In Figure S2, the two curves * (standard reaction) and $\square$ (reaction starting after $25 \%$ conversion) are not superimposable. Thus, catalyst deactivation/decomposition heavily occurs affecting (lowering) the reaction rate. To check if catalyst inhibition by the product was the reason for this behaviour, a third experiment $\Delta$ was carried out under the same conditions of $\square$ but adding at the beginning the amount of product $\mathbf{3 a}$ formed when the curve $\star$ reaches $25 \%$ conversion. However, as this curve
is roughly superimposable to $\quad$ catalyst inhibition by the product is not the reason for this considerable decrease in catalyst activity with time.

We then performed two similar experiments, but in the absence of molecular sieves, in order to check if these drying agents were responsible for catalyst deactivation (Figure S3). Due to the much lower activity of catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ in the absence of molecular sieves, higher catalyst/substrates initial concentrations had to be used.


Figure S3: : $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.15 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.30 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ ] $0.015 \mathrm{M} . ■ \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [imine 1a] $0.12 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [dienophile 2a] $0.27 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{C}_{0}$ [catalyst $\left.\mathbf{4 h}\right] 0.015 \mathrm{M}$.

As the two curves in Figure S3 are also clearly not superimposable, catalyst deactivation is not due to the presence of molecular sieves in the reaction.

From these experiments, it can be concluded that the reaction rate is approximately first order in catalyst concentration, but that catalyst deactivation heavily occurs during the course of this reaction. This prevents the determination of a rate law using the reaction progress kinetic analysis approach, which requires the same amount of active catalyst during the whole (or most of) the reaction course. This catalyst deactivation is not due to product inhibition nor to the presence of molecular sieves.
This result suggests that the $1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ catalyst loading which at least has to be employed in this reaction is not due to the scarce activity of the catalyst, but rather to its decomposition, giving a crucial information on the direction to follow for decreasing the catalyst loading in this (and related) reaction.

# Determination of relative and absolute configuration of the adducts 3 and 9 

## Conformational analysis and absolute configuration determination of $3 k$ through chiroptical methods

In recent years, the determination of the absolute configuration (AC) of chiral molecules by spectroscopic methods other than X-ray, i.e. using chiroptical techniques like optical rotation (OR), electronic circular dichroism (ECD), and vibrational circular dichroism (VCD) has gained feasibility and reliability because of the development of methods for the prediction of these properties based on density functional theory (DFT) and on its Time-Dependent formalism (TDDFT). It has been successfully used many times to assign the AC of chiral molecules. In fact, the assignment of the absolute configuration by chiroptical methods has been one of the main stream research field of many physical organic chemists and many theoretical chemists analysed the pitfalls and drawbacks of this approach (S. Grimme, G. Scalmani and others). Recently a whole issue of Wiley's "Chirality" (Chirality, Volume 20, Issue 5, Page 605-759) has been devoted to the absolute configuration assignment by spectroscopic methods. An increasing number of papers in which the AC was assigned by simulation of chiroptical spectra has appeared in the recent literature. ${ }^{2}$ The main pitfall of this approach is the difficulty to manage flexible molecules. About this point, the adducts 3 reported herein are not really flexible, since there is a rigid core containing the two chiral centres and strong UV chromophores close to them. Thus, chirooptical methods for the assignment of the absolute configuration of adducts $\mathbf{3}$ should be reliable.

[^1]Accordingly, compound $\mathbf{3 k}$ was selected as representative compound for the determination of the relative and absolute configuration by a combination of conformational analysis and theoretical simulations of chiro-optical spectra.


The relative stereochemistry was determined by means of NMR spectroscopy. Full assignment of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra was preliminarily achieved by bi-dimensional experiments (COSY, gHSQC and gHMBC, taken in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ solutions). The two diastereotopic hydrogens belonging to $\mathrm{C}-3$ were found at 1.89 and 2.11 ppm . The COSY spectrum showed they are coupled with the hydrogens at 3.66 and 4.49 ppm . The hydrogen at 3.66 ppm showed additional coupling with the signal at 4.93 $\mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{H}-1)$. This allowed us to assign the signal at 3.66 ppm to $\mathrm{H}-4$ and the signal at 4.49 ppm to $\mathrm{H}-$ 2. The proton at 4.93 ppm , that is coupled with the signal at 6.64 ppm with a coupling constant of 14.1 Hz provided evidence of the E-geometry of the exocyclic double bond. The signals of the tetrahydroquinoline NH at 3.42 ppm and of the carbamate $\mathrm{NH}(6.45 \mathrm{ppm}$, doublet, $J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ) were assigned by the lack of correlation in the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ HSQC spectrum.
One of the signals of the two diastereotopic protons at C-3 appears as a pseudo-quartet, with a large coupling constant ( $J=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{~b}$ in Figure S4). This implies that this proton is coupled with three hydrogens with similar and large coupling constants, which are consistent with the geminal coupling with $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{a}$ and with two trans-diaxial couplings with $\mathrm{H}-2$ and $\mathrm{H}-4$, due to a dihedral angle close to $180^{\circ} .^{3}$ This clearly indicates that both H-2 and H-4 are in pseudo-axial position on the tetrahydroquinoline ring, whereas the phenyl and the ene-carbamate moiety occupy the pseudoequatorial positions. As a confirm, the signal of $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{a}$ (the second diastereotopic hydrogen of $\mathrm{C}-3$ ) exhibits the same large geminal constant ( 12.4 Hz ) and two small coupling constants due to the equatorial-axial coupling, where the dihedral angle is close to $90^{\circ}$.

[^2]

Figure S4: expansion of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ spectrum $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ of $\mathbf{3 k}$ showing the signals of the two diastereotopic hydrogens of C-3

Mono-dimensional DPFGSE-NOE experiments ${ }^{4}$ were acquired in order to confirm the relative stereochemistry at C-2 and C-4. On saturation of the vinylic hydrogen H-1' (trace a in Figure S5), NOE enhancement was observed for one proton at C-3 (H-3b, in pseudo-axial position) and no enhancement was observed for the other ene-carbamate proton $\mathrm{H}-2$ '. This confirms the $E$ geometry of the double bond. The large NOE on $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{~b}$ suggests that $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}$ is anti to $\mathrm{H}-4$. On saturation of $\mathrm{H}-4$, NOE are observed on $\mathrm{H}-2$ (trace c in Figure S5) and on the signal of $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{a}$ (in pseudo-equatorial position). On saturation of H-2 (trace b in Figure S5), NOE are observed for $\mathrm{H}-4$ and for $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{a}$, thus confirming the 1-3 diaxial relationship of $\mathrm{H}-2$ and $\mathrm{H}-4$, already deduced from the analysis of the $J$ couplings of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum. NMR analysis thus confirms the cis relative configuration of the two asymmetric centres of the $1,2,3,4$-tetrahydroquinoline skeleton (thus $2 R^{*}, 4 S^{*}$ ), and the Egeometry of the exocyclic double bond.
Having in hand the relative configuration and suitable information about the preferred conformation, the assignment of the absolute configuration was tackled by chiro-optical methods.

[^3]

Figure S5: DPFGSE-NOE spectra of $\mathbf{3 k}\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$. Bottom: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ control spectrum; trace a) saturation of $\mathrm{H}-1$ '; trace b) saturation of $\mathrm{H}-2$; trace c) saturation of $\mathrm{H}-4$.

The theoretical calculation of the electronic circular dichroism spectra (ECD) was selected for the absolute configuration assignment. Although the rigidity of the 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline core of compound $\mathbf{3 k}$ helps in the reduction of the number of conformations to be considered, ${ }^{5}$ the conformational freedom of the exocyclic ene-carbamate moiety represent a challenging issue for the conformational analysis step.
As the first stage, we performed a conformational search on a model compound where all the enecarbamate moiety ( $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CH}-\mathrm{NH}-\mathrm{Cbz}$ ) was reduced to a methyl group (model compound $\mathbf{M e}-3 \mathbf{k}$ ).

[^4]Me-3k


All the conformations found by MM search within a $10 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ window (Monte Carlo searching together with the MMFF94 molecular mechanics force field as implemented in Titan 1.0.5, Wavefunction inc.) were then optimized using DFT at the B3LYP/6-31G(d) level ${ }^{6}$. The harmonic vibrational frequencies of each conformation were calculated at the same level to confirm their stability (no imaginary frequencies were observed) and to evaluate the free energy of each conformation. After DFT minimization, only two conformations were found to be enclosed in the $10 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ window, and one of them (conformation a in figure S6) was much more stable than the other (conformation $\mathbf{b}$ ). Conformation $\mathbf{b}$ differs form $\mathbf{a}$ because of the different shape of the sixmembered ring, that corresponds to a pseudo-boat conformation where the phenyl ring and the methyl occupy a pseudo-axial position. The energy gain ( $3.25 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ as internal energy difference, $3.71 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ as ZPE-corrected free energy) suggest that a should be the only populated conformer in solution. (Figure S6).


Conf. a
$\mathrm{E}=0.00$
$\mathrm{G}^{\circ}=0.00$


Conf. b
$\mathrm{E}=3.25$
$\mathrm{G}^{\circ}=3.71$

Figure S6. 3D view of the two conformations of the model compound Me-3k with a methyl group in position 4. Reported energies are in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$

The electronic excitation energies and rotational strengths have been calculated for the isolated

[^5]molecule in the gas phase for the best conformation of Me-3k using TD-DFT with four different methods (functionals), to ascertain if different computational approaches provide different shapes of the simulated spectra. ${ }^{7}$ Simulations were performed with the hybrid functionals BH\&HLYP ${ }^{8}$ and M06-2X, ${ }^{9}$ the Long-range Correlated LC- $\omega$ B97XD that includes empirical dispersion, ${ }^{10}$ and CAMB3LYP that includes long range correction using the Coulomb Attenuating Method. ${ }^{11}$. The calculations employed the $6-311++\mathrm{G}(2 \mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{p})$ basis set that proved to be sufficiently accurate at a reasonable computational cost. ${ }^{12}$ Rotational strengths were calculated in both length and velocity representation, the resulting values being very similar (RMS differences $<5 \%$ ). For this reason the errors due to basis set incompleteness should be very small, or negligible. ${ }^{13}$

As shown in Figure S7, the simulated spectra match the Cotton effects at 190 nm and 203 when the $2 S, 4 S$ absolute configuration is assumed in the calculations. However, the lower energy Cotton effect at 229 nm is not reproduced by the calculations. This means that the contribution of the enecarbamate moiety on the ECD spectrum cannot be ruled out, thus the simulation of the ECD spectra must be performed on the whole structure of $3 \mathbf{k}$


Figure S7. Black line: experimental ECD spectrum of $\mathbf{3 k}$. Colored lines: TD-DFT simulated spectra calculated for Me-3k.All the simulated spectra were red-shifted by 15 nm to match the experimental maximum at 203 nm .

[^6]Starting from the best conformation of $\mathbf{M e}-\mathbf{3 k}$, a new conformational search was then performed on 3k. After DFT optimization, two conformations were found to be very close in energy. Both exibit a pseudo-chair conformation of tetrahydroquinoline ring and they are different because of the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ rotational isomerism of the amidic part of the carbamate. If the internal energy is considered, the Z conformation is favoured by $1.18 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. On the contrary, the E conformation is more stable by $0.38 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ when the free energies obtained by thermochemistry corrections are applied.

Apart from the E/Z rotational isomerism, the calculated geometry of conformations $3 \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{3 k}$-b are in good agreement with the experimental NOE data, as one of the two hydrogens belonging to C-3 (H-3b) has dihedral angles close to $180^{\circ}$ with H-2 and H-4 ( $179^{\circ}$ and $168^{\circ}$, respectively). Also the position of $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}$ corresponds to the distance constraints extracted by NOE data, with an antirelationship with H-4.

Variable temperature NMR spectra, taken at $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{14}$, showed that the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ interconversion due to rotation of the carbamate could be frozen in the NMR timescale. ${ }^{15}$ The ratio of the two conformations due to $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{Z}$ isomerism was $90: 10$, corresponding to a $\Delta \mathrm{G}^{\circ}=1.1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Unfortunately, NOE spectra cannot ascertain whether the Z or the E rotamer was the more populated. DFT calculations of the chemicals shifts at the B3LYP/6-311++G(2d,p) level (GIAO approach ${ }^{16}$ ) suggested that the chemical shift of the $\mathrm{NH}-\mathrm{Cbz}$ hydrogen is shielded by 0.35 ppm in the E-rotamer with respect to the NH of the Z . Since the upfield signal experimentally corresponds to the most populated conformer, this theoretical result agrees well with the calculations based on the free energies and it assigns the E-conformation (b in Figure S8) as the more stable rotamer in solution.

## 3k


$\mathrm{E}=0.00$
$\mathrm{G}^{\circ}=0.38$


Figure S8. 3D view of the two most stable conformation of 3k, calculated at the B3LYP/6-31G(d) level. Energy differences are in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ and represent ZPE -corrected free energy in standard conditions $\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}\right)$ or uncorrected internal energies (E).

[^7]The electronic excitation energies and rotational strengths were calculated in the gas phase for the two conformation of $\mathbf{3 k}$ using TD-DFT with the same four different methods (functionals) and basis sets used for Me-3k (BH\&HLYP, M06-2X, LC- $\omega$ B97XD, and CAM-B3LYP with 6-311++G(2d,p) basis set). All the calculations were performed supposing $2 S, 4 R$ Absolute Configuration, ${ }^{17}$ with the results shown in Figure S9.


Figure S9. TD-DFT simulated spectra calculated for $\mathbf{3 k}$. The reddish set of lines corresponds to conformation a (Z-rotamer). The bluish set corresponds to conformation $\mathbf{b}$ (E-rotamer).

As shown in Figure S9, the simulated spectra are similar within the same conformation, but the two conformations show quite different spectra. In particular, they show opposite phase in the high energy region between 200 and 180 . However, the experimental ratio to be used to get the averaged spectrum was provided by low-temperature NMR. The simulated spectra were then obtained by using a $86: 14$ ratio, corresponding to a $\Delta \mathrm{G}^{\circ}=1.1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ at $+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. (Figure S 10 ). It should be stressed that if the opposite ratio of the rotamers is used the agreement is still acceptable, but the wavelength of the highest energy Cotton does not match to the experimental value. From an alternative point of view, the ECD spectrum confirms the conformational preference toward the Zrotamer of the ene-carbamate.

[^8]

Figure S10: Simulations of the experimental ECD spectrum of $\mathbf{3 k}$ (black traces). Each simulated spectrum (red, blue, green and purple lines) was obtained starting from the spectra obtained for the two conformations weighted using the experimental NMR data (86:14). The experimental spectrum of $\mathbf{3 k}$ was obtained in acetonitrile solution ( $5.510^{-5} \mathrm{M}, 0.2 \mathrm{~cm}$ path length). $\Delta \varepsilon$ are expressed in Mol $\mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The simulated spectra were vertically scaled to match the experimental maximum at 203 nm ( $0.35,0.40,0.43$ and 0.20 for CAM-B3LYP, BH\&HLYP, M06-2X and LC- $\omega$ B97XD, respectively) and red shifted (by $15,20,15$ and 15 nm , respectively)

The best simulation was obtained by the M06-2X functional, but all the simulated spectra now show a good agreement with the experimental one, also in the 230 nm region. Thus the absolute configuration could be reliably assigned as $2 S, 4 R$. This result is in agreement with previously published Povarov reactions. ${ }^{18}$

[^9]
## Absolute configuration determination of 3b through X-ray diffraction

After several unsuccessful attempts, suitable crystals for the determination of the absolute configuration of the adducts by the anomalous dispersion X-ray method, ${ }^{19}$ which requires a suitable heavy atom ( $\mathrm{Z}>$ Si using standard $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation ${ }^{20}$ ), were obtained for compound $\mathbf{3 b}$ by vapour diffusion of $n$-hexane into an EtOAc ethyl acetate solution. As shown below, the determined relative and absolute configuration on compound $\mathbf{3 b}$ by X-ray confirmed the stereochemistry determined on $\mathbf{3 k}$ by a combination of NMR, chiro-optical and computational techniques, both for the relative configuration of the two chiral centres and the double bond, but also for the absolute configuration.

## Crystal Data for compound 3b



Molecular formula: $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Br}, M_{\mathrm{r}}=493.39$, monoclinic, space group $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ (No. 3), $a=$ $9.5555(17), b=5.0614(9), c=24.813(4) \AA, \beta=92.316(2), V=1199.1(4) \AA^{3}, \mathrm{~T}=298(2) \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{Z}=2$, $\rho_{\mathrm{c}}=1.367 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, F(000)=508$, graphite-monochromated $\mathrm{Mo}_{\mathrm{K} \alpha}$ radiation $(\lambda=0.71073 \AA)$, $\mu\left(\mathrm{Mo}_{\mathrm{K} \alpha}\right)=1.743 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$, colourless rods $\left(0.40 \times 0.10 \times 0.05 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}\right)$, empirical absorption correction with SADABS (transmission factors: $0.9179-0.5423$ ), 2400 frames, exposure time $90 \mathrm{~s}, 1.64 \leq \theta \leq$ $26.00,-11 \leq h \leq 11,-6 \leq k \leq 6,-30 \leq l \leq 30,12298$ reflections collected, 4637 independent reflections $\left(R_{\text {int }}=0.0218\right)$, solution by direct methods (SHELXS97) and subsequent Fourier syntheses, full-matrix least-squares on $F_{0}{ }^{2}$ (SHELX97), hydrogen atoms refined with a riding model except for the two NH hydrogen, that were experimentally located and refined. Data / restraints / parameters ratio $=4637 / 1 / 246, S\left(F^{2}\right)=1.083, R(F)=0.0742$ and $w R\left(F^{2}\right)=0.1971$ on all data,

[^10]$R(F)=0.0645$ and $w R\left(F^{2}\right)=0.1888$ for 4637 reflections with $I>2 \sigma(I)$, weighting scheme $w=$ $1 /\left[\sigma^{2}\left(F_{o}{ }^{2}\right)+(0.1122 P)^{2}+0.839 P\right]$ where $P=\left(F_{o}{ }^{2}+2 F_{c}{ }^{2}\right) / 3$, largest difference peak and hole 0.998 and -0.0674 e $\AA^{-3}$. Flack Parameter for $S, R$ absolute configuration (C1 and C5, respectively): $0.013(19)$. The benzyl moiety (C20-C26) was found to be disordered over two positions, and it was isotropically refined. Crystallographic data (excluding structure factors) for the structure reported in this paper have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre as supplementary publication no. CCDC-913761. Copies of the data can be obtained free of charge on application to CCDC, 12 Union Road, Cambridge CB21EZ, UK (fax: (+44) 1223-336-033; e-mail: deposit@ccdc.cam.ac.uk).

## Absolute and relative configuration of the remaining adducts 3

The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of the other cycloadducts 3 showed, in all cases, that the signal related to $\mathrm{H}-3 \mathrm{~b}$ appears as a pseudo-quartet. This is consistent with a cis relative configuration of the two asymmetric centres. Thus the relative configuration of all other cycloadducts $\mathbf{3}$ was surmised to be 2,4-cis, with the exception of $\mathbf{3 0}$ which furnished a mixture of diastereoisomers, with the 2,4-trans as the major product (see below in the experimental section).

To account for the observed ( $2 S, 4 R$ ) absolute configuration, a reaction model involving double coordination of catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ to both imine and dienophile can be considered (Scheme S2), on the basis of the generally accepted mode of action of BINOL derived phosphoric acid catalysts. ${ }^{21}$ In particular, as shown in Scheme S2 for imine 1a and dienophile 2a, it can be assumed that attack of the dienophile to the imine $\mathbf{A}$, activated by the catalyst through a hydrogen bond interaction or protonation, gives a transition state $\mathbf{B}$ wherein the phosphoryl oxygen stabilises the positive charge on the dienophile by acting as a Lewis base coordinating the carbamate proton. The large 9anthracenyl groups guide the stereoselectivity mainly by steric interactions with the substrates, favouring attack of the dienophile at the Si-face of the activated imine. Presuming a two step cycloaddition pathway, an intermediate catalyst coordinated $N$-acyl iminium ion $\mathbf{C}$ is formed first, which then undergoes an intramolecular Friedel-Crafts reaction to give the $(2 S, 4 R)$-disubstituted $1,2,3,4$ tetrahydroquinoline product $\mathbf{3 a}$. We assumed a similar reaction pathway leading to the attack at the same face of the imines $\mathbf{1}$ in all other cases. This assumption is confirmed by the order of elution in the chiral stationary phase HPLC analysis (Phenomenex Lux) of cycloadducts 3. In all cases, the reactions performed with the $(R)$-BINOL derived catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ gave the first eluting peak as the major enantiomer.

[^11]


Scheme S2. Proposed reaction pathway and model for enantioselectivity.

## Determination of the relative configuration in compounds 9

The configuration of the chiral centre deriving from the addition of indole to the enecarbamate of cycloadduct 3a catalysed by $\mathbf{4 c}$ can be tentatively assigned on the basis of the previously reported face-selectivity of catalyst ( $R$ )-TRIP $\mathbf{4 c}$ in the reaction of indoles with simpler enecarbamates. ${ }^{22}$

In particular, it is known that $(R)-4 c$ promotes a selective addition of indole at the Re-face of an intermediate N -Boc imine, generated in situ from an N -Boc enecarabamate (Scheme S3).


Scheme S3. Reported addition of indole to in situ generated N-carbamoyl imines catalysed by 4c.

It can be assumed that also in our case $(R)-4 \mathrm{c}$ promotes the attack of indole at the same prochiral face of the intermediate $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Cbz}$ imine, derived from the enecarbamate of 3a, giving predominantly

[^12](96:4) an $S$ configured product 9 . This hypothesis is confirmed by the reaction performed with ent4c ((S)-4c), which gives predominantly (75:25) the opposite diastereoisomer of 9 . Thus, the configuration of the newly formed chiral centre in the Friedel-Crafts addition is partially controlled by the catalyst employed, with $(R)-4 c$ matching the stereochemical bias given by the pre-existing chiral centres of cycloadduct 3a, and (S)-4c mismatching this bias (see Scheme S 4 ).


Scheme S4. Addition of indole to the enecarbamate of 3a catalysed by 4c and ent-4c.

## Experimental Details

General Methods. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian AS 300, 400 or 600 spectrometer. Chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) are reported in ppm relative to residual solvent signals for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR. ${ }^{23}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were acquired with ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ broad band decoupled mode. Mass spectra were recorded on a micromass LCT spectrometer using electrospray (ES) ionisation techniques. Optical rotations were measured on a Perkin-Elmer 241 polarimeter. The enantiomeric excess (ee) of the products was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC, using a UV detector operating at 254 nm . Several of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra show some minor, broad signals, besides the major described ones, due to the presence of a small $(<10 \%)$ amount of a rotamer at the carbamate moiety (see Determination of Relative and Absolute Configuration Section).

Materials. Analytical grade solvents and commercially available reagents were used as received, unless otherwise stated. Chromatographic purifications were performed using 70-230 mesh silica. Racemic samples were prepared using diphenylphosphonic acid or $\mathrm{Sc}(\mathrm{OTf})_{3}$ as the catalyst, in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ or toluene at room temperature for $24-60 \mathrm{~h}$. Toluene was passed through neutral alumina before use. Pyridine was dried by standing on activated 4 Á molecular sieves. N-4-methoxyphenyl imines 1a-h were obtained refluxing an equimolar mixture of 4-methoxyaniline and the appropriate aldehyde in EtOH for a few hours, and collected by filtration. Imines $\mathbf{1 k - 0}$ were obtained stirring for 48-60 h benzaldehyde and the appropriate aniline derivative in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in the presence of activated $4 \AA$ molecular sieves. Dienophiles $2 \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}^{24}$ and $\mathbf{2 b}{ }^{25}$ were prepared by following a literature procedure. ( $R$ )-3,3'-Dibromo-H8-BINOL was prepared according to the literature. ${ }^{26} 9$-Anthracenyl boronic acid was obtained following a reported procedure, ${ }^{27}$ except that the crude boronic acid was employed in the Suzuki reaction.

[^13]
## Preparation of the H8-BINOL derived phosphoric acid catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$.

The preparation of catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}$ from $3,3^{\prime}$-dibromo-H8-BINOL reported below is based on ref. ${ }^{26 \mathrm{~b}}$ However, we have substantially modified both steps (Suzuki coupling and phosphoric acid formation, (Scheme S5). In our hands, the protocol herein described, still based on the same catalyst used in ref. ${ }^{25 b}$, proved to be more reliable than the original procedure, furnishing clean and wellcharacterised products.


Scheme S5: Synthesis of the chiral Brønsted acid 4h
(R)-3,3'-Di(anthracen-9-yl)-5,5',6,6',7,7',8,8'-octahydro-[1,1'-binaphthalene]-2,2'-diol.


A Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar was charged with $(R)-3,3^{\prime}-$ dibromo-H8-BINOL ( $244 \mathrm{mg}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), crude 9 -anthracenyl boronic acid ( 600 $\mathrm{mg}), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(12.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.054 \mathrm{mmol}), n-\mathrm{Bu}(\mathrm{Ad})_{2} \mathrm{P}(21.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.059 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(894 \mathrm{mg}, 0.48 \mathrm{mmol})$. The tube was evacuated, then backfilled with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$. Toluene ( 6.0 mL ) and EtOH ( 1.7 mL ) were added, the Schlenk tube was closed and screw-capped and immediately placed in an oil bath pre-warmed to $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The dark mixture was stirred at this temperature for 20 h , then cooled to RT. Sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ was then added and the mixture transferred to a separating funnel with the aid of a little amount of EtOAc. The phases were separated and the aqueous phase extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic extracts were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated. Chromatographic purification on silica gel ( $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ from 3:1 to $1: 1$ ) gave the title compound as a pale yellow solid in $61 \%$ yield. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{33}=+34{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.385\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=8.52(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.10-8.06(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 8.05-8.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.87-7.82(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 7.73-7.69 (m, 2H), 7.53-7.39 (m, 6H), 7.29 (ddd, J = 8.8, 6.6, $1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.09 (s, 2H), 4.62 $(\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.88-2.81(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.70\left(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{d}}=18.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{t}}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right), 2.64\left(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{d}}=17.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{t}}=6.1\right.$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=149.2,137.2,133.1,131.8,131.6$, 131.5, 130.7, 130.6, 129.9, 128.6, 128.4, 127.1, 126.5, 126.4, 125.8, 125.7, 125.2, 125.1, 122.2, 120.9, 29.2, 27.4, 23.3, 23.1; ESIMS $669\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## (R)-3,3'-Di(anthracen-9-yl)-5,5',6,6',7,7',8,8'-octahydro-[1,1'-binaphthalene]-2,2'-diyl hydrogen phosphate (4h)



In a 100 mL round bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stirring bar, the thus obtained ( $R$ )-3,3'-di(anthracen-9-yl)-H8-BINOL ( $211 \mathrm{mg}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in dry pyridine ( 0.6 mL ). To this solution, $\mathrm{POCl}_{3}(62 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.66 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry pyridine $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise. The mixture was then heated at 80 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ with stirring, until TLC ( $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ 1:1) indicated disappearance of the starting material (ca 2 h 30 min ). After cooling to RT, fresh pyridine (not dry, 6 mL ) and water ( 10 mL ) were added giving a white suspension. A condenser was applied to the flask, and the mixture was heated at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight ( 16 h ) with vigorous stirring. After cooling to RT, 5 M aqueous HCl was added (ca 20 mL , until $\mathrm{pH}<1$ ), and the resulting suspension was heated at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 minutes with stirring. After cooling to RT, the mixture was transferred to a separating funnel, with
the aid of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and water. The two phases were separated, and the aqueous phase extracted twice with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic phases were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure, leaving a residue which was purified by chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{MeOH}\right.$ from 98:2 to $\left.93: 7\right)$. The fractions containing the phosphoric acid product were collected and evaporated, the residue dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and transferred in a separating funnel containing an aqueous 5 M HCl solution. The phases were separated, the aqueous phase extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, the organic phases combined, dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated, affording the title compound as a pale yellow solid in $63 \%$ yield. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{28}=-148^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.335\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) [the signal at $5.00 \mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{O}) \mathrm{OH}$ integrates 3 H presumably due to interactions with a water molecule] $\delta=8.10(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.87(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 2 H ), 7.61 (d, J = $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.52 (d, J = $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 7.42-7.29 (m, 4H), 7.20-7.10 (m, 4H), 7.07 $(\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.07-2.95(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.94-2.86(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.64\left(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{d}}=17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{t}}=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $2 \mathrm{H})$, , 2.09-1.80 (m, 8H), ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ [several signals are split in doublets due to $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{P}}$ с coupling] $\delta=145.0,144.9,137.6,134.92,134.90,133.4,131.6,131.2,130.9,130.4,130.1,128.5$, 128.01, 127.98, 127.82, 127.78, 127.0, 126.3, 125.6, 124.70, 124.65, 29.3, 28.2, 22.8; ESIMS 731 $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## General procedure for the catalytic enantioselective vinylogous Povarov reaction.

To a Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar, $4 \AA$ powdered molecular sieves ( 20 mg ) were added. The molecular sieves were thermally activated under vacuum for 5 minutes and then allowed to cool to r.t. After backfilling the Schlenk tube with nitrogen, the aldimine $\mathbf{1 a - h}, \mathbf{1 k - 0}$ $(0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added, followed by catalyst $\mathbf{4 h}(2.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0038 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, and toluene $(0.60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was allowed to stir for 5 minutes and then the dienophile 2a-c $(0.18 \mathrm{mmol}$ or 0.30 mmol ) was added in one portion. The mixture was then stirred at room temperature under a nitrogen atmosphere. After 16 h , the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of silica gel, and the plug was washed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4 \mathrm{x})$. After concentration of solvents, the residue was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy to determine the diastereomeric ratio of the cycloadducts 3 . Finally, the residue was purified by chromatography on silica gel. In some cases, the residue was instead purified by dissolving it in a minimal amount of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, followed by precipitation with $n$-hexane, and final removal of the supernatant with a Pasteur pipette after few minutes of decantation. The enantiomeric excess of the adducts purified by precipitation was determined on their crude mixture.

## Three-component procedure.

To a Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar, $4 \AA$ powdered molecular sieves ( 110 mg ) were added. The molecular sieves were then thermally activated under vacuum for 10 minutes and then allowed to cool to r.t. After backfilling the Schlenk tube with nitrogen, $p$-anisidine ( 0.15 $\mathrm{mmol})$, the catalyst $4 \mathrm{~h}(5.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0076 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, and toluene $(0.30 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added, followed by the dienophile $2(0.30 \mathrm{mmol})$. A solution of the aldehyde in toluene ( $0.30 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.15$ mmol ) was finally added, and the resulting mixture was stirred at room temperature under a nitrogen atmosphere. After 16 h , the reaction mixture was worked up and purified as in the above procedure.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (3a)



Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a white solid in $85 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel ( $n$-hexane/EtOAc 8:2). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane/i$\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=19.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=45.1 \mathrm{~min}, 98 \%$ ee). $[\alpha]_{D}{ }^{27}=-45^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.62, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.44-$ $7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.4,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.54(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.50(\mathrm{~d}$, $\mathrm{J}=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.6,10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.73(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.68-3.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.86(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,152.2,144.0,139.0,136.0,128.6$, 128.6, 128.3, 128.2, 127.6, 126.6, 125.2, 124.9, 115.4, 114.6, 113.6, 113.5, 67.2, 56.8, 55.9, 40.3, 39.6; ESIMS 437 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$].

Using the three component procedure, the title compound was obtained in $70 \%$ yield and in $98 \%$ ee.
Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-(4-bromophenyl)-6-methoxy-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3b)


Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained in $83 \%$ yield as a pale yellow solid, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$,
$\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=23.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=36.4 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{28}=-29^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.51\right.$ in $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400\right.$ $\mathrm{MHz}) \delta=7.49-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 7.31-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}$ $=8.6,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.51(\mathrm{brd}$, J = $9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.15(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.88(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.2,9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.37(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.0,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.68-3.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=13.2,5.9,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.80(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,152.3,143.1,138.6,135.9,131.7,128.6,128.33$, $128.30,128.2,125.3,124.8,121.2,115.5,114.5,113.5,113.2,67.2,56.3,55.9,40.3,39.4$. ESIMS: $515 / 517\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-(2-bromophenyl)-6-methoxy-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3c)

Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title
 compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $90 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane/i$\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=18.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=27.2 \mathrm{~min}, 92 \%$ ee). $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-99^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.62, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right),{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.64(\mathrm{~d}$, $\mathrm{J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.41-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.17-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 6.66 (dd, J = 8.4, 2.9 Hz, 1H), $6.54(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.44(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 4.96-4.86 (m, 1H), $4.83(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.72-3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.69(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,152.4,142.5,138.9,135.9$, 133.0, 128.9, 128.6, 128.4, 128.3, 127.9, 127.7, 125.3, 125.1, 123.1, 115.8, 114.5, 113.6, 113.3, 67.2, 55.9, 55.2, 39.4, 38.2; ESIMS 515/517 [M + Na $\left.{ }^{+}\right]$.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-(4-methoxyphenyl)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3d)



Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile $\mathbf{2 a}$, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $78 \%$ yield, after precipitation. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC on the crude product (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=18.6 \mathrm{~min}$, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=31.2 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-30^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.46, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.48-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 6.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.70$ (dd, J = 17.9, 15.1 Hz, 2H), $6.63(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.6,3.0,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.48(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.91(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.0,9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.36(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94-3.83(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.69-3.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1,86(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{3} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ $\delta=159.1,153.5,152.1,139.1,136.2,136.0,128.6,128.3,128.2$ 127.7, 125.1, 124.8, 115.3, 114.6, $114.0,113.6,113.4,67.2,56.2,55.9,55.3,40.3,39.6$; ESIMS 467 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$].

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-(3,4-dimethoxyphenyl)-6-methoxy-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-

 yl)vinyl)carbamate (3e)

Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $63 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel ( $n$-hexane/EtOAc 2:1). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, $\lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=34.5 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=39.7 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-33^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=$ $\left.0.92, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.41-7.29(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.98-6.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.84(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$
$8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 6.64(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.4,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.52(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}$, $\mathrm{J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.14(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H ), $4.35(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.4,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.68-$ $3.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5$, $152.2,149.1,148.4,139.0,136.7,136.0,128.6,128.3,128.2,125.1,124.9,118.7,115.4,114.6$, $113.55,113.5,111.1,109.5,67.2,56.6,55.95,55.93,55.88,40.5,39.6 ;$ ESIMS $497\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-(naphthalen-2-yl)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3f)



Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $91 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 100: 0\right.$ to $\left.95: 5\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda$ $=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=32.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=44.4 \mathrm{~min}, 98 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-31^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=$ $\left.0.360, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right),{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.89-7.81(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.57-7.44(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.30$ $(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.65(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.61-6.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=9.7,14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.56$ (d, J = $11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.21-2.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.94(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.6,152.2,141.5,139.0,136.0,133.5,133.1,128.61,128.57$, $128.4,128.3,128.2,128.1,127.9,127.7,126.2,125.8,125.2,125.0,124.9,115.5,114.7,113.5$, 67.2, 56.9, 55.9, 40.2, 39.6; ESIMS 464 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$].

Using the three-component procedure, the title compound was obtained in $70 \%$ yield and $>99 \%$ ee.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-(naphthalen-1-yl)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3g)



Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title
 compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $79 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{i}$ - $\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=27.6 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=$ $62.9 \mathrm{~min}, 89 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{22}=-126\left(\mathrm{c}=0.30, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right),{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600\right.$ $\mathrm{MHz}) \delta=8.14(\mathrm{brd}, \mathrm{J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.89(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.79(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.56-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.80-6.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.68(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.5,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.51(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.14(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.92(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.7,9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.82-3.75$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.29(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.98(\mathrm{brq}, \mathrm{J}=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ $\delta=153.5,152.3,139.2,139.1,136.0,133.9,130.8,129.0,128.6,128.4,128.2,128.0,126.2,125.7$, $125.6,125.2,125.1,115.8,114.7,113.6,113.5,67.2,65.9,56.0,39.8,39.0$; ESIMS $464\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-(thiophen-2-yl)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3h)


Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $53 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 98: 2\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=20.1 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}$ $=38.5 \mathrm{~min}, 87 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-51^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.980, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$, $400 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta=7.42-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.0,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.98-6.94(\mathrm{~m}$,

1H), 6.76-6.66 (m, 2H), 6.63 (dd, J = 8.6, $2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 6.52-6.43 (m, 2H), 5.16 (br s, 2H), 4.89 (dd, $\mathrm{J}=13.9,9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.73(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.71(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.68-3.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.24-2.15 (m, 1H), $1.93(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.4,152.4,148.0$, $138.2,135.9,128.5,128.3,128.2,126.5,125.1,124.9,124.1,123.5,115.6,114.4,113.4,113.2$, 67.1, 55.8, 52.4, 41.1, 39.2; ESIMS $443\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-isopropyl-6-methoxy-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3i)



Following the three-component procedure, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $80 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$.The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 80: 20,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$, $\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=13.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=19.8 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-22^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.80, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.45-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.57(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.49-6.40$ (m, 2H), 5.17 (br s, 2H), 4.92 (dd, J = 13.9, $9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.38$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.13-3.03(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.46(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.98$ $(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.96(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 75 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,151.9,139.1$, 136.0, 128.6, 128.4, 128.2, 125.3, 124.8, 115.3, 114.5, 114.2, 113.4, 67.2, 57.2, 55.9, 39.2, 33.9, 32.7, 18.3, 18.1; ESIMS 403 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$].

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2R,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenethyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-

 yl)vinyl)carbamate (3j) ${ }^{28}$

Following the three-component procedure, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $76 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / n\right.$-hexane from 2:1 to 100:0). The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{i}$-PrOH 70:30, $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}$ $=24.7 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=34.1 \mathrm{~min}, 84 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-32^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.81, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.41-7.19(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 6.75-6.45(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.18$ (br s, 2H), $4.91(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.51-3.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.35-3.26(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.78-$ $2.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-1.98(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.85(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.5,14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,152.5,141.6,137.8,135.9,128.6,128.5,128.4,128.3,126.0$, $124.9,115.9,114.5,113.8,67.2,55.8,51.6,38.9,38.1,37.2,31.9$; ESIMS $465\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (3k)



Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $94 \%$ yield as a pale yellow solid, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, nhexane $/ \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=22.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=47.3 \mathrm{~min}$, $99 \%$ ee $) \cdot[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{28}=-58^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.515, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=$ 7.45-7.28 (m, 10H), 7.11 (br d, J = $7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $7.03(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.77-6.69(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.68$ $\left(\mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{t}}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{d}}=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 6.53(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.9,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.48(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.20$ (d, J = $12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.3,9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.49(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.1$, $2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.72-3.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=12.9,5.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.89(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=$ $11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,144.7,143.9,135.9,128.8,128.6,128.5$, $128.3,128.2,127.7,127.5,126.6,125.0,123.4,117.5,114.2,113.6,67.1,56.5,40.1,39.1$; ESIMS 407 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$].

[^14]Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-2-(4-bromophenyl)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (3I)


Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale orange solid in $74 \%$ yield, after precipitation. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC on the crude product (Phenomenex Lux, nhexane $/ \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=23.0 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=32.7$ $\min , 99 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-19^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.360, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400\right.$ $\mathrm{MHz}) \delta=7.52-7.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.09(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7.06-6.98 (m, 1H), 6.72-6.64 (m, 2H), $6.52(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.42(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22-5.10$ (br s, 2H), $4.92(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.45(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70-3.58(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.03(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.82(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,144.5$, $143.0,135.9,131.8,128.8,128.6,128.4,128.3,128.2,127.5,125.2,123.4,121.3,117.8,114.4$, 113.4, 67.2, 56.0, 40.2, 39.1; ESIMS 487/489 [M $\left.+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6,7-dimethoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3m)


Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $98 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 98: 2\right)$. A single regio- and diastereo-isomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254$ $\left.\mathrm{nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=28.1 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=38.3 \mathrm{~min}, 97 \% \mathrm{ee}\right) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-27^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=0.87$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.44-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.7,11.2,1 \mathrm{H}), 6.65$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.57(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.14(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.19(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}$ $=13.9,9.8,1 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.1,1 \mathrm{H}), 3.83-3.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.787(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.778(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.57$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09($ ddd, $\mathrm{J}=13.0,5.4,1.7,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=12.2,1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=$ 153.6, 148.9, 143.9, 141.7, 139.0, 136.0, 128.64, 128.60, 128.4, 128.3, 127.7, 126.6, 124.9, 114.9, $114.0,113.5,99.4,67.2,57.0,56.9,55.8,40.5,39.0$; ESIMS 467 [M + Na ${ }^{+}$].
The reaction can in principle give two regioisomeric cycloadducts $\mathbf{3 m}$ and $\mathbf{3 m}$ '(Figure S7). From the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum, it is possible to determine that the only cycloadduct formed is the $6,7-$ dimethoxy regioisomer $3 \mathbf{m}$, as the signals related to the aromatic protons of the $1,2,3,4-$ tetrahydroquinoline moiety, at 6.65 and 6.14 ppm , appear as two singlets, and are thus indicative of a para relationship between these protons as $\mathbf{3 m}$.



Figure S11: Compounds $\mathbf{3 m}$ and $\mathbf{3 m}$ '

Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-chloro-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (3n)


Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $25 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / n\right.$-hexane 2:1). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=23.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=$ $53.5 \mathrm{~min}, 98 \%$ ee $) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-41^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.63, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400\right.$ $\mathrm{MHz}) \delta=7.41-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 11 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.96(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.5,2.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.0,11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.44(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.90(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1$, $9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.46(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.4,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.84(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.5,152.0$, 143.5, 143.3, 135.9, 128.7, 128.6, 128.4, 128.3, 127.8, 127.3, 126.5, 125.6, 125.1, 122.0, 115.25, 112.6, 67.2, 56.5, 39.6, 39.2; ESIMS $418\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$

Benzyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-7-bromo-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate and ( $(E)$-2-((2S,4S)-7-bromo-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (30)


Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile 2a, the two diastereoisomers of the title compound were obtained in $60 \%$ combined yield, after chromatography on silica gel. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the crude mixture indicated a 2.8:1 ratio, in favour of the 2,4-trans diastereosiomer. The two diastereoisomers were separated by chromatography on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / n\right.$ hexane 2:1): the minor 2,4-cis diastereoisomer as the first $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ fraction and the major 2,4-trans diastereoisomer as the second $R_{f}$ fraction. The enantiomeric excesses of the two diastereoisomers were determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (minor diastereoisomer: Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{i}$-PrOH 70:30, $0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=34.0$ $\min , \mathrm{t}_{\min }=59.6 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \%$ ee; major diastereoisomer: Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30$, $\left.0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{maj}}=30.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=69.0 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \% \mathrm{ee}\right)$.
The reaction can in principle give two regioisomeric cycloadducts $\mathbf{3 o}$ and $\mathbf{3 o}$ ’(Figure S12). From the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum, it is possible to determine that the only cycloadducts formed are the minor and the major diastereoisomers of the 7-bromo regioisomer 30: the signals related to the aromatic protons of the 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline moiety of the minor diastereoisomer, at 6.93 ( $\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=$ $8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.76(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.2,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ and $6.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ are indicative of the ortho/meta relationship and not compatible with the ortho/ortho one. Also the signals related to the aromatic proton of the 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline moiety of the major diastereoisomer $\left(\mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$ at 6.58 is critical for the attribution of the regiochemistry, since it appear as a doublet of doublets ( $\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $7.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$ and is thus indicative of a ortho/meta relationship with the other aromatic protons.



Figure S12: Compounds 30 and $\mathbf{3 o}^{\prime}$.
Minor 2,4-cis diastereoisomer:
$[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-69^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.28, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.41-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}$
$=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) 6.76(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.2,1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.67-6.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.56(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.42(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}$,
$\mathrm{J}=11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.89(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.0,9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.48(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.5,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.61-3.51(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.13-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.82(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=$ $153.4,145.9,143.2,135.8,130.1,128.7$, 128.5, 128.3, 128.2, 127.8, 126.4, 125.4, 120.8, 120.0, 116.3, 112.7, 67.15, 56.4, 39.6, 38.7; ESIMS 462, $464\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

The relative configuration of this diastereoisomer was tentatively assigned as 2,4 -cis on the basis of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals relative to the $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ protons: as in all other cycloadducts 3 , one of these two protons (at 1.82 ppm ) gives a pseudo-quartet, with a large $\mathrm{J}=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, which can be accounted for two large axial-axial coupling constants with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ (besides the large geminal coupling with its geminal proton), deriving from a 2,4-cis relative configuration.

Major 2,4-trans diastereoisomer:
$[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-42^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.67, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.39-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 7.21-7.15$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.94-6.87(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.58(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=7.3,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.29(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.9,11.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.9(\mathrm{br}$ $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.58-4.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.50(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.1,7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84-3.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.40(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=13.5,6.6,5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.22(\mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=13.5,5.8,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=153.2,146.3,144.4,136.1,128.5,128.4,128.35,128.3,128.25$, $126.9,126.4,126.15,124.5,122.1,122.0,113.6,113.45,67.00,54.0,38.2,37.1$. ESIMS $462 / 464$ $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.
The relative configuration of this diastereoisomer was tentatively assigned as 2,4-trans on the basis of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals relative to the $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ protons: in contrast with all other cycloadducts 3 , both signals given by these protons appear as ddd, with a large $\mathrm{J}=13.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$ geminal coupling constant between themselves, and two J ca $=5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$ with the vicinal $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ protons. This pattern is expected for a 2,4-trans configuration, wherein two chair conformations are energetically viable and give rise to undefined equatorial and axial coupling constants between $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ protons and the vicinal $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{4}$.

## tert-Butyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)vinyl)carbamate (3p)



Following the general procedure using 0.30 mmol of dienophile $\mathbf{2 b}$, the title compound was obtained as a white solid in $89 \%$ yield, after precipitation. A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC on the crude mixture (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane/i-PrOH 80:20, 0.75 $\left.\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=12.6 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=19.9 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \% \mathrm{ee}\right) .[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-18^{\circ}$ $\left(\mathrm{c}=0.360, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.44-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-$ $6.62(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.29(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13.6,9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.42(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.3,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.70-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.86(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.9,1 \mathrm{H}), 1.48(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=152.7,152.1,144.0,138.9$, $128.5,127.5,126.5,125.3,125.0,115.2,114.6$ 113.3, 112.1, 80.3, 56.8. 55.9, 40.3, 39.5, 28.2; ESIMS $404\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Allyl ((E)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)vinyl)carbamate (3q)


Following the general procedure using 0.18 mmol of dienophile $2 \mathbf{c}$, the title compound was obtained as a pale yellow solid in $73 \%$ yield, after chromatography on silica gel ( $n$-hexane/EtOAc 8:2). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, nhexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=11.0 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=21.4$ $\min , 99 \%$ ee $) \cdot[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-52^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.66, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$
$=7.45-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.76-6.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.6,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.50(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $6.45(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.01-5.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.33(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=17.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.25(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.92(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14.2,9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.72-4.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.42(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.4,2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.73(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.70-3.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.14-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$, $100 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta=153.4,152.2,144.0,139.0,132.3,128.7$, 128.6, 127.6, 126.6, 125.2, 124.8, 118.2, $115.4,114.6,113.5,66.0,56.8,55.9,40.3,39.5$; ESIMS $387\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Product elaboration

## Hydrolysis of the enecarbamate to the aldehyde followed by reduction/olefination:

## 2-((2S,4R)-6-Methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)ethanol (6)



In a round bottomed flask, product $3 \mathrm{a}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.072 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in
 acetone $(0.900 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Aq. $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(0.700 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.700$ mmol ) was then added in 2 min , while stirring. The resulting solution was allowed to warm to rt, and, after 4 h , quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, and extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$; the organic layers were combined and dried over a short celite pad and the solvents were evaporated. The thus obtained crude aldehyde was dissolved in methanol ( 1.0 mL ) and the mixture was cooled at $-35{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a liquid nitrogen/acetone bath. Excess $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ (ca 15 mg ) was added and the mixture was allowed to warm to $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with stirring. After 15 min , the reaction was monitored by TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 94: 6\right)$. Since the aldehyde was still detected, additional $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ (ca 5 mg ) was added. After additional 20 minutes the reaction was complete (TLC), and the mixture was quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ and extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The organic layers were combined and dried over a celite pad. After evaporation of the solvents, the crude product was purified by column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O} 9: 1\right)$ to give the title compound as a pale yellow solid in $62 \%$ overall yield (over two steps). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture, thus showing that epimerisation did not occur. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=11.4 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=18.8 \mathrm{~min}, 96 \%$ ee $)$, thus showing that racemisation did not occur to a considerable extent. [ $\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-9^{\circ}(\mathrm{c}=0.77$ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.44-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.82(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.64(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $8.4,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.51(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.3,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86-3.69(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.29-$ $3.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.81-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=152.4,144.4$, 139.6, 128.6, 127.6, 126.6, 126.0, 115.6, 113.0, 112.7, 60.5, 57.1, 55.9, 38.5, 37.9, 33.3; ESIMS $306\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.
(E)-Benzyl 4-((2R,4S)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)but-2-enoate (7)
 In a round bottomed flask, product $\mathbf{3 a}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.072 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in acetone $(0.900 \mathrm{~mL})$ and cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Aq. $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}(0.700 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.700 \mathrm{mmol})$ was then added in 2 min , while stirring. The resulting solution was allowed to warm to rt , and, after 4 h , quenched with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, and extracted three times with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$; the organic layers were combined and dried over a short celite pad and the solvents were evaporated. The crude aldehyde was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture was cooled at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a water/ice bath. Benzyl (triphenyl-phosphoranylidene)-acetate ( $41 \mathrm{mg}, 0.100 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added under stirring. Progress of the reaction was monitored by TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. After 1 h , the reaction was complete, and the mixture was passed over a celite pad. The crude product was purified by column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 99: 1\right)$ to give the title compound as a pale yellow solid in $86 \%$ overall yield (over two steps). A single diastereoisomer was observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in the crude mixture, thus showing that epimerisation did not occur, and that olefination proceeded with full $E$ selectivity. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ \mathrm{i}$-PrOH $70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=20.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=$ $29.5 \mathrm{~min},>99 \%$ ee $)$, thus showing that racemisation did not occur. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27}=-34^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.11 \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.49-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 7.08-6.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.77(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $6.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.5,2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 4.35 (dd, J = 11.0, 2.7 Hz, 1H), 3.75 (br s, 3H), 3.31-3.19 (m, 1H), 2.94-2.82 (m, 1H), 2.48-2.35 (m, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.72(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=165.7,146.4$,
$135.0,127.5,127.2,127.1,126.7,125.7,122.1,112.1,112.0,65.1,55.9,54.9,37.5,36.8,34.7$; ESIMS $436\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Reduction of the enecarbamate to a protected amine:

tert-Butyl (3-((2S,4S)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)ethyl)carbamate (8)


A Schlenk tube was equipped with a magnetic stirring bar and saturated with a nitrogen atmosphere. Ammonium formate ( $43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.66 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added in one portion, followed by 1 mL of MeOH , activated $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(10 \mathrm{wt} \%, 12 \mathrm{mg})$ and finally the product $3 \mathbf{p}$ ( $21 \mathrm{mg}, 0.055 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The mixture was stirred at room temperature for five minutes and then warmed to $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Progress of the reaction was monitored by TLC $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. After 1 h , the reaction was complete and the mixture was passed over a celite pad, diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, and washed with water. The organic phase was dried over a short celite pad, the solvents were evaporated and the crude product was purified by column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$ to give the title compound as a colourless oil in $87 \%$ overall yield. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Phenomenex Lux, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 80: 20,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=18.2 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=$ $25.4 \mathrm{~min}, 94 \%$ ee) thus showing that racemisation did not occur to a considerable extent. $[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}=$; $-13^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{c}=0.60, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=7.45-7.27(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.78(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.64(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.4,8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.51(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.54(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.31(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2.7,11.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.76(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.27-3.05(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.82-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.43(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=155.9,152.4,144.3$, 139.6, 128.6, 127.6, 126.6, 125.7, 115.7, 113.1, $112.8,79.2,57.1,55.9,38.4,38.2,35.4,34.2,28.4$; ESIMS $405\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Addition of indole to the enecarbamate (for a tentative assignment of the relative configuration of the adducts, see the section "Determination of the relative and absolute configuration of adducts 3 and 9 ", on page S16):

Benzyl ((S)-1-(1H-indol-3-yl)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4yl)ethyl)carbamate and benzyl (( $R$ )-1-(1H-indol-3-yl)-2-((2S,4R)-6-methoxy-2-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinolin-4-yl)ethyl)carbamate (9)

from catalyst 4c

from catalyst ent-4c

A vial equipped with a magnetic stirring bar was sequentially charged with compound $3 \mathbf{3}$ ( 29 mg , 0.076 mmol ), $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), indole ( 27 mg , $0.228 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ equiv.) and catalyst $4 \mathrm{c}(5.7 \mathrm{mg}, 10$ $\mathrm{mol} \%)$. The vial was carefully capped, and warmed to $55{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with stirring. After 16 h , the solution was passed through a short pad of silica, the pad washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and the solvent evaporated, leaving a residue which was analysed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR showing a $94: 6$ diasteremoeric ratio, favouring the S configured diastereoisomer at the $\alpha$-indol-3-yl chiral centre. Chromatographic purification on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ from 100:0 to $\left.95: 5\right)$ gave the title compound as a diastereomeric mixture and as a white solid in $91 \%$ yield. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Chralpak ADH, $n$-hexane $/ i-\mathrm{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; major diastereoisomer: $\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=46.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=75.9 \mathrm{~min},>99 \%$ ee , thus showing that racemisation did not occur.
The same reaction, performed with ent-4c as the catalyst, afforded the title compound in $88 \%$ yield and as a diastereomeric mixture. The diastereomeric ratio, determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR on the crude mixture, was found to be $75: 25$, favouring the R configured diastereoisomer at the $\alpha$-indol-3-yl chiral centre, in contrast with the reaction performed with $\mathbf{4 c}$. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Chralpak ADH, n-hexane/i-PrOH 70:30,
$0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; minor diastereoisomer: $\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=46.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\min }=75.9 \mathrm{~min}, 90 \%$ ee, major diastereoisomer: $\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=66.3 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=35.2 \mathrm{~min}, 98 \%$ ee), thus showing that racemisation did not occur.

The same title compound was also obtained in a one-pot procedure: to the catalytic reaction for obtaining 3a (after 18 h ), indole ( $88 \mathrm{mg}, 0.75 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and catalyst $\mathbf{4 c}(11.3 \mathrm{mg}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ were sequentially added, and the resulting mixture was heated at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 h with stirring. The mixture was then filtered on a short plug of silica, the plug washed several times with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and the solvents evaporated, leaving a residue which was analysed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR showing a $94: 6$ diastereomeric ratio, presumably at the $\alpha$-NHCbz chiral centre. Chromatographic purification on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ from 100:0 to $95: 5$ ) gave the title compound as a diastereomeric mixture and as a pale yellow solid in $61 \%$ yield. The enantiomeric excess of the product was determined by chiral stationary phase HPLC (Chralpak ADH, $n$-hexane $/ i-\operatorname{PrOH} 70: 30,0.75 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, \lambda=254 \mathrm{~nm}$; major diastereoisomer: $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\text {maj }}=46.8 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{t}_{\text {min }}=75.9 \mathrm{~min}, 99 \% \mathrm{ee}\right)$.

Spectral data for the major diastereoisomer (S-configured at the $\alpha$-indol-3-yl chiral centre) deriving from the reaction with catalyst 4 c :
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=8.11(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.61(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44-7.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $7.38-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.08(\mathrm{brt}$, J $=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.00(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.86$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}), 6.65(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.6,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.54(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.31(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.15$ (d, J $=12.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.13(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.32(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.31-3.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.66-2.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.79(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=10.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=156.1,152.3,144.3,137.9,136.6,136.5,128.6,128.5,128.1$, $128.0,127.5,126.7,125.8,122.4,120.9,119.8,119.4,118.1,115.6,113.5,112.5,111.3,66.7,57.0$, $55.9,46.0,42.2,38.6,33.4$; ESIMS $554\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

Spectral data for the diastereomeric mixture (favouring the R-configured product at the $\alpha$-indol-3-yl chiral centre) deriving from the reaction with catalyst ent-4c:
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta=8.20\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right), 8.11\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right), 7.73\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, 7.61 (br d, J = $8.61 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\min }$ ), $7.40-7.00\left(\mathrm{~m}, 16 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{maj}}, 16 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{min}}\right)$, $6.86\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\min }\right), 6.76\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, $6.65\left(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.4,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\min }\right.$ ), $6.61\left(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8.6,2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {mai }}\right.$ ), $6.54\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\min }\right.$ ), 6.49 (br d, J = $8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}$ ), $5.38-5.28\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right), 5.23-4.98\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}, 3 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right), 4.32(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\min }$ ), $4.10\left(\mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=11.1,2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right.$ ), $3.75\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}_{\min }\right)$, $3.72\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, $3.32-3.20\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right)$, 2.97-2.83 (m, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, 2.86-2.70 (m, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, 2.67-2.53 (m, $2 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}$ ), 2.35-2.23 $\left(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}\right)$, 2.19-2.03 $\left(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right)$, 1.97-1.74 (m, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {maj }}, 1 \mathrm{H}_{\text {min }}\right) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ [signals of both diastereoisomers] $\delta=155.1,154.5,151.3,143.0,138.4,135.6,135.5,127.6,127.5,127.4,127.2$, $127.1,127.0,126.9,126.6,126.5,125.8,125.7,125.3,124.8,124.7,124.5,121.5,121.4,121.1$, $119.0,118.8,118.4,118.2,117.7,114.8,114.6,112.4,112.3,111.5,111.4,110.5,110.3,65.7,65.6$, $56.0,55.9,54.9,54.8,46.0,45.0,41.1,40.4,37.6,37.3,33.0,32.4$. ESIMS $554\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}\right]$.

## Copies of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra of synthesized compounds ${ }^{29}$
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