

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Tetrahedron Letters

Tetrahedron Letters 48 (2007) 2245–2249

Trapping enols of esters and lactones with diazomethane

Martha S. Morales-Ríos,^{a,*} Perla Y. López-Camacho,^a Oscar R. Suárez-Castillo^b and Pedro Joseph-Nathan^a

^a Departamento de Química y Sección Externa de Farmacología, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del Instituto

Politécnico Nacional, Apartado 14-740, México, DF 07000, Mexico
^bCentro de Investigaciones Químicas, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, Apartado 1-622, Pachuca, Hidalgo 42001, Mexico

Received 11 November 2006; revised 1 February 2007; accepted 4 February 2007 Available online 7 February 2007

Abstract—A series of regioisomeric ketene-O,O-dialkyl acetals were prepared from ambident β -dicarbonylfuroindoles by trapping the enol tautomers of esters and lactones with diazomethane. Definitive structural characterization was accomplished by X-ray crystal structure determination on a ketene-O,O-dimethyl acetal ($R = Me$). $© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.$

In recent years, extensive studies of enols of carboxylic acid derivatives^{[1](#page-2-0)} provided essential information on the relative importance of electron withdrawing β -substituents, 2 push-pull effects, 3 steric effects, 4 hydrogen-bonding, $3,5$ solvent effects, 3 and the acid group derivatives that are responsible for the stability of these enol types.^{[6](#page-2-0)} For instance, in recent theoretical studies, Rappoport and co-workers^{[7](#page-2-0)} found that enols of anhydrides and amides have a better chance of being observed than enols of acids and esters. This finding supports previous suggestions about the relevant contribution of the heteroatom in stabilizing the acid tautomer by electron donation.1a Consequently, only few reports dealing with the detection, preparation, and characterization of highly unstable enols of esters are available.^{[8](#page-2-0)}

As part of a synthetic program aimed to develop practical pathways for the synthesis of therapeutically promising Flustra foliacea constituents,⁹ we have recently reported a convenient method for the preparation of β -dicarbonylfuroindoles 1a-d.^{[10](#page-2-0)} It was found that, in solution and at room temperature, compounds 1a–d show a dynamic stereochemistry governed by the steric preferences of the ester group at the C3 stereocenter (Scheme 1). In these epimeric mixtures, the methine proton bearing two electron-withdrawing groups rapidly

Scheme 1. Epimeric mixture of β -dicarbonylfuroindoles 1a-d showing the relative stereochemistry.

exchanges with deuterium. Although, even in non-polar CD_2Cl_2 solvent, enol forms were not detected by NMR measurements in this series of compounds, it is well recognized^{[11](#page-2-0)} that the H–D exchange reaction in β -dicarbonyl acid derivatives occurs through the enol tautomer as the rate-limiting step. Thus, in the case of β -dicarbonylfuroindoles **1a–d** the possible mechanism of the H–D exchange process could involve enol tautomers as intermediates. Therefore, we became interested in trapping such very rare species. In this respect, one recent example of the reaction of enols of amides with diazomethane described the occurrence of a diversity of reactions, among them, O- and Cmethylation.¹²

On the basis of the above considerations, the ambident b-dicarbonylfuroindoles 1a–d could provide unique systems to study a competing enolization process between the ester and lactone groups by trapping the corresponding enol esters 2a–d and enol lactones 3a–d with

Keywords: Ketene-O,O-dialkyl acetals; β -Dicarbonylfuroindoles; Enols of esters; Enols of lactones; Diazomethane.

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: $+52$ 5557477112; fax: $+52$ 5557477137; e-mail: smorales@cinvestav.mx

^{0040-4039/\$ -} see front matter © 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.tetlet.2007.02.006

Scheme 2. Preparation of regioisomeric ketene-O,O-dialkyl acetals 4a–d and 5a–d.

diazomethane (Scheme 2). On the other hand, it is known 13 13 13 that enols may be stabilized by introduction of bulky groups onto the β -carbon to the carbonyl groups. In this context, the influence of the bulkiness of β -alkyl groups on the relative stability of the expected regioisomeric ketene-O,O-dialkyl acetals 4a–d and 5a–d could be evaluated, without, at the same time, introducing electronic effects.

Thus, a reaction run of 1a with an excess of freshly prepared diazomethane in ether, 2 h at room temperature, furnished a mixture of the regioisomeric pair 4a and 5a (ΔR_f = ca. 0.2 hexane/AcOEt 9:1), which was easily separated into their individual components by routine flash chromatography on silica gel. The product ratio of 4a/5a was 1:4 with a combined yield of 95% (Table 1, entry 1). It is pointed out that the sterically congested C-methylated products at the α -carbon to the carbonyl groups were not detected in the crude reaction mixture. To check the relationship between the chemoselectivity and the steric effect of the β -alkyl substituent present in dicarbonylfuroindoles 1a–d, the reactions of 1b–d with diazomethane were examined under the reaction conditions mentioned above. Interestingly, the formed products exhibited similar distribution and yields as those obtained from 1a, although 4d is isolated in lower yields due to its instability. Table 1 summarizes the results of the reaction of β -dicarbonylfuroindoles 1a-d with diazomethane in ether. In all cases, compounds 4a–d and 5a–d cleanly return to the starting β -dicarbonylfuroindoles $1a-d$ when treated with $CCl₃CO₂H$ at

Table 1. Regioselective O-methylation of ambident β -dicarbonylfuroindoles $1a-d$ with $CH₂N₂$

Compound			4 $(\%$	5 $(\%$
1a	Me	а	18	
1b	Et		17	75
1c	i -Pr	c	17	80
1d	Bn	\mathbf{d}^{a}	18	

^a The 4/5 ratio of the crude reaction mixture is ca. 1:4, as determined by ¹H NMR.

Figure 1. Global minima conformations of regioisomeric ketene-O,Odialkyl acetals 4a (left) and 5a (right).

room temperature for 15 min, as determined by GC/ MS.

The optimized geometry calculated (MMFF) for 4a–d and 5a–d was consistent with our experimental data, that is, the ketene- O, O -dialkyl acetals **5a–d** were lower in energy than their regioisomers 4a–d, with relative values between the predominant 4a–d/5a–d pairs of conformers ranging from 1.2 to 1.8 kcal/mol. Figure 1 shows the global minima conformations for 4a and 5a as examples. The diminished stability observed for 4a–d with respect to 5a–d can be explained based on the knowledge that the formation of endocyclic double bonds is preferred over exocyclic double bonds.^{[14](#page-2-0)} In addition, the very low spanning range of 0.6 kcal/mol shows that the β -alkyl groups had no significant impact on the product ratio, once again in good agreement with experimental observations.

The structural characterization of trapped isomeric enols 4a–d and 5a–d was accomplished by one- and two-dimensional NMR parameters, IR and HRMS.[15](#page-3-0) The IR and ${}^{1}H$ NMR spectra of $4a-d$ showed very similar patterns to those of 5a–d except for the double bond absorption which appears around 1625 cm^{-1} for 4a-d and around 1635 cm^{-1} for **5a–d** in the IR spectra. A common feature of regioisomeric compounds 4a–d and 5a–d is their π -conjugative push–pull nature, which is evidenced from the observed large 13 C chemical shift differences between the two ethylenic carbon atoms $(C3=CO)$ in 4a–d, and $C2=CO$ in 5a–d), which occur in the range 80–85 ppm (Table 2), reflecting a significant

Table 2. Selected ¹³C chemical shifts (δ , in ppm) of ketene-O,O-dialkyl acetals 4a–d and 5a–d

Compound	C ₃	C9	$\Delta\delta_{\rm C9-C3}$
4a	90.3	168.7	78.4
4b	88.0	168.5	80.5
4c	89.1	168.0	78.9
4d	88.6	168.1	79.5
	C2	C ₃	$\Delta\delta_{\rm C2-C3}$
5а	167.4	83.6	83.8
5b	167.6	81.5	86.1
5c	167.4	82.1	85.3

zwitterionic character. Since there is no plane of symmetry through the C3–C9 axis in $4a-d$, the twisted methoxy groups show different carbon-13 NMR signals. The assignment of the syn O-methyl group at higher frequency (δ ca. 63 ppm) than the *anti* O-methyl group (δ ca. 54 ppm) in $4a-d$ was made considering that the syn O-methyl group is under the deshielding field of the carbonyl lactone group, as was confirmed by NOESY experiments.

The crystal structure of $4a^{16}$ $4a^{16}$ $4a^{16}$ is shown in Figure 2, with selected bond lengths given in the caption. A survey of the Cambridge Structural Database (version 5.27) reveals that this is the first structure having the ketene acetal $C=C(OR)_2$ moiety as part of a push–pull system. The X-ray structure of 4a exhibits geometrical parameters and characteristic torsion angles which are strikingly close to values predicted by MMFF calculations for the lowest energy conformer. Furthermore, consistent with calculations, but in contrast to precedents, the interatomic distances within the atoms involved in the π -conjugative push-pull interaction do not show special effects on their bond lengths,^{[17](#page-4-0)} for example, the \dot{C} 3=C9 distance of 1.333(3) Å is typical for sp²-hybrid-ized carbons not involved in a zwitterionic form.^{[18](#page-4-0)}

In summary, we quite efficiently trapped enol esters and enol lactones as the corresponding ketene- O , O -dialkyl acetals by reaction of β -dicarbonylfuroindoles with diazomethane. The reaction occurs rapidly at room temperature in the absence of a catalyst. Calculations support that the observed product selectivity depends on the thermodynamic stability of products. Although the β alkyl substituents do not influence the 4a–d/5a–d product ratio, they could impede the formation of the C-methyl-

Figure 2. Crystal structure of 4a showing a non-planar gauche–gauche conformation. Selected bond lengths (\AA): C(9)–O(11) 1.323(3), C(9)– O(10) 1.343(3), C(3)–C(9) 1.333(3), C(2)–C(3) 1.449(3), C(2)–O(2) 1.201(3).

ation products of tautomers 2a–d/3a–d. The selective protection of one of the carbonyl groups in 1a–d might further be of utility for synthetic purposes. The crystal structure of ketene-O,O-dimethyl acetal 4a shows unexpected bond lengths for the compound involved in a π -conjugative push–pull interaction.

References and notes

- 1. For reviews on carboxylic acid enols, see: (a) Hegarty, A. F.; O'Neill, P. In The Chemistry of Enols; Rappoport, Z., Ed.; Wiley: Chichester, 1990; Chapter 10, p 639; (b) Kresge, A. J. Chem. Soc. Rev. 1996, 25, 275–280.
- 2. (a) Andraos, J.; Chiang, Y.; Kresge, A. J.; Popik, V. V. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1997, 119, 8417–8424; (b) Carrondo, M. A. A. F. de C. T.; Matias, P. M.; Heggie, W.; Page, P. R. Struct. Chem. 1994, 5, 73–77; (c) Glatz, B.; Helmchen, G.; Muxfeldt, H.; Porcher, H.; Prewo, R.; Senn, J.; Stezowski, J. J.; Stojda, R. J.; White, D. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 2171–2181.
- 3. Mukhopadhyaya, J. K.; Sklenák, S.; Rappoport, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 1325–1336.
- 4. (a) O'Neill, P.; Hegarty, A. F. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1987, 744–745; (b) Yamataka, H.; Rappoport, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 9818–9828.
- 5. Perrin, C. L.; Nielson, J. B. Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 1997, 48, 511–544.
- 6. (a) Gao, J. J. Mol. Struct. (THEOCHEM) 1996, 370, 203–208; (b) Rosenberg, R. E. J. Org. Chem. 1998, 63, 5562–5567; (c) Raspoet, G.; Nguyen, M. T.; Kelly, S.; Hegarty, A. F. J. Org. Chem. 1998, 63, 9669–9677; (d) Sung, K.; Tidwell, T. T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1998, 120, 3043–3048; (e) Nguyen, M. T.; Sengupta, D.; Raspoet, G.; Vanquickenborne, L. G. J. Phys. Chem. 1995, 99, 11883– 11888; (f) Skancke, P. N. J. Phys. Chem. 1992, 96, 8065– 8069; (g) Duan, X.; Page, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1995, 117, 5114–5119.
- 7. Sklenak, S.; Apeloig, Y.; Rappoport, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1998, 120, 10359–10364.
- 8. (a) Lei, Y. X.; Cerioni, G.; Rappoport, Z. J. Org. Chem. 2000, 65, 4028–4038; (b) Allen, B. M.; Hegarty, A. F.; O'Neill, P. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2 1997, 2733– 2736; (c) Vilsmaier, E.; Joerg, K.; Mass, G. Chem. Ber. 1984, 117, 2947–2962; (d) Bruce, M. I.; Walton, J. K.; Williams, M. L.; Skelton, B. W.; White, A. H. J. Organomet. Chem. 1981, 212, C35–C38; (e) Bruce, M. I.; Walton, J. K.; Williams, M. L.; Hall, S. R.; Skelton, B. W.; White, A. H. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1982, 2209-2220.
- 9. (a) Morales-Ríos, M. S.; Rivera-Becerril, E.; Joseph-Nathan, P. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 2005, 16, 2493– 2499; (b) Morales-Ríos, M. S.; Suárez-Castillo, O. R.; Trujillo-Serrato, J. J.; Joseph-Nathan, P. J. Org. Chem. 2001, 66, 1186–1192.
- 10. (a) Morales-Ríos, M. S.; Suárez-Castillo, O. R.; Joseph-Nathan, P. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2 2000, 769–775; (b) Morales-Ríos, M. S.; Santos-Sánchez, N. F.; Fragoso-Vázquez, M. J.; Alagille, D.; Villagómez-Ibarra, J. R.; Joseph-Nathan, P. Tetrahedron 2003, 59, 2843–2853.
- 11. Eberlin, A. R.; Williams, D. L. H. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2 1996, 883–887, 1043–1046.
- 12. Lei, Y. X.; Rappoport, Z. J. Org. Chem. 2002, 67, 6971– 6978.
- 13. Yamataka, H.; Rappoport, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 9818–9828.
- 14. Taskinen, E.; Salmela, J.; Haapasaari, K. Struct. Chem. 1997, 8, 425–433.

15. General procedure for reaction with diazomethane: To a solution of the corresponding β -dicarbonylfuroindole 1 (0.075–0.085 mmol) in ether (10 mL) was added an excess of freshly prepared ethereal solution of diazomethane^{[19](#page-4-0)} $(15 \text{ mL}, \text{ca. } 13.6 \text{ mg } CH_2N_2/\text{mL}, 4.8 \text{ mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2 h and evaporated at room temperature under atmospheric pressure with a stream of nitrogen which was bubbled into a solution containing 5% acetic acid in ethanol. ¹H NMR spectroscopic analysis of the crude products indicated a pair of regioisomers in a ca. 4:1 ratio. Separation of the regioisomers was achieved by purification of the resultant residue by flash chromatography (2:3 EtOAc/ hexane) to yield first 5 as the major component, followed by 4. Data for 4a: colorless crystals (18%); mp 165–166 °C (from EtOAc/hexane); $R_f = 0.21$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH_2Cl_2) v_{max} 3024, 1731, 1624, 1070 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD_2Cl_2) δ 7.74 (1H, br s, H7), 7.49 (1H, dd, $J = 7.6$, 0.9 Hz, H4), 7.23 (1H, td, $J = 7.5$, 1.4 Hz, H6), 7.03 (1H, td, $J = 7.6$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 5.97 (1H, s, H8a), 4.05 (3H, s, OMe syn), 3.90 (3H, s, OMe anti), 3.89 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 1.63 (3H, s, Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 168.7 (s, C9), 168.1 (s, C2), 153.4 (s, CO₂Me), 140.0 (s, C7a), 136.8 (s, C3b), 128.9 (d, C6), 124.7 (d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 115.1 (d, C7), 95.6 (s, C8a), 90.3 (s, C3), 63.5 (q, OMe syn), 54.9 (q, OMe anti), 53.5 (q, CO₂Me), 51.0 (s, C3a), 23.8 (q, Me);
EIMS m/z 319 (M⁺, 90), 290 (100), 262 (60), 216 (32), 200 (34); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{16}H_{17}NO_6$ 319.1056, found 319.1060. Data for 4b: colorless oil (17%); $R_f = 0.28$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH₂Cl₂) v_{max} 3024, 1735, 1625, 1076 cm^{-1} ; ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 7.78 (1H, br s, H7), 7.44 (1H, dd, $J = 7.6$, 1.4 Hz, H4), 7.24 (1H, td, $J = 7.5$, 1.3 Hz, H6), 7.03 (1H, td, $J = 7.5$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.05 (1H, s, H8a), 4.06 (3H, s, OMe syn), 3.89 (3H, s, OMe anti), 3.89 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 2.15 and 1.89 (2H, 2dq, $J = 14.2$, 7.5 Hz, CH₂), 0.83 (3H, t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 168.5 (s, C9), 168.5 (s, C2), 153.4 (s, CO2Me), 140.6 (s, C7a), 136.0 (s, C3b), 128.9 (d, C6), 124.6 (d, C4), 124.4 (d, C5), 115.1 (d, C7), 92.9 (s, C8a), 88.0 (s, C3), 63.6 (q, OMe syn), 55.5 (s, C3a), 54.8 (q, OMe anti), 53.5 (q, $CO₂Me$), 28.1 (t, CH₂), 8.8 (t, Me); EIMS m/z 333 (M⁺, 96), 304 (74), 276 (100), 216 (22); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{17}H_{19}NO_6$ 333.1223, found 333.1223. Data for 4c: colorless oil (17%); $R_f = 0.32$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH_2Cl_2) v_{max} 3026, 1728, 1624, 1062 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD_2Cl_2) δ 7.74 (1H, br s, H7), 7.45 (1H, dd, $J = 7.6$, 1.4 Hz, H4), 7.26 (1H, td, $J = 7.4$, 1.4 Hz, H6), 7.05 (1H, td, $J = 7.6$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.12 (1H, s, H8a), 4.04 (3H, s, OMe syn), 3.91 (3H, s, OMe anti), 3.90 (3H, s, $CO₂Me$), 2.78 (1H, h, $J = 6.9$ Hz, CH), 1.02 and 0.60 (6H, 2d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 2Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 168.5 (s, C2), 168.0 (s, C9), 153.3 (s, CO₂Me), 140.9 (s, C7a), 135.7 (s, C3b), 128.9 (d, C6), 124.3 (d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 115.0 (d, C7), 89.8 (s, C8a), 89.1 (s, C3), 63.4 (q, OMe syn), 59.1 (s, C3a), 54.6 (q, OMe anti), 53.5 (q, $CO₂Me$), 31.2 (d, CH), 18.0 and 16.7 (2q, 2Me); EIMS m/z 347 (M⁺, 32), 304 (72), 276 (100), 232 (23), 218 (27); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{18}H_{21}NO_6$ 347.1369, found 347.1373. Data for 4d: colorless crystals (18%); mp 175–176 °C (from EtOAc/ hexane); $R_f = 0.27$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH₂Cl₂) v_{max} 3016, 1730, 1623, 1076 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 7.70 $(1H, br s, H7), 7.64 (1H, dd, J = 7.4, 1.7 Hz, H4),$ 7.26 (1H, td, $J = 7.7$, 1.4 Hz, H6), 7.23–6.97 (5H, m, Ph), 7.09 (1H, td, $J = 7.6$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.19 (1H, s, H8a), 4.01 (3H, s, OMe syn), 3.99 (3H, s, OMe anti), 3.79 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 3.41 and 3.34 (2H, d, $J = 14.3 \text{ Hz}$, CH₂); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 168.7 (s, C2), 168.1 (s, C9), 153.3 (s, CO2Me), 140.6 (s, C7a), 136.5 (s, C3b), 135.8 (s, Ci), 130.1 $(d, Co), 129.1 (d, Co), 128.6 (d, Cm), 127.4 (d, Cp), 125.0$

(d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 115.3 (d, C7), 92.4 (s, C8a), 88.6 (s, C3), 63.5 (q, OMe syn), 55.9 (s, C3a), 54.7 (q, OMe anti), 53.5 (q, $CO₂Me$), 41.5 (t, CH₂); EIMS m/z 395 (M⁺, 10), 336 (18), 304 (100), 276 (30); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{22}H_{21}NO_6$ 395.1369, found 395.1377. Data for **5a**: colorless oil (77%); $R_f = 0.45$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH_2Cl_2) v_{max} 3016, 1732, 1638, 1085 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD_2Cl_2) δ 7.74 (1H, br s, H7), 7.66 (1H, dd, $J = 7.7, 0.8$ Hz, H4), 7.21 (1H, td, $J = 7.4, 1.4$ Hz, H6), 7.02 (1H, td, $J = 7.7$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.20 (1H, s, H8a), 3.90 (3H, s, OMe), 3.90 (3H, s, NCO₂Me), 3.69 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 1.71 (3H, s, Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 167.4 (s, C2), 165.3 (s, CO₂Me), 153.6 (s, NCO₂Me), 140.1 (s, C7a), 137.4 (s, C3b), 128.4 (d, C6), 125.1 (d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 114.9 (d, C7), 99.9 (s, C8a), 83.6 (s, C3), 57.5 (q, OMe), 54.2 (s, C3a), 53.8 (q, NCO₂Me), 50.6 (q, CO₂Me), 24.7 (q, Me); EIMS m/z 319 (M⁺, 13), 287 (48), 260 (100), 229 (27), 217 (18); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{16}H_{17}NO_6$ 319.1056, found 319.1053. Data for 5b: colorless oil (75%); $R_f = 0.49$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH_2Cl_2) v_{max} 3016, 1730, 1638, 1090 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD_2Cl_2) δ 7.73 (1H, br s, H7), 7.63 (1H, dd, $J = 7.6$, 1.5 Hz, H4), 7.21 (1H, td, $J = 7.4$, 1.5 Hz, H6), 7.02 (1H, td, $J = 7.6$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.29 (1H, s, H8a), 3.90 (3H, s, OMe), 3.90 (3H, s, NCO₂Me), 3.68 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 2.31 and 1.92 (2H, 2dq, $J = 14.5$, 7.5 Hz, CH₂), 0.83 (3H, t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 167.6 (s, C2), 165.3 (s, $CO₂Me$), 154.0 (s, NCO₂Me), 140.4 (s, C7a), 136.6 (s, C3b), 128.4 (d, C6), 125.1 (d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 114.9 (d, C7), 97.2 (s, C8a), 81.5 (s, C3), 59.1 (s, C3a), 57.5 (q, OMe), 53.5 (q, NCO₂Me), 50.6 (q, CO₂Me), 28.9 (t, CH₂), 9.0 (q, Me); EIMS m/z 333 (M⁺, 6), 301 (27), 274 (100), 269 (77), 216 (30); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{17}H_{19}NO_6$ 333.1212, found 333.1223. Data for 5c: colorless oil (80%); $R_f = 0.53$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH_2Cl_2) v_{max} 3022, 1729, 1638, 1095 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD_2Cl_2) δ 7.74 (1H, br s, H7), 7.63 (1H, dd, $J = 7.6$, 1.5 Hz, H4), 7.21 (1H, td, $J = 7.7$, 1.3 Hz, H6), 7.02 (1H, td, $J = 7.5$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.32 (1H, s, H8a), 3.90 (3H, s, $NCO₂Me$, 3.89 (3H, s, OMe), 3.67 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 2.97 $(1H, h, J = 6.9 Hz, CH), 1.00 and 0.56 (6H, 2d,$ $J = 6.9$ Hz, 2Me); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 167.4 (s, C2), 165.2 (s, $CO₂Me$), 153.3 (s, NCO₂Me), 140.7 (s, C7a), 136.5 (s, C3b), 128.3 (d, C6), 124.8 (d, C4), 124.2 (d, C5), 114.8 (d, C7), 94.1 (s, C8a), 82.1 (s, C3), 62.9 (s, C3a), 57.5 (q, OMe), 53.5 (q, NCO₂Me), 50.6 (q, CO₂Me), 30.9 (d, CH), 18.3 and 16.6 (2q, 2Me); EIMS m/z 347 (M⁺, 12), 315 (43), 304 (100), 288 (53), 283 (86), 276 (42); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{18}H_{21}NO_6$ 347.1368, found 347.1358. Data for 5d: colorless oil (51%); $R_f = 0.49$ (EtOAc/hexane 3:2); IR (CH₂Cl₂) v_{max} 3018, 1734, 1635, 1094 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CD₂CI₂) $\frac{3}{6}$ 7.83 (1H, dd, $J = 7.7$, 1.6 Hz, H4), 7.63 (1H, br s, H7), 7.26–7.00 (5H, m, Ph), 7.22 (1H, overlapped, H6), 7.08 (1H, td, $J = 7.5$, 1.1 Hz, H5), 6.36 (1H, s, H8a), 3.83 (3H, s, NCO2Me), 3.78 (3H, s, OMe), 3.76 (3H, s, CO₂Me), 3.68 and 3.19 (2H, 2d, $J = 13.8$ Hz, CH₂); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂) δ 167.9 (s, C2), 165.6 (s, CO2Me), 153.2 (s, NCO2Me), 140.5 (s, C7a), 136.9 (s, C3b), 136.8 (s, Ci), 130.4 (d, Co), 128.6 (d, C6), 128.5 (d, Cm), 125.3 (d, C4), 124.3 (d, C5), 115.1 (d, C7), 96.5 (s, C8a), 82.1 (s, C3), 59.3 (s, C3a), 57.5 (q, OMe), 53.6 (g, NCO₂Me), 50.8 (g, CO₂Me), 41.7 (t, CH₂); EIMS m/z 395 (M⁺, 10), 336 (18), 304 (100), 276 (30); accurate EIMS: calculated for $C_{22}H_{21}NO_6$ 395.1369, found 395.1374.

16. Crystal data for $4a$: C₁₆H₁₇O₆N₁, colorless, crystal size $0.42 \times 0.38 \times 0.20$ mm, monoclinic, space group $P2_1/c$, $a = 11.396(3)$ Å, $b = 8.837(1)$ Å, $c = 15.840(2)$ Å, $\alpha = \gamma = 90^{\circ}, \quad \beta = 100.13(2)^{\circ}, \quad V = 1570.4(5) \text{ Å}^3, \quad Z = 4,$

 $D_c = 1.35$ mg/mm³, $\lambda = 1.54184$ Å, μ (CuK_α) = 0.878 mm⁻¹, $F(000) = 672$, $3.94 < \theta < 59.95^{\circ}$, $R = 4.7\%$, $wR_2 = 13.5\%$, largest difference in peak and hole: 0.255 and $-0.163 e/\text{\AA}^3$. The CCDC deposition number is 635173.

- 17. Lei, Y. X.; Cerioni, G.; Rappoport, Z. J. Org. Chem. 2001, 66, 8379–8394.
- 18. Heileman, M. J.; Moore, H. W. Tetrahedron Lett. 1998, 39, 3643–3646.
- 19. Arndt, F. Org. Synth. Coll. Vol. 1943, 2, 165–167.