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Metal-catalyzed metathesis is a powerful method in chemical synthesis. ${ }^{1}$ Different versions of this important transformation include catalytic ring-closing, ring-opening, ${ }^{2}$ and cross metathesis; ${ }^{3}$ several approaches have been devised that employ these processes in combination. ${ }^{4}$ With the availability of chiral complexes 1a, $\mathbf{1 b},{ }^{5}$ and $\mathbf{2},{ }^{6}$ which promote efficient asymmetric ring-closing

metathesis (ARCM), we wish to develop other catalytic asymmetric metathesis reactions. A major aspect of our program thus relates to the design of enantioselective protocols that involve the tandem occurrence of different metathesis-based processes. Herein, we report the results of our initial studies on tandem Mocatalyzed asymmetric ring-opening/cross metathesis reactions (catalytic AROM/CM). The present method allows access to unsaturated carbocycles, which are formed in high yield, as single olefin isomers and in excellent enantiopurity. To the best of our knowledge, this disclosure documents the first examples of a catalytic AROM.

We initiated our studies by examining the possibility of effecting catalytic AROM/CM with norbornene and styrene in the presence of $\mathbf{1 a}, \mathbf{1 b}$, and $\mathbf{2}$. All attempts resulted in the formation of substantial amounts of poly(norbornene), even in the presence of excess styrene. Accordingly, to discourage polymerization, we decided to use the sterically more encumbered
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## Scheme 1



Table 1. Tandem Mo-Catalyzed Asymmetric Ring-Opening/Cross Metatheses ${ }^{a}$

| entry | substrate | terminal alkene | product | time (h) | $\begin{gathered} \text { total conv }(\%)^{b} \\ \text { conv to product }(\%)^{b} \end{gathered}$ | trans (\%) | yield (\%) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | ${ }^{\text {ee }(\%))^{e}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ${ }^{\text {OTBS }}$ |  |  | 7 | 77; 61 | >98 | 57 | 96 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 7 | 90; 75 | >98 | 64 | 91 |
| 3 | $3$ |  | 5 | 20 | <10 | >98 | -. | -- |
| 4 | Ms |  |  | 1 | >98; 97 | >98 | 85 | >98 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 98; 98 | >98 | 84 | >98 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 4.5 | 67; 54 | >98 | 48 | >97 |
| 7 | Омом |  |  | 0.3 | >98; 96 | >98 | 96 | >98 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 0.1 | >98; 95 | >98 | 88 | >98 |
| 9 | $8$ | $4$ |  | 0.4 | >98; 80 | >98 | 80 | >98 |

${ }^{a}$ Conditions: $5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{1 a}, 2$ equiv of $\mathbf{4}, \mathrm{Ar}$ atm, $22{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$. ${ }^{b}$ Percent product determined by $400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis. ${ }^{c}$ Determined by $400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis. ${ }^{d}$ Isolated yield of purified products by silica gel chromatography. ${ }^{e}$ Determined by HPLC (Chiralcel OD for entries $1,2,4-7$ and AD chiralpak for entries $8-9$ ), in comparison with authentic racemic materials. Analysis of products in entries $1,4,6$, and 7 were performed on the derived acetates.
silyl ether $\mathbf{3},{ }^{7}$ which was prepared and treated with styrene (4a) in the presence of $5 \mathrm{~mol} \% \mathbf{1 a}, \mathbf{1 b}$, and $\mathbf{2}$. The biphen-based complex 1a proves to be superior (Scheme 1); catalytic AROM/ CM proceeds in the presence of 10 equiv of styrene and 5 mol $\%$ 1a to $39 \%$ conversion ( $22^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ ). Importantly, the desired product (5a) is obtained in $>98 \%$ ee and as a single olefin isomer (GLC and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis, respectively).

Subsequent studies indicated that lower concentrations of styrene result in higher conversions. ${ }^{8}$ Thus, with 1a as the catalyst and with 5 equiv of styrene, $52 \%$ conversion is observed; with 2 equiv of styrene, $>77 \%$ conversion is attained. As shown in entry 1 of Table 1, treatment of 3 with 2 equiv of styrene (4a) in the presence of $5 \mathrm{~mol} \% 1 \mathbf{a}$ at $22{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 h affords 5 a in $57 \%$ isolated yield and $96 \%$ ee ( $>98 \%$ trans). The stereochemical identity of the catalytic AROM/CM product $\mathbf{5 b}$ was established through determination of the crystal structure of the corresponding camphor sulfonate derivative (see the Supporting Information).

The results of our studies involving the Mo-catalyzed AROM/ CM of various norbornene and styrene derivatives are summarized in Table 1. Regardless of the electronic proprties of the styrene partner ( $\mathbf{4 a}, \mathbf{4 b}$, or $\mathbf{4 c}$ ), reactions can be designed to proceed in high conversion to afford 5, 7, and 9 with complete control of olefin stereochemistry (>98\% trans), in good yield and high optical purity ( $>91 \%$ ee). ${ }^{9}$ A number of related issues are worthy of note: (1) Catalytic AROM/CM reactions can be carried out with catalyst loadings lower than $5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$; for example, with 1

[^1]$\mathrm{mol} \% \mathbf{1 a}, \mathbf{7 b}$ is formed in $>98 \%$ ee and $92 \%$ yield ( $>98 \%$ trans, 5 h ). (2) Toluene may be used as solvent; the reaction in entry 7 proceeds in toluene to afford 9a in $86 \%$ isolated yield and $>99 \%$ ee $(0.3 \mathrm{~h})$. (3) In general, catalytic AROM/CM are faster with more electron-rich styrenes. Thus, as shown in entries 1-3 of Table 1, transformations with $\mathbf{4 a}$ and $\mathbf{4 b}$ proceed to $>75 \%$ conv within 7 h , whereas reaction with $\mathbf{4 c}$ proves to be prohibitively slow. Nevertheless, as the alkene unit of the norbornene substrate becomes more sterically accessible, catalytic AROM/CM of the slower reacting and electron-deficient $\mathbf{4 c}$ reaches synthetically useful levels of efficiency (entries 6 and 9). (4) With the exception of the reaction shown in entry 5 , varying amounts of $\mathbf{1 0}, \mathbf{1 1}$, and 12 are isolated as minor byproducts. ${ }^{10}$ If transformations are

allowed to proceed for extended times (see Table 1), more of $\mathbf{1 0}$ (CM between product molecules) and $\mathbf{1 1}$ (CM between $\mathbf{4}$ and product) are formed.

Our attempts to use aliphatic olefin substrates in catalytic AROM/CM reactions have been promising but less successful. When vinyl cyclohexane $\mathbf{1 3}$ is employed with silyl ether 6 (eq 1 ), diene $\mathbf{1 4}$ is formed with diminished efficiency and enantiose-

lectivity ( $36 \%$ isolated yield, $82 \%$ ee) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR analysis of the unpurified reaction mixture indicates $30 \%$ of byproducts related to $\mathbf{1 1}$ and $\mathbf{1 2}$ and $34 \%$ recovered $\mathbf{6}$. However, as illustrated in Scheme 2, catalytic processes with vinylsilanes afford optically pure materials in an efficient manner. Treatment of $\mathbf{8}$ with 5 mol $\%$ 1a and one equiv of $\mathbf{1 5}\left(50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 85 \%\right.$ conversion, 24 h$)$ leads to the formation of vinylsilane 16 in $>98 \%$ ee and $62 \%$ purified yield ( $>98 \%$ trans by $400 \mathrm{MHz}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR). When trialkoxysilane 17 is utilized, catalytic AROM/CM is more efficient ( $>98 \%$ conversion, $22{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 24 \mathrm{~h}$ ). The resulting vinylsilane 18 ( $>98 \%$ ee) undergoes Pd-catalyzed cross coupling with various aryl iodides to afford a wider range of optically pure adducts. ${ }^{11}$ The example shown in Scheme 2 is illustrative ( $\mathbf{8 \rightarrow 1 9} ; 51 \%$ overall).

## Scheme 2



A general pathway for the catalytic AROM/CM is proposed (Scheme 3). Several intricate issues regarding the suggested mechanism merit mention: (1) The initial Mo-neophylidene (e.g., 1a) may react with the terminal alkene (v) to generate $\mathrm{L}_{n} \mathrm{Mo}=$
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CHR (ii) or the less substituted $\mathrm{L}_{n} \mathrm{Mo}=\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ (iii); each of these two complexes may then promote catalytic AROM. Initiation with ii generates iv, which can undergo catalytic CM to afford vi. Alternatively, reaction through Mo-alkylidene iii would generate ent-vi via alkylidene viii. If AROM occurs with the same sense of stereocontrol with ii and iii, then reaction with $\mathbf{i i}$ would afford vi, whereas that with iii would yield ent-vi. (2) One olefinic substrate (i, Scheme 3) must be more reactive, so that AROM occurs efficiently and effectively competes with homo-metathesis of the other alkene (v). (3) Terminal alkene substrates need to be sterically and electronically ${ }^{12}$ compatible; if not, competitive catalytic CM might occur to reduce overall efficiency (e.g., homometathesis of $\mathbf{v}$ or CM of $\mathbf{i v}+\mathbf{v i}$ ). (4) The terminal alkene substrate ( $\mathbf{v}$ ) should be selected so that its reaction with iv or viii proceeds with the appropriate regiocontrol during metallacyclobutane formation; otherwise, the undesired achiral meso adducts vii or ix will form.

## Scheme 4



Mode of addition I, presented in Scheme 4, may be suggested as one plausible working model for the formation of the major enantiomer. In the alternative II, leading to the minor enantiomer, there is significant unfavorable steric strain between the substrate and the imido ligand of the chiral catalyst. The lower selectivity observed in reactions catalyzed by $\mathbf{1 b}$ is consistent with this proposal: with the smaller Me groups on the imido ligand (vs $i-\mathrm{Pr}$ ), reaction pathway through II is less disfavored. The suggestion that $\mathrm{L}_{n} \mathrm{Mo}=\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{H}) \mathrm{Ph}$, and not the corresponding $\mathrm{L}_{n^{-}}$ $\mathrm{Mo}=\mathrm{CH}_{2}$, is the active catalyst is based on the fact that treatment of $\mathbf{1 a}$ with 40 equiv of styrene ${ }^{13}$ leads to $<2 \%$ stilbene formation and the immediate generation of $\mathrm{L}_{n} \mathrm{Mo}=\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{H}) \mathrm{Ph}$, as judged by the appearance of new alkylidene resonances at 11.50 and 13.05 $\operatorname{ppm}\left(3: 1\right.$, syn and anti isomers, ${ }^{6}$ respectively; $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ ). Detailed mechanistic investigation is in progress; in addition to the above issues, these studies aim to determine whether the bridgehead alkoxide is involved in chelation with the Lewis acidic Mo. ${ }^{14}$

Supporting Information Available: Experimental procedures and spectral and analytical data for all reaction products (PDF). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.
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