# **Supporting Information**

## Asymmetric Total Synthesis of (-)-Cebulactam A1

Shouliang Yang,<sup>†</sup> Yumeng Xi,<sup>†</sup> Jiahua Chen,<sup>\*, †</sup> Zhen Yang<sup>\*,†,‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Key Laboratory of Bioorganic Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, Ministry of Education and Beijing National Laboratory for Molecular Science, College of Chemistry, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

<sup>‡</sup> Laboratory of Chemical Genomics, School of Chemical Biology and Biotechnology, Peking University Shenzhen Graduate School, Shenzhen 518055, China

> E-mail: jhchen@pku.edu.cn zyang@pku.edu.cn

Tel: +86 10 6275 9105; fax: +86 10 6275 9105

#### Table of Contents:

General Information	- S3
Experimental Data for SmI <sub>2-</sub> mediated Reformatsky Reactions	S4
Comparison of NMR spectra with natural products	S7
NMR Spectra	S9
	27

#### **General Information**

Unless otherwise mentioned, all reactions were carried out under a nitrogen atmosphere using Schlenk techniques. Solvent purification was conducted according to *Purification of Laboratory Chemicals* (Peerrin, D. D.; Armarego, W. L. and Perrins, D. R., Pergamon Press: Oxford, 1980). Compound **6** was synthesized from L-Phenylglycinol according to literature.<sup>1</sup> Compound **7** was synthesized from 2-hydroxy-5-methoxybenzaldehyde according to literature.<sup>2</sup> All other reagents were purchased from commercial sources and used as received. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically (<sup>1</sup>H NMR) homogeneous materials. Reactions were monitored by Thin Layer Chromatography on plates (GF254) supplied by Yantai Chemicals (China) using UV light as visualizing agent and iodine as developing agents. If not specially mentioned, flash column chromatography uses silica gel (200-300 mesh) supplied by Tsingtao Haiyang Chemicals (China).

NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Ascend 500, Ascend 400 instruments. TMS was used as internal standard for <sup>1</sup>H NMR (0 ppm), solvent signal was used as reference for <sup>13</sup>C NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub> =  $\delta$  77.0 ppm, d<sub>6</sub>-DMSO =  $\delta$  39.5 ppm). The following abbreaviations were used to explain the multiplicities: s = singlet, d = doublet, br = broad, dd = double doublet, m = multiplet. Infrared (IR) spectra were recorded on a Thermo Nicolet Avatar 330 FT-IR spectrometer. Mass spectra were recorded on a Bruker Apex IV FTMS mass spectrometer using ESI (electrospray ionization). Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatograph (UPLC) was performed on a UPLC SQD (Waters Technology) equipment.

- Nicolaou, K. C.; Guduru, R.; Sun, Y. P.; Banerji, B.; Chen, David Y.-K. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2007, 46, 5896.
- 2. Panek, J. S.; Xu, F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1995, 117, 10587.

**Investigation of SmI<sub>2</sub>-mediated Reformatsky reaction.** With **13** in hand, we proceeded to evaluate its performance in the SmI<sub>2</sub>-mediated intramolecular Reformatsky reaction. The treatment of **13** with SmI<sub>2</sub> in THF under the optimized conditions<sup>1</sup> at a concentration of 0.005M under refluxing conditions gave the desired product **14** in 84% yield as a couple of diastereoisomers. Then detailed investigation of the key reaction was conducted with **13a**, the key intermediate in our previous synthesis<sup>1</sup>, in hoping that we could further get insight into this key reaction. Treatment of **13a** under the typical condition gave the desired product **14a** as a mixture of two pairs of diastereoisomers at the C2 and C3 carbon centers in a ratio of 3.9:1:4.0:3.3 based on UPLC analysis (see SI). We then investigated the concentration effect<sup>2</sup> on the outcome of the annulation by carrying out the reaction at a substrate concentration of 0.017 M. At this concentration, compound **14a** was obtained in 82% yield, indicating that the reductive annulation reaction was independent of the substrate concentration.

A variety of different solvents were tested to evaluate their effect on the outcome of the reductive annulation. The use of benzene<sup>2</sup> as a solvent gave the desired product **14** in approximately 50% yield, whereas the use of protic solvents<sup>3</sup> such as MeOH and *n*-BuOH, did not give any of the desired product. Based on these results, it was proposed that the reaction was proceeding via a samarium enolate intermediate<sup>4</sup> which would effectively mediate the ring contraction<sup>5</sup> reaction to afford the annulated products (Table 1).



<sup>a</sup>isolated yield; <sup>b</sup>ratio of the diastereoisomers was determined by UPLC.

Table 1. SmI<sub>2</sub>-mediated Reformatsky reaction

#### Experimental Data for SmI<sub>2</sub>-mediated Reformatsky Reaction

Entry 1: To a solution of SmI<sub>2</sub> (1.8 mL, 0.1 M in THF, 0.18 mmol) was added 13a (17.4 mg, 0.031 mmol) in dry THF (0.2 mL), and the mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 2 h. The reaction was quenched by addition of a saturated aqueous solution of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl (3 mL) at room temperature, and the mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 3 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (10 mL), and then dried over anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and the residue was purified by a flash column chromatography on silica gel (hexane/ethyl acetate = 2:1 to 1:1) to give product 14a (12.2 mg, 82%) as a mixture of four diastereoisomers.  $R_f$  = 0.28, 0.30, 0.50, 0.60 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 1:2). The ratio of four diastereoisomers was determined by UPLC: 4.6/1.0/4.0/3.3.

Entry 2 To a solution of SmI<sub>2</sub> (60 mL, 0.1 M in THF, 6.0 mmol) in anhydrous THF (130 mL) was slowly added 13a (0.55 g, 0.98 mmol) in (5 mL) under refluxing conditions in a dropwise manner, the reaction mixture was then stirred at the same temperature for 2 h. The reaction was quenched by addition of a saturated aqueous solution of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl (50 mL) at room temperature, and the mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 50 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (50 mL), and then dried over anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and the residue was purified by a flash column chromatography on silica gel (hexane/ethyl acetate = 2:1 to 1:2) to give product 14a (0.397 g, 84%) as a mixture of diastereoisomers.  $R_f = 0.28$ , 0.30, 0.50, 0.60 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 1:2). The ratio of four diastereoisomers was determined by UPLC: 3.9/1.0/4.0/3.3.

Entry 3: Benzene (3 mL) was degassed by bubbling N<sub>2</sub> for 0.5 h, followed by addition of a solution of SmI<sub>2</sub> (0.9 mL, 0.1 M in THF, 0.09 mmol). To this solution was a solution od **13a** (8.7 mg, 0.0155 mmol) in dry benzene (0.2 mL) at refluxing conditions in a dropwise manner, and the reaction mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 2 h. The reaction was quenched by addition of a saturated solution of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl (3 mL) at room temperature, and the resultant mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 3 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (10 mL), and then dried over anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and the residue was purified by a flash column chromatography on silica gel (hexane/ethyl acetate = 2:1 to 1:1) to give product **14a** (4.0 mg, 53%) as a mixture of four diastereoisomers.  $R_f$  = 0.28, 0.30, 0.50, 0.60 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 1:2). The ratio of four diastereoisomers was determined by UPLC: 3.4/1.0/13.4/8.6.

Entry 4: MeOH (3 mL) was degassed with  $N_2$  for 0.5 h, followed by addition of a solution of SmI<sub>2</sub> (1 mL, 0.1 M in THF, 0.10 mmol). To this solution was added a solution of **13a** (10 mg, 0.018 mmol) in dry MeOH (0.2 mL) under refluxing conditions in a dropwise manner, and the reaction mixture was then stirred at the same temperature for 2 h. The reaction was quenched by addition of a

saturated solution of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl (3 mL), and the resultant mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 3 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (10 mL), and then dried over anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and no desired product was detected on UPLC.

Entry 5: *n*BuOH (3.2 mL) was degassed with  $N_2$  for 0.5 h, followed by addition of a solution of SmI<sub>2</sub> (1 mL, 0.1 M in THF, 0.10 mmol). To this solution was added a solution of **13a** (9 mg, 0.016 mmol) in dry *n*BuOH (0.2 mL) under refluxing conditions in a dropwise manner, and reaction mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 2 h. The reaction was quenched by addition of a saturated solution of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl (3 mL), and the resultant mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 3 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (10 mL), and dried over anhydrous Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and no desired product was detected on UPLC.

#### **Reference:**

- 1: Yang, S.-L.; Xi, Y.-M.; Zhu, R.; Wang, L.; Chen, J.-H.; Yang, Z. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 812.
- 2: Tamiya, H.; Goto, K.; Matsuda, F. Org. Lett. 2004, 6, 545.
- 3: Kunishima, M.; Tanaka, S.; Kono, K.; Hioki, K.; Tani, S. Tetrahedron Lett. 1995, 36, 3707.
- 4: (a) Chopade, P. R.; Prasad, E.; Flowers, II, R. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 44; (b) Kleiner, G.; Tarnopolsky, A.; Hoz, S. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 4197.
- 5: Molander, G. A.; Etter, J. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 6556.
- 6: Inanaga, J.; Yokoyama, Y.; Handa, Y.; Yamaguchi, M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1991, 32, 6371.

#### **Comparison of NMR spectra with natural products** (NMR spectroscopic data of Cebulactam A1 in acetone-d<sub>6</sub>)



Note: the numbering was according to the original isolation paper.

Position	$\delta_H$ of Cebulactam A1	$\delta_{\rm H}$ of Cebulactam A1	
	(Synthesized, 400 MHz,	(Natural, 400 MHz,	
	$\delta$ in ppm, J in Hz,)	$\delta$ in ppm, J in Hz)	
1	4.38 (d, <i>J</i> = 10.1)	$4.38 (dd, J = 10.0, 6.4)^{a}$	
2	1.82 (m)	1.82 m	
Me-2	1.19 (d, J = 6.6)	1.20 (d, J = 6.4)	
3	4.27 (d, <i>J</i> = 8.5)	4.27 (d, J = 8.5)	
Me-4	1.86 (s)	1.87 (d, $J = 1.6$ )	
5	4.98 (d, J = 9.8)	5.00 (dd, <i>J</i> = 10.0, 1.0)	
6	3.19 (m)	3.19 m	
Me-6	1.00 (d, J = 6.3)	1.01 (d, J = 6.8)	
8	3.43 (q, J = 6.8)	3.42 (q, J = 6.8)	
Me-8	1.21 (d, J = 6.8)	1.22 (d, J = 6.8)	
13	7.02 (d, $J = 2.8$ )	7.02 (d, J = 2.8)	
15	6.65 (d, J = 2.8)	6.65 (d, J = 2.8)	
NH	7.88 (br)	7.91 br	

### <sup>1</sup>H NMR Comparison:

Ref. a: Addition of a drop of  $D_2O$  could change dd peak into d (10.5)

## <sup>13</sup>C NMR Comparison:

Position	δc of	δc of	δc of	δc difference between
	Cebulactam A1	Cebulactam A1	Cebulactam A1	synthesized (in ppm,
	(in ppm,	(in ppm,	(in ppm,	100 MHz) and
	literature,	Synthesized,	Synthesized,	literature
	100 MHz)	100 MHz)	125 MHz)	(in ppm, 100 MHz)
1	70.9	70.5	70.5	-0.4
2	42.4	41.9	41.9	-0.5
Me-2	16.7	16.2	16.2	-0.5
3	87.4	86.9	87.0	-0.5
4	140.5	140.0	140.0	-0.5
Me-4	19.3	18.8	18.8	-0.5
5	124.7	124.3	124.3	-0.4
6	46.2	45.6	45.6	-0.6
Me-6	17.8	17.3	17.3	-0.5
7	207.1	206.5	206.5	-0.6
8	48.2	47.8	47.8	-0.4
Me-8	16.6	16.1	16.1	-0.5
9	173.9	173.4	173.4	-0.5
10	131.0	130.5	130.5	-0.5
11	142.7	142.3	142.3	-0.4
12	140.9	140.4	140.4	-0.5
13	111.1	110.6	110.6	-0.5
14	154.4	153.9	153.9	-0.5
15	114.0	113.6	113.6	-0.4



#### 





















































