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(−)-Dictyostatin, isolated from a marine sponge, shows potent cancer cell antiproliferative activity by stabilizing microtubules. Following the structure proof of dictyostatin, efforts have focused on the design and synthesis of analogs on the basis of the structural similarities between dictyostatin and discodermolide. To this end, the C15 Z-alkene was introduced in dictyostatin and the C16 methyl group was removed to simplify the structure, which gave 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin. The macrolactone was disconnected into three main fragments, each of which had a full carbon skeleton. The C1–C9 fragment was synthesized via Brown crotylation and cross metathesis as key reactions. The C10–C15 fragment was synthesized via Roush crotylation of the (S)-Roche ester and diimide reduction. The C16–C26 fragment was synthesized via Evans aldol reaction of the (S)-Roche ester, syn 1,3-reduction and Nozaki–Hiyama reaction. The C10–C15 and C16–C26 fragments were coupled via a Wittig reaction, and the C1–C9 fragment was coupled with the lithium reagent derived from the C10–C26 vinyl iodide. Yamaguchi macrolactonization and global deprotection produced 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin, along with C2E-, C9 isomers and an isomeric lactone. 16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin showed a low nanomolar cancer cell antiproliferative activity and effectively competed with paclitaxel for binding to tubulin polymer.

6-epi-Dictyostatin showed potent cancer cell antiproliferative activity in preliminary results. Further biological evaluation of 6-epi-dictyostatin required the preparation of a large
quantity. A common intermediate was made to reduce the number of reaction steps for constructing both the C11′–C17 and C18–C26 fragments. The C1–C10′ and C11′–C17 fragments were coupled via a silicon-tethered ring-closing metathesis reaction. The C1–C17 and C18–C26 fragments were united via a HWE reaction. The Stryker and syn 1,3-reductions converted the C19 enone into the saturated alcohol regio- and diastereoselectively. A Shiina reagent used for macrolactonization suppressed the isomerization of the C2 Z-unsaturated ester. A mild global deprotection method was developed to complete the synthesis. As an effort to validate the routes for the large-scale synthesis, 33 mg of 6-epi-dictyostatin was synthesized.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 MICROTUBULE STABILIZERS AND CANCER

Microtubules are protein structures found within cells and one of the components of the cytoskeleton. They have a diameter of about 25 nm and varying length from 200 nm to 20 μm. Microtubules are polymers of α- and β-tubulin dimers. The tubulin dimers polymerize end-to-end to form protofilaments. The protofilaments are arranged by lateral contacts into hollow cylindrical filaments to complete the microtubules.¹

Microtubules are dynamic structures and grow and shrink mainly through addition and loss of the tubulin dimers at their ends. This process is called microtubule dynamics and plays critical roles in the assembly and function of the mitotic spindle. Microtubule dynamics can be altered by drugs. For example, paclitaxel ¹ (Figure 1) suppresses the dynamics by binding β-tubulin and stabilizing the microtubule. This alteration of microtubule dynamics causes cell cycle arrest and cell death by apoptosis. Natural products (paclitaxel ¹, discodermolide ² and epothilone B ³ in Figure 1) that stabilize microtubules (called microtubule stabilizers) are recognized as cancer chemotherapy agents.²
Figure 1. Structures of representative natural microtubule stabilizers

Paclitaxel 1, isolated from the Pacific yew Taxus brevifolia, has demonstrated clinical success in the treatment of breast, lung and ovarian cancers. However, the use of this compound has been limited by poor solubility, undesirable side effects and partial effectiveness towards multidrug-resistant or recurrent cancers. As a result, new microtubule stabilizers are being developed with antiproliferative activity against paclitaxel-resistant cells and in the hopes that they will have fewer side effects.

(+)-Discodermolide 2, a marine sponge-derived polyketide, was isolated and characterized by Gunasekera et al. in 1990. It was initially reported to have strong in vitro and in vivo immunosuppressive activities. Later, (+)-discodermolide was shown to have microtubule stabilizing properties similar to those of paclitaxel 1 and to also retain antiproliferative activity against paclitaxel-resistant cells. Total syntheses of (+)-discodermolide 2 have been reported to date by Schreiber, Smith, Paterson, Marshall, Myles, Panek and Ardisson. Other efforts have focused on the design and synthesis of structurally simplified analogs of (+)-discodermolide. In addition, the Novartis pharmaceutical company synthesized about 60 g of
this natural product for clinical trials. The phase II clinical trial of (+)-discodermolide was halted.\textsuperscript{17} This increases the need for discovery of the new microtubule stabilizers.

Epothilone B \textbf{3} was isolated and characterized by Hofle \textit{et al.} from the myxobacterium \textit{Sorangium} cellulosum and was shown to have cancer cell antiproliferative activity by stabilizing microtubule.\textsuperscript{18} Epothilone analogs are undergoing clinical development for treatment of various cancers.

\section*{1.2 DICTYOSTATIN}

In 1994, the Pettit group reported the isolation of a macrocyclic lactone, (–)-dictyostatin, from a marine sponge of the genus \textit{Spongia} in the Republic of Maldives. They assigned it the structure \textbf{4} (Figure 2) on the basis of 2D NMR spectroscopic data.\textsuperscript{19} (–)-Dictyostatin strongly inhibited the growth of a selection of human cancer cell lines (GI\textsubscript{50} = 0.05–1 nM), as well as murine P388 lymphocytic leukemia cells (ED\textsubscript{50} = 0.38 nM).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{dictyostatin_structures.png}
\caption{Structures \textbf{4} and \textbf{5} for dictyostatin}
\end{figure}
In 2003, the Wright group again isolated (–)-dictyostatin from a Lithistida sponge of the family *Corallistidae* collected off the north Jamaican coast. They reported that its mechanism of cytotoxic activity was similar to that of paclitaxel, and that dictyostatin induced the polymerization of purified bovine brain tubulin *in vitro*. Dictyostatin was highly potent toward two paclitaxel-resistant human cancer cell lines expressing P-glycoprotein.

In 2004, Paterson and Wright proposed the structure 5 for dictyostatin, as shown in Figure 2, on the basis of a combination of high field NMR studies and molecular modeling. The first total syntheses of dictyostatin 5 and the confirmation of its structure were simultaneously reported by the groups of Curran and Paterson. Additional total syntheses of dictyostatin 5 by the groups of Phillips and Ramachandran, as well as synthesis of analogs, were reported.

Detailed studies of biological activities were conducted with synthetic dictyostatin 5 by the Day group. The 50% growth inhibitory concentration (GI50, against 1A9 cells) of dictyostatin was comparable to those of paclitaxel 1 and discodermolide 2 (0.69, 0.71 and 1.7 nM, respectively). Like discodermolide, dictyostatin retained antiproliferative activity against cells resistant to paclitaxel (3.2 nM against 1A9PTX10 cells, 1.3 nM against 1A9PTX22 cells) and inhibited the paclitaxel binding to tubulin polymer (61% inhibition at 1 µM concentration). The competitive binding implies that dictyostatin and paclitaxel bind at the same site on tubulin polymers.

Since proving the structure of dictyostatin, the dictyostatin project in the Curran group has been centered on two goals. The first goal is the synthesis of analogs designed to investigate the structure-activity relationship as well as to define the important structural
elements required for anticancer activity. The second goal is the exploration of various strategies to develop a practical synthesis of drug candidates.
2.1 DESIGN OF A CONFORMATIONALLY RESTRICTED ANALOG OF DICTYOSTATIN

Acetylcholine (6a, 6b) shows a nicotinic activity as well as a muscarinic activity. Archer suggested that the nicotinic activity arose from the syn-conformer 6a and that the muscarinic activity was due to the anti-conformation 6b (Figure 3). This was based on the observation that the β-conformer (key bonds highlighted in bold) of 2-tropanyl ethanoate methiodide 7a binds preferentially to nicotinic receptors, whereas the α-conformer 7b (key bonds highlighted in bold) prefers binding to muscarinic receptors. This study suggests that conformationally restricted analogs could result in the selective binding of drugs to target sites with reduced binding to unwanted sites.
While designing analogs of dictyostatin, we focused on the structural differences between dictyostatin 5 and discodermolide 2. This was because dictyostatin 5 shares identical configurations at all common stereocenters with discodermolide 2. The key differences in the structures of discodermolide and dictyostatin are highlighted in dashed boxes in Figure 4. Discodermolide has an open chain carbamate (in box A), a double bond at C13–C14 (in box B), and a C1–C5 six-membered lactone (in box C). In an attempt to design a hybrid of dictyostatin/discodermolide, the C15 Z-alkene was envisioned in dictyostatin to give 15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 8 (Figure 5). (Note that the carbon skeleton of dictyostatin is two atoms longer than that of discodermolide, so C14 of discodermolide 2 corresponds to C16 of dictyostatin 5.)
Figure 4. Structural comparison of discodermolide 2 and dictyostatin 5

Figure 5. 16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 and other simplified analogs

The C16 methyl group of 15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 8 was removed to simplify the structure, because 14-normethyldiscodermolide 10 retains much of antiproliferative activity as its
parent discodermolide (IC$_{50} =$ 46, 28 nM, respectively)$^{27}$ This led us to 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 as a target compound (Figure 5). In the course of synthesizing 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9, 16-normethyldictyostatin 11 was synthesized and showed the antiproliferative activity similar to that of dictyostatin (GI$_{50} =$ 0.41, 0.69 nM, respectively)$^{24b}$

### 2.2 RETROSYNTHETIC ANALYSIS

In the original synthesis of dictyostatin 5 by the Curran group (Figure 6), primary disconnections were made across the C1–O21, C9–C10 and C17–C18 bonds to give three main fragments (the phosphonate 16, the alkyne 17 and the Weinreb amide 18)$^{22b}$ The C3–C17 fragment was first constructed via addition of the alkynyllithium derived from the alkyne 17 to the Weinreb amide 18. The resulting ynone (not shown) was subjected to Noyori and Lindlar reductions to give the C9 $\alpha$-hydroxy group and the C10 $Z$-alkene. Next, the C3–C17 aldehyde 15 was united with the C18–C23 phosphonate 16 via a Horner–Wadsworth–Emmons (HWE) olefination reaction. After fragment couplings were done, the C24–C26 bonds were constructed with the allyl bromide 13, and the C1–C2 unsaturated ester with the phosphonate 14.
Figure 6. Summary of the Curran’s synthetic strategy for dictyostatin 5

The plan for the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 is outlined in Figure 7. The C15–C16 Z-alkene was envisioned to be made by a Wittig olefination reaction to give the aldehyde 19 and the phosphonium salt 20. Further disconnection of the C1–C15 fragment 19 across the C9–C10 bond gave the alkyne 21 and the Weinreb amide 22. They were envisioned to be united by addition of the alkynyllithium derived from the alkyne 15 to the Weinreb amide 16. This is similar to the strategy for constructing the C9–C11 region of dictyostatin 5. In addition, each of three fragments (20, 21 and 22) had a full carbon skeleton so as to increase convergency of the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9.
2.3 SYNTHESIS OF THE C16–C26 FRAGMENT 20

The Weinreb amide 28 was synthesized from the (S)-Roche ester 23 by following the procedures established by Smith\textsuperscript{10c} (Figure 9). Commercially available (S)-Roche ester 23 was protected by using trichloroimidate 24\textsuperscript{28} to give a 4-methoxybenzyl (PMB) ether 25 in 87\% yield. The ester group of 25 was reduced with lithium borohydride to give an alcohol, which was oxidized via a Swern reaction\textsuperscript{29} to provide the crude aldehyde. The aldehyde was subjected to the Evans \textit{syn}-aldol reaction\textsuperscript{30} to give the aldol product 27 in 89\% yield over three steps. Transamidation of the aldol product 27 by using trimethylaluminum\textsuperscript{10c} produced the Weinreb amide 28 in 96\% yield.
Next, the alkyl iodide 29 (3.0 equiv) was treated with \( t\)-BuLi (6.5 equiv), then the Weinreb amide 28 was added to give a \( \beta \)-hydroxyketone 30 in 84% yield. The ketone 30 was reduced with NaBH\(_4\) and Et\(_2\)BOMe\(^{31}\) to give a \( syn\)-1,3-diol 31 in 85% yield. To measure the diastereoselectivity of the reaction, a mixture of two C19 isomers (31 and 32) was synthesized by reduction of the ketone 30 with NaBH\(_4\) (Figure 9). The two C19 isomers were resolved by LC-MS and the ratio was 1.7:1 (31/32). Next, the diol 31 from the NaBH\(_4\)/Et\(_2\)BOMe reduction was analyzed by LC-MS under the same conditions. The ratio was 127:1 (31/32).

![Figure 8. Synthesis of the diol 31](image)

![Figure 9. Preparation of the C19 diastereomeric mixture](image)
As shown in Figure 10, the diol 31 was treated with DDQ in the presence of 4 Å molecular sieves\textsuperscript{32} to provide a p-methoxybenzylidene (PMB) acetal 33 in 60% yield. The C19 hydroxyl group of the acetal 33 was protected with TBSOTf to give a TBS ether 34 in 99% yield. Treatment of the ether 34 with DIBAL-H\textsuperscript{33} at –45 °C gave the expected alcohol 35 resulting from the PMB acetal opening, and the diol 36 in which the C16 TBS group was also removed. They were separated by silica gel chromatography (41% yield for the alcohol 35 and 55% yield for the diol 36). The diol 36 was then converted to the desired alcohol 35 by treatment with TBSCl and imidazole in 55% yield.

\textbf{Figure 10.} Synthesis of the diene 37
Next, a Paterson protocol (Nozaki–Hiyama reaction followed by Peterson elimination)\textsuperscript{34} was used to install the C23–C26 diene, as shown in Figure 10. To this end, oxidation of the alcohol \textsuperscript{35} under Parikh–Doering conditions (SO\textsubscript{3}•pyr, DMSO and Et\textsubscript{3}N)\textsuperscript{35} gave the crude aldehyde, which reacted with the allyl bromide \textsuperscript{13} in the presence of CrCl\textsubscript{2} to give the crude β-hydroxysilane (not shown). Next, this silane was treated with sodium hydride to provide the C23–C24 Z-diene \textsuperscript{37} after silica gel chromatography in 85% yield over three steps.

Completion of the synthesis of the C16–C26 fragment \textsuperscript{20} is summarized in Figure 11. The C16 TBS protecting group of \textsuperscript{37} was removed with HF•pyr to give the primary alcohol \textsuperscript{38} in 75% yield. The alcohol \textsuperscript{38} was converted into the iodide \textsuperscript{39} by using PPh\textsubscript{3}, I\textsubscript{2} and imidazole in 93% yield. The iodide \textsuperscript{39} was treated with PPh\textsubscript{3} to produce the phosphonium salt \textsuperscript{20} in 78% yield.\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{synthesis}
\caption{Synthesis of the C16–C26 fragment \textsuperscript{20}}
\end{figure}

Overall, the C16–C26 fragment \textsuperscript{20} (2.0 g) was synthesized from the (S)-Roche ester \textsuperscript{23} in 16 steps and 12% yield.
2.4 SYNTHESIS OF THE C1–C9 FRAGMENT 22

The Weinreb amide 18 was synthesized by following procedures used for synthesis of dictyostatin 5. This began with mono-protection of 1,3-propanediol 40 using TBSCI and NaH (Figure 12). The resulting alcohol was oxidized with TEMPO and bleach to provide the aldehyde 41 after silica gel chromatography (76% yield, two steps). A Brown (E)-crotylboration of the aldehyde 41 with (+)-(ipc)2-B-crotyl gave the anti-homoallylic alcohol 42 after silica gel chromatography (69% yield). The alcohol 42 was protected with TBSCI to provide the TBS ether 43 (95% yield), which was oxidatively cleaved with OsO4/NaIO4 to give the crude aldehyde. The aldehyde was treated with ethyl 2-(diethoxyphosphoryl)acetate and NaH to give the E-unsaturated ester 44 after silica gel chromatography (83% yield, three steps). The ester 44 was reduced with DIBAL-H at 0 °C to give an allyl alcohol, which was protected with TrCl to give the trityl ether 45 after silica gel chromatography (70% yield, two steps).

![Chemical Structures](image)

**Figure 12.** Synthesis of the trityl ether 45
As summarized in Figure 13, the TBS ether 45 was treated with HF•pyr at room temperature to provide the alcohol 46 after silica gel chromatography in 74% yield. The primary alcohol 46 was oxidized by using SO$_2$•pyr, DMSO and Et$_3$N$^{35}$ to give the corresponding aldehyde 47, which was further oxidized with sodium chlorite to give a carboxylic acid.$^{40}$ The crude carboxylic acid was coupled with $N,O$-dimethylhydroxylamine by using DCC to give the Weinreb amide 18 after silica gel chromatography in 78% yield for two steps.$^{22b}$

![Figure 13. Synthesis of the Weinreb amide 18](image)

To reduce the number of reaction steps for synthesizing the Weinreb amide 18, a cross metathesis reaction$^{41}$ was attempted to construct the C4 $E$-alkene. A mixture of the homoallylic alcohol 43 and an allyl ether 48 was treated with a Grubbs second-generation (Grubb II) catalyst 49 or a Blechert–Grubbs catalyst 50$^{42}$ (Figure 14) in methylene chloride at 40°C. This gave the dimer (not shown) of the ether 48 without formation of the coupled product 45. It was hypothesized that the C7 TBS group of 43 might prevent the cross coupling by steric hindrance.
Next, the metathesis reaction between the unprotected alcohol 42 and the allyl ether 48 in methylene chloride was tried. This provided an inseparable mixture of the coupled product 51 and two isomerized alcohols 52 and 53 in a 2:1:1 ratio (Figure 15). This mixture was protected to give the corresponding TBS ethers (45, 54 and 55). They were then separated by silica gel chromatography to give the TBS ether 45 in 40% yield over two steps. In contrast, the use of degassed methylene chloride gave a mixture of the coupled product 51 and the two isomerized alcohols 52 and 53 in a 9:1:1 ratio. The TBS ether 45 was isolated after protection (0.5 g, 55% yield over two steps). This cross metathesis approach could reduce the number of reaction steps from the homoallylic alcohol 42 to the trityl ether 45 from six to two with the similar overall yield.

Figure 14. Attempted cross metathesis reaction between the TBS ether 43 and the trityl ether 48.
Figure 15. Cross metathesis reaction between the alcohol 42 and the trityl ether 48

To complete the synthesis of the C1–C9 fragment 22, the trityl group of 18 was removed with zinc bromide to provide the alcohol 56 in 91% yield (Figure 16).\(^{22b}\) Next, oxidation of the alcohol by using SO\(_3\)•pyr, DMSO and DIPEA gave the aldehyde, which was submitted to Still–Gennari olefination conditions (14, KHMDS and 18-crown-6)\(^{44}\) to produce the C1–C9 fragment 22 (3.0 g, 70% yield over two steps). The C2 Z-geometry of 22 was confirmed in the \(^1\)H NMR spectrum by the coupling constant between H2 and H3 (\(J = 11.5\) Hz).

Figure 16. Synthesis of the C1–C9 fragment 22
For an alternative approach to synthesizing the C1–C9 fragment 22 (Figure 17), the cross metathesis reaction between crotonaldehyde and the alkene 43 was tried. The reaction proceeded in the presence of the Grubb II catalyst 49 to provide the unsaturated aldehyde 57 in 77% yield. Carrying out seven reactions used for constructing the C9 Weinreb amide and the C1 unsaturated ester provided the C1–C9 fragment 22 (0.4 g). This cross metathesis approach could reduce the number of reaction steps from the homoallylic alcohol 42 to the C1–C9 fragment 22 from 13 to 7 in comparison to the strategy using no cross metathesis (Route 1), as shown in Table 1.

**Figure 17.** Cross metathesis strategy for synthesizing the C1–C9 fragment 22
Table 1. Comparison of the strategies for synthesizing the fragment the C1–C9 fragment 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Reaction steps from the alcohol 42 to the C1–C9 fragment 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No cross metathesis via HWE reaction and Tr protection 13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cross metathesis with allyl ether 48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cross metathesis with crotonaldehyde</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 SYNTHESIS OF THE C10–C15 FRAGMENT 21

The synthesis of the C10–C15 fragment 21 is summarized in Figure 18. The alcohol 61 derived from the (S)-Roche ester 23 was oxidized with SO$_3$•pyr, DMSO and DIPEA. The resulting crude aldehyde was reacted with the Roush reagent 62 at $-78^\circ$C for 8 h to provide the alcohol 63 in 67% yield over two steps. This alcohol was protected with TBSOTf and 2,6-lutidine to give the TBS ether 64 (82% yield), which was oxidatively cleaved by using a Jin one-pot protocol (OsO$_4$, NaIO$_4$, 2,6-lutidine) to provide the aldehyde. The crude aldehyde was submitted to Corey–Fuchs olefination conditions (CBr$_4$, PPh$_3$) with 2,6-lutidine to give the vinyl dibromide 65 in 74% yield over two steps. Next, the dibromide 65 was treated with BuLi (4 equiv) to produce the alkyne 21 in 96% yield. Overall, 4.3 g of the C10–C15 fragment 21 was synthesized from the alcohol 61 in 39% yield over 6 steps.
2.6 COUPLING OF THE FRAGMENTS 21 AND 22

The plan for construction of the C9–C11 region was to use the three-step sequence of alkynyllithium addition, Noyori reduction then Lindlar reduction as was used for the synthesis of dictyostatin 5.\textsuperscript{22b,28} First, the alkyne 21 was deprotonated with BuLi, and then addition of the Weinreb amide 22 gave a 1:1 mixture of the C2 Z-isomer 66 and the C2 E-isomer 67 (Figure 19). The mixture was separated by silica gel chromatography to give each pure isomer. The C2 geometries were confirmed in the 1H NMR spectrum by the coupling constant between H2 and H3. It was presumed that the C2 isomerization originated from the addition of the C9 alkoxy anion to the C5 position of the intermediate 68 (Figure 20). This produced the tetrahydropyran ring 69, which broke down to a mixture of the C2 Z-isomer 66 and the C2 E-isomer 67 during acidic workup.
To prevent the 1,6-conjugate addition of the C9 alkoxy anion, the ester group of the C1–C9 fragment 22 with DIBAL-H was reduced. Next, the crude alcohol was treated with TBSOTf to produce the TBS ether 70 in 96% yield over two steps (Figure 21). The addition of the
alkynyllithium derived from the alkyne 21 to the aldehyde 70 provided a mixture of two C9 epimers, which was oxidized without purification to the ynone 71 in 55% yield over two steps (Figure 22). The ynone 71 was reduced with the (S,S)-Noyori catalyst 72\(^\text{48}\) to give the alcohol 73 in 81% yield. The C9 configuration of the alcohol 73 was assigned by analogy to dictyostatin 5, because the same method was used to establish the C9 configuration. The stereoselectivity of the reaction was not determined.

**Figure 21.** Synthesis of the dienyl ether 70

**Figure 22.** Attempted partial reduction reaction of the dienyl ether 73
Next, the partial reduction of the C10–C11 alkyne of the dienyl ether 73 in the presence of the C2–C4 diene was attempted by using H₂ and Lindlar catalyst. However, this saturated the C2–C3 alkene in addition to partial reduction of the C10–C11 alkyne to give the ether 74 (Figure 22). Likewise, treatment of the ether 73 with the diimide generated from o-nitrobenzenesulfonyl hydrazide (NBSH) and Et₃N gave the same product, 74. It was presumed that the C1–C5 dienyl ether of 73 is too electron-rich to be differentiated from the C10–C11 alkyne.

Thus, the reduction of the C10 alkyne possessing a C1–C5 dienoate was attempted because the dienoate is less electron-rich than the dienyl ester. To this end, the C9 ketone of the ynone 66 was reduced with the Noyori catalyst 72 to give the C9 alcohol, which was subjected to hydrogenation using Lindlar catalyst poisoned with quinoline, as well as diimide reduction. These reduction reactions gave the C4–C5 saturated ester 75 (Figure 23).

![Figure 23. Attempted partial reduction reactions of the dienoate 66](image)

Overall, the hydrogenation or diimide reduction of the C10–C11 alkyne of the dienoate 66 or the dienyl ether 73 in the presence of the C2–C4 diene partially saturated the C2–C5 region as well as the C10 alkyne. It was concluded that the reactivity of the C10 alkyne and C2–C4 diene toward the reduction seems to be too similar to be differentiated from each other. Thus, the
coupling strategy was revised with a vinyl iodide 76, which requires no reduction reaction of the C10–C11 bond.

2.7 REVISED COUPLING STRATEGY

In the revised strategy, it was decided to first couple the aldehyde 77 and the phosphonium salt 20 via a Wittig olefination, and then to add the lithium reagent derived from the vinyl iodide 76 to the aldehyde 70, as shown in Figure 24. The Wittig olefination between the aldehyde 78 and the phosphonium salt 79 gave a 29% yield (previously done by Dr. Y. Shin, Figure 25). Thus, it was decided to first do the Wittig reaction with the relatively small fragments 20 and 77.

![Figure 24](image-url)

**Figure 24.** Revised retrosynthetic analysis for 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9
The conversion of the alkyne 21 to the vinyl iodide 77 is summarized in Figure 26. First, the alkyne 21 was deprotonated with BuLi and quenched with iodine to produce the iodoalkyne 81 in 99% yield. Diimide generated from o-nitrobenzenesulfonyl hydrazide (NBSH) and Et₃N smoothly reduced the iodoalkyne 81 to the Z-vinyl iodide 82 without overreduced products in 95% yield. Removal of the PMB group with DDQ followed by a Dess–Martin oxidation provided the aldehyde 77, which was used for the Wittig reaction without purification.

To construct the C10–C26 fragment 76 (Figure 27), the phosphonium salt 20 (0.64 g) that was dried azeotropically with benzene was deprotonated with NaHMDS to give a reddish
solution of the ylide, and then the aldehyde 77 (0.38 g) was added. This produced 0.47 g of the C10–C26 fragment 76 after silica gel chromatography in 82% yield. The C15 Z-geometry of the Wittig product 76 was confirmed by the coupling constant between H15 and H16 ($J = 10.7$ Hz) in the $^1$H NMR spectrum. This reaction was repeated with 1.50 g of the phosphonium salt 20 and 0.90 g of the aldehyde 77 to give 1.05 g of the Wittig product 76 (72% yield).

![Figure 27. Coupling of the C10–C15 fragment 77 and the C16–C26 fragment 20](image)

Next, methods for the addition of the vinyl iodide 76 to the aldehyde 70 were studied. A Nozaki–Hiyama–Kishi reaction$^{53}$ of 76 and 70 using CrCl$_2$ and NiCl$_2$ gave two C9 epimers $84\alpha$ and $84\beta$ in 32% yield. In contrast, lithium-halogen exchange with tert-BuLi gave a 60% yield in a test reaction. Thus, this method was used with the vinyl iodide 76 (0.76 g, 0.94 mmol) and the aldehyde 70 (0.37 g, 0.88 mmol) to give a mixture of two epimers $84\alpha$ and $84\beta$. They were separated by silica gel chromatography to provide the C9 $\alpha$-epimer $84\alpha$ (more polar, 0.26 g, 27% yield) and the C9 $\beta$-epimer $84\beta$ (0.42 g, 43% yield), as shown in Figure 28.
Figure 28. Coupling of the aldehyde 70 and the vinyl iodide 76

The assignment of the C9 configurations of two C9 epimers (84α and 84β) was based on

$^1$H NMR similarities between a seco-acid 85α and analogous 86, 87 and 88. The seco-acid 86 is the intermediate for 16-normethyldictyostatin,24b 87 for 16-epi-dictyostatin24d and 88 for dictyostatin,22b and they differ only in the C15–C16 region (Figure 29). The H9 signal of 85α was at $\delta$ 4.48 ppm (dd, $J = 7.6, 12.4$ Hz). For 86, 87 and 88, dd’s with similar chemical shifts and $J$-values were observed for the H9. In contrast, the H9 signal of a seco-acid 85β of the C9 β-alcohol 84β was a triplet ($J = 8.1$ Hz) at $\delta$ 4.41 ppm.

Figure 29. Structures of the seco-acids 85α, 86, 87 and 88
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2.8 COMPLETION OF THE SYNTHESIS

The completion of the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 is shown in Figure 30. The C9 hydroxyl group of the coupled product 84α was protected with TBSOTf, and then the C1 TBS group was removed with HF•pyr to provide the alcohol 89α in 85% yield over two steps. The alcohol 89α was oxidized with Dess–Martin periodinane to give the aldehyde, which was converted without purification into a carboxylic acid by using NaClO₂. Next, the C21 PMB group of the resulting acid was removed with DDQ to provide a seco-acid 85α after silica gel chromatography in 31% yield over three steps.

In turn, the seco-acid 85α was submitted to Yamaguchi conditions (2,4,6-trichlorobenzoyl chloride (TCBC), Et₃N, DMAP)⁵⁴ to give an inseparable mixture of the C2 Z-macrolactone and the C2 E-isomer 91 (less polar, 5% by ¹H-NMR analysis) in 71% yield. Finally, global deprotection of the TBS-protected macrolactones with HCl produced 16-normethy-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 in 42% yield and the more polar C2 E-isomer 92⁵⁵ in 3% yield after silica gel chromatography. The C2 geometries of the macrolactones were confirmed by the coupling constants of the H2–H3 in the ¹H NMR spectra (J = 11.5 Hz for 16-normethy-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 and 15.3 Hz for the C2 E-isomer 92).

Overall, 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 was synthesized from the (S)-Roche ester in total 44 steps and 25 steps (longest linear sequence) and in 0.013% overall yield.
Figure 30. Completion of the synthesis of 16-normethy-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9

All proton resonances of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 were assigned by $^1$H and $^1$H-$^1$H COSY spectroscopies and the carbon atoms were assigned by HMQC and HMBC NMR studies. The coupling constants measured ($J = 10.8$ Hz for H10–H11, 11.0 Hz for H15–H16) confirmed the Z-olefins at C10–C11 and C15–C16. In addition, the correlation between C1 and H21 in the HMBC spectrum (boxed in Figure 31) confirmed the connectivity of the C1 carbonyl to the C21 hydroxy group.
2.9 SYNTHESIS OF THE 9-EPIMER

The synthesis of 9-\textit{epi}-16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 94 was achieved by following the same seven-step sequence starting from the C9 $\beta$-epimer 84$\beta$, as summarized in Figure 32. The TBS-protection of the C9 hydroxy group of the alcohol 84$\beta$ and the removal of the C1 TBS group provided a primary alcohol 89$\beta$ in 60\% yield over two steps. The alcohol 89$\beta$
was converted into the corresponding carboxylic acid via two successive oxidations. The C21 PMB group of the carboxylic acid was then removed to provide a seco-acid 85β in 47% yield over three steps.

Next, the seco-acid 85β was cyclized to the macrolactone 90β under Yamaguchi conditions, which contained an inseparable C2 E-isomer 93 (1:2 E/Z ratio). The global deprotection of the TBS-protected macrolactones produced 9-epi-16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 94.
dehydrodictyostatin 94 and a C19 lactone 95 in 37% yield over two steps, as well as the impure C2 E-isomer (5%). The structure of the C19 lactone 95 was determined by observing the three-bond coupling between H19 ($\delta$ 5.07 ppm) and C1 ($\delta$ 166.3 ppm) in the HMBC spectrum.56

2.10 BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION

16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9, its C2E-isomer 92, its C9-epimer 94 and the C19 lactone 95 were tested for cellular and biochemical activity in comparison to paclitaxel 1, dictyostatin 5 and 16-normethyldictyostatin 11 by the groups of Day and Vogt.24d,57

The minimum detectable effective concentrations (MDECs) for the chemicals to cause increases in cellular tubulin polymer mass in HeLa cells are given in Table 2.24d 16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydro-dictyostatin 9 caused tubulin polymer increase at a low nanomolar concentration, which was comparable to paclitaxel 1, dictyostatin 5 and 16-normethyldictyostatin 11. The C2E-isomer 92 was less active, and the C9-epimer 94 and the C19 lactone 95 were not potent.

The 50% growth inhibitory concentrations (GI50s) were determined against human ovarian carcinoma 1A9, 1A9/Ptx10 and 1A9/Ptx22 cells(Table 2).24d The 1A9/Ptx10 and 1A9/Ptx22 cells are mutant $\beta$-tubulin-expressing, paclitaxel resistant clones of the 1A9 cells (Phe270ÆVal and Ala364ÆThr, respectively). The GI50 of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 against 1A9 cells was 10- to 20-fold less than dictyostatin 5 and 16-normethyldictyostatin 11. For 1A9/Ptx10 cells, 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 was comparable to 16-normethyldictyostatin 11, but 300-fold less active than dictyostatin 5. For 1A9/Ptx22 cells, 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 was 10- to 50-fold less potent than
dictyostatin 5 and 16-normethyl-dictyostatin 11. The large cross resistance of 1A9/Ptx10 cells (as compared to the parental 1A9 cells) toward 16-normethyl analogs 9 and 11, indicates that the C-16 region of 9 and 11 interacts with or is positioned near the Phe270 region of the binding pocket of β-tubulin.

**Table 2. Biological activities of 9, 92, 94 and 95**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test agent</th>
<th>Cellular</th>
<th>In vitro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GI₅₀, b nM (N = 4)</td>
<td>% tubulin polymerized by 10 µM test agent relative to 10 µM paclitaxel c (N ≥ 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDEC a for tubulin polymer increase, nM ± SD (N)</td>
<td>1A9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11 ± 2 (3)</td>
<td>8.3 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 (2E)</td>
<td>674 ± 106 (4)</td>
<td>210 ± 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 (9-epi)</td>
<td>&gt;5000 (1)</td>
<td>4260 ± 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 (19-lactone)</td>
<td>&gt;5000 (1)</td>
<td>&gt;50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (16-normethyl)</td>
<td>25 ± 9 (3)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (dictyostatin)</td>
<td>5.4 ± 1.9 (4)</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (paclitaxel)</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.4 (4)</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Minimum detectable effective concentration of the test agent in HeLa cells after 21 h of continuous exposure.
b Fifty percent growth inhibitory concentration after 72 h of continuous exposure to the test agent.
c Bovine brain tubulin (10 µM) in 0.2 M monosodium glutamate was treated at 0 °C with the test agent (predissolved in DMSO). The mixture was transferred to a cuvette in a 6-channel, temperature-controlled spectrophotometer, and the temperature was rapidly raised to 30 °C. Tubulin assembly was monitored by turbidity development at 350 nm, and the percent assembly reported is relative to that caused by 10 µM paclitaxel, analyzed in the same experiment in one of the six cuvettes, after 20 min at 30 °C.
d Percent competition at 37 °C by 4 µM test agent with 2 µM [³H]paclitaxel for binding to microtubules formed from 2 µM bovine brain tubulin and 20 µM dideoxyGTP.
The potencies of inducing polymer assembly of isolated bovine brain tubulin were evaluated (Table 2). 24d 16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 was equipotent with paclitaxel 1 and 16-normethyldictyostatin 11. In addition, 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 effectively competed with [3H]-paclitaxel for binding to tubulin polymer, but the potency was half of that of dictyostatin 5.

Table 3. Potencies of 9, 92, 94 and 95 on HeLa cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>EC50 (nM)</th>
<th>MDEC (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cell density</td>
<td>Nuclear condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.9 ± 15.5</td>
<td>12.6 ± 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 (2E)</td>
<td>896 ± 135</td>
<td>738 ± 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 (9-epi)</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 (19-lactone)</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (16-normethyl)</td>
<td>37.4 ± 6.2</td>
<td>23.7 ± 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (dictyostatin)</td>
<td>9.2 ± 6.6</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (paclitaxel)</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>3.9 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAverage of at three independent experiments ± S.D.
bMinimal detectable effective concentration.
cPercentage of phosphohistone H3 positive cells.

The cellular effects of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9, its C2E-isomer 92, its C9-epimer 94 and the C19 lactone 95 are shown in Table 3. 57 The EC50s were measured for cell density (cytotoxicity) and nuclear condensation. In addition, the effects on histone H3 phosphorylation (mitotic index), and changes in microtubule morphology (microtubule mass)
were evaluated. The overall cellular effects of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 were slightly better than 16-normethyldictyostatin 11, but 2- to 3-fold worse than paclitaxel 1 and dictyostatin 5.

2.11 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin, a hyrid of dictyostatin/discodermolide, was designed and synthesized along with three related analogs. Synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin was achieved in a convergent manner from three main fragments, each of which has a full carbon skeleton. Fragments were coupled via a Wittig olefination and a vinylolithium addition to an aldehyde. This addition reaction gave two C9-epimers (1.6:1, β/α) favoring the undesired C9 β-epimer. Thus, improved selectivity of the addition reaction is still needed. Otherwise, the development of methods for converting the C9 α-isomer into the β-isomer is needed. This synthesis proceeded in total 44 steps and 25 steps (longest linear sequence) from the (S)-Roche ester and in 0.013% overall yield (Scheme 1).

16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin, C2E-isomer, C9-epimer and the C19 lactone were evaluated for anticancer activity. 16-Normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin was, overall, equipotent with 16-normethyldictyostatin, but 2- to 10-fold less active toward several cancer cell lines than dictyostatin. To date, 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydro-dictyostatin is one of the most potent hybrids of dictyostatin/discodermolide.
Scheme 1. Summary of the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9

**Synthesis of the C1-C9 fragment**

1. **OH**
2. **OH**
3. **TBSO**
4. **OTBS**
5. **CO₂Me**
6. **TBSO**
7. **OTBS**
8. **OH**
9. **TBSO**
10. **OTBS**

**1) TBSCl, NaH**
**2) TEMPO, bleach**
**3) (+)-(ipc)₂-B-E-crotyl, 69%**

**1) TBSCl, imid, 95%**
**2) crotonaldehyde**
**3) Still-Gennari, 98%**

**OH**
**OH**
**OTBS**
**TBSO**
**CO₂Me**

**1) HF•pyr, 92%**
**2) SO₃•pyr, TEA, DMSO, 91%**
**3) NaClO₂**
**4) Me(MeO)NH, DCC, TEA**

**OTBS**
**TBSO**
**O**
**H**

**1) DIBAL-H**
**2) TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine**
**96%, two steps**

**21% overall yield**

**Synthesis of the C16-C26 fragment**

**MeO**

1. **OH**
2. **PMBOC(=NH)CCl₃**
3. **LiBH₄**
4. **Swern oxidation**
5. **Evans aldol**

**1) PMBOC(=NH)CCl₃**
**2) PPTS, 87%**
**3) LiBH₄**
**4) Swern oxidation**
**5) Evans aldol**

**1) PMBOC(=NH)CCl₃**
**2) PPTS, 87%**
**3) LiBH₄**
**4) Swern oxidation**
**5) Evans aldol**

**27**
**37**

**1) DDQ, 4Å MS, 60%**
**2) TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine, 99%**
**3) DIBAL-H, 71%**

**35**
**20**

**1) SO₃•pyr, DMSO, TEA**
**2) CrCl₂, (TMS)BrHCCH=CH₂**
**3) NaH**

**85%, three steps**

**1) SO₃•pyr, DMSO, TEA**
**2) CrCl₂, (TMS)BrHCCH=CH₂**
**3) NaH**

**10% overall yield**
Scheme 1. Summary of the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 (continued)

Synthesis of the C10-C15 fragment

![Chemical Structures]

Fragment couplings

![Chemical Structures]
Scheme 1. Summary of the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9 (continued)

Completion of the synthesis

1.7% from the Wittig reaction of 77
0.013% overall yield from Roche ester
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3.0 IMPROVED SYNTHESIS OF 6-EPIDICTYOSTATIN

3.1 FIRST SYNTHESIS OF 6-EPIDICTYOSTATIN

In the course of studying the structure-activity relationship of dictyostatin through the total synthesis of analogs, dictyostatin 5 and three 6,7-epimers (6-epi 101, 7-epi 102, 6,7-bis-epi 103)24c were prepared via a fluorous mixture synthesis (FMS)58 by the Curran group. As summarized in Figure 34, four 6,7-isomers coded with fluorous silyl groups were synthesized separately and mixed to give a mixture 96. Lithium acetylide generated from the alkyne 97 was added to the Weinreb amide 96 to give an ynone (not shown). Next, carrying out the 5-step sequence used for synthesis of dictyostatin 5 provided the C3–C17 fragment 98. In turn, the C3–C17 aldehyde 98 was coupled with the C18–C26 phosphonate 99 via a Horner–Wadsworth–Emmons (HWE) reaction to give the enone 100. Carrying out 10 steps further and demixing provided dictyostatin 5 and three 6,7-epimers (101, 102, 103).
Figure 33. Summary of the FMS of dictyostatin and three 6,7-epimers

Preliminary antiproliferative assays\textsuperscript{24c} against human ovarian carcinoma 1A9/Ptx22 cells showed that 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin 101 was 4-fold more potent than dictyostatin 5 (GI\textsubscript{50} = 0.81 and 3.4 nM, respectively), as shown in Table 4. The fact that 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin 101 showed the high potency and dictyostatin will be off patent before if it could be commercialized, led us to further evaluate biological activity of 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin for the treatment of cancer. This required the preparation of a large quantity of the material. The large-scale synthesis of 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin,
aimed at increasing the convergency of the original synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101 and developing practical methods for a large-scale synthesis, was therefore pursued.

Table 4. Biological activities of 5, 101, 102 and 103\textsuperscript{24c,57}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>GI\textsubscript{50} ± S.D. (nM)\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>EC\textsubscript{50} ± S.D. (nM)\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A9/Ptx22</td>
<td>Cell density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictyostatin (5)</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>9.2 ± 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-epi (101)</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.17</td>
<td>8.9 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-epi (102)</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.6</td>
<td>17.5 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,7-epi (103)</td>
<td>123 ± 25</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paclitaxel (1)</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Fifty percent growth inhibitory concentration after 72 h of continuous exposure of human ovarian cancer cells to the test agent.\textsuperscript{b}Average of at three independent experiments on human cervical cancer HeLa cells.

3.2 ATTEMPTED SYNTHESIS OF 6-\textit{EPI}-DICTYOSTATIN

3.2.1 Background

In the course of synthesizing dictyostatin analogs, the Curran group had at this point developed four synthetic strategies for constructing the C9–C11 region as summarized in Figure 35. The first-generation approach, introduced in the synthesis of 6,16-bis-epi-dictyostatin,\textsuperscript{24c} used the Wittig olefination between the phosphonium salt 104 and the aldehyde 105 possessing the C9 \(\beta\)-hydroxy group to provide the C10–C11 Z-olefin ((a) in Figure 34). The second-
A generation approach developed for the synthesis of dictyostatin included the three-step sequence of alkynyllithium addition, Noyori reduction, and Lindlar reduction ((b) in Figure 34).²²b
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\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{PMB} \quad \text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\n\end{array}
+ \begin{array}{c}
\text{HOC} \\
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{PMB} \quad \text{O} \\
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(b)} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
+ \begin{array}{c}
\text{O} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{O} \\
\end{array}
\rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(c)} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{HO} \\
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
+ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CO2H} \\
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(d)} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
+ \begin{array}{c}
\text{H} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{TBSO} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\text{OTBS} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 34.** Fragment coupling strategies for dictyostatin analogs by the Curran group. (a) Wittig reaction; (b) alkynyllithium addition; (c) RCM; (d) vinyllithium addition
The third attempt toward forming the C10–C11 Z-olefin utilized the RCM reaction of the ester derived from the alcohol 108 and the carboxylic acid 109, followed by LiAlH₄ reduction to give the C5–C23 fragment 110 possessing the C10 Z-alkene ((c) in Figure 34).⁵⁹ All of the above-mentioned methods had truncated bottom fragments (the C1–C2 for the aldehyde 105 and the Weinreb amide 18 or the C1–C4 for the alkene 109 were absent).

In the fourth-generation strategy used for the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9, the bottom fragment 70 possessed the full carbon skeleton. This strategy used the addition reaction of the lithium reagent derived from the vinyl iodide 76 to the aldehyde 70, which directly generated the C9 β-hydroxy group of the coupled product 84α ((d) in Figure 34).²⁴ᵈ

### 3.2.2 The initial synthetic plan for a large-scale synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin

To synthesize 6-epi-dictyostatin on a large scale, it was decided to use the strategy of a vinyllithium addition to an aldehyde to maximize the synthetic convergency (Figure 35). To this end, the macrolactone 101 was divided into three fragments of roughly equal complexity. The disconnection across the C9–C10 bond leads to the C10–C26 vinyl iodide 111 and the C1–C9 aldehyde 112. Further disconnection of 111 across the C17–C18 bond by a HWE olefination reaction reveals the aldehyde 113 and the phosphonate 99, the C18–C26 fragment in the initial FMS.²⁴ᶜ
3.2.3 Attempted large-scale synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin

The new approach needed the C10–C17 fragment 113 possessing both vinyl iodide and aldehyde functional groups. Its synthesis started with the known intermediate 114 used for the synthesis of dictyostatin.\(^\text{22b}\) As shown in Figure 36, the TBS ether 114 was deprotected with HCl to give a diol, which was protected as a TES ether 115 (86% yield, two steps). Removal of the PMB group of the ether 115 with DDQ gave the alcohol 116 (90% yield), which was oxidized with \(\text{SO}_3\cdot\text{pyr}\), DMSO and \(\text{Et}_3\text{N}\) to provide the aldehyde 117 (80% yield). Next, the aldehyde 117 was submitted to Wittig olefination conditions (ICH\(_3\)PPh\(_3\), I\(_2\), BuLi and NaHMDS)\(^\text{60}\) to give the Z-vinyl iodide, which was used for the next reaction without further purification. The crude vinyl iodide was treated with dichloroacetic acid to give a primary alcohol 118 (48% yield, two steps). The C10 Z-geometry of 118 was confirmed by the coupling constant between H10 and H11 (\(J = 7.5\) Hz) in the \(^1\text{H}\) NMR spectrum. The alcohol 118 was then oxidized under Parikh–Doering
conditions to provide the C10–C17 aldehyde 113 (70% yield). Overall, 6 g of the C10–C17 fragment 113 was synthesized from the known intermediate 114 in 7 steps and 21% overall yield.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 36.** Synthesis of the C10–C17 fragment 113

Next, the C18–C26 phosphonate 99 (synthesized by Dr. C. Harrison) was coupled with the C10–C17 aldehyde 113. By following the procedure used for dictyostatin 5, the phosphonate 99 was deprotonated with Ba(OH)2, and then the aldehyde was added (Figure 37). The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 18 h. This produced the enone 119 after silica gel chromatography (11.9 g, 88% yield). The C17 E-geometry of 119 was confirmed by the coupling constant of the H17–H18 ($J = 15.7$ Hz) in the $^1$H NMR spectrum. The C17 Z-isomer of the enone 119 was not observed in the spectrum.

The C17–C18 alkene of the enone 119 was then saturated with a Stryker reagent ([Ph$_3$PCuH]$_6$, red powder) to give the ketone 120 (9.1 g, 77% yield). The ketone 120 was
The addition of the lithium reagent derived from the vinyl iodide 76 to the aldehyde 70 was previously used for the synthesis of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydridictyostatin 9 (Figure 28). This gave two C9 epimers of 84α (desired) and 84β in a 1:1.6 ratio favoring 84β. Likewise, the initial test reaction with the vinyl iodide 111 and the aldehyde 112 (synthesized by Dr. G. Moura-Letts) gave two C9 epimers of 122α (desired) and 122β in a 1:1.9 ratio favoring 122β (Figure 38). The ratio was determined by chiral HPLC analysis.
The asymmetric addition of a vinylzinc reagent to the aldehyde 112 was tried with (+)- or (–)-methylephedrine (Oppolzer reaction). The vinyl iodide 111 was treated with tert-BuLi, and then a solution of zinc reagents (ZnBr₂, ZnCl₂ or ZnEt₂) and (+) or (–)-methylephedrine were added. However, the use of zinc reagents and methylephedrines gave the unreacted aldehyde and the C10 deiodinated alkene of the vinyl iodide 111.

Chiral additives were added to the vinyllithium reagent to increase the formation of the desired epimer 122α (Figure 38 and Table 5). Use of (+)- or (–)-methylephedrine as an additive did not improve ratio (1.7:1, favoring 122β). In contrast, addition of (–)-sparteine (1.3 equiv) gave a 1.2:1 ratio (β/α). More (–)-sparteine (3.6 equiv) was not helpful (1.7:1 ratio (β/α)). Then, the reaction was scaled up with 1 g of the vinyl iodide 111 and (–)-sparteine (1.3 equiv) to give two C9-epimers 122α (0.32 g, 26% yield) and 122β (0.32 g). This reaction was repeated with 4.9 g of the vinyl iodide 111, which gave 122α (0.45 g, 8% yield) and 122β (0.70 g, 12% yield). It seemed that the reactive vinyllithium reagent derived from 111 decomposed over the long time period required for tert-BuLi addition in the reaction of large scale.

Figure 38. Coupling of the vinyl iodide 111 and the aldehyde 112
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Table 5. Reaction of the lithium reagent derived from the vinyl iodide 111 with the aldehyde 112

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vinyl iodide</th>
<th>additive</th>
<th>122α (yield)</th>
<th>122β (yield)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>no additive</td>
<td>1:1.9 ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>(+) or (−)-methylephedrine</td>
<td>1:1.7 ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>(−)-sparteine (1.3 equiv)</td>
<td>1:1.2 ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>(−)-sparteine (3.6 equiv)</td>
<td>1:1.7 ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 mg</td>
<td>(−)-sparteine (1.3 equiv)</td>
<td>20 mg (23%)</td>
<td>20 mg (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 g</td>
<td>(−)-sparteine (1.3 equiv)</td>
<td>0.32 g (26%)</td>
<td>0.32 g (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 g</td>
<td>(−)-sparteine (1.3 equiv)</td>
<td>0.45 g (8%)</td>
<td>0.70 g (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> by chiral HPLC analysis

The assignment of the C9 configuration of the coupled product 122α was based on <sup>1</sup>H NMR similarities between the TBS ether 123α and the fluorous TIPS ether 124 previously synthesized in the FMS of 6,7-epimers (Figure 39).<sup>24c</sup>

![Figure 39](Image)

Figure 39. Structures of the TBS ether 123α and the fluorous TIPS ether 124

At this time, a more scalable synthetic route was sought to provide coupling of two main fragments. Thus, a ring-closing metathesis reaction with two silicon-tethered alkenes was tried.
3.3 REVISED PLAN FOR THE SYNTHESIS OF 6-EPI-DICTYOSTATIN

The revised plan for the large-scale synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101 is outlined in Figure 40. The macrolactone 101 was again divided into three fragments. The disconnection across the C17–C18 bond by a HWE olefination reaction reveals the C1–C17 aldehyde 125 and the C18–C26 ketophosphonate 99. Further disconnection of the C1–C17 fragment 125 across the C10–C11 bond leads to the C1–C10′ fragment 127 and the C11′–C17 fragment 128, which can be united via a silicon-tethered ring-closing metathesis (RCM) reaction.

![Diagram of the synthesis process]

Figure 40. Retrosynthetic analysis of 6-epi-dictyostatin
3.4 SYNTHESIS OF THE COMMON INTERMEDIATE 132

In the initial synthesis of 6,7-epimers of dictyostatin, each of the TBS- and PMB-protected aldehydes (129 and 131) was submitted to the Evans syn-aldol reaction to provide the C18–C26 fragment 99 or the C10–C17 fragment 97, respectively (Figure 41). In contrast, a common intermediate 132 was selected to develop a practical method for synthesizing both the C18–C26 phosphonate 99 and the C11′–C17 alkene 128. As shown in Figure 42, the structural analysis of the fragments 99 and 128 showed that a triad of contiguous stereogenic centers with a syn,anti-relationship was present at both the C20→C22 of 99 and the C14→C12 of 128. In addition, both fragments have the alkenes at the C23 or C11, respectively. Thus the synthesis of these C11′–C17 and C18–C26 fragments from 132 as the common intermediate could reduce the number of steps required to prepare both main fragments from 24 to 19.

Figure 41. Synthesis of the fragments 97 and 99 in the attempted synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin
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As summarized in Figure 43, the starting point for synthesis of the common intermediate 132 was the protection of 75 g of the (S)-Roche ester 23 as a TBS ether.\textsuperscript{24c} Formation of the corresponding Weinreb amide was achieved in a single step by addition of magnesium \(N, O\)-dimethylhydroxyamide to the methyl ester.\textsuperscript{24c} Reduction of the Weinreb amide with DIBAL-H provided the aldehyde,\textsuperscript{24c} which was subjected without purification to the Roush \textit{anti}-crotylation reaction.\textsuperscript{45} The crude product\textsuperscript{65} was purified by silica gel chromatography to provide the alcohol 132. Overall, 136 g of the common intermediate 132 was synthesized in four steps and 58\% overall yield starting from 75 g of the ester 23, with one silica-gel chromatographic purification.

![Figure 42. Structural analysis of the C11–C14 and C20–23 regions](image)

![Figure 43. Synthesis of the common intermediate 132](image)
3.5 SYNTHESIS OF THE C18–C26 FRAGMENT 99

The synthesis of the C18–C26 fragment 99 is outlined in Figure 44. The common intermediate 132 was treated with NaH and PMBBr to provide the PMB ether 133 in 84% yield after silica gel chromatography.\textsuperscript{9a,b} The ether 133 was submitted to ozonolysis to give the crude aldehyde 134.\textsuperscript{9a,b}

Construction of the C23–C26 diene was accomplished by a Matteson protocol\textsuperscript{66} as shown in Figure 44. The crude aldehyde 134 was reacted with 1-trimethylsilyl-1-propene boronate 135 at room temperature to provide the $\beta$-hydroxysilane (not shown). The crude silane was treated with sodium hydride to produce the Z-diene 136\textsuperscript{24c} as a single isomer after silica gel chromatography in 72% yield over three steps. This Matteson protocol seems to be more practical for construction of the C23–C26 diene than the Nozaki–Hiyama or Wittig reactions used by the Curran group, because it allows for mild reaction conditions and no use of chromium salt.

The resulting TBS ether 136 was deprotected with CSA as a catalyst to give a primary alcohol. The installation of the phosphonate group on the C19 of the alcohol was based on procedures previously established by the Curran group.\textsuperscript{24c} The crude alcohol was subjected to Parikh–Doering oxidation conditions (SO$_3$•pyr, DMSO and DIPEA) to give the aldehyde. Subsequent treatment of the crude aldehyde with lithium phosphonate provided a secondary alcohol, which was used for the next step without purification. Swern oxidation\textsuperscript{67} of the crude alcohol produced the ketophosphonate 99\textsuperscript{24c} via silica gel chromatography in four steps and 61% yield.
Overall, 8 g of the C18–C26 fragment 99 was synthesized in eight steps and in 37% overall yield starting from the common intermediate 132, via three chromatographic purification steps.

![Figure 44. Synthesis of the C18–C26 fragment 99](image)

### 3.6 SYNTHESIS OF THE C11′–C17 FRAGMENT 128

The C11′–C17 fragment 128 was synthesized on the basis of the methods used in the Curran group for the synthesis of dictyostatin 5,22b as shown in Figure 45. This began with the TBS protection of the secondary hydroxy group of the common intermediate 132 by using TBSOTf and 2,6-lutidine. The crude TBS ether was treated with a catalytic amount of CSA to provide the primary alcohol 137 in 67% yield over two steps. Next, the alcohol 137 was converted to a primary iodide by using PPh3, iodine and imidazole.68 The crude iodide was submitted to Myers alkylation conditions69 by using the chiral amide 138 to give an alkylated product, which was used for the next reaction without purification. The alkylated product was
reduced with BH$_3$•NH$_3$ and LDA to provide a primary alcohol 139 after silica gel chromatography in 78% yield over three steps.

The alcohol 139 was protected as a PMB ether by using trichloroimidate 24$^{20}$ in 70% yield, and the C13 TBS group was subsequently removed with TBAF to provide the secondary alcohol 128$^{70}$ in 63% yield. Overall, 13 g of the C11′–C17 fragment 128 was synthesized in eight steps and 23% overall yield, starting from the common intermediate 132, via four silica gel chromatographic purification.

![Chemical structures and reactions](image)

Figure 45. Synthesis of the C11′–C17 fragment 128

### 3.7 SYNTHESIS OF THE C1–C10′ FRAGMENT 127

The C1–C10′ fragment 127 was synthesized by Dr. G. Moura-Letts$^{71}$ (Figure 46). The Brown syn-crotylboration$^{38}$ of the aldehyde 41 gave an alcohol, which was protected to give the
TBS ether 140. The cross metathesis between the alkene 140 and the diene 141 was mediated by a fluorous Hoveyda–Grubbs II catalyst 142 to produce the C1–C9 dienoate 143. Removal of the TBS group of 143 with HF•pyr and then the Dess–Martin oxidation of the resulting primary alcohol provided the aldehyde 112, which was then submitted to Wipf reaction conditions (1-hexyne, Cp2Zr(H)Cl, Me2Zn, 133) to provide an inseparable mixture of two C9-epimers 127 and 145 in a 7:1 ratio favoring the desired alcohol 127 in 80% yield.

![Figure 46. Synthesis of the C1–C10′ fragment 127](image)
3.8 FRAGMENT COUPLINGS

3.8.1 Coupling of the C1–C10′ and C11′–C17 fragments

The silylketals (a mixture of 126 and 147) were synthesized by Dr. G. Moura-Letts.\textsuperscript{53} As shown in Figure 47, the C11′–C17 alcohol 128 was treated with BuLi then 8 equiv of dimethyldichlorosilane to produce the intermediate 146. The reaction mixture was concentrated and dried under vacuum to remove solvents and excess dimethyldichlorosilane. The dissolution of the residue in THF was followed by addition of imidazole and the C1–C10′ alcohols (a mixture of the C9-epimers 127 and 145) to provide an inseparable mixture of the silylketals (126 and 147) in 73% yield.

At this point, the validation of this RCM strategy for the large-scale synthesis was required prior to the scale-up of the synthesis of 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin. Henceforth, research on a ten-milligram scale synthesis of 6-\textit{epi}-dictyostatin was performed to validate the scalability of the new synthetic approach.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{silylketals_diagram}
\caption{Synthesis of the silylketals 126 and 147}
\end{figure}
3.8.2 RCM reactions of the silylketals

The silylketals (a mixture of 126 and 147, from Dr. G. Moura-Letts) were submitted to the RCM reaction conditions (at a 0.01 M concentration in toluene at 110 °C with 0.1 equiv of a Hoveyda-Grubbs II (H–G II) catalyst, Figure 48). These conditions gave an inseparable mixture of the RCM products 148 and 149 contaminated with impurities in 53% yield. In addition to the 8-membered disiloxanes (148 and 149), a mixture of a 11-membered disiloxane 150 and the recovered silylketals (29%) was isolated after silica gel chromatography. The 1H NMR spectrum of the pure fraction of the 11-membered disiloxane 150 showed the resonances from the C10′ butyl group and two alkenes, but no resonances from the characteristic H2–H4 and methyl group of the C1 ester. The geometry of the C5 alkene was not clear because the resonances of two C5 and C10 alkenes were overlapped in the spectrum. It was postulated that the 11-membered disiloxane 150 might originate from the metathesis reaction between the C11–C11′ and the C4–C5 alkenes (pathway (b) in Figure 48).

Figure 48. Two reaction pathways in the RCM reaction of the silylketals 126 and 147
Next, the C1–C10′ alcohol 151 possessing the terminal alkene at the C10 was selected to increase the preference for the metathesis of the C10–C10′ alkene over the C4–C5 because, in general, terminal olefins are more reactive than internal olefins toward the metathesis reaction mediated by Grubbs catalysts.75

The synthesis of the new C1–C10′ fragment 151 is summarized in Figure 49. The reaction of the aldehyde 112 with vinylmagnesium bromide and subsequent oxidation of the resulting alcohol gave a ketone. Next, a Corey–Bakshi–Shibata (CBS) reduction76 of the ketone provided an inseparable mixture of two C9-epimers 151 and 152 in a 5:1 ratio favoring the desired alcohol 151. The ratio of two epimers was determined by 1H NMR spectroscopic analysis. To this end, the ketone (not shown) was reduced with (R)-CBS or (S)-CBS independently to give two C9 epimers. The resonances of 1H NMR from the C9 proton were shown at δ 4.33 ppm for the epimer treated with (R)-CBS, and at δ 4.26 ppm for (S)-CBS. The 1H NMR spectrum of a mixture of two epimers (151 and 152) showed a major peak at δ 4.33 ppm and a minor one at δ 4.26 in a 5:1 ratio by integration. The assignment of the C9 configuration was based on Rychnovsky acetonide analysis.77 For this, the C7 TBS group of a mixture of two epimers (151 and 152) was removed with HCl to give diols, which was treated with 2,2-dimethoxypropane to provide a mixture of the acetonides 153 and 154 (Figure 50). The 13C NMR spectrum of the acetonide mixture showed two signals from two methyl groups of a major acetonide at δ 24.66 and 25.45 ppm (Figure 51). This indicated the anti-relationship of the C7 and C9 hydroxy groups of the major acetonide. In addition, the resonances from two methyl groups of a minor acetonide were at δ 19.95 and 30.38 ppm, which indicated the syn-relationship of the C7 and C9 hydroxy groups of the minor acetonide. In conclusion, the C9 configuration of
the major component of a mixture of the C9-epimers (151 and 152) was assigned as "S" (α or anti-diol).

Figure 49. Synthesis of the new C1–C10' fragment (151 and 152)

Figure 50. Synthesis of a mixture of the acetonides 153 and 154

Figure 51. Selected resonances of the acetonide mixture (153 and 154) on the $^{13}$C NMR spectrum
Next, the C1–C10' fragment (151 and 152) and the C11’–C17 fragment 128 were coupled to provide an inseparable mixture of the silylketals (155 and 156) in 85% yield by following the procedures used for the silylketal 126, as shown in Figure 52. The silylketal mixture (155 and 156) possessing terminal alkenes at both the C10 and C11 positions was treated with a Hoveyda-Grubbs II (H–G II) catalyst to provide the 8-membered disiloxanes (an inseparable mixture of 148 and 149). The RCM reaction of 0.28 g of the silylketal mixture (155 and 156) produced 0.17 g (69% yield) of the RCM products (148 and 149). In addition, with 2.23 g of the silylketal mixture, 1.23 g (57% yield) of the RCM products was obtained along with a mixture of the 11-membered disiloxane 150 and the recovered silylketals (0.21 g, 10% yield). The ratio of an inseparable mixture of the disiloxanes (148 and 149) could not be determined because the resonances from two epimers were overlapped in the $^1$H NMR spectrum.

![Figure 52](image_url)  
**Figure 52.** Synthesis of the 8-membered disiloxanes 148 and 149
3.8.3 Coupling of the C1–C17 and C18–C26 fragments

As summarized in Figure 53, a mixture of the disiloxanes (148 and 149) was treated with dichloroacetic acid to provide the desired diol 157 (more polar, C9S only) in 65% yield after careful silica gel chromatography. In addition, the C9R-isomer 158 originating from the CBS reduction was isolated in 10% yield. The diol 157 was protected with TBSOTf to give the TBS ether 159 (0.73 g, 85% yield). The TBS ether 159 was treated with DDQ to produce the alcohol 160 (70% yield), which was oxidized to the aldehyde 125 (Figure 40) by using the Dess–Martin periodinane. The crude aldehyde 125 (0.42 g) was coupled with the phosphonate 99 (0.35 g) by using Ba(OH)$_2$ to provide the enone 161 possessing the full C1–C26 carbon skeleton of 6-epi-dictyostatin (0.51 g, 89% yield over two steps).

![Chemical structures](image_url)

**Figure 53.** Construction of the full C1–C26 carbon skeleton
3.9 COMPLETION OF THE SYNTHESIS

3.9.1 Selective reduction reactions of the C17–C19 region

Prior to the reduction of the C17–C18 alkene of the enone 161, a model study on regioselective reduction of an enone in the presence of a dienoate was performed (Figure 54). A mixture of the dienoate 58 and the enone 162 was treated with a Stryker reagent ([Ph₃PCuH]₆), which selectively reduced the enone 162 to the ketone 163 without reduction of the dienoate 58. Then, as summarized in Figure 55, the C17–C18 olefin of the enone 161 was selectively reduced under Stryker reduction conditions to provide the ketone 164 (0.39 g, 78% yield).

**Figure 54.** Model study on the selective reduction of the enone

**Figure 55.** Regioselective reduction of the C17–C18 olefin of the enone 164
Next, a model study on the reduction of the C19 ketone was performed (Figure 56). A mixture of the dienoate 58 and the ketone 163 was treated with LiAlH(Ot-Bu)3 to give a mixture of the C2–C3 saturated ester 165 and the alcohol 166. This suggests that treatment of the ketone 164 possessing the C1–C5 dienoate with LiAlH(Ot-Bu)3 may reduce the C2 alkene.

![Chemical structures](image)

**Figure 56.** Model study on the selective reduction of the ketone

At this time, we attempted the Shapiro reduction conditions (NaBH4 and Et2BOMe)31 used for the reduction of the C19 ketone of 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9.24d To this end, the C21 PMB group of the ketone 164 was removed with DDQ to provide the β-hydroxyketone (not shown, 0.23g, 87% yield, Figure 57). The β-hydroxyketone was then treated with NaBH4 and Et2BOMe to produce the diol 167 (0.20 g, 87% yield) without reduction of the C1–C5 dienoate region. The selectivity of the C19 reduction was measured by comparison of 1H NMR spectrum of a C19 mixture (not shown), which was synthesized from reduction of the β-hydroxyketone with NaBH4. The resonances from the C21 protons of the C19 mixture were shown at δ 3.68 (minor) and 3.47 (major) ppm in a 1:2 ratio by integration. The signal from the C21 proton of the diol 167 was shown at δ 3.47 ppm without observable signal at δ 3.68 ppm.
The C19 configuration of the diol 167 was assigned by analog to 16-normethyl-15,16-dehydrodictyostatin 9.24d

![Chemical structure](image)

**Figure 57.** Diastereoselective reduction of the C19 ketone 164

### 3.9.2 Completion of the synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101

As shown in Figure 58, the C19 hydroxy group of the diol 167 was selectively protected with TBSOTf and 2,6-lutidine in the presence of the C21 hydroxy group to provide the alcohol 168 (0.19g, 85% yield).78 In turn, the C1 methyl ester of 168 was hydrolyzed by using KOH to produce a seco-acid 169, which was used for the next reaction without further purification.

Next, the crude seco-acid 169 was submitted to the macrolactonization conditions by using a Yamaguchi reagent (2,4,6-trichlorobenzoyl chloride), Et₃N and DMAP.54 This gave a mixture of the C2 E/Z-isomers of the macrolactone, as shown in Table 6. In toluene, the use of 5 equiv of DMAP at room temperature gave a 1:1.5 ratio (C2 E/Z), and 0.1 equiv of DMAP at 80°C gave a 1:5 ratio (C2 E/Z). Next, solvents were screened. THF gave a 1:1 ratio (C2 E/Z), and dichloromethane gave a >10:1 ratio (C2 E/Z). The ratios were determined by integration of resonances from H3’s on the ¹H NMR spectra (Figure 59). Their C2 geometries were confirmed
by the coupling constants of the H2–H3 ($J = 12.0$ Hz for Z-isomer and $15.6$ Hz for E-isomer) in the $^1$H NMR spectra.

Next, we used a Shiina reagent (2,6-methylnitrobenzoyl anhydride) $^{79}$ for macrolactonization. The reaction of the seco-acid 169 with the Shiina reagent, Et$_3$N and DMAP in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ gave a >10:1 ratio (C2 $E/Z$). In contrast, use of toluene preferentially produced the C2 Z-isomer of the macrolactone (1:13, $E/Z$). The $^1$H NMR spectra of the TBS-protected macrolactones produced by using Yamaguchi or Shiina reagents, are compared as shown in Figure 60. This macrolactone was contaminated with impurities after silica gel chromatography and used for the next reaction without further purification.

Figure 58. Completion of the synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101
Table 6. Macrolactonization of the seco-acid 169

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reagent</th>
<th>DMAP (equiv)</th>
<th>solvent</th>
<th>E/Z ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>1:1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CH₂Cl₂</td>
<td>&gt; 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CH₂Cl₂</td>
<td>&gt; 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>toluene</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 59. Comparison of ¹H NMR spectra of the TBS-protected macrolactones

(a) with Yamaguchi reagent (C2 E/Z mixture)

(b) with Shiina reagent (C2 E/Z, 1:13)

The four TBS groups of the macrolactone was removed by using about 30 equiv of HCl to produce 33 mg of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101 as a white powder and in 45% yield, starting from 0.14 g of the ester 168. This newly synthesized 6-epi-dictyostatin was identical in all respects with ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectroscopic data provided for the previously synthesized one.²⁴c
3.10 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A convergent total synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin was achieved to produce 33 mg of the material for a biological evaluation. A common intermediate 132 was used to efficiently construct the C11′–C17 and C18–C26 fragments. However, more selective methods for installing the C9 stereocenter is still needed.

Three advanced fragments for 6-epi-dictyostatin, each of which possesses a full carbon skeleton, were coupled via a silicon-tethered RCM reaction and a HWE reaction. The optimization of the RCM reaction is still needed. Improved and reproducible methods for diastereoselective reduction of the C19 ketone, macrolactonization, and global deprotection were developed. This synthesis proceeded in totally 43 steps (longest linear sequence, 26 steps, Scheme 2), which is more efficient than that of dictyostatin by the Curran group (the number of the total steps is 52 and the longest linear sequence is 34). The overall yield is 0.04% starting from the (S)-Roche ester and 5% from the fragment coupling.
Scheme 2. Summary of the synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101

Synthesis of the C1–C10' fragment

1) (-)-(ipc)₂-B-Z-crotyl, 61%
2) TBSCI, imid, 91%
3) cross metathesis, 59%

Synthesis of the C11'–C17 fragment

1) TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine
2) CSA, 67%, two steps
3) cross metathesis, 59%
4) Myers alkylation
5) PMBOC=NHCCl₃, PPTS, 70%
6) TBAF, 63%

Synthesis of the C18–C26 fragment

1) TBSCI, imid, DMAP
2) MeON(Me)H, i-PrMgCl
3) DIBAL-H
4) Roush crotylation, 58%, four steps

1) PMBBr, NaH, 84%
2) O₃; Me₂S
3) Matteson reagent
4) NaH

Synthesis of the C11'–C17 fragment

1) CSA
2) SO₃-pyr, DMSO, DIPEA
3) CH₃P(O)(OMe)₂, BuLi
4) (COCl)₂, DMSO, DIPEA

1) (+)-B-Z-crotyl, 61%
2) TBSCI, imid, 91%
3) cross metathesis, 59%
4) (+)-(ipc)₂-B-Z-crotyl, 61%
5) TBSCI, imid, 91%
6) cross metathesis, 59%
7) Roush crotylation, 58%, four steps
8) Myers alkylation
9) PMBOC=NHCCl₃, PPTS, 70%
10) TBAF, 63%

17% overall yield

21% overall yield
Scheme 2. Summary of the synthesis of 6-epi-dictyostatin 101 (continued)

Fragment couplings and completion of the synthesis:

1. **CO2Me**

   1) **128**, BuLi Me2SiCl2

   2) **imid**, 85%

   **C9S, α: 151**
   **C9R, β: 152**
   (151/152, 5:1)

2. **OH**

   1) **TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine**, 85%

   2) **DDQ**, 70%

   **157**

3. **CO2Me**

   1) **H-G II**, 57–69%

   2) **ClCHCO2H**, 65% for **157**

   **157**

4. **OH**

   1) **TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine**, 85%

   2) **DDQ**, 70%

   **160**

5. **OH**

   1) **Dess-Martin**

   2) **99, Ba(OH)2**, 89%, two steps

   **161**

6. **[Ph3PCuH]6, 78%**

   2) **DDQ, 87%**

   3) **Et2BOMe, NaBH4**, 87%

   **167**

7. **OH**

   1) **TBSOTf, 2,6-lutidine, 85%**

   2) **KOH**

   **169**

8. **OH**

   1) **2,6-((O2N)MePhCO)2O, DMAP, Et3N**

   2) **HCl**, 45% from **168**

   **101**

From the fragment coupling: 5% yield

Overall: 0.04% yield
4.0 EXPERIMENTAL

4.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

All reactions were run under argon unless otherwise noted. Toluene, THF, dichloromethane, and diethyl ether were purified by filtration through an activated alumina under a nitrogen atmosphere. Other reagents were used as they were received from Aldrich. 4 Å Molecular sieves were flame-dried for at least 30 min before use. All new compounds were fully characterized by $^1$H NMR, $^{13}$C NMR, IR, optical rotation, and mass spectrometry. $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Avance DPX 300 (300 MHz), Avance DRX 500 (500 MHz) and Avance 600 (600 MHz) spectrometers. Chemical shifts were reported in ppm. CDCl$_3$ was used as the NMR solvent unless otherwise noted. In reporting spectral data, the following abbreviations were used: s = singlet, d = doublet, t = triplet, q = quartet, m = multiplet. Coupling constants were measured in Hertz (Hz). Infrared spectra were taken on a Mattson Genesis Series FTIR using thin film deposition on NaCl plates unless otherwise noted. Peaks are reported in wavenumbers (cm$^{-1}$). Low and high resolution mass spectra were obtained on Waters LC/Q-Tof and reported in $m/z$ units. High resolution mass spectra were obtained on a VG Autospec double focusing instrument and are reported in units of $m/z$. Optical rotations are measured on a Perkin-Elmer 241 polarimeter at the Na D-line ($\lambda$= 589 nm) using a 1 dm cell at 20 °C. HPLC analyses
were conducted by using Waters 600 controller and Waters 2487 dual λ absorbance detector or polymer laboratory PL-ELS 1000 detector controlled with the Millennium™ program. Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on silica gel 60 F$_{254}$ glass backed plates with a layer thickness of 0.25 mm manufactured by E.Merck. TLC visualization was performed by illumination with a 254 nm UV lamp or by staining with phosphomolybdic acid in ethanol (50 mg/mL) and subsequent heating. Silica gel chromatography was performed on silica gel (230–400 mesh ASTM) purchased from Sorbtech or Bodman.

### 4.2 PROCEDURES AND DATA

![Structural formula of (S)-Methyl 3-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-2-methylpropanoate (25)](attachment:structural_formula.png)

(S)-Methyl 3-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-2-methylpropanoate (25):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 10c, (S)-Roche ester 23 (12.9 g, 0.11 mol) was protected with trichloroimidate (37.1 g, 0.13 mol) to give the title PMB-ether (22.8 g, 87% yield).

![Structural formula of (R)-3-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-2-methylpropan-1-ol (61)](attachment:structural_formula.png)

(R)-3-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-2-methylpropan-1-ol (61):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 17, the PMB ether 25 (22.8 g, 0.10 mol) was reduced with LiBH$_4$ (2.0 M in THF, 138 mL, 0.27 mol) to give the title alcohol (20.12 g, 100% yield).
**(R)-4-Benzyl-3-((2R,3S,4S)-3-hydroxy-5-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-2,4-dimethylpentanoyl)oxazolidin-2-one (27):**

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 10c, the alcohol 61 (6.3 g, 30.0 mmol) was oxidized with (COCl)₂ (4.1 mL, 48.0 mmol), DMSO (6.8 mL, 96.0 mmol) and Et₃N (27.2 mL, 195.0 mmol) to give the corresponding aldehyde (6.54 g). Next, the aldehyde was reacted with the oxazolidinone 26 (6.54 g, 58.5 mmol), Bu₂BOTf (1.0 M in CH₂Cl₂, 28.5 mL, 28.5 mmol) and Et₃N (7.1 mL, 51.0 mmol) to give the title compound (11.75 g, 89% yield for two steps).

**(2R,3S,4S)-3-Hydroxy-N-methoxy-5-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-N,2,4-trimethylpentanamide (28):**

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 10c, the aldol product 27 (5.45 g, 12.34 mmol) was reacted with AlMe₃ (2.0 M in hexane, 18.5 mL, 37.03 mmol) and N,O-dimethylhydroxylamine hydrochloride (3.61 g, 37.03 mmol) to give the title amide (3.84 g, 96% yield).
(5R,6S,7S)-8-(4-Methoxybenzyl)oxy)-1-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-6-hydroxy-5,7-
dimethyldec-4-one (30):

A 1.7 M solution of tert-BuLi in pentane (35.6 mL, 60.54 mmol) was added to a solution of tert-butyl(3-iodopropoxy)dimethylsile (29) (8.53 g, 28.38 mmol) in diethyl ether (240 mL) at
–78 °C dropwise over 30 min. After 15 min, a solution of the Weinreb amide 28 (3.08 g, 9.46 mmol) in diethyl ether (20 mL) was added to the above solution dropwise over 15 min. The mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 1 h and at –40 °C for 2.5 h. After quenching at –40 °C by addition of a sat. aq. NH₄Cl (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/diethyl ether) provided the title compound (3.48 g, 84%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3480, 2955, 2930, 2856, 1705, 1613, 1249, 1094, 835 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.26 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 4.43 (s, 2H), 3.89 (dd, J = 8.4, 3.3 Hz, 1H), 3.79 (s, 3H), 3.60 (t, J = 6.1 Hz, 3H), 3.55 (m, 2H), 2.64 (m, 1H), 2.60 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 1.91 (m, 1H), 1.82 (q, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 1.13 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.90 (d, J = 4.5 Hz, 3H), 0.88 (s, 9H), 0.03 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 214.6, 159.5, 130.3, 129.6, 114.1, 75.3, 74.5, 73.4, 62.4, 55.5, 49.0, 37.5, 36.2, 27.0 26.2, 18.5, 14.2, 9.4, –5.0; LRMS (ESI) 461 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₄H₄₂O₅SiNa 461.2699, found 461.2671; [α]²⁰D +22.5 (c 0.08, CHCl₃).
(2S,3S,4S,5R)-1-(4-Methoxybenzyl)oxy)-8-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,4-dimethyloctane-3,5-diol (31):

A solution of the ketone 30 (3.48 g, 7.93 mmol) in THF (79 mL) and MeOH (20 mL) at –78 °C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of Et₂BOMe in THF (12.7 mL, 12.69 mmol) dropwise over 10 min. After 30 min, NaBH₄ (0.36 g, 9.52 mmol) was added in three portions over 10 min. The mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 7 h, and quenched by the dropwise addition of acetic acid (7 mL). Water (80 mL) was added and the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with NaOH (1.0 M, 100 mL), dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The residue was taken up in a 1.0 M solution of NaOAc in MeOH (360 mL) and H₂O (40 mL), then 30% H₂O₂ (30 mL) was added. After stirring at ambient temperature for 1 h, the mixture was concentrated, then diluted with H₂O (50 mL) and extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (4 × 50 mL), dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (1:1 hexanes/diethyl ether) provided the title compound (2.95 g, 85%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3440, 2953, 2930, 2856, 1513, 1463, 1249, 1096, 835 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.25 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 4.46 (s, 2H), 4.41 (s, 1H), 4.06 (s, 1H), 3.84 (m, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.71–3.64 (m, 3H), 3.57 (dd, J = 4.6, 9.1 Hz, 1H), 3.48 (t, J = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 1.99 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.53 (m, 5H), 0.91 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.89 (s, 9H), 0.77 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.05 (s, 6H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.6, 130.1, 129.5, 114.1, 81.9, 76.8, 76.0, 73.4, 63.6, 55.4, 38.5, 36.3, 32.1, 29.9, 26.2, 18.5, 13.5, 4.6, –5.0; LRMS (ESI) 463 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₄H₄₄O₅SiNa 463.2856, found 463.2851; [α]²⁰_D +17.7 (c 0.18, CHCl₃).
(2S,3R)-6-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2-((2S,4S,5S)-2-(4-methoxyphenyl)-5-methyl-1,3-dioxan-4-yl)hexan-3-ol (33):

A solution of the diol 31 (3.48 g, 7.93 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (136 mL) was treated with 4 Å molecular sieves (3.00 g) at room temperature. After stirring for 20 min, the mixture was cooled to 0 °C and DDQ (3.09 g, 13.62 mmol) was added in three portions over 3 min. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1.5 h and warmed to ambient temperature over 30 min, then filtered through Celite. Sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (100 mL) was added and the mixture was extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (2 × 100 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (2 × 100 mL), dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (5:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (3.47 g, 60%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3535, 2954, 2855, 1518, 1251, 1100, 834 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.37 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.98 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 5.50 (s, 1H), 4.12 (dd, $J = 4.7$, 11.2 Hz, 1H), 3.87 (m, 1H), 3.79 (s, 3H), 3.69 (dd, $J = 2.1$, 9.9, 2H), 3.65 (m, 1H), 3.52 (t, $J = 11.1$ Hz, 1H), 3.24 (s, 1H), 2.12 (m, 1H), 1.80 (tq, $J = 1.8$, 7.1 Hz, 1H), 1.67–1.49 (m, 4H), 0.90 (s, 9H), 0.77 (d, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 3H), 0.06 (s, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 160.0, 131.1, 127.5, 113.9, 101.4, 88.7, 76.2, 73.4, 63.5, 55.5, 37.8, 31.6, 30.7, 29.7, 26.2, 18.6, 12.2, 6.3, –4.9; LRMS (ESI) 461 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{24}$H$_{42}$O$_5$SiNa 461.2699, found 461.2673; $[\alpha]_{D}^{20} +38.6 (c 0.15, CHCl$_3$).
(2S,4S,5S)-4-((2R,3R)-3,6-Bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)hexan-2-yl)-2-(4-methoxyphenyl)-5-methyl-1,3-dioxane (34):

A solution of the alcohol 33 (3.47 g, 7.91 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (2.80 mL, 23.73 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (79 mL) at −78 °C was treated with TBSOTf (2.40 mL, 10.28 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h and warmed to 0 °C over 30 min. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (4.32 g, 99%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2954, 2929, 2856, 1518, 1462, 1251, 1038, 835, 774 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.40 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.90 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 5.43 (s, 1H), 4.11 (dd, J = 4.6, 11.1 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.74 (m, 1H), 3.69 (dd, J = 1.4, 10.1, 2H), 3.60 (m, 1H), 3.51 (t, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 3.24 (s, 1H), 2.05 (m, 1H), 1.80 (dqn, J = 1.2, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 1.60 (m, 4H), 1.03 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.92 (s, 9H), 0.90 (s, 9H), 0.76 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H), 0.06 (d, J = 2.7 Hz, 6H), 0.04 (d, J = 1.6 Hz, 6H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.8, 131.7, 127.3, 113.5, 100.7, 81.9, 74.4, 73.4, 63.6, 55.3, 38.8, 30.8, 29.8, 28.3, 26.1, 18.4, 18.2, 12.4, 10.7, −4.1 −4.2, −5.1 −5.2; LRMS (ESI) 575 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₀H₆₆O₅Si₂Na 575.3564, found 575.3616; [α]₀⁺D +26.2 (c 0.16, CHCl₃).
(2S,3S,4R,5R)-3-(4-Methoxybenzoyloxy)-5,8-bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,4-dimethyloctan-1-ol (35):

A solution of the PMB acetal 34 (3.70 g, 6.69 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (33 mL) at –78 ºC was treated with a 1.0 M solution of diisobutylaluminum hydride in hexane (66.9 mL, 66.9 mmol) dropwise over 30 min, and the reaction mixture was stirred at –45 ºC for 12 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. potassium sodium tartrate (130 mL), the mixture was stirred at ambient temperature for 1 h, extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (3 × 50 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.49 g, 41%) as a colorless oil and the more polar diol 36 (1.57 g, 55%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3434, 2954, 2929, 2856, 1514, 1250, 1036, 835, 773 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$7.28 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 4.52 (s, 2H), 3.82 (dd, $J = 3.4$, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.68 (m, 1H), 3.61–3.56 (m, 3H), 3.47 (dd, $J = 4.7$, 6.3 Hz, 1H), 2.65 (s, 1H), 1.95 (m, 1H), 1.88 (m, 1H), 1.59 (m, 2H), 1.48 (m, 2H), 1.11 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H), 1.02 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 0.91 (s, 9H), 0.90 (s, 9H), 0.08 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$159.5, 130.8, 129.5, 114.1, 86.0, 75.4, 73.6, 65.6, 63.4, 55.5, 40.9, 37.4, 31.1, 28.9, 26.2, 18.5, 18.4, 15.9, 10.4, –3.5, –4.1, –5.0; LRMS (ESI) 577 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{30}$H$_{58}$O$_5$Si$_2$Na 557.3721, found 557.3687; [$\alpha$]$^{20}_D$ +3.5 (c 0.17, CHCl$_3$).

**Conversion of the diol 36 to the title compound 35.** A solution of the diol 36 (1.57 g, 3.68 mmol) and imidazole (0.38, 5.52 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (37 mL) was treated with a solution of
TBSCI (0.57 g, 0.57 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (18 mL) at –78 °C. The reaction mixture was warmed to 0 °C over 3 h, then additional imidazole (0.38, 5.52 mmol) and TBSCI (0.57 g, 0.57 mmol) were added. The mixture was stirred at –25 °C for 2 h and at ambient temperature for 1.5 h. After concentration in vacuum, purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the TBS ether (1.09 g, 55%). The $^1$H NMR spectrum of this product was consistent with the title compound 35.

1-(((5S,6S,7R,8R,Z)-8,11-bis(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-5,7-dimethylundeca-1,3-dien-6-yloxy)methyl)-4-methoxybenzene (37):

A solution of the alcohol 35 (2.10 g, 3.78 mmol) and triethylamine (1.60 mL, 11.34 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (8 mL) and DMSO (6 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of SO$_3$•pyr (1.50 g, 9.45 mmol) in DMSO (9.5 mL) dropwise over 10 min. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of H$_2$O (80 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. The aldehyde as a colorless oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification.

A suspension of CrCl$_2$ (5.11 g, 41.58 mmol) in THF (42 mL) at ambient temperature was treated with a solution of the aldehyde and 1-bromoallyltrimethylsilane 13 (4.38 g, 22.68 mmol) in THF (19 mL) via cannula, and the mixture was stirred for 17 h. After quenching by addition of pH 7 phosphate buffer (250 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 150 mL). The
combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The alcohol as a pale blue oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification.

A solution of the alcohol in THF (95 mL) at 0 °C was treated with NaH (95 wt. %, 1.91 g, 75.60 mmol) in three portions over 3 min. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 15 min and at ambient temperature for 1 h. After quenching by addition of water (100 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 100 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.85 g, 85% for three steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2929, 2856, 1514, 1249, 1085, 773 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.29 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.61 (dt, J = 10.6, 16.6 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (t, J = 10.7 Hz, 1H), 5.21 (d, J = 16.9 Hz, 1H), 5.12 (d, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 4.57 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.50 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.65 (m, 1H), 3.53 (dt, J = 1.7, 6.2 Hz, 2H), 3.34 (dd, J = 3.4, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 2.98 (m, 1H), 1.67 (m, 1H), 1.52 (m, 2H), 1.36 (m, 2H), 1.11 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.97 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.92 (s, 9H), 0.88 (s, 9H), 0.08 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 6H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.3, 134.9, 132.6, 131.7, 129.4, 129.2, 117.5, 113.9, 84.5, 75.2, 72.8, 63.4, 55.5, 40.8, 35.6, 31.5, 28.9, 26.3, 26.2, 19.0, 18.5, 18.4, 9.5, –3.4, –4.2, –4.9; LRMS (ESI) 599 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₃H₆₀O₄Si₂Na 599.3928, found 599.3958; [α]²⁰D +2.2 (c 0.10, CHCl₃).
(4R,5R,6S,7S,Z)-6-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-4-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-5,7-dimethylundeca-8,10-dien-1-ol (38):

A solution of the TBS ether 37 (3.70 g, 6.69 mmol) in THF (34 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of HF•pyr in pyr/THF (78 mL, prepared by slow addition of HF•pyr (6 mL) to a solution of pyridine (24 mL) and THF (48 mL)) dropwise, and the reaction mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 1 h and at ambient temperature for 5 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (150 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (4 × 80 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. CuSO₄ (3 × 50 mL), brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.20 g, 75%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3366, 2954, 2929, 1514, 1249, 1038, 835 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.86 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.60 (dt, J = 10.3, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.56 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.21 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.11 (d, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 4.57 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 4.46 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.66 (m, 1H), 3.55 (t, J = 6.4 Hz, 2H), 3.33 (dd, J = 3.9, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 2.99 (m, 1H), 1.71 (m, 1H), 1.50 (m, 2H), 1.41 (m, 2H), 1.09 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.96 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.91 (s, 9H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.06 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.3, 135.1, 132.7, 131.6, 129.4, 129.2, 117.6, 113.9, 84.2, 75.1, 72.7, 63.2, 55.5, 40.7, 35.6, 31.4, 28.8, 26.2, 19.0, 18.4, 9.8, −3.4, −4.1; LRMS (ESI) 485 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₇H₄₆O₄SiNa 485.3063, found 485.3071; [α]₂⁰ D +38.6 (c 0.07, CHCl₃).
((4R,5R,6S,7S,Z)-6-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-1-iodo-5,7-dimethylundeca-8,10-dien-4-yloxy)(tert-butyl)dimethylsilane (39):

A solution of the alcohol 38 (1.10 g, 2.38 mmol) in benzene (15 mL) and diethyl ether (30 mL) at ambient temperature was treated with triphenylphosphine (0.93 g, 3.56 mmol) and imidazole (0.24 g, 3.56 mmol). Then, iodine (0.90 g, 3.56 mmol) was added to the vigorously stirred mixture portionwise over 10 min. After 30 min, the mixture was diluted with EtOAc (50 mL), quenched with sat. aq. Na₂S₂O₃ (50 mL), and extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. Na₂S₂O₃, brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (19:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.26 g, 93%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2928, 1514, 1249, 835 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.30 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.60 (dt, J = 10.4, 16.9 Hz, 1H), 6.04 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.16 (d, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 4.60 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.51 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.67 (m, 1H), 3.36 (dd, J = 3.6, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 3.11 (t, J = 6.3 Hz, 2H), 2.99 (m, 1H), 1.66 (m, 3H), 1.58 (m, 2H), 1.12 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.99 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (s, 9H), 0.01 (s, 6H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.3, 134.9, 132.5, 131.5, 129.4, 129.3, 117.9, 114.0, 84.1, 75.1, 71.9, 55.5, 40.9, 35.8, 35.6, 29.6, 26.2, 19.0, 18.4, 9.8, 7.4, −3.4, −4.1; LRMS (EI) 515 [M − tert-Bu]⁺; HRMS (EI) calcd. for C₂₃H₃₆IO₃Si 515.147851, found 515.14812; [α]²⁰_D +24.6 (c 0.15, CHCl₃).
A solution of the iodide 39 (1.26 g, 2.20 mmol) in benzene (8 mL) at ambient temperature was treated with triphenylphosphine (2.97 g, 11.0 mmol). The mixture was heated at 80 °C for 16 h in the dark. After concentration under vacuum, purification by column chromatography (19:1 CH$_2$Cl$_2$/MeOH) provided the title compound (1.42 g, 78%) as a white solid: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2928, 2855, 1513, 1438, 1248, 1112 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.86–7.73 (m, 15H), 7.29 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 2H), 6.87 (d, $J = 8.3$ Hz, 2H), 6.59 (dt, $J = 10.6$, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.91 (t, $J = 10.9$ Hz, 1H), 5.60 (t, $J = 10.4$ Hz, 1H), 5.06 (d, $J = 15.8$ Hz, 1H), 5.01 (d, $J = 9.4$ Hz, 1H), 4.64 (d, $J = 11.0$ Hz, 1H), 4.47 (d, $J = 11.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.68 (dd, $J = 7.2$, 12.2 Hz, 1H), 3.59 (q, $J = 5.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.47 (t, $J = 5.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.39 (dd, $J = 7.2$, 12.5 Hz, 1H), 2.95 (m, 1H), 1.96 (m, 1H), 1.77 (m, 1H), 1.58 (m, 3H), 1.03 (d, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 3H), 0.93 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H), 0.83 (s, 9H), 0.04 (s, 3H), –0.04 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 159.1, 135.8, 135.5, 135.4, 133.9, 133.8, 132.6, 131.8, 130.9, 130.7, 129.4, 128.9, 128.5, 118.8, 117.7, 117.5, 113.9, 83.4, 74.6, 72.6, 55.6, 40.5, 36.0, 35.6, 35.4, 26.2, 23.9, 23.3, 18.7, 18.5, 18.3, 10.2, –3.5, –4.1; LRMS (ESI) 707 [M]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{45}$H$_{60}$O$_3$PSi 707.4049, found 707.4058; $[\alpha]^{20}_D +23.3$ (c 2.7, CHCl$_3$).
3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)propanal (41):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 51, propandiol (4.5 mL, 61.0 mmol) was protected with TBSCl (9.5 g, 61.0 mmol), NaH (95 wt. %, 1.7 g, 67.1 mol) to give the crude alcohol (11.9 g). The alcohol was oxidized with TEMPO (95 mg, 0.61 mmol), KBr (15.0 g, 41.2 mmol), KHCO₃ (67.0 g) and bleach (6.15% in H₂O, 99.0 g) to give the title aldehyde (8.68 g, 76% yield, two steps).

(3S,4R)-1-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-4-methylhex-5-en-3-ol (42):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 22b, the aldehyde 41 (5.13 g, 27.1 mmol) was reacted with K(Ot-Bu) (4.20 g, 37.4 mmol), trans-2-butene (6.7 mL, 74.2 mmol), (+)-(ipc)₂-B-OMe (12.0 g, 37.9 mmol), BF₃•OEt (5.1 mL, 40.0 mmol), BuLi (1.6 M in hexane, 25.0 mL, 40.0 mL) to give the title alcohol (4.6 g, 69% yield).

(S)-5-((R)-But-3-en-2-yl)-2,2,3,3,9,9,10,10-octamethyl-4,8-dioxa-3,9-disilaundecane (43):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 22b, the alcohol 42 (9.0 g, 36.8 mmol) was protected with TBSCl (7.5 g, 47.9 mmol), imidazole (5.1 g, 73.6 mmol), DMAP (0.5 g, 3.7 mmol) to give the title TBS ether (12.5 g, 95% yield).
(4R,5S,E)-Ethyl 5,7-bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-4-methylhept-2-enoate (44):

Following the procedure for the same compound in references 22b, the alkene 43 (24.5 g, 68.4 mmol) was oxidatively cleaved with OsO₄ (2.5 wt. % in t-BuOH, 27.8 mL, 2.7 mmol), NMO (17.6 g, 150.5 mmol) and NaIO₄ (17.5 g, 82.1 mmol) to give the crude aldehyde (22.8 g). The aldehyde (22.8 g) was reacted with ethyl 2-(diethoxyphosphoryl)acetate (72.1 g, 355.9 mmol), and NaH (95 wt. %, 7.19 g, 284.8 mmol) to give the ester (23.8 g, 78% yield).

(3S,4R,E)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-4-methyl-7-(trityloxy)hept-5-en-1-ol (46):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 22b, the ester 44 (15.8 g, 36.7 mmol) was reduced with DIBAL-H (1.0 M in hexane, 80.7 mL, 80.7 mmol) to give the crude alcohol (14.5 g). Next, the alcohol was protected with TrCl (11.5 g, 40.4 mmol) and DMAP (3.7 mmol, 0.5 g) to give the crude ether 45 (23.0 g). Next, the crude ether 45 was deprotected with HF•pyr in pyridine/THF(630 mL, made with HF•pyr (60%, 42 mL), pyridine (168 mL) and THF (420 mL)) to give the title alcohol (8.1 g, 45% yield, three steps from the ester 44).
(3S,4R,E)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-4-methyl-7-(trityloxy)hept-5-enal (47):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 22b, the alcohol 46 (7.5 g, 14.5 mmol) was oxidized with SO$_3$•pyr (9.4 g, 58.0 mmol), DMSO (20.6 mL, 290.0 mmol), Et$_3$N (14.2 mL, 101.5 mmol) to give the title aldehyde (6.5 g, 87% yield).

(3S,4R,E)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-N-methoxy-N,4-dimethyl-7-(trityloxy)hept-5-enamide (18):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 22b, the aldehyde 47 (6.5 g, 13.3 mmol) was oxidized with NaClO$_2$ (4.5 g, 39.9 mmol), NaH$_2$PO$_4$•H$_2$O (5.5 g, 39.9 mmol), 2-methyl-2-butene (2 M in THF, 66.6 mL, 133.0 mmol) to give the crude carboxylic acid (7.5 g). The carboxylic acid was coupled with $N,O$-dimethylhydroxylamine hydrochloride (1.6 g, 15.9 mmol) by using DCC (3.3 g, 15.9 mmol), DMAP (0.2 g, 1.3 mmol) and Et$_3$N (2.8 mL, 19.9 mmol) to give the Weinreb amide (5.5 g, 75% yield).

(3S,4R,E)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-7-hydroxy-N-methoxy-N,4-dimethylhept-5-enamide (56):

A solution of the trityl ether 18 (5.00 g, 8.71 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (87 mL) at −5 °C was treated with a solution of ZnBr$_2$ (9.80 g, 43.51 mmol) in MeOH (12 mL) and CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (65 mL)
dropwise over 30 min. The reaction mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 1 h and at ambient temperature for 1 h. The mixture was cooled to –10 °C, and solid ZnBr₂ (14.70 g, 65.28 mmol) was added portionwise over 5 min. The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (1:2 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (2.63 g, 91%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3422, 2956, 2929, 2894, 1638, 1077, 836 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 5.67–5.62 (m, 2H), 4.22 (ddd, J = 3.3, 5.2, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 4.10–4.06 (m, 2H), 3.66 (s, 3H), 3.14 (s, 3H), 2.59 (m, 1H), 2.43–2.28 (m, 3H), 1.04 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.85 (s, 9H), 0.06 (s, 3H), 0.00 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 172.9, 134.0, 130.3, 72.7, 63.8, 61.5, 42.4, 36.2, 32.3, 26.1, 18.3, 15.3, –4.3, –4.6; LRMS (ESI) 354 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₁₆H₃₃NO₄SiNa 354.2077, found 354.2069; [α]²⁰_D +20.0 (c 0.18, CHCl₃).

(2Z,4E,6R,7S)-Methyl 7-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-9-(methoxy(methyl)amino)-6-methyl-9-oxonona-2,4-dienoate (22):

A solution of the alcohol 56 (3.85 g, 11.60 mmol) and diisopropylethylamine (5.75 mL, 34.80 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (116 mL) and DMSO (23 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of SO₃•pyr (5.54 g, 34.80 mmol) in DMSO (35 mL) dropwise over 15 min, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of brine at 0 °C, the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (2 × 100 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. CuSO₄ (2 × 100 mL) and brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The aldehyde as a pale
yellow oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 9.55 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 6.90 (dd, $J = 7.9$, 15.8 Hz, 1H), 6.11 (ddd, $J = 1.0$, 7.8, 15.7 Hz, 1H), 4.33 (dt, $J = 3.0$, 6.4 Hz, 1H), 3.65 (s, 3H), 3.16 (s, 3H), 2.75–2.58 (m 2H), 2.38 (dd, $J = 6.3$, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 1.18 (d, $J = 6.8$ Hz, 3H), 0.90 (s, 9H), 0.13 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 193.8, 171.8, 159.4, 133.5, 72.0, 61.4, 60.3, 42.9, 37.5, 32.1, 26.0, 18.2, 15.8, –4.3, –4.7.

A mixture of bis(2,2,2-trifluoroethyl) (methoxycarbonylmethyl)phosphate 14 (2.75 mL, 12.32 mmol) and 18-crown-6 (14.80 g, 60.00 mol) in THF (112 mL) at –78 °C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of sodium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide in THF (13.40 mL, 13.40 mmol) dropwise over 13 min. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 45 min, cooled to –78 °C. A solution of the crude aldehyde in THF (24 mL) was added dropwise over 20 min and the mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 3 h and at –40 °C for 10 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NH$_4$Cl, the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 100 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (3.01 g, 70% over two steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2895, 2856, 1721, 1666, 1439, 1196, 836 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.38 (dd, $J = 11.2$, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 6.57 (t, $J = 11.3$ Hz, 1H), 6.09 (dd, $J = 8.0$, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 5.60 (d, $J = 11.3$ Hz, 1H), 4.29 (ddd, $J = 3.2$, 5.1, 7.4 Hz, 1H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.65 (s, 3H), 3.17 (s, 3H), 2.68–2.48 (m, 2H), 2.33 (dd, $J = 5.2$, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 1.13 (d, $J = 6.8$ Hz, 3H), 0.88 (s, 9H), 0.09 (s, 3H), 0.03 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 172.6, 167.1, 146.7, 145.6, 127.6, 115.9, 72.6, 61.5, 51.3, 43.4, 37.1, 26.1, 18.3, 15.8, –4.2, –4.6; LRMS (ESI) 408 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{19}$H$_{35}$NO$_5$SiNa 408.2182, found 408.2177; $[\alpha]_{D}^{20}$ –53.6 ($c$ 0.33, CHCl$_3$).
(2Z,4E,6R,7S)-Methyl 7,9-bis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-6-methylnona-2,4-dienoate (58):

**Cross metathesis reaction.** A mixture of the alkene 43 (180 mg, 0.491 mmol) and crotonaldehyde (80 µL, 0.982 mmol) in degassed CH₂Cl₂ (5 mL, argon sparged) was refluxed for 15 min, then cooled to ambient temperature. Grubbs second generation catalyst 49 (12.5 mg, 0.015 mmol) was added and the mixture was refluxed at 50 °C. Two portions of Grubbs second generation catalyst (4.2 mg, 0.005 mmol) were added every 12 h. After 36 h, the mixture was concentrated under vacuum. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/diethyl ether) provided the aldehyde 57 (150 mg, 77%) as a colorless oil, which was used immediately in the next step: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.58 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 6.93 (dd, J = 7.6, 15.8 Hz, 1H), 6.18 (dd, J = 7.9, 15.8 Hz, 1H), 3.96 (m, 1H), 3.72 (t, J = 5.9 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (m, 1H), 1.82–1.55 (m, 2H), 1.21 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.98 (s, 9H), 0.96 (s, 9H), 0.15 (s, 3H), 0.14 (s, 3H), 0.11 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 194.0, 160.5, 133.2, 72.4, 59.6, 42.6, 37.7, 26.1, 18.4, 18.3, 15.5, -4.2, -4.3, -5.4.

**Formation of the dienoate.** A mixture of bis(2,2,2-trifluoroethyl) (methoxycarbonyl-methyl)phosphonate 14 (0.97 mL, 4.56 mmol) and 18-crown-6 (5.02 g, 19.00 mol) in THF (19 mL) at −78 °C was treated with a 0.5 M solution of potassium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide in toluene (11.40 mL, 5.70 mmol) dropwise over 12 min. The mixture was stirred at −45 °C for 1 h, cooled to −78 °C. A solution of the aldehyde 57 (1.47 g, 3.80 mmol) in THF (4 mL) was added. The mixture was stirred to −78 °C for 5.5 h and warmed to ambient temperature over 30 min. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NH₄Cl (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated.
Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.68 g, 100%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2954, 2857, 1721, 1175, 1097, 835, 775 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.23 (ddd, J = 0.9, 11.3, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 6.44 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.93 (dd, J = 7.9, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 5.46 (d, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 3.69 (m, 1H), 3.60 (s, 1H), 3.52 (dt, J = 2.0, 6.5 Hz, 1H), 2.37 (m, 1H), 1.56–1.39 (m, 3H), 0.96 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.80–0.74 (m, 18H), −0.06 (s, 6H), −0.08 (s, 6H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 167.1, 147.6, 145.8, 127.1, 115.6, 72.6, 60.0, 51.2, 42.9, 37.4, 26.1, 18.5, 18.3, 15.7, −4.1, −5.0; [α]²⁰D −6.6 (c 0.36, CHCl₃).

(2Z,4E,6R,7S)-Methyl 7-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-9-hydroxy-6-methylnona-2,4-dienoate (59):

A solution of the TBS ether 58 (0.80 g, 1.75 mmol) in THF (9 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of HF•pyr in pyr/THF (39 mL, prepared by slow addition of HF•pyr (3 mL) to a solution of pyridine (12 mL) and THF (24 mL)) dropwise. The reaction mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 8 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃, the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (4 × 40 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. CuSO₄ (3 × 30 mL), brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.54 g, 92%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3428, 2953, 2857, 1719, 1412, 1196, 1176, 837 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.33 (dd, J = 11.3, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 6.53 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 5.97 (dd, J = 7.8, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (d, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 3.83 (dt, J = 4.5, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 3.73–3.65 (m, 5H), 2.53 (m, 1H), 2.16 (s, 1H), 1.73–1.57 (m, 2H), 1.06 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.87 (s, 9H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 3H); ¹³C
NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 166.8, 147.2, 145.5, 126.8, 115.5, 73.2, 59.4, 51.0, 42.7, 36.0, 25.8, 18.0, 15.0, –4.4, –4.5; \([\alpha]_{D}^{20} = -14.3\) (c 0.21, CHCl\textsubscript{3}).

**Synthesis of the Weinreb amide 22 from the alcohol 59.** A solution of the alcohol 59 (0.52 g, 1.58 mmol) and triethylamine (0.66 mL, 4.74 mmol) in CH\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2} (4 mL) and DMSO (2 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of SO\textsubscript{3}•pyr (0.63 g, 3.96 mmol) in DMSO (5 mL) dropwise over 2 min, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of water (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 30 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. CuSO\textsubscript{4} (2 × 30 mL) and brine, dried (MgSO\textsubscript{4}) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the aldehyde 60 (0.47 g, 91%) as a pale yellow oil, which was used immediately in the next step: \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 9.78 (dd, \( J = 1.7, 2.5 \) Hz, 1H), 7.39 (ddd, \( J = 1.1, 11.2, 15.4 \) Hz, 1H), 6.56 (dt, \( J = 0.7, 11.3 \) Hz, 1H), 6.02 (dd, \( J = 7.6, 15.6 \) Hz, 1H), 5.65 (d, \( J = 11.3 \) Hz, 1H), 4.22 (ddd, \( J = 4.0, 4.9, 6.8 \) Hz, 1H), 3.75 (s, 3H), 2.63–2.42 (m, 3H), 1.11 (d, \( J = 6.8 \) Hz, 3H), 0.88 (s, 9H), 0.09 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 3H).

A mixture of the aldehyde 60 (0.43 g, 1.32 mmol) and NaH\textsubscript{2}PO\textsubscript{4}•H\textsubscript{2}O (1.09 g, 7.92 mmol) in \( t \)-BuOH (97 mL) and H\textsubscript{2}O (32 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a 2.0 M solution of 2-methyl-2-butene in THF (33.0 mL, 66.00 mmol), then NaClO\textsubscript{4} (0.35 g, 3.96 mmol) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 15 min and at ambient temperature for 2 h. After quenching by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. NH\textsubscript{4}Cl (20 mL) and brine (20 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (4 × 80 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO\textsubscript{4}) and concentrated. The carboxylic acid as a pale yellow oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification.
A solution of the carboxylic acid (0.43 g, 1.32 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (8.4 mL) at 0 ºC was
treated with triethylamine (0.35 mL, 2.50 mmol), N,O-dimethylhydroxylamine hydrochloride
(0.16 g, 1.67 mmol), and DCC (0.34 g, 1.67 mmol). The reaction mixture was warmed to
ambient temperature and stirred for 12 h. The reaction mixture was concentrated under vacuum.
Purification by column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound as a
colorless oil (0.36 g, 70% for two steps). The $^1$H NMR spectrum of the product was consistent
with that of the Weinreb amide 16.

(2S,3S,4S)-1-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-3-ol (63).

A solution of the alcohol 61 (4.20 g, 20.0 mmol) and diisopropylethylamine (9.90 mL,
60.0 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (200 mL) and DMSO (40mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of
SO$_3$•pyr (9.74 g, 60.0 mmol) in DMSO (60 mL) dropwise over 20 min. The reaction mixture was
stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of H$_2$O (200 mL), the mixture was extracted with
EtOAc (3 × 100 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. CuSO$_4$ (2 × 50
mL) and brine, dried (MgSO$_4$). The concentration under vacuum provided the aldehyde as a
colorless oil, which was used immediately in the next step without further purification.

A 1.0 M solution of (R,R)-diisopropyl tartrate (E)-crotylboronate 62 in toluene (28.16
mL, 28.16 mmol) was added to a slurry of powdered 4 Å molecular sieves (0.8 g) in toluene (17
mL) at ambient temperature. After 20 min, the mixture was cooled to –78 ºC, then a solution of
the aldehyde (4.20 g, 20.0 mmol) in toluene (17 mL) was added via cannula over 50 min. After 8
h, the reaction mixture was quenched by 1 M NaOH (60 mL), stirred vigorously for 30 min and
extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 50 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (3.54 g, 67% for two steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3479, 2966, 2932, 1613, 1513, 1248, 1036 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.25 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.87 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 5.80 (dd, J = 8.4, 10.2, 17.1 Hz, 1H), 5.17–5.06 (m, 2H), 4.45 (s, 2H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.58–3.43 (m, 3H), 2.28 (m, 1H), 1.97 (m, 1H), 0.98 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.5, 142.1, 130.7, 129.4, 115.8, 114.1, 75.9, 74.7, 73.2, 55.5, 42.1, 35.4, 16.9, 10.2; [α]²⁰D –2.4 (c 1.08, CHCl₃).

((2S,3S,4S)-1-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-3-yloxy)(tert-butyldimethylsilane (64):

Following the procedure for the TBS ether 34, the alcohol 63 (3.50 g, 13.2 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (130 mL) was protected with 2,6-lutidine (4.0 mL, 17.2 mmol) and TBSOTf (4.6 mL, 39.6 mmol) for 1 h. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (4.07 g, 82%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2957, 2929, 2856, 1513, 1249, 1039, 836 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (d, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 5.86 (ddd, J = 7.7, 10.2, 17.8 Hz, 1H), 5.01–4.94 (m, 2H), 4.43 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 4.38 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.65 (dd, J = 3.4, 4.6 Hz, 1H), 3.37 (dd, J = 6.6, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.22 (dd, J = 6.8, 8.8 Hz, 1H), 2.35 (m, 1H), 1.94 (m, 1H), 1.01 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.91–0.89 (m, 12H), 0.04 (s, 3H), 0.02 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.1, 142.0, 130.9, 129.4, 115.8, 114.1, 75.9, 74.7, 73.2, 55.5, 42.1, 35.4, 16.9, 10.2; [α]²⁰D –2.4 (c 1.08, CHCl₃).
76.0, 73.4, 72.5, 55.3, 42.9, 37.2, 26.2, 18.5, 17.4, 12.4, –3.5, –3.9; LRMS (ESI) 401 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₂H₃₈O₃Si Na 401.2488, found 401.2481; [α]²⁰D –5.0 (c 0.20, CHCl₃).

((2S,3S,4S)-1-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-6,6-dibromo-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-3-yloxy)(tert-butyldimethylsilane (65):

**Oxidative cleavage of the alkene 64.** A solution of the alkene 64 (4.00 g, 10.56 mmol) in dioxane (75 mL) and H₂O (25 mL) at ambient temperature was treated with 2,6-lutidine (2.5 mL, 21.12 mmol), OsO₄ (2.5% in 2-methyl-2-propanol, 2.2 mL, 0.02 mmol), and NaIO₄ (9.00 g, 42.24 mmol). After 5 h, additional OsO₄ (2.5% in 2-methyl-2-propanol, 1.1 mL, 0.01 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. Na₂S₂O₃ (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The aldehyde as a pale yellow oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification.

**Formation of the vinyl dibromide.** A solution of PPh₃ (11.08 g, 42.24 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (35 mL) at 0 °C was treated with CBr₄ (7.00 g, 21.12 mmol) portionwise over 7 min. After 10 min, 2,6-lutidine (6.1 mL, 52.80 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred for 10 min. A solution of the aldehyde in CH₂Cl₂ (20 mL) was added and the mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NH₄Cl (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (2 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (4.20 g, 74% for two steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2930, 2856, 1513, 1249, 1038,
838 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.27 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2H), 6.90 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 2H), 6.4 (d, $J = 9.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.44 (d, $J = 11.6$ Hz, 1H), 4.39 (d, $J = 11.6$ Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.69 (t, $J = 3.9$ Hz, 1H), 3.38 (dd, $J = 6.1$, 8.9 Hz, 1H), 3.21 (dd, $J = 7.0$, 8.9 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 1.89 (m, 1H), 1.00 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H), 0.93–0.90 (m, 12H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.04 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 159.2, 141.7, 130.7, 129.4, 113.8, 88.0, 75.8, 72.7, 72.4, 55.4, 42.6, 38.5, 26.2, 26.1, 18.4, 17.2, 12.5, –3.7, –3.8; LRMS (ESI) 559 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for Br$_2$C$_{22}$H$_{36}$O$_3$SiNa 557.0698, found 557.0715; [$\alpha$]$^D_{20}$ +3.7 (c 0.27, CHCl$_3$).

$\text{(2S,3S,4S)-1-(4-Methoxybenzylxylo)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-yn-3-yloxy)(tert-}$

butyl)dimethylsilane (21):

A solution of the vinyl dibromide 65 (6.43 g, 12.00 mmol) in THF (60 mL) at −78 °C was treated with a 1.6 M solution of BuLi in hexane (18.75 mL, 30.00 mmol) dropwise over 10 min. After 30 min, an additional solution of BuLi (9.3 mL, 14.88 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred for 2.5 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NH$_4$Cl (50 mL) at −78 °C, the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (4.36 g, 96%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3309, 2955, 2930, 2856, 1513, 1249, 1055, 836 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.28 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 4.42 (s, 2H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.79 (dd, $J = 3.3$, 5.1 Hz, 1H), 3.45 (dd, $J = 6.8$, 9.2 Hz, 1H), 3.29 (dd, $J = 6.6$, 9.2 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 2.21 (m, 1H), 2.04 (d, $J = 2.5$ Hz, 1H), 1.20 (d, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 3H), 0.98–0.89 (m, 12H), 0.09 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR
(75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.2, 130.9, 129.3, 113.8, 87.4, 74.5, 73.2, 72.5, 70.1, 55.3, 37.0, 31.7, 26.2, 18.5, 17.5, 12.2, −3.7, −4.0; LRMS (ESI) 399 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₂H₃₆O₃SiNa 399.2331, found 399.2336; [α]_{D}^{20} +2.2 (c 0.23, CHCl₃).

((2S,3S,4S)-1-(4-Methoxybenzyloxy)-6-iodo-2,4-dimethylhex-5-yn-3-yloxy)(tert-butyldimethylsilane (81):

A solution of the alkyne 21 (3.50 g, 9.29 mmol) in THF (46 mL) at −50 °C was treated with a 1.6 M solution of BuLi in hexane (7.00 mL, 11.15 mmol) dropwise over 7 min. After 1 h, a solution of I₂ (4.00 g, 15.79 mmol) in THF (4 mL) was added. The mixture was stirred for 20 min, warmed to ambient temperature over 30 min. After quenching by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. Na₂S₂O₃ (25 mL) and brine (25 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (4.60 g, 99%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2930, 2881, 2855, 1612, 1513, 1462, 1248, 1062, 837 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.28 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.90 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 4.42 (s, 2H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.75 (dd, J = 3.0, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 3.43 (dd, J = 7.0, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.26 (dd, J = 6.6, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 2.76 (m, 1H), 2.04 (m, 1H), 1.18 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 3H), 0.93–0.85 (m, 12H), 0.09 (s, 3H), 0.04 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.2, 130.8, 129.3, 113.8, 97.8, 74.8, 73.0, 72.5, 55.3, 36.9, 34.0, 26.2, 18.5, 17.7, 11.7, −3.7, −4.0, −4.4; LRMS (EI) 445 [M – tert-Bu]⁺; HRMS (EI) calcd. for C₁₈H₂₆O₃Si 445.0696, found 445.0672; [α]_{D}^{20} −3.3 (c 0.42, CHCl₃).
((2S,3S,4S,Z)-1-(4-Methoxy)benzylloxy)-6-iodo-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-3-yloxy)(tert-butyl)dimethylsilane (82):

A solution of the iodoalkyne 81 (3.50 g, 9.29 mmol) in THF (20 mL) and i-PrOH (20 mL) at ambient temperature was treated with triethylamine (1.70 mL, 12.21 mmol) and o-nitrobenzenesulfonylhydrazide (2.30 g, 10.58 mmol). After 12 h, additional triethylamine (0.79 mL, 5.69 mmol) and o-nitrobenzenesulfonylhydrazide (1.06 g, 4.88 mmol) were added and the mixture was stirred for 12 h. After quenching by addition of H2O (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO4) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (3.90 g, 95%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2955, 2929, 2855, 1513, 1249, 1039, 837, 773 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.87 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.24 (dd, J = 7.3, 8.8 Hz, 1H), 6.13 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 4.61 (s, 2H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.74 (t, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 3.40 (dd, J = 5.8, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.21 (dd, J = 7.1, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 1.90 (m, 1H), 1.00 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.90 (s, 9H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.05 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.2, 144.0, 130.9, 129.3, 113.8, 81.8, 76.0, 72.7, 55.3, 43.8, 38.9, 26.3, 18.5, 17.7, 13.4, –3.5, –3.7; LRMS (EI) 447 [M – tert-Bu]+; HRMS (EI) calcd. for C₁₈H₂₈IO₃Si 447.0853, found 447.0851; [α]²⁰D +32.4 (c 0.61, CHCl₃).
(2S,3S,4S,Z)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-6-iodo-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-1-ol (83):

A mixture of the PMB ether 82 (1.5 g, 2.97 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (60 mL) and H$_2$O (4 mL) at 0 °C was treated with DDQ (0.81 g, 3.56 mmol). After 25 min, additional DDQ (0.24 g, 1.48 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred for 15 min. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (50 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ and brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. The residue was diluted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (15 mL) and MeOH (1.5 mL). The mixture was cooled to 0 °C and NaBH$_4$ (0.11 g, 2.97 mmol) was added. After 30 min, sat. aq. NH$_4$Cl (50 mL) was added and the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (1.13 g, 98%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3353, 2956, 2929, 2856, 1471, 1461, 1256, 1024, 837, 773 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 6.37 (dd, $J = 7.4$, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 6.18 (d, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 1H), 3.76 (t, $J = 3.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.68 (m, 1H), 3.46 (m, 1H), 2.75 (m, 1H), 2.05–1.88 (m, 2H), 1.05 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H), 0.96–0.87 (m, 12H), 0.12 (s, 3H), 0.10 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 143.5, 81.9, 77.5, 65.4, 42.6, 40.9, 26.1, 18.3, 18.2, 13.1, −3.8, −3.9; LRMS (EI) 327 [M − tert-Bu]$^+$; HRMS (EI) calcd. for C$_{10}$H$_{20}$O$_2$Si 327.0277, found 327.0286; [α]$^D_{20}$ +2.3 (c 0.57, CHCl$_3$).

A solution of the alcohol 83 (0.38 g, 1.00 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (10 mL) at 0 °C was treated with Dess-Martin periodinane (0.57 g, 1.30 mmol). The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. Na$_2$S$_2$O$_3$ (10 mL) and sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (10 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 20 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (2 × 20 mL) and brine, dried (MgSO$_4$). The concentration under vacuum provided the aldehyde 77 as a colorless oil, which was used immediately in the next step without further purification: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 9.77 (s, 1H), 6.27–6.18 (m, 2H), 4.06 (dd, $J$ = 3.2, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 2.75 (m, 1H), 2.50 (m, 1H), 1.14 (d, $J$ = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 1.06 (d, $J$ = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.92 (s, 9H), 0.13 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H).

A solution of the phosphonium salt 20 (0.64 g, 0.77 mmol, dried azeotropically with benzene and at 40 °C for 1 h under vacuum) in THF (2 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of sodium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide in THF (0.71 mL, 0.71 mmol) dropwise over 5 min. The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 45 min. The mixture was cooled to −78 °C and a solution of the aldehyde 77 (0.38 g, 1.00 mmol) in THF (2 mL) was added via cannula over 5 min. The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 4 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NH$_4$Cl (30 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated.
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Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.47 g, 82%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2956, 2929, 2856, 1514, 1461, 1250, 1078, 1038, 836, 773 cm\(^{-1}\); \(^1\)H NMR (500 MHz, C\(_6\)D\(_6\)) \(\delta\) 7.31 (d, \(J = 8.5\) Hz, 2H), 6.82 (d, \(J = 8.6\) Hz, 2H), 6.75 (dt, \(J = 10.4, 16.7\) Hz, 1H), 6.30 (t, \(J = 7.7\) Hz, 1H), 6.08 (t, \(J = 11.0\) Hz, 1H), 6.00 (d, \(J = 7.3\) Hz, 1H), 5.76 (t, \(J = 10.7\) Hz, 1H), 5.41 (dt, \(J = 7.0, 10.7\) Hz, 1H), 5.20 (t, \(J = 10.3\) Hz, 1H), 5.18 (d, \(J = 18.0\) Hz, 1H), 5.11 (d, \(J = 10.1\) Hz, 1H), 4.57 (q, \(J = 10.6\) Hz, 2H), 3.84 (m, 1H), 3.49 (dd, \(J = 3.6, 7.0\) Hz, 1H), 3.38 (dd, \(J = 2.5, 7.8\) Hz, 1H), 3.30 (s, 3H), 3.15 (m, 1H), 2.84 (m, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 2.13 (m, 1H), 2.06 (m, 1H), 1.93 (m, 1H), 1.81 (m, 1H), 1.66 (m, 1H), 1.24–1.17 (m, 7 H), 1.07 (d, \(J = 6.9\) Hz, 3H), 1.05 (s, 9H), 1.03 (d, \(J = 7.1\) Hz, 3H), 0.99 (s, 9H), 0.15 (s, 3H), 0.14 (s, 3H), 0.08 (s, 6H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 159.3, 143.6, 134.9, 133.3, 132.7, 131.6, 129.5, 129.3, 129.1, 117.6, 114.0, 84.4, 82.2, 79.9, 75.3, 73.0, 55.5, 44.5, 41.0, 37.4, 35.7, 35.6, 26.6, 26.3, 24.1, 19.1, 18.7, 18.6, 18.5, 17.2, 9.8, –3.0, –3.1, –3.3, –3.9; LRMS (ESI) 833 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{41}\)H\(_{71}\)IO\(_4\)Si\(_2\)Na 833.3833, found 833.3850; [\(\alpha\)]\(^{20}\)D +117.8 (c 0.09, CHCl\(_3\)).

(3S,4R,5E,7Z)-3,9-bis(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-4-methylnona-5,7-dienal (70):

A solution of the Weinreb amide 22 (0.37 g, 0.96 mmol) in THF (5 mL) at \(-78^\circ\)C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of diisobutylaluminum hydride in hexane (3.16 mL, 3.16 mmol) dropwise over 3 min, and the reaction mixture was warmed to ambient temperature over 1 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. potassium sodium tartrate (7 mL), the mixture was stirred for 1 h at ambient temperature, extracted with CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (3 \times 10 mL). The combined organic layers
were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The alcohol as a pale yellow oil was used immediately in the next step without further purification.

A solution of the alcohol and 2,6-lutidine (0.34 mL, 2.88 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL) at –78 °C was treated with TBSOTf (0.28 mL, 1.25 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (10 mL) at –78 °C, the mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.38 g, 95% for two steps) as a colorless oil which was used immediately in the next step: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.77 (dd, J = 1.8, 2.6 Hz, 1H), 6.28 (dd, J = 11.0, 15.1 Hz, 1H), 5.97 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (dd, J = 7.9, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 5.54 (dt, J = 6.3, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 4.32 (dd, J = 1.5, 6.4 Hz, 1H), 4.17 (ddd, J = 4.3, 5.0, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 2.58–2.38 (m, 3H), 1.05 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.91–0.86 (m, 18H), 0.09–0.04 (m, 12H).


A solution of the vinyl iodide 76 (0.76 g, 0.94 mmol) in diethyl ether (47 mL) at –78 °C was treated with a 1.7 M solution of tert-BuLi in pentane (1.26 mL, 2.13 mmol) dropwise over 5 min. After 15 min, a solution of the aldehyde 70 (0.37 g, 0.88 mmol) in diethyl ether (12 mL)
was added via cannula over 10 min. The mixture was warmed to –10 °C over 1 h. After quenching at –10 °C by addition of a sat. aq. NH₄Cl (30 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The residue was diluted with CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL) and MeOH (1 mL). The mixture was cooled to 0 °C and NaBH₄ (0.10 g, 2.64 mmol) was added. After 30 min, sat. aq. NH₄Cl (30 mL), was added and the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (15:1 hexanes/ EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.26 g, 27%) as a colorless oil and the less polar C9 β-epimer 84β (0.42 g, 43%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3493, 2956, 2929, 2856, 1514, 1471, 1462, 1251, 903, 807, 774 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.28 (m, 2H), 6.86 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.60 (dt, J = 11.1, 16.7 Hz, 1H), 6.27 (dd, J = 11.0, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 6.02 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.98 (t, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.64–5.48 (m, 3H), 5.44 (dt, J = 6.4, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.34 (dd, J = 8.4, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.24–5.15 (m, 3H), 5.10 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.59 (m, 1H), 4.55 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.48 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.34 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 1H), 3.89–3.75 (m, 4H), 3.65 (m, 1H), 3.37–3.26 (m, 2H), 2.99 (m, 1H), 2.68 (m, 1H), 2.58–2.40 (m, 3H), 1.95–1.62 (m, 4H), 1.53 (m, 1H), 1.45 (m, 1H), 1.11 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.00 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.98 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 0.95 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.94–0.85 (m, 39H), 0.13–0.03 (m, 24H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.3, 138.6, 134.8, 134.5, 134.4, 132.6, 132.5, 131.6, 129.6, 129.4, 129.3, 128.5, 125.6, 117.6, 113.9, 84.4, 80.5, 75.3, 73.6, 72.8, 65.0, 60.0, 55.5, 42.8, 40.8, 39.8, 37.0, 36.3, 35.6, 35.5, 26.5, 26.3, 26.2, 23.8, 19.8, 19.0, 18.7, 18.4, 18.3, 17.2, 15.1, 9.6, –2.9, –3.2, –3.4, –4.1, –4.2, –4.8; LRMS (ESI) 1119 [M + Na]⁺;
HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C_{63}H_{116}O_{7}Si_{4}Na 1119.7696, found 1119.7727; [\alpha]^{20}_D +42.0 (c 0.94, CHCl_3).

The C9 \beta-epimer 84\beta: IR (NaCl) 3385, 2956, 2929, 2856, 1514, 1462, 1251, 1082, 836, 774 cm\(^{-1}\); \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.27 (m, 2H), 6.87 (d, \(J = 8.5\) Hz, 2H), 6.58 (dt, \(J = 10.5, 16.8\) Hz, 1H), 6.27 (dd, \(J = 11.2, 14.9\) Hz, 1H), 6.01 (t, \(J = 11.3\) Hz, 1H), 5.97 (t, \(J = 11.1\) Hz, 1H), 5.64 (dd, \(J = 7.8, 15.1\) Hz, 1H), 5.57 (t, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 5.50–5.32 (m, 3H), 5.28–5.16 (m, 3H), 5.11 (d, \(J = 10.0\) Hz, 1H), 4.55 (d, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 4.47 (d, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 4.43–4.25 (m, 3H), 3.87–3.72 (m, 4H), 3.66 (m, 1H), 3.37–3.25 (m, 2H), 2.99 (m, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 2.56–2.38 (m, 2H), 2.01 (m, 1H), 1.98–1.73 (m, 2H), 1.72–1.60 (m, 2H), 1.48–1.37 (m, 2H), 1.10 (d, \(J = 6.7\) Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, \(J = 6.7\) Hz, 3H), 0.96 (d, \(J = 6.8\) Hz, 3H), 0.96–0.83 (m, 42H), 0.11–0.00 (m, 24H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 159.3, 137.9, 134.9, 134.2, 134.1, 133.3, 132.6, 131.6, 129.6, 129.5, 129.4, 129.3, 128.7, 125.8, 117.6, 114.0, 84.4, 80.5, 75.2, 74.5, 72.9, 66.1, 60.0, 55.5, 42.3, 41.3, 40.8, 37.4, 36.6, 35.7, 35.5, 35.0, 34.1, 26.6, 26.3, 26.2, 25.9, 23.9, 19.1, 19.0, 18.7, 18.5, 18.3, 17.8, 15.8, 9.7, –2.7, –3.3, –3.4, –4.0, –4.1, –4.7; LRMS (ESI) 1119 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C_{63}H_{116}O_{7}Si_{4}Na 1119.7696, found 1119.7708; [\alpha]^{20}_D +38.4 (c 0.19, CHCl\(_3\)).
7,9,13,19-tetrakis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-6,12,14,20,22-pentamethylhexacosa-
2,4,10,15,23,25-hexaen-1-ol (89α):

Following the procedure for the TBS ether 34, the alcohol 84α (0.26 g, 0.24 mmol) in
CH₂Cl₂ (4.7 mL) was protected with 2,6-lutidine (0.083 mL, 0.71 mmol) and TBSOTf (0.082
mL, 0.36 mmol) to provide the TBS ether (0.29 g, 100%) as a colorless oil, which was used in
the next step without further purification: IR (NaCl) 2956, 2929, 2857, 1471, 1462, 1252, 1171,
836, 774 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, C₆D₆) δ 7.32 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.96–6.70 (m, 3H), 6.50
(dd, J = 11.0, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 6.12 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.05 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.83–5.69 (m,
2H), 5.67–5.42 (m, 6H), 5.23 (d, J = 16.9 Hz, 1H), 5.13 (d, J = 10.4 Hz, 1H), 4.77 (t, J = 7.6 Hz,
1H), 4.59 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 4.54 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 4.40 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 1H), 4.16 (m, 1H),
3.87 (m, 1H), 3.54–3.42 (m, 2H), 3.32 (s, 3H), 3.15 (m, 1H), 2.92–2.74 (m, 2H), 2.60 (m, 1H),
2.29–1.87 (m, 3H), 1.86–1.53 (m 4H), 1.27–1.14 (m, 12H), 1.12–0.97 (m, 48H), 0.29–0.06 (m,
30H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.3, 138.5, 134.8, 134.2, 133.9, 132.6, 132.1, 131.6,
129.6, 129.5, 129.3, 129.1, 128.5, 125.4, 117.6, 113.9, 84.5, 80.7, 75.3, 72.7, 72.6, 66.9, 60.0,
55.5, 43.4, 42.2, 40.8, 36.7, 36.1, 35.6, 35.5, 26.6, 26.3, 26.2, 26.0, 23.8, 19.1, 18.9, 18.7, 18.6,
(ESI) 1233 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₆₉H₁₃₀O₇Si₅Na 1233.8561, found 1233.8673;
[α]²₀°D +17.0 (c 0.20, CHCl₃).
Following the procedure for the alcohol 59, the TBS ether (0.29 g, 0.24 mmol) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of HF•pyr in pyr/THF (8 mL) for 15 h. Purification by column chromatography (95:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.22 g, 85%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3422, 2955, 1613, 1514, 1462, 1250, 1039, 835, 773, 735 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.29 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.60 (dt, J = 10.6, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.30 (dd, J = 11.1, 14.9 Hz, 1H), 6.06 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 6.02 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.67 (dd, J = 7.0, 15.1 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (t, J = 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.50 (dt, J = 7.0, 10.7 Hz, 1H), 5.39 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.34–5.16 (m, 4H), 5.12 (d, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 4.58–4.44 (m, 3H), 4.28 (dd, J = 2.4, 6.7 Hz, 2H), 3.91 (m, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.67 (m, 1H), 3.42–3.26 (m, 2H), 3.01 (m, 1H), 2.68–2.36 (m, 3H), 1.95–1.64 (m, 3H), 1.60–1.31 (m 4H), 1.12 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H), 1.04–0.82 (m, 48H), 0.15–0.02 (m, 24H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 158.9, 139.1, 134.3, 133.7, 133.5, 132.1, 131.4, 131.2, 131.1, 129.1, 128.9, 128.1, 127.4, 124.5, 117.3, 113.6, 84.1, 80.3, 75.0, 72.2, 72.1, 66.4, 58.7, 55.1, 42.9, 41.8, 40.3, 36.1, 35.8, 35.1, 26.1, 25.8, 23.4, 18.6, 18.4, 18.0, 17.0, 13.4, 9.1, –3.0, –3.2, –3.7, –4.1, –4.3, –4.4, –4.5; LRMS (ESI) 1119 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₆₃H₁₁₅O₇Si₄Na 1119.7696, found 1119.7795; [α]₂⁰⁻D +16.9 (c 0.61, CHCl₃).
A solution of the alcohol \( \text{89}\alpha \) (0.22 g, 0.20 mmol) in \( \text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2 \) (20 mL) at 0 °C was treated with Dess–Martin periodinane (0.17 g, 0.40 mmol). The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 2 h. After quenching by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. \( \text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_3 \) (10 mL) and sat. aq. \( \text{NaHCO}_3 \) (10 mL), the mixture was extracted with \( \text{EtOAc} \) (3 × 20 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. \( \text{NaHCO}_3 \) (20 mL) and brine, dried (\( \text{MgSO}_4 \)). The concentration under vacuum provided the aldehyde as a colorless oil, which was used in the next step without further purification: \( ^1\text{H NMR} \) (300 MHz, \( \text{CDCl}_3 \)) \( \delta \) 10.18 (d, \( J = 8.1 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 7.29 (d, \( J = 8.4 \text{ Hz} \), 2H), 7.02 (dd, \( J = 11.9, 14.3 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 6.91 (t, \( J = 10.5 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 6.86 (d, \( J = 8.6 \text{ Hz} \), 2H), 6.58 (dt, \( J = 10.6, 16.8 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 6.10 (dd, \( J = 7.2, 14.3 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 6.01 (t, \( J = 11.0 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 5.80 (dd, \( J = 8.2, 10.3 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 5.57 (t, \( J = 10.7 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 5.37 (t, \( J = 11.1 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 5.32–5.14 (m, 4H), 5.10 (d, \( J = 10.2 \text{ Hz} \), 1H), 4.59–4.43 (m, 3H), 3.93 (m, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.66 (m, 1H), 3.38–3.27 (m, 2H), 3.00 (m, 1H), 2.64–2.46 (m, 3H), 1.91–1.62 (m, 3H), 1.54 (m, 1H), 1.49–1.36 (m 3H), 1.11 (d, \( J = 6.8 \text{ Hz} \), 3H), 1.05 (d, \( J = 6.7 \text{ Hz} \), 3H), 1.02–0.81 (m, 45H), 0.16–0.01 (m, 24H).

Following the procedure for the aldehyde \( \text{60} \), the aldehyde in \( \text{t-BuOH} \) (15 mL) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) (5 mL) was oxidized with \( \text{NaH}_2\text{PO}_4\cdot\text{H}_2\text{O} \) (0.165 g, 1.20 mmol), a 2.0 M solution of 2-methyl-2-
butene in THF (5.00 mL, 10.00 mmol), and NaClO₄ (0.068 g, 0.60 mmol) to provide the title compound as a pale yellow oil, which was used in the next step without further purification: IR (NaCl) 2956, 2856, 1693, 1471, 1462, 1250, 1039, 773 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.32 (dd, J = 11.5, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 7.28 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.85 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.62 (t, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 6.58 (dt, J = 10.6, 16.9 Hz, 1H), 6.03 (dd, J = 7.2, 15.9 Hz, 1H), 5.99 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.02 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.55 (t, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 5.43–5.31 (m, 2H), 5.29–5.15 (m, 3H), 5.10 (d, J = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 4.56 (d, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 4.52–4.43 (m, 2H), 3.91 (m, 1H), 3.79 (s, 3H), 3.65 (m, 1H), 3.35 (dd, J = 3.2, 7.9 Hz, 1H), 3.28 (t, J = 4.6 Hz, 1H), 2.98 (m, 1H), 2.61–2.42 (m, 3H), 1.85 (m, 1H), 1.79–1.63 (m, 2H), 1.60–1.36 (m, 4H), 1.08 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.02 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 6H), 0.99–0.77 (m, 42H), 0.12–0.00 (m, 24H); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 170.9, 159.0, 148.1, 147.1, 134.2, 133.7, 133.4, 132.1, 131.5, 130.9, 129.3, 128.9, 128.1, 126.9, 117.3, 115.1, 113.6, 84.2, 80.3, 74.9, 72.2, 71.9, 66.4, 55.1, 43.3, 42.2, 40.2, 36.3, 35.8, 35.1, 29.6, 26.1, 25.8, 23.4, 18.6, 18.3, 18.0, 17.0, 13.4, 9.1, −3.2, −3.7, −4.2, −4.5, −4.6; LRMS (ESI) 1133 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₆₃H₁₁₄O₈Si₄Na 1133.7489, found 1133.7568; [α]²⁰ D +15.9 (c 0.27, CHCl₃).
Following the procedure for the alcohol 83, the above-obtained carboxylic acid in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (20 mL) and H$_2$O (2 mL) was treated with DDQ (0.136 g, 0.60 mmol). Two chromatographic purification steps (95:1 MeOH/ CH$_2$Cl$_2$, then 4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.062 g, 31% for three steps), which was used immediately in the next step: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.35 (dd, $J = 11.3$, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 6.72–6.53 (m, 2H), 6.10 (t, $J = 11.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.03 (dd, $J = 6.9$, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 5.60 (d, $J = 11.4$ Hz, 1H), 5.47–5.36 (m, 2H), 5.34–5.17 (m, 4H), 5.13 (d, $J = 10.1$ Hz, 1H), 4.56 (d, $J = 10.6$ Hz, 1H), 4.48 (m, 1H), 3.93 (m, 1H), 3.77 (m, 1H), 3.49 (dd, $J = 3.5$, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 3.32 (dd, $J = 4.1$, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.83 (m, 1H), 2.65–2.45 (m, 3H), 2.08–1.80 (m, 2H), 1.78–1.35 (m, 5H), 1.08–0.82 (m, 51H), 0.12–0.02 (m, 24H).
A solution of the seco-acid 85α (62 mg, 0.063 mmol) in THF (6.3 mL) at 0 °C was treated with triethylamine (61 µL, 0.434 mmol), 2,4,6-trichlorobenzoyl chloride (49 µL, 0.313 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 30 min and at ambient temperature for 1 h. A solution of DMAP (76 mg, 0.625 mmol) in toluene (63 mL) was added at ambient temperature. The reaction mixture was stirred for 17 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (30 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with a 0.2 M solution of HCl (3 × 50 mL), a sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (50 mL), brine, then dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (98:2 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (43 mg, 71%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3359, 2956, 2926, 2855, 1713, 1463, 1256, 1086, 835, 773 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.10 (dd, J = 11.5, 14.7 Hz, 1H), 6.61 (dt, J = 10.7, 16.7 Hz, 1H), 6.55 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 6.07 (dd, J = 7.6, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 6.00 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.63 (t, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 5.57 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 5.40 (t, J = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 5.32 (dd, J = 8.1, 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.20 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.17–5.10 (m, 4H), 4.46 (q, J = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 3.88 (m, 1H), 3.54 (m, 1H), 3.37 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 3.04 (m, 1H), 2.55–2.29 (m, 3H), 1.96 (m, 1H), 1.85 (m, 1H), 1.77 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.51 (m, 2H), 1.48–1.28 (m, 2H), 1.09
1.04 (dd, $J = 7.1, 9.7$ Hz, 6H), 1.00 (t, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 6H), 0.97–0.84 (m, 39H), 0.12–0.01 (m, 24H);

$^{13}$C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 166.3, 144.7, 142.8, 134.0, 133.6, 133.4, 132.1, 131.2, 129.7, 128.1, 127.7, 117.7, 117.5, 79.9, 77.3, 73.4, 71.6, 66.8, 66.1, 43.5, 39.5, 37.6, 37.3, 34.5, 34.4, 29.7, 26.1, 25.9, 25.8, 25.4, 19.6, 18.5, 18.0, 17.9, 17.5, 15.4, 10.5, −2.8, −3.1, −3.6, −4.0, −4.3;

LRMS (ESI) 995 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{55}$H$_{104}$O$_6$Si$_4$Na 995.6808, found 995.6902; $\left[\alpha\right]^{20}_D +5.6$ (c 0.20, CHCl$_3$).


A solution of the TBS-protected macrolactone 90$\alpha$ (43.0 mg, 0.044 mmol) in THF (2.4 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a 6 M solution of HCl in H$_2$O/MeOH (2.4 mL, prepared by slow addition of conc. HCl (1.2 mL) to MeOH (1.2 mL)). The reaction mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred. Three portions of a 6 M solution of HCl (2.4 mL) and THF (2.4 mL) were added every 45 min. After 4 h, the solid NaHCO$_3$ was added to the reaction mixture until no gas evolved. The mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 30 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (15:85 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (9.6 mg, 42%) as a colorless powder and the more polar C2 $E$-isomer 91 (0.7 mg, 3%) as a colorless powder: IR
(NaCl) 3390, 2965, 2927, 1704, 1455, 1275, 1179, 1002, 959 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.20 (dd, J = 11.2, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.60 (dt, J = 11.0, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.53 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (dd, J = 8.5, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.00 (t, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.62 (t, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.54 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 5.52 (dd, J = 8.9, 10.7 Hz, 1H), 5.32 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.22 (dt, J = 6.9, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.19 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.18 (d, J = 6.9, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 4.66 (dt, J = 3.8, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 4.01 (dt, J = 2.6, 10.7 Hz, 1H), 3.38 (ddd, J = 2.8, 6.8, 12.7 Hz, 1H), 3.29 (dd, J = 3.6, 8.0 Hz, 1H), 3.05 (m, 1H), 2.66 (m, 1H), 2.51 (m, 1H), 2.38 (m, 1H), 2.14 (m, 1H), 1.97 (m, 1H), 1.90 (dt, J = 3.0, 6.9 Hz, 1H), 1.66 (m, 1H), 1.59 (ddd, J = 3.9, 10.5, 14.3 Hz, 1H), 1.44 (ddd, J = 2.4, 8.3, 14.2 Hz, 1H), 1.22 (dt, J = 4.1, 9.6 Hz, 1H), 1.17 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.10 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 1.08 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 1.02 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.00 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 166.6, 134.0, 132.5, 132.3, 132.0, 131.8, 129.9, 129.5, 127.9, 79.0, 76.4, 73.0, 71.1, 65.4, 43.3, 40.2, 40.1, 36.9, 35.4, 34.4, 33.9, 24.8, 19.3, 18.0, 17.4, 15.8, 10.1; LRMS (ESI) 539 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₁H₄₈O₆Na 539.3349, found 539.3352; [α]₂⁰ D −74.0 (c 0.17, CHCl₃).

The C₂ E-isomer 92: IR (NaCl) 3408, 2962, 2926, 1698, 1640, 1455, 1300, 1261, 1003 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.15 (dd, J = 10.9, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 6.59 (dt, J = 10.3, 17.3 Hz, 1H), 6.16 (dt, J = 10.8, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 6.04 (dd, J = 7.9, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 5.97 (t, J = 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.73 (d, J = 15.3 Hz, 1H), 5.50 (dd, J = 8.8, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.42 (t, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 5.38–5.32 (m, 2H), 5.20 (t, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.17 (d, J = 17.7 Hz, 1H), 5.09 (d, J = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (dd,
\[ J = 1.7, 8.7 \text{ Hz, 1H}, 4.79 (dt, J = 2.7, 7.3 \text{ Hz, 1H}), 4.03 (d, J = 10.5 \text{ Hz, 1H}), 3.48–3.35 (m, 2H), 3.01 (m, 1H), 2.73 (m, 1H), 2.61 (m, 1H), 2.42 (m, 1H), 2.20 (m, 1H), 2.10 (m, 1H), 1.83 (m, 1H), 1.69 (ddd, J = 2.5, 10.6, 13.9 \text{ Hz, 1H}), 1.58 (m, 1H), 1.54 (m, 1H), 1.34–1.28 (m, 2H), 1.16 (d, J = 6.8 \text{ Hz, 3H}), 1.10 (d, J = 6.9 \text{ Hz, 3H}), 1.02 (d, J = 6.8 \text{ Hz, 3H}), 1.00 (d, J = 6.7 \text{ Hz, 3H}), 0.93 (d, J = 6.9 \text{ Hz, 3H}); ^{13}\text{C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl}_3\delta) 166.7, 145.5, 145.1, 134.3, 133.2, 131.9, 131.5, 131.3, 130.7, 129.7, 129.0, 119.7, 117.8, 78.3, 76.1, 71.7, 71.2, 65.8, 42.4, 40.5, 40.2, 35.9, 34.2, 34.1, 31.8, 23.7, 19.3, 17.3, 15.7, 14.6, 9.8; LRMS (ESI) 539 [M + Na]^+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{31}H_{48}O_6\)Na 539.3349, found 539.3362; [\alpha]_{20}^{D} +21.9 (c 0.16, CHCl\(_3\)).


Following the procedure for the TBS ether 89\(\alpha\), the alcohol 84\(\beta\) (0.20 g, 0.20 mmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (4.0 mL) was protected with 2,6-lutidine (0.069 mL, 0.59 mmol) and TBSOTf (0.068 mL, 0.30 mmol) to provide the TBS ether as a colorless oil, which was used in the next step without further purification.

The TBS ether at 0 °C was treated with a solution of HF•pyr in pyr/THF (6.7 mL) for 14 h. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.12 g, 60%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3400, 2956, 2928, 2856, 1250, 1084, 1037, 835, 773
cm\(^{-1}\); \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.30 (d, \(J = 8.5\) Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, \(J = 8.5\) Hz, 2H), 6.61 (dt, \(J = 10.5, 16.8\) Hz, 1H), 6.30 (dd, \(J = 11.1, 15.2\) Hz, 1H), 6.15–5.95 (m, 2H), 5.85 (dd, \(J = 8.6, 15.2\) Hz, 1H), 5.59 (t, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 5.50–5.05 (m, 7H), 4.58 (d, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 4.51 (d, \(J = 10.5\) Hz, 1H), 4.40 (m, 1H), 4.30 (dd, \(J = 7.4, 12.8\) Hz, 1H), 4.23 (dd, \(J = 6.9, 12.8\) Hz, 1H), 3.87 (m, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.68 (m, 1H), 3.40 (t, \(J = 4.2\) Hz, 1H), 3.35 (dd, \(J = 3.2, 7.7\) Hz, 1H), 3.00 (m, 1H), 2.67–2.49 (m, 2H), 2.43 (m, 1H), 1.92–1.80 (m, 2H), 1.69 (m, 1H), 1.62–1.40 (m, 4H), 1.12 (d, \(J = 6.8\) Hz, 3H), 1.08 (d, \(J = 6.9\) Hz, 3H), 1.00–0.84 (m, 45H), 0.12–0.02 (m, 24H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 159.3, 152.4, 138.8, 134.8, 134.5, 133.6, 132.6, 131.6, 129.4, 129.3, 128.2, 127.5, 125.5, 118.8, 117.5, 114.0, 84.5, 79.8, 75.3, 72.7, 66.7, 59.1, 55.5, 44.8, 41.0, 40.7, 37.7, 35.9, 35.6, 35.4, 29.9, 26.5, 26.2, 26.1, 23.7, 19.0, 18.9, 18.7, 18.4, 18.3, 17.0, 9.68, –3.2, –3.3, –3.7, –4.1, –4.3, –4.4; LRMS (ESI) 1119 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{63}\)H\(_{116}\)O\(_7\)Si\(_4\)Na 1119.7696, found 1119.7700; \([\alpha]^{20}_D\) +50.0 (c 0.18, CHCl\(_3\)).

(2\(^Z\),4\(^E\),6\(^R\),7\(^S\),9\(^R\),10\(^Z\),12\(^S\),13\(^R\),14\(^S\),15\(^Z\),19\(^R\),20\(^R\),21\(^S\),22\(^S\),23\(^Z\))-7,9,13,19-tetrakis(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-21-hydroxy-6,12,14,20,22-pentamethylhexacosa-2,4,10,15,23,25-hexaenoic acid (85\(^\beta\)):

A solution of the alcohol 89\(^\beta\) (0.11 g, 0.10 mmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (10 mL) at 0 °C was treated with Dess–Martin periodinane (0.085 g, 0.20 mmol). The mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred for 1 h. After quenching by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. Na\(_2\)S\(_2\)O\(_3\) (5 mL) and sat. aq. NaHCO\(_3\) (5 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 10 mL). The
combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (10 mL) and brine, dried (MgSO₄). The concentration under vacuum provided the aldehyde as a pale yellow oil, which was used in the next step without further purification.

The aldehyde in t-BuOH (6 mL) and H₂O (2 mL) was oxidized with NaH₂PO₄•H₂O (0.083 g, 0.60 mmol), a 2.0 M solution of 2-methyl-2-butene in THF (2.50 mL, 5.00 mmol), and NaClO₄ (0.034 g, 0.30 mmol) to provide the carboxylic acid as a pale yellow oil, which was used in the next step without further purification.

The carboxylic acid in CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL) and H₂O (1 mL) was treated with DDQ (0.068 g, 0.30 mmol). Purification by chromatography (15:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.047 g, 47% for three steps) as a colorless oil, which was used immediately in the next step: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.38 (dd, J = 11.4, 17.3 Hz, 1H), 6.75–6.52 (m, 2H), 6.24 (dd, J = 8.7, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 6.11 (t, J = 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (d, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 5.52–5.33 (m, 3H), 5.32–5.17 (m, 3H), 5.13 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.41 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 3.92 (d, J = 9.4 Hz, 1H), 3.80 (m, 1H), 3.52 (dd, J = 2.6, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 3.41 (t, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 2.81 (m, 1H), 2.64–2.44 (m, 2H), 2.10–1.82 (m, 2H), 1.78 (m, 1H), 1.72–1.31 (m, 5H), 1.11 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 1.02–0.80 (m, 48H), 0.18–0.02 (m, 24H).
tetramethyl-22-((1S,2Z)-1-methyl-penta-2,4-dienyl)-oxa-cyclodocosa-3,5,11,16-tetraen-2-
one (94):

A solution of the seco-acid 85β (0.037 g, 0.037 mmol) in THF (3.7 mL) at 0 °C was treated with triethylamine (0.036 mL, 0.259 mmol), 2,4,6-trichlorobenzoyl chloride (0.029 mL, 0.186 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 30 min and at ambient temperature for 1 h. A solution of DMAP (0.045 g, 0.370 mmol) in toluene (37 mL) was added at ambient temperature. The reaction mixture was stirred for 15 h. After quenching by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (15 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 15 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with a 0.2 M solution of HCl (3 × 25 mL), a sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (25 mL), brine, then dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (98:2 hexanes/EtOAc) provided a mixture (0.035 g) of 90ß and the C2 E-isomer 93 as a pale yellow oil. The same reaction with 0.034 g of the seco-acid 85β gave the mixture of macrolactone (0.027 g).

A solution of a mixture of the TBS-protected macrolactones (0.062 g, 0.064 mmol) in THF (3.2 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a 6 M solution of HCl in H₂O/MeOH (3.2 mL, prepared by slow addition of conc. HCl (1.6 mL) to MeOH (1.6 mL)). The reaction mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and stirred. Three portions of a 6 M solution of HCl (1.6 mL) and THF (1.6 mL) were added every 45 min. After 8 h, the solid NaHCO₃ was added to the reaction
mixture until no gas evolved. The mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (15:85 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.004 g, 14%, two steps) as a colorless powder and the more polar C19-lactone 95 (0.005 g, 16%, two steps) as a colorless powder: IR (NaCl) 3384, 2964, 1698, 1635, 1456, 1271, 1001 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.28 (dd, J = 10.9, 15.8 Hz, 1H), 6.61 (dt, J = 10.7, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.55 (t, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 6.05 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.02 (dd, J = 5.9, 16.0 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (dd, J = 8.4, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (d, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 5.38–5.32 (m, 2H), 5.28 (dt, J = 4.9, 10.2 Hz, 1H), 5.22 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.12 (d, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 4.87 (dd, J = 3.3, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 4.67 (dt, J = 3.6, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 4.14 (m, 1H), 3.58 (dt, J = 4.4, 6.4 Hz, 1H), 3.15 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 3.00 (m, 1H), 2.74 (m, 2H), 2.61 (m, 1H), 2.40 (m, 1H), 2.05 (m, 1H), 1.80 (m, 1H), 1.66 (m, 1H), 1.55 (m, 1H), 1.31 (m, 1H), 1.10 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 1.08 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 3H), 1.06 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.00 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H), 0.97 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 167.3, 146.3, 144.6, 134.5, 133.9, 133.8, 133.2, 130.0, 128.6, 126.5, 118.0, 116.7, 79.2, 78.7, 73.2, 72.3, 67.8, 41.0, 38.9, 38.3, 38.2, 35.6, 34.1, 29.7, 23.6, 19.1, 18.9, 17.5, 14.7, 8.3; LRMS (ESI) 539 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₁H₄₈O₆Na 539.3349, found 539.3339; [α]²⁰_D −58.0 (c 0.20, CHCl₃).

The C19-lactone 95: IR (NaCl) 3390, 2963, 2929, 1698, 1635, 1456, 1267, 1180, 1003 736 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (m, 1H), 6.66 (dt, J = 10.2, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.58 (t, J
= 11.2 Hz, 1H), 6.17 (t, \( J = 10.9 \) Hz, 1H), 6.14 (dd, \( J = 6.4, 15.7 \) Hz, 1H), 5.63 (d, \( J = 11.3 \) Hz, 1H), 5.50 (dd, \( J = 8.8, 11.0 \) Hz, 1H), 5.41–5.29 (m, 3H), 5.27 (d, \( J = 16.7 \) Hz, 1H), 5.18 (d, \( J = 10.1 \) Hz, 1H), 5.07 (dd, \( J = 5.0, 6.4 \) Hz, 1H), 4.57 (m, 1H), 3.40 (dd, \( J = 3.2, 7.9 \) Hz, 1H), 3.17 (dd, \( J = 6.0, 7.7 \) Hz, 1H), 2.86 (m, 1H), 2.67 (m, 1H), 2.58 (m, 1H), 2.48 (q, \( J = 7.5 \) Hz, 1H), 2.13 (m, 1H), 2.00 (dt, \( J = 3.3, 6.7 \) Hz, 1H), 1.81 (m, 2H), 1.70 (ddd, \( J = 7.3, 10.1, 14.1 \) Hz, 1H), 1.60 (ddd, \( J = 3.5, 5.2, 14.1 \) Hz, 1H), 1.14 (d, \( J = 7.0 \) Hz, 3H), 1.05 (d, \( J = 6.7 \) Hz, 3H), 1.02 (d, \( J = 6.9 \) Hz, 3H), 1.01 (d, \( J = 6.7 \) Hz, 3H), 0.98 (d, \( J = 6.7 \) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 166.3, 146.1, 143.8, 134.1, 134.0, 133.8, 133.7, 132.0, 131.4, 128.1, 126.7, 118.7, 117.3, 78.8, 76.2, 75.0, 72.7, 67.3, 41.3, 39.8, 38.4, 38.1, 37.6, 36.1, 31.4, 22.9, 19.5, 18.0, 17.1, 14.1, 8.8; LRMS (ESI) 539 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{31}\)H\(_{48}\)O\(_6\)Na 539.3349, found 539.3356; \([\alpha]\)\(^{20}\)\(_D\) –10.5 (c 0.19, CHCl\(_3\)).

(5R,6S,8R)-3,3,11,11-Tetraethyl-5-((S)-1-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)propan-2-yl)-6,8-dimethyl-4,10-dioxo-3,11-disilatridecane (115):

Following the procedure for the alcohol 9, the TBS 114 (12.70 g, 29.90 mmol) in MeOH (60 mL) was deprotected with a 3 M solution of HCl in MeOH (60 mL, 180.00 mmol). After workup, the crude diol (10.32 g) was protected with TESOTf (15.00 mL, 56.69 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (7.50 mL, 64.43 mmol). Purification by chromatography (15:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (13.65 g, 86% over two steps) as a colorless oil: \(^1\)H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 7.28 (d, \( J = 8.5 \) Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, \( J = 8.5 \) Hz, 2H), 4.47 (d, \( J = 12.0 \) Hz, 1H), 4.41 (d, \( J = 11.5 \) Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.55 (dd, \( J = 4.0, 8.5 \) Hz, 1H), 3.50 (dd, \( J = 5.0, 9.5 \) Hz, 1H), 3.46 (dd, \( J =
2.5, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 3.35–3.25 (m, 2H), 1.91 (m, 1H), 1.80–1.62 (m, 2H), 1.41 (m, 1H), 1.03–0.96 (m, 22H), 0.92 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.87 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.68–0.57 (m, 12H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 158.9, 130.8, 129.0, 113.5, 109.4, 72.8, 72.6, 67.9, 55.0, 38.6, 37.9, 33.3, 32.9, 17.8, 14.9, 14.2, 7.0, 6.7, 5.4, 4.3; LRMS (ESI) 561 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{30}\)H\(_{58}\)O\(_4\)Si\(_2\)Na 561.3874, found 561.3885.

(2\(S\),3\(R\),4\(S\),6\(R\))-2,4,6-Trimethyl-3,7-bis(triethylsilyloxy)heptan-1-ol (116):

Following the procedure for the alcohol 83, the PMB ether 115 (32.00 g, 59.37 mmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (900 mL) and pH 7 phosphate buffer (100 mL) was deprotected with DDQ (26.96 g, 118.75 mmol). Purification by chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (22.45 g, 90%) as a colorless oil: \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 3.59 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 2H), 3.52–3.42 (m, 2H), 3.30 (dd, J = 6.9, 9.9 Hz, 1H), 1.81 (m, 1H), 1.76–1.58 (m, 2H), 1.44 (m, 1H), 1.02–0.86 (m, 27H), 0.70–0.51 (m, 12H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 81.3, 67.7, 66.3, 38.2, 37.8, 34.9, 33.5, 18.1, 15.8, 15.3, 7.0, 6.8, 5.4, 4.4; LRMS (ESI) 441 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{22}\)H\(_{50}\)O\(_3\)Si\(_2\)Na 441.3196, found 441.3184.

(2\(R\),3\(R\),4\(S\),6\(R\))-2,4,6-Trimethyl-3,7-bis(triethylsilyloxy)heptanal (117):

Following the procedure for the aldehyde 60, the alcohol 116 (21.53 g, 51.4 mmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (186 mL) and DMSO (93 mL) was oxidized with SO\(_3\)•pyr (26.68 g, 167.62 mmol) in DMSO (93 mL) and Et\(_3\)N (31.15 mL, 223.48 mmol). Purification by chromatography (95:5 to
9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (17.18 g, 80%) as a colorless oil: \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta \) 9.77 (d, \(J = 2.7\) Hz, 1H), 3.77 (dd, \(J = 3.6, 5.7\) Hz, 1H), 3.49 (dd, \(J = 5.1, 9.9\) Hz, 1H), 3.34 (dd, \(J = 6.6, 9.6\) Hz, 1H), 2.56 (m, 1H), 1.82–1.62 (m, 2H), 1.44 (m, 1H), 1.06 (d, \(J = 7.2\) Hz, 3H), 1.02–0.88 (m, 24H), 0.67–0.54 (m, 12H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta \) 205.2, 78.0, 67.6, 50.2, 37.5, 34.7, 33.4, 18.1, 14.9, 11.9, 7.0, 6.8, 5.4, 4.4.

(2R,4S,5R,6S,Z)-8-Iodo-2,4,6-trimethyl-5-(triethylsilyloxy)oct-7-en-1-ol (118):

A suspension of methyltriphenylphosphonium iodide (28.00 g, 69.26 mmol) in THF (140 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a 1.6 M solution of BuLi in hexane (43.29 mL, 69.26 mmol) dropwise over 20 min. The resulting red solution was transferred via cannula to a solution of I\(_2\) (17.58 g, 69.26 mmol) in THF (210 mL) vigorously stirring at –78 °C. The resulting brown suspension was stirred for 0.5 h at –78 °C, and then a 1.0 M solution of sodium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide in THF (62.91 mL, 62.91 mmol) was added dropwise over 15 min. The red suspension was stirred at –78 °C for 30 min, and then at –20 °C for 15 min. The red solution was cooled to –78 °C, and then the aldehyde 117 (13.26 g, 31.81 mmol) in THF (33 mL) was added dropwise over 45 min. The mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 30 min, and then at –20 °C for 60 min. After quenching the reaction by addition of sat. aq. NH\(_4\)Cl (5 mL), the mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated under vacuum, then treated with hexane. The mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated. The filtration followed by concentration was repeated two more times to give the crude vinyl iodide (16.52 g), which was used for the next reaction without further purification.
The vinyl iodide was dissolved in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (400 mL) and MeOH (300 mL). The mixture was cooled to −10 °C, and then a solution of dichloroacetic acid (26.17 mL, 318.10 mmol) in MeOH (100 mL) was added dropwise over 30 min. The mixture was stirred −10 °C for 4 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (300 mL), the mixture was concentrated under vacuum. The residue was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 150 mL), and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (6.43 g, 48% over two steps) as a colorless oil: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 6.28 (dd, $J = 7.3$, 8.7 Hz, 1H), 6.14 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 3.53 (dd, $J = 4.5$, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 3.46 (dd, $J = 3.6$, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 3.33 (dd, $J = 6.9$, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 2.68 (m, 1H), 1.75–1.55 (m, 3H), 1.39 (m, 1H), 1.02–0.92 (m, 15H), 0.90 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H), 0.65–0.56 (m, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 144.0, 81.4, 79.7, 67.7, 43.1, 37.1, 35.8, 33.4, 18.2, 17.9, 16.2, 7.2, 5.6; LRMS (ESI) 449 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{17}$H$_{35}$IO$_2$SiNa 449.1349, found 449.1338.

(2R,4S,5R,6S,Z)-8-Iodo-2,4,6-trimethyl-5-(triethylsilyloxy)oct-7-enal (113):

Following the procedure for the aldehyde 60, the alcohol 118 (6.43 g, 15.08 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (50 mL) and DMSO (10 mL) was oxidized with SO$_3$•pyr (7.20 g, 45.23 mmol), DMSO (25 mL) and Et$_3$N (8.41 mL, 60.32 mmol). Purification by chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (6.01 g, 70%) as a colorless oil: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 9.51 (d, $J = 3.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.29 (dd, $J = 7.2$, 8.7 Hz, 1H), 6.14 (d, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 1H), 3.50 (dd, $J = 3.3$, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 2.34 (m, 1H), 1.86 (m, 1H), 1.56 (m, 1H), 1.08 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 0.99–
0.88 (m, 15H), 0.68–0.55 (m, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 205.3, 143.8, 81.5, 79.6, 44.4, 42.6, 36.4, 34.3, 18.0, 15.8, 14.7, 7.2, 5.5.


A solution of the phosphonate 99 (5.94 g, 14.48 mmol) in THF (70 mL) was treated with Ba(OH)$_2$ (1.65 g, 9.65 mmol) at room temperature. The suspension was stirred for 0.5 h. The aldehyde 113 (5.12 g, 12.06 mmol) in THF (70 mL) and H$_2$O (1.8 mL) was added to the above suspension. The mixture was stirred for 6 h, then Ba(OH)$_2$ (0.84 g) was added. After additional 6 h, the phosphonate 99 (0.99 g) was added. After additional 6h, H$_2$O (200 mL) and diethyl ether (60 mL) were added. After separation of the organic layer, the aqueous layer was extracted with diethyl ether (100 mL $\times$ 3). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (11.86 g, 88%) as a colorless oil: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.29 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 2H), 6.68 (d, $J = 8.3$, 15.7 Hz, 1H), 6.40 (dt, $J = 10.5$, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.28 (dd, $J = 7.4$, 8.7 Hz, 1H), 6.14 (d, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 1H), 6.06 (d, $J = 15.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.01 (t, $J = 11.4$ Hz, 1H), 5.53 (t, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 5.18 (dd, $J = 1.8$, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.00 (d, $J = 10.2$ Hz, 1H), 4.58 (d, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 4.53 (d, $J = 11.1$ Hz, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.69 (dd, $J = 3.0$, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 3.45 (dd, $J = 3.3$, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 2.94 (m, 1H), 2.78 (m, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 2.35 (m, 2H), 1.60–1.40 (m, 3H), 1.21 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.10 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H).
Hz, 3H), 0.99–0.92 (m, 12H), 0.87 (d, \( J = 6.6 \text{ Hz}, 3\text{H} \)), 0.68–0.56 (m, 6H); \(^{13}\text{C} \) NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 203.2, 159.2, 152.8, 143.8, 134.0, 132.4, 130.9, 129.7, 129.4, 128.2, 117.5, 113.8, 84.3, 81.5, 80.0, 75.5, 55.3, 48.6, 42.7, 39.5, 36.5, 36.3, 34.6, 20.8, 19.0, 18.0, 15.6, 14.6, 7.2, 5.6; LRMS (ESI) 731 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{36}\)H\(_{57}\)IO\(_4\)SiNa 731.2968, found 731.2975.


A solution of the enone 119 (11.34 g, 16.00 mmol) in benzene (argon-sparged, 400 mL) at 0 °C was treated with [Ph\(_3\)PCuH]\(_6\) (red powder, 20.00 g, 10.20 mmol). The red mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of H\(_2\)O (5.50 mL), the mixture was stirred under air for 1 h, then filtered through a pad of silica gel (2 cm). The filtrate was concentrated, and then hexane (100 mL) was added to the residue. The mixture was filtered through a pad of silica gel. The filtrate was concentrated. Purification by chromatography (15:1 to 4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (9.07 g, 77%) as a colorless oil: \(^1\text{H} \) NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 7.28 (d, \( J = 8.7 \text{ Hz}, 2\text{H} \)), 6.89 (d, \( J = 8.7 \text{ Hz}, 2\text{H} \)), 6.44 (dt, \( J = 10.5, 17.1 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 6.31 (dd, \( J = 7.5, 9.0 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 6.14 (d, \( J = 7.2 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 6.03 (t, \( J = 10.8 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 5.57 (t, \( J = 10.8 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 5.22 (dd, \( J = 1.8, 16.8 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 5.10 (d, \( J = 10.2 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 4.59 (d, \( J = 10.8 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 4.52 (d, \( J = 10.5 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.66 (dd, \( J = 3.3, 8.4 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 3.46 (dd, \( J = 3.6, 4.8 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H} \)), 2.83–2.62 (m, 3H), 2.45–2.35 (m, 2H), 1.78–1.57 (m, 3H), 1.46 (m, 1H), 1.25 (m, 1H), 1.19 (d, \( J = 7.2 \text{ Hz}, 3\text{H} \)), 1.10 (d, \( J = 6.6 \text{ Hz}, 3\text{H} \)), 1.03–0.92 (m, 122
12H), 0.88 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.83 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.68–0.57 (m, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 214.5, 159.2, 144.0, 134.0, 132.2, 130.8, 129.7, 129.4, 117.9, 113.8, 83.9, 81.4, 80.0, 75.4, 55.3, 50.5, 43.1, 41.0, 40.1, 36.3, 35.5, 29.8, 29.1, 20.5, 18.9, 17.7, 15.9, 14.2, 7.2, 5.6; LRMS (ESI) 733 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{36}$H$_{59}$IO$_4$SiNa 733.3125, found 733.3132.


The ketone 120 (8.24 g, 11.59 mmol) in THF (58 mL) at 0°C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of LiAlH(Ot-Bu)$_3$ in THF (57.96 mL, 57.96 mmol). After 24 h, the reaction was quenched with sat. aq. NH$_4$Cl (100 mL) and diluted with diethyl ether (100 mL). The mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 100 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (6.01 g, 70%) as a colorless oil and the less polar C19 α-epimer contaminated with impurities: $^{1}$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.27 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.86 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.74 (dt, J = 10.8, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.33 (dd, J = 7.2, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 6.13 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 6.07 (t, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.54 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.27 (dd, J = 1.2, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.16 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.72 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.42 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 3.79 (s, 3H), 3.69 (m, 1H), 3.52–3.36 (m, 2H), 3.06 (m, 1H), 2.81 (d, J = 1.8 Hz, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 1.72 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.20 (m, 9H), 1.04 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 1.02–0.92 (m, 15H), 0.89 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 3H), 0.85 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.67–0.59 (m, 6H); $^{13}$C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 159.3.
144.0, 135.4, 132.5, 129.8, 129.5, 117.9, 113.8, 87.8, 81.4, 80.1, 75.4, 74.2, 55.3, 43.1, 41.2, 38.9, 35.6, 35.5, 32.4, 32.1, 30.4, 20.8, 18.2, 17.8, 15.9, 7.3, 6.7, 5.7; LRMS (ESI) 735 [M + Na]^+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C_{36}H_{61}IO_{4}SiNa 735.3281, found 735.3287.

**The C19 α-epimer of 121:** $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.25 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 2H), 6.86 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.67 (dt, $J = 10.8, 17.1$ Hz, 1H), 6.30 (t, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 1H), 6.13 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 6.00 (t, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 5.58 (t, $J = 10.5$ Hz, 1H), 5.25 (dd, $J = 1.5, 16.5$ Hz, 1H), 5.10 (d, $J = 9.9$ Hz, 1H), 4.58 (d, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 4.52 (d, $J = 10.5$ Hz, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.60–3.51 (m, 2H), 3.46 (m, 2H), 3.01 (m, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 2.58 (d, $J = 4.8$ Hz, 1H), 1.79 (m, 1H), 1.55–1.23 (m, 8H), 1.12–0.85 (m, 24H), 0.68–0.58 (m, 6H).

![Structure of (5R,6S,8S,11R)-3,3,13,13-Tetraethyl-5-((S,Z)-4-iodobut-3-en-2-yl)-11-((2R,3S,4S,Z)-3-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-4-methylocta-5,7-dien-2-yl)-6,8-dimethyl-4,12-dioxa-3,13-disilapentadecane (111):](image)

Following the procedure for the TBS ether 34, the alcohol 121 (6.00 g, 8.42 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (84 mL) was protected with TESOTf (2.28 mL, 10.10 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (1.37 mL, 11.79 mmol). Purification by chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (6.89 g, 99%) as a colorless oil: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.32 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.90 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.64 (dt, $J = 10.5, 16.8$ Hz, 1H), 6.30 (dd, $J = 7.5, 8.7$ Hz, 1H), 6.16 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 6.07 (t, $J = 11.1$ Hz, 1H), 5.63 (t, $J = 10.5$ Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, $J = 16.8$ Hz, 1H), 5.13 (d, $J = 10.2$ Hz, 1H), 4.59 (d, $J = 10.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.53 (d, $J = 10.8$ Hz, 1H), 3.82 (s, 3H), 3.67 (m, 1H), 124
3.48 (t, J = 4.2 Hz, 1H), 3.36 (dd, J = 3.3, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 3.02 (m, 1H), 2.70 (m, 1H), 1.75–1.50 (m, 3H), 1.47–1.20 (m, 8H), 1.14 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 1.07–0.95 (m, 24H), 0.87 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.85 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 3H), 0.68–0.60 (m, 12H); 13C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl 3) δ 159.1, 144.1, 134.8, 132.4, 131.4, 129.2, 129.0, 117.3, 113.7, 84.5, 81.4, 80.0, 75.1, 73.1, 43.4, 41.5, 40.7, 35.4, 35.2, 32.6, 31.2, 30.6, 20.6, 18.9, 17.6, 15.6, 9.3, 7.3, 5.7; LRMS (ESI) 849 [M + Na]+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C42H75IO4Si2Na 849.4146, found 849.4153.


Following the procedure for the alcohol 84α, the vinyl iodide 111 (1.00 g, 1.21 mmol) in diethyl ether (24 mL) was treated with a 1.7 M solution of tert-BuLi in pentane (1.78 mL, 3.02 mmol), (–)-sparteine (0.36 mL, 1.57 mmol) and the aldehyde 112 (0.47 g, 1.45 mmol). Purification by chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.32 g, 26%) as a colorless oil and the less polar C9 β-epimer 122β (0.32 g, 26%): 1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl 3) δ 7.42 (dd, J = 11.3, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 7.29 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.91–6.85 (m, 2H), 6.21 (dd, J = 6.3, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 6.00 (t, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.61–5.55 (m, 2H), 5.44–5.32 (m, 2H), 5.20 (d, J = 16.5 Hz, 1H), 5.10 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.58–4.39 (m, 3H), 3.93 (m, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.33–3.28 (m, 2H), 2.99 (m, 1H), 2.72–2.59 (m, 2H), 2.34 (s,
1H), 1.75–1.32 (m, 6H), 1.20–0.75 (m, 50H), 0.70–0.51 (m, 12H), 0.16–0.05 (m, 9H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 147.1, 145.6, 134.9, 134.6, 132.4, 132.3, 131.3, 129.1, 129.0, 126.7, 116.2, 115.4, 113.6, 84.3, 80.2, 75.0, 72.9, 71.4, 64.8, 55.1, 50.9, 43.2, 42.7, 40.7, 40.4, 36.2, 35.4, 33.7, 32.6, 31.6, 30.4, 29.6, 20.3, 19.3, 18.8, 18.1, 15.1, 14.2, 9.2, 7.2, 7.1, 5.7, 5.6, –4.2, –4.5; LRMS (ESI) 1049 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{59}\)H\(_{106}\)O\(_8\)Si\(_3\)Na 1049.7093, found 1049.7101.

**The C\(_9\) \(\beta\)-epimer 122β:** \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.41 (dd, \(J = 11.4, 15.6\) Hz, 1H), 7.29 (d, \(J = 8.1\) Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, \(J = 8.7\) Hz, 2H), 6.65–6.54 (m, 2H), 6.25 (dd, \(J = 6.6, 15.6\) Hz, 1H), 6.04 (t, \(J = 11.1\) Hz, 1H), 5.61 (d, \(J = 11.4\) Hz, 1H), 5.55–5.34 (m, 3H), 5.20 (d, \(J = 16.8\) Hz, 1H), 5.10 (d, \(J = 10.2\) Hz, 1H), 4.57–4.46 (m, 3H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.73 (s, 3H), 3.65 (m, 1H), 3.31 (m, 2H), 2.99–2.94 (m, 2H), 2.74 (m, 1H), 2.58 (m, 1H), 1.85–1.50 (m, 6H), 1.45–0.75 (m, 50H), 0.66–0.51 (m, 12H), 0.07 (m, 9H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 166.8, 159.1, 136.8, 134.7, 133.4, 132.4, 131.3, 129.1, 129.0, 126.6, 84.4, 80.0, 75.0, 73.6, 73.1, 64.6, 55.2, 51.0, 42.7, 42.3, 41.1, 40.6, 36.9, 35.4, 33.5, 32.5, 31.6, 30.4, 25.9, 20.3, 18.8, 18.5, 18.1, 14.2, 13.9, 9.3, 7.1, 5.6, –4.1, –4.4; LRMS (ESI) 1049 [M + Na]\(^+\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{59}\)H\(_{106}\)O\(_8\)Si\(_3\)Na 1049.7093, found 1049.7189.

(S)-3-(\textit{tert}-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2-methylpropanal (129):

Following the procedures for the same compound in reference 24(c), the title aldehyde was synthesized from the (S)-Roche ester 23 (75.00 g, 0.63 mol) in three steps without purification. The crude aldehyde (135.24 g) was used for the next reaction without further purification.
(2S,3S,4S)-1-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-3-ol (132):

Following the procedure for the crotylated product 63, the title alcohol (136.05 g, 0.53 mol) was synthesized from the crude aldehyde (128.46 g, 0.63 mol) and the Roush reagent 62 (2 M in toluene, 425 mL, 0.85 mol) in four steps and 58% overall yield, starting from the (S)-Roche ester. This is a known compound (reference 45).

\[
\text{TBSO} \begin{array}{c}
\text{OH} \\
\text{CH}_2
\end{array}
\]

tert-Butyl((2S,3S,4S)-3-(4-methoxybenzylxoy)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-enyloxy)dimethylsilane (133):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 9b, the title PMB ether (72.35 g, 0.19 mol) was synthesized from the alcohol 132 (58.95 g, 0.23 mol), PMBBBr (100.00 g, 0.50 mol) and NaH (60 wt. %, 12.0 g, 0.60 mol) in 84% yield.

\[
\text{TBSO} \begin{array}{c}
\text{OPMB} \\
\text{CH}_2
\end{array}
\]

(2R,3R,4S)-5-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-3-(4-methoxybenzylxox)-2,4-dimethylpentanal (134):

Following the procedure for the same compound in reference 9b, the alkene 133 (24.70 g, 65.30 mmol) was ozonized to give the crude aldehyde (24.84 g). The aldehyde was used for the next reaction without further purification.
**tert-Butyl((2S,3S,4S,Z)-3-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-2,4-dimethylocta-5,7-dienyloxy)dimethylsilane (136):**

A Matteson reagent 135 (20.88 g, 86.93 mmol) was added to a mixture of 4 Å molecular sieves (3.0 g, powdered) and the above-obtained aldehyde (24.84 g) in diethylether (65 mL) at room temperature. After 2 days, the mixture was diluted with H₂O (100 mL), and extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 100 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated to give the crude β-hydroxysilane (35.2 g).

A solution of the β-hydroxysilane in THF (650 mL) at 0 °C was treated with NaH (95 wt. %, 33.00 g, 1.31 mol) portionwise over 30 min. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 2 h. Then the mixture was carefully poured into a mixture of ice and NH₄Cl. The mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 100 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (19.10 g, 72% yield for three steps). This is a known compound (reference 24(c)).
Dimethyl (3R,4S,5S,Z)-4-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-3,5-dimethyl-2-oxona-6,8-dienylphosphonate (99):

Following the procedures for the same compound in reference 24(c), the title phosphonate (7.80 g) was synthesized from the TBS ether 136 (19.00 g, 46.73 mol) in 61% yield for four steps.

(2S,3R,4S)-3-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,4-dimethylhex-5-en-1-ol (137):

Following the procedure for the TBS ether 34, the alcohol 132 (58.0 g, 224.4 mmol) was protected with TBSOTf (56.7 mL, 246.8 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (39.2 mL, 336.2 mmol) in CH2Cl2 (224 mL). After workup, the crude TBS ether (92.35 g) was used for the next reaction without further purification.

A solution of the TBS ether in CH2Cl2 (750 mL) and MeOH (700 mL) at –50 °C was treated with a solution of camphor-10-sulfonic acid (10.4 g, 44.9 mmol) in MeOH (50 mL) dropwise over 30 min. The mixture was warmed to –10 °C and stirred. After 2 h, additional camphor-10-sulfonic acid (10.4 g) was added. The mixture was stirred for 1.5 h. After quenching the reaction at –10 °C by addition of NaHCO3 (15 g) and H2O (150 mL), the mixture was concentrated under vacuum. The residue was extracted with ether (2 × 300 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO4) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (38.6 g, 67% over
two steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3346, 2958, 2886, 1462, 1254, 1041 cm⁻¹; \(^1\)H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 5.89 (ddd, \(J = 8.0, 10.5, 17.0\) Hz, 1H), 5.05–4.95 (m, 2H), 3.66 (t, \(J = 3.5\) Hz, 1H), 3.61 (dd, \(J = 7.5, 11.0\) Hz, 1H), 2.46 (s, 1H), 2.40 (m, 1H), 1.88 (m, 1H), 1.02 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H), 0.90 (s, 3H), 0.87 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H), 0.06 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 141.6, 114.3, 77.0, 65.6, 41.9, 39.6, 26.0, 18.2, 17.9, 12.3, –3.9, –4.1; LRMS (ESI) 281 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{14}\)H\(_{30}\)O\(_2\)SiNa 281.1913, found 281.1918; \([\alpha]^{20}_D\) –2.0 (c 0.70, CHCl\(_3\)).

\(\text{(2R,4S,5S,6S)-5-(tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy)-2,4,6-trimethyloct-7-en-1-ol (139):}
\)

**Iodination.** PPh\(_3\) (94.0 g, 358 mmol), imidazole (24.4 g, 358 mmol) and DIPEA (62.4 mL, 358 mmol) were added to a mixture of benzene (440 mL), diethyl ether (900 mL) and acetonitrile (150 mL). Then, I\(_2\) (90.9 g, 358 mmol) was added to the above solution portionwise over 1 h, maintaining the internal temperature at 15–25 °C. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1.5 h. The alcohol 137 (62.0 g, 239 mmol) in diethyl ether (30 mL) was added. After 3 h, the reaction mixture was quenched with ice. H\(_2\)O (300 mL) was added to the mixture. The organic layer was separated, and washed with 0.5 N NaHSO\(_4\) (300 mL × 2) then sat. aq. NaHCO\(_3\) (300 mL). Then, the organic layer was dried (MgSO\(_4\)) and concentrated. Pentane (500 mL) was added to the residue, and the mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated. The crude iodide (92.05 g, 105% yield) was used for the next reaction without further purification.
**Myers alkylation.** A suspension of LiCl (128.6 g, 3035 mmol) and diisopropylamine (144.0 mL, 1028 mmol) in THF (500 mL) at –78 °C was treated with a solution of BuLi in hexane (1.6 M, 597.5 mL, 956 mmol) dropwise over 1h, maintaining the internal temperature below –65 °C. The mixture was warmed to 0 °C, stirred for 15 min, and then cooled to –78 °C. The Myers amide 138 (111.1 g, 502 mmol) in THF (500 mL) was added to the above mixture dropwise over 1 h, maintaining the internal temperature below –65 °C. The mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 2.5 h, and warmed to room temperature over 1 h, and stirred for 15 min, and then cooled to –50 °C. The crude iodide was added dropwise over 1 h. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 3 h and then at room temperature for 48 h. After quenching the reaction at 0 °C by addition of sat. aq. NH₄Cl (100 mL) and H₂O (200 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 300 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. A mixture of hexane (400 mL) and diethyl ether (100 mL) was added to the residue. The mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated. The alkylated compound (115.3 g, 104%) was used for the next reaction without further purification.

**Reductive removal of the auxiliary.** A solution of diisopropylamine (107.0 mL, 765 mmol) in THF (765 mL) at –78 °C was treated with a solution of BuLi in hexane (1.6 M, 448.0 mL, 717 mmol) dropwise over 1 h, maintaining the internal temperature below –65 °C. The mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 10 min, and then at 0 °C for 10 min. BH₃•NH₃ (tech. 90%, 25.7 g, 748 mmol) was added to the mixture portionwise over 30 min, maintaining the internal temperature below 5 °C. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 30 min, and at room temperature for 30 min, and then cooled to 0 °C. The above-obtained alkylated compound in THF (240 mL) was added to the reaction mixture dropwise over 25 min. The mixture was warmed to room
temperature and stirred for 6 h. After quenching the reaction at 0 °C by slow addition of 2 M NaOH (230 mL), the mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1.5 h, and then extracted with diethyl ether (2 × 300 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Hexane (400 mL) was added to the residue. The mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (56.0 g, 78% over three steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3347, 2957, 2929, 2857, 1460, 1253, 1038 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 5.84 (ddd, J = 8.0, 10.5, 18.0 Hz, 1H), 4.98–4.93 (m, 2H), 3.52 (dd, J = 4.5, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 3.37 (dd, J = 4.0, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 3.26 (dd, J = 7.0, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 2.51 (s, 1H), 2.35 (m, 1H), 1.68–1.63 (m, 2H), 1.38 (m, 1H), 0.99 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.92–0.86 (m, 16H), 0.03 (s, 6H); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 142.1, 113.8, 79.0, 67.5, 42.7, 38.2, 33.9, 33.2, 26.1, 18.3, 17.8, 17.6, 15.7, –3.6, –3.7; LRMS (ESI) 323 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₁₇H₃₆O₂SiNa 323.2382, found 323.2375; [α]²⁰_D –9.2 (c 0.13, CHCl₃).

**tert-Butyl((3S,4S,5S,7R)-8-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-3,5,7-trimethyloct-1-en-4-yloxy)dimethylsilane:**

**Preparation of trichloroimidate 24.** A suspension of sodium hydride (0.79 g, 30 mol) in diethyl ether (300 mL) at −10 °C was treated with p-methoxybenzyl alcohol (47.7 g, 330 mmol) dropwise over 1 h. The mixture was warmed to room temperature, stirred for 30 min, and then cooled to −10 °C. A solution of trichloroacetonitrile (47.65 g, 330 mmol) in diethyl ether (100 mL) was added dropwise over 1 h. The mixture was warmed to 0 °C then stirred for 30 min. The
mixture was concentrated under vacuum, then pentane (400 mL) was added. The mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite. The filtrate was concentrated. The crude trichloroimidate (93.24 g) was used for the next reaction without further purification.

**Formation of the PMB ether.** A solution of the alcohol 139 (29.9 g, 99.7 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (100 mL) and cyclohexane (200 mL) at 0 °C was treated with trichloroimidate 24 (42.2 g) dropwise over 10 min. Then, BF₃•OEt₂ in CH₂Cl₂ (50 mL) was added over 8 h via syringe pump. After quenching the reaction at 0 °C by addition of ice and sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (200 mL), the mixture was warmed to room temperature and extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 200 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (27.9 g, 70%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2956, 2930, 2856, 1513, 1462, 1249, 1091 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.30 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.92 (d, J = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 5.87 (ddd, J = 8.0, 10.5, 18.0 Hz, 1H), 5.03–4.98 (m, 2H), 4.49 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 4.43 (d, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 3.84 (s, 3H), 3.43 (dd, J = 3.5, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 3.36 (dd, J = 4.5, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.18 (dd, J = 7.0, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 2.39 (m, 1H), 1.83 (m, 1H), 1.73 (m, 1H), 1.48 (m, 1H), 1.04 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.99 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.96–0.94 (m, 10H), 0.92 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.09 (s, 3H), 0.07 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.0, 142.2, 130.9, 129.0, 127.5, 113.8, 113.7, 113.6, 79.1, 75.4, 72.6, 55.2, 42.8, 39.0, 34.0, 31.2, 26.2, 26.0, 18.4, 17.6, 15.7, −3.6, −3.7; LRMS (ESI) 443 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₂₅H₄₄O₅SiNa 443.2957, found 443.2968; [α]₂₀ D −14.4 (c 0.25, CHCl₃).
(3S,4S,5S,7R)-8-(4-Methoxybenzyl)-3,5,7-trimethyl-1-en-4-ol (128):

A solution of TBAF in THF (1.0 M, 164.5 mL, 164.5 mmol) was added to the above-obtained PMB ether (27.70 g, 65.84 mmol) at room temperature. The mixture was warmed to 50 °C, then stirred for 24 h. An additional solution of TBAF (65 mL) was added, and the mixture was stirred for 8 h. After quenching the reaction at room temperature by addition of brine (250 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (4 × 200 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (12.8 g, 63%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3465, 2961, 2931, 2870, 1513, 1247, 1091 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 5.74 (m, 1H), 5.15–5.10 (m, 2H), 4.43 (s, 3H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.35 (dd, J = 5.4, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.23–3.11 (m, 2H), 2.27 (m, 1H), 1.86 (m, 1H), 1.76 (m, 1H), 1.60–1.50 (m, 2H), 0.98 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.89 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 159.7, 142.4, 131.4, 129.6, 116.3, 114.3, 76.7, 76.2, 73.2, 55.7, 42.4, 38.9, 32.4, 31.3, 18.7, 17.2, 14.0; LRMS (ESI) 329 [M + Na]+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₁₉H₃₀O₃SiNa 329.2093, found 329.2088; [α]²⁰D –3.9 (c 0.58, CHCl₃).
Mixture of the silylketals 155 and 156:

A solution of the C11′–C17 alcohol 128 (1.12 g, 3.67 mmol) in THF (30 mL) at −78 °C was treated with a 1.6 M solution of BuLi in hexane (2.50 mL, 4.04 mmol) dropwise over 3 min. The mixture was stirred for 15 min and warmed to room temperature over 15 min, and then cooled to −78 °C. Dichlorodimethylsilane (3.54 mL, 29.36 mmol) was added to the mixture, which was warmed to room temperature over 15 min and stirred for 1.5 h. The mixture was concentrated under vacuum for 4 h. CH₂Cl₂ (3 mL) was added to the residue and the mixture was cooled to 0 °C. A mixture of the C9 S/R alcohols 151 and 152 (1.30 g, 3.67 mmol) and imidazole (0.97 g, 14.68 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (3.7 mL) was added to the reaction mixture. This was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 36 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (10 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 15 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 to 9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (2.23 g, 85%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2959, 2931, 2857, 1720, 1254, 1089 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.38 (dd, J = 11.4, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 7.27 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.60 (t, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 6.19 (dd, J = 6.9, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 5.93–5.75 (m, 2H), 5.60 (d, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 5.20–4.92 (m, 4H), 4.46 (q, J = 12.0 Hz, 2H), 4.29 (m, 1H), 3.81 (m, 4H), 3.77 (s, 3H), 3.41–3.32 (m, 2H), 3.16 (dd, J = 7.5, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 2.53 (m, 1H), 2.34 (q, J = 6.6 Hz, 1H), 1.87 (m, 1H), 1.80–1.60 (m, 2H), 1.50–1.30 (m, 2H), 1.05 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 3H), 0.98–0.92 (m, 7H), 0.89–0.84 (m,
$13^C$ NMR (75 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 166.7, 159.0, 147.9, 145.6, 142.0, 141.6, 130.8, 128.9, 126.3, 115.3, 114.4, 114.1, 113.6, 80.1, 75.2, 72.6, 71.6, 55.0, 50.8, 42.6, 42.2, 41.8, 38.6, 33.4, 31.0, 25.9, 18.5, 18.0, 17.5, 14.8, 13.8, 1.0, −0.6, −1.0, −4.1, −4.2; LRMS (ESI) 739 $[M + Na]^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{40}$H$_{68}$O$_7$Si$_2$Na 739.4401, found 739.4431; $[\alpha]^{20}_D$ −34.4 (c 1.10, CHCl$_3$).

(2Z,4E,6S,7S,9S,10Z,12S,13R,14S,16R)-Methyl 7-(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-9,13-dihydroxy-17-(4-methoxybenzyl oxy)-6,12,14,16-tetramethylheptadeca-2,4,10-trienoate (157): 

**Ring-closing metathesis.** A solution of the silylketal mixture 155 and 156 (2.23 g, 3.11 mmol) in degassed benzene (310 mL, argon-sparged) was treated with a Hoveyda-Grubbs II catalyst (0.1 g, 0.16 mmol). The mixture was warmed to 90 °C and stirred for 1 h. An additional catalyst (0.1 g, 0.16 mmol) in benzene (16 mL) was added to the mixture over 2 h via a syringe pump. After 3 h, an additional catalyst (0.1 g, 0.16 mmol) was added. After 1h, the mixture was cooled to room temperature and concentrated under vacuum. Purification of the residue by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the disiloxane mixture 148 and 149 (1.23 g, 57%) contaminated with impurity, and a mixture of the 11-membered disiloxane 150 and the recovered silylketals (0.21 g, 10% yield).
Deprotection. A solution of the disiloxane mixture 148 and 149 (1.23 g, 1.78 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (35 mL) and MeOH (25 mL) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of dichloroacetic acid (0.74 mL, 8.93 mmol) in MeOH (10 mL) dropwise over 1 min. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 3 h, and then an additional solution of dichloroacetic acid (0.37 mL, 4.47 mmol) in MeOH (5 mL) was added. The mixture was stirred for 1 h. After quenching the reaction at 0 °C by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (50 mL), the mixture was concentrated under vacuum. The residue was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 50 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc with 2% MeOH) provided the title compound (more polar, 0.73 g, 65%) and the impure C9R diol (0.12 g, 10% yield): IR (NaCl) 3415, 2957, 2930, 2857, 1718, 1250, 1069 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.41 (dd, J = 11.1, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 7.25 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 6.87 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.58 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 6.17 (dd, J = 6.9, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (d, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 5.51 (dd, J = 8.0, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.30 (t, J = 10.6 Hz, 1H), 4.65 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 4.43 (q, J = 11.8 Hz, 2H), 3.90 (m, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.73 (s, 3H), 3.29 (dd, J = 5.7, 8.9 Hz, 1H), 3.21 (m, 1H), 3.17 (m, 1H), 2.72 (m, 1H), 2.65 (m, 1H), 1.86 (m, 1H), 1.75 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.49 (m, 3H), 1.10 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 1.06 (m, 1H), 0.96–0.90 (m, 15H), 0.86 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H), 0.15–0.10 (m, 6H); ¹³C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 166.9, 159.1, 147.1, 145.6, 134.7, 133.9, 130.7, 129.2, 129.1, 126.7, 115.5, 113.8, 113.7, 76.2, 75.8, 73.6, 72.6, 65.2, 55.2, 51.1, 42.2, 40.3, 38.4, 36.1, 31.4, 30.6, 26.0, 25.9, 18.0, 17.9, 17.4, 17.3, 15.5, 13.0, –4.4, –4.5; LRMS (ESI) 655 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₆H₆₀O₇SiNa 655.4006, found 655.4026; [α]₂⁰D –27.8 (c 0.50, CHCl₃).

The 11-membered disiloxane 150: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.27 (d, J = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 5.64 (m, 1H), 5.52 (m, 1H0, 5.40–5.35 (m, 2H), 4.50–4.35 (m,
3H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.69 (m, 1H), 3.40–3.33 (m, 2H), 3.15 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 2.33 (m, 1H), 2.12–1.95 (m, 3H), 1.93–1.77 (m, 2H), 1.75–1.62 (m, 2H), 1.50–1.25 (m, 6H), 1.06 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 1.00–0.80 (m, 24H), 0.15–0.03 (m, 12H).

The C9R diol 158: $^1$H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.37 (dd, J = 11.1, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 7.25 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.59 (t, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 6.23 (dd, J = 6.3, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 5.52 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.51 (dd, J = 7.8, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.35 (t, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.49–4.47 (m, 1H), 4.42 (s, 2H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.77 (m, 1H), 3.73 (s, 3H), 3.25 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 2H), 3.17 (dd, J = 1.5, 8.1 Hz, 1H), 2.70 (m, 1H), 2.59 (m, 1H), 1.86–1.50 (m, 6H), 1.05 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 0.95–0.80 (m, 18H), 0.07 (s, 6H).

![Chemical structure](image)

(2Z,4E,6S,7S,9S,10Z,12S,13S,14S,16R)-Methyl 7,9,13-tris(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-17-(4-methoxybenzyloxy)-6,12,14,16-tetramethylheptadeca-2,4,10-trienoate (159):

A solution of the alcohol 157 (0.20 g, 0.32 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (0.15 mL, 1.26 mmol) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (6 mL) at –78 °C was treated with TBSOTf (0.22 mL, 0.95 mmol). The reaction mixture was warmed to 0 °C and stirred for 1.5 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of H$_2$O, the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.23 g, 85%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2957, 2931, 2858, 1721, 1252, 1090 cm$^{-1}$; $^1$H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.35 (dd, J = 11.3, 15.5...
Hz, 1H), 7.25 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.54 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 6.22 (dd, J = 5.9, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 5.55 (d, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 5.38 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (dd, J = 8.4, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 4.54 (t, J = 9.2 Hz, 1H), 4.41 (q, J = 11.7 Hz, 2H), 3.93 (dd, J = 3.4, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.35 (m, 1H), 3.32 (dd, J = 4.7, 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.08 (t, J = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 2.55 (m, 2H), 1.75 (m, 1H), 1.62 (m, 1H), 1.51–1.30 (m, 3H), 1.04 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.95 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.92–0.87 (m, 31H), 0.85 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H), 0.10–0.00 (m, 18H); $^{13}$C NMR (151 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 166.7, 159.1, 146.8, 145.7, 132.7, 132.4, 130.8, 129.0, 126.6, 115.1, 113.6, 79.8, 75.4, 72.8, 72.6, 66.4, 55.0, 50.8, 42.9, 42.2, 37.8, 35.6, 35.4, 31.6, 31.2, 26.3, 26.2, 26.0, 25.9, 19.5, 18.8, 18.4, 18.1, 15.5, 14.6, –2.8, –3.5, –3.8, –4.2; LRMS (ESI) 883 [M + Na]$^+$; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C$_{48}$H$_{88}$O$_7$Si$_3$Na 883.5736, found 883.5770; $[\alpha]_{D}^{20}$ –72.2 (c 0.68, CHCl$_3$).

![Chemical structure](image_url)

(2Z,4E,6S,7S,9S,10Z,12S,13R,14S,16R)-Methyl 7,9,13-tris(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-17-hydroxy-,12,14,16-tetramethylheptadeca-2,4,10-trienoate (160):

A mixture of the PMB ether 159 (0.73 g, 0.85 mmol), CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (17 mL) and pH 7 buffer (0.85 mL) at 0 °C was treated with DDQ (0.23 g,1.02 mmol). The mixture was stirred for 1.5 h. After quenching the reaction at 0 °C by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ (20 mL), the mixture was warmed to room temperature and extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 20 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO$_3$ and brine, dried (MgSO$_4$) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.44
g, 73%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3376, 2957, 2931, 2858, 1723, 1463, 1254, 1070 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.35 (dd, J = 11.3, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.56 (t, J = 11.3 Hz, 1H), 6.22 (dd, J = 6.0, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.44 (t, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, J = 8.4, 11.2 Hz, 1H), 4.56 (t, J = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.95 (dd, J = 2.9, 8.1 Hz, 1H), 3.74 (s, 3H), 3.52 (m, 1H), 3.38–3.30 (m, 2H), 2.57 (m, 2H), 1.64–1.58 (m, 2H), 1.50–1.23 (m, 3H), 1.05 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.98 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.92–0.86 (m, 31H), 0.11–0.03 (m, 18H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 167.4, 147.5, 146.2, 133.3, 132.8, 127.1, 115.7, 80.4, 73.4, 68.1, 66.9, 51.5, 43.4, 42.7, 37.8, 36.1, 36.0, 33.8, 26.8, 26.5, 20.1, 18.9, 18.6, 16.1, 15.2, −2.2, −3.0, −3.1; LRMS (ESI) 763 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₄₀H₈₀O₆Si₃Na 763.5160, found 763.5157; [α]²₀_D −96.1 (c 0.34, CHCl₃).


A solution of the alcohol 160 (0.42 g, 0.57 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (5.7 mL) at 0 °C was treated with Dess–Martin periodinane (0.29 g, 0.68 mmol). The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 2 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of a mixture of sat. aq. Na₂S₂O₃ (3 mL) and sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (3 mL), the mixture was extracted with EtOAc (3 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (10 mL) and brine, then
dried over MgSO₄. Concentration under vacuum provided the crude aldehyde 125 (0.51 g), which was used in the next step without further purification: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.48 (d, J = 2.7 Hz, 1H), 7.35 (dd, J = 10.9, 15.2 Hz, 1H), 6.55 (t, J = 11.2 Hz, 1H), 6.24 (dd, J = 5.6, 15.4 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.45 (t, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, J = 8.7, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 4.55 (t, J = 9.2 Hz, 1H), 3.95 (dd, J = 2.0, 6.0 Hz, 1H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.39 (m, 1H), 2.65–2.50 (m, 3H), 2.34 (m, 1H), 1.84 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.42 (m, 3H), 1.27 (m, 1H), 1.08–1.01 (m, 6H), 0.98 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H), 0.93–0.85 (m, 31H), 0.11–0.02 (m, 18H).

A solution of the phosphonate 99 (0.35 g, 0.85 mmol) in THF (2.8 mL) at room temperature was treated with Ba(OH)₂ (0.10 g, 0.57 mmol). The mixture was stirred for 0.5 h, and then the aldehyde 125 in THF (5.6 mL) and water (0.14 mL) was added. The mixture was stirred for 12 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of water (10 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (15:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.51 g, 89% over two steps) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3351, 2958, 2931, 2857, 1722, 1630, 1462, 1251, 1072 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.36 (dd, J = 11.5, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 7.28 (d, J = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.65 (dd, J = 8.0, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.53 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.39 (dt, J = 10.5, 16.5 Hz, 1H), 6.22 (dd, J = 6.0, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.04 (dd, J = 11.5, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.57 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.53 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.41 (t, J = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 5.26 (dd, J = 8.5, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.15 (d, J = 16.5 Hz, 1H), 5.02 (d, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 4.57–4.50 (m, 3H), 3.95 (dd, J = 3.5, 8.0 Hz, 1H), 3.87 (s, 3H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.69 (dd, J = 3.5, 8.5 Hz, 1H), 3.35 (t, J = 3.5 Hz, 1H), 2.93 (m, 1H), 2.79 (m, 1H), 2.60–2.50 (m, 2H), 2.20 (m, 1H), 1.53–1.42 (m, 2H), 1.35–1.25 (m, 2H), 1.19 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H).
Hz, 3H), 1.09 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 1.05 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 1.02 (m, 1H), 0.98–0.94 (m, 6H), 0.91–0.87 (m, 27H), 0.83 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 0.11–0.00 (m, 18H); 13C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 166.7, 159.1, 152.6, 146.7, 145.5, 133.9, 132.6, 132.4, 132.1, 130.7, 129.6, 129.3, 127.9, 126.5, 125.4, 117.3, 115.2, 113.6, 84.1, 80.0, 75.3, 72.8, 66.3, 55.1, 50.9, 48.7, 42.9, 42.1, 38.9, 36.4, 36.0, 34.5, 34.4, 30.3, 26.2, 25.9, 20.7, 19.8, 18.9, 18.3, 18.1, 15.2, 14.6, 14.3, −2.7, −3.7, −4.1, −4.2; LRMS (ESI) 1045 [M + Na]+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C59H102O8Si3Na 1045.6780, found 1045.6769; [α]20D −51.0 (c 0.30, CHCl3).


A mixture of [Ph3PCuH]6 (red powder, 0.78 g, 0.40 mmol) in benzene (12.5 mL, argon-sparged) at 0 °C was treated with a solution of the enone 161 (0.51g, 0.50 mmol) in benzene (2 mL). The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1.5 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of pH 7 phosphate buffer (0.2 mL), the mixture was stirred under air for 1 h. The mixture was filtered through Celite-pad, and then concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (95:5 to 9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.39 g, 78%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3350, 2957, 2930, 2857, 1718, 1641, 1462, 1251, 1072 cm−1; 1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.35 (dd, J = 10.5, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 7.28 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (d, J = 9.0
Hz, 2H), 6.55 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.44 (dt, J = 10.5, 17.0 Hz, 1H), 6.22 (dd, J = 5.5, 15.5 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.58–5.50 (m, 2H), 5.42 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, J = 8.5, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.21 (d, J = 17.0 Hz, 1H), 5.08 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 4.58–4.49 (m, 3H), 3.95 (dd, J = 2.5, 8.0 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.65 (dd, J = 3.5, 8.5 Hz, 1H), 3.36 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 2.80–2.71 (m, 2H), 2.60–2.50 (m, 2H), 2.43–2.33 (m, 2H), 1.70–1.60 (m, 2H), 1.52 (dd, J = 10.5, 13.0 Hz, 1H), 1.40–1.20 (m, 3H), 1.18 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 1.10 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 1.04 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 0.97 (m, 4H), 0.90–0.87 (m, 27H), 0.83 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 3H), 0.78 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.11–0.00 (m, 18H); \(^{13}\text{C NMR} (125\text{ MHz, CDCl}_3) \delta 166.7, 159.2, 147.0, 145.7, 133.9, 132.6, 132.4, 132.1, 130.7, 129.6, 129.3, 126.4, 117.7, 115.1, 113.7, 83.8, 80.0, 75.3, 72.8, 66.4, 55.1, 50.9, 50.4, 42.9, 42.2, 40.9, 40.2, 36.1, 35.3, 35.2, 29.7, 29.3, 26.2, 25.9, 20.4, 19.6, 18.8, 18.4, 18.1, 15.3, 14.6, 14.0, −2.7, −3.5, −3.6, −4.1, −4.2; LRMS (ESI) 1047 [M + Na]^+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{59}\)H\(_{104}\)O\(_8\)Si\(_3\)Na 1047.6937, found 1047.6963; [\(\alpha\)]\(^{20}\)\(_{D}\) −50.6 (c 0.34, CHCl\(_3\)).


**PMB-deprotection.** A mixture of the PMB ether 164 (0.30 g, 0.29 mmol), CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (10 mL) and pH 7 buffer (0.50 mL) at 0 °C was treated with DDQ (0.10 g, 0.44 mmol). The mixture was stirred for 1.5 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO\(_3\) (10 mL), the
mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 1.5 h, and then extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with sat. aq. NaHCO₃ and brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (9:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided a ketone (0.23g, 87%), which was contaminated with unknown impurities: ¹H NMR of the pure fraction (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.38 (dd, J = 11.1, 15.3 Hz, 1H), 6.63–6.49 (m, 2H), 6.25 (dd, J = 6.0, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 6.12 (t, J = 11.10 Hz, 1H), 5.57 (d, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 5.45–5.37 (m, 2H), 5.29–5.20 (m, 2H), 5.15 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.58 (t, J = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.95 (dd, J = 2.4, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 3.75–3.70 (m, 4H), 3.37 (m, 1H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 2.63–2.43 (m, 4H), 2.36 (d, J = 3.3 Hz, 1H), 1.70–1.61 (m, 2H), 1.57–1.20 (m, 6H), 1.18 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 1.05–0.80 (m, 42H), 0.11–0.03 (m, 18H).

**Reduction.** A solution of the ketone (0.23 g, 0.25 mmol) in THF (2.5 mL) and MeOH (0.5 mL) at −78 °C was treated with a 1.0 M solution of Et₂BOMe in THF (0.76 mL, 0.76 mmol) dropwise over 2 min. After 1 h, NaBH₄ (19 mg, 0.51 mmol) was added. The mixture was stirred at −78 °C for 6 h, and quenched by the dropwise addition of acetic acid (1 mL). H₂O (10 mL) was added and the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (4 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. The residue was taken up in a 1.0 M solution of NaOAc in MeOH (18 mL) and H₂O (2 mL), to which 30% H₂O₂ (1.5 mL) was added. After stirring at room temperature for 2 h, the mixture was diluted with H₂O (10 mL) and extracted with diethyl ether (4 × 10 mL), dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (4:1 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.20 g, 87%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 3382, 2957, 2930, 2857, 1721, 1462, 1254, 1073 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.35 (dd, J = 11.4, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 6.65 (dt, J = 10.8, 16.8 Hz, 1H), 6.56 (t, J =
11.4 Hz, 1H), 6.24 (dd, \( J = 6.0, 15.6 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 6.20 (t, \( J = 10.8 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 5.58 (d, \( J = 11.4 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 5.42 (t, \( J = 10.8 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 5.30–5.20 (m, 3H), 5.18 (d, \( J = 10.2 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 4.57 (t, \( J = 9.6 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 3.94 (dd, \( J = 3.6, 9.0 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 3.77 (m, 1H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.47 (d, \( J = 9.0 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 3.36 (t, \( J = 3.6 \text{ Hz}, 1H \)), 3.29 (s, 1H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.60–2.53 (m, 2H), 2.30 (s, 1H), 1.75–1.63 (m, 2H), 1.50–1.40 (m, 5H), 1.30–1.25 (m, 3H), 1.05 (d, \( J = 7.2 \text{ Hz}, 3H \)), 1.10–0.94 (m, 10H), 0.92–0.88 (m, 27H), 0.85 (d, \( J = 6.6 \text{ Hz}, 3H \)), 0.83 (d, \( J = 7.2 \text{ Hz}, 3H \)), 0.11–0.03 (m, 18H); \(^{13}\text{C} \text{ NMR (75 MHz, CDCl}_3 \text{)} \delta 167.5, 147.7, 146.3, 135.0, 133.2, 133.0, 132.5, 132.3, 127.0, 119.4, 115.6, 81.2, 80.7, 77.8, 73.3, 67.0, 51.5, 43.5, 42.8, 41.5, 37.6, 36.9, 35.9, 32.9, 32.8, 30.9, 26.8, 26.5, 21.2, 20.2, 19.0, 18.6, 17.3, 16.0, 15.1, 4.8, –2.2, –2.9, –3.0, –3.5, –3.6; LRMS (ESI) 929 [M + Na]^+; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{51}\)H\(_{98}\)O\(_7\)Si\(_3\)Na 929.6518, found 929.6531; [\(\alpha\)]\(^{20}\)D –55.4 (c 0.26, CHCl\(_3\)).

(2\(Z\),4\(E\),6\(S\),7\(S\),9\(S\),10\(Z\),12\(S\),13\(R\),14\(S\),16\(S\),19\(R\),20\(R\),21\(S\),22\(S\),23\(Z\))-Methyl 7,9,13,19-tetrakis(tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-21-hydroxy-6,12,14,16,20,22-hexamethylhexacosa-2,4,10,23,25-pentaenoate (168):

A solution of the diol 167 (0.20 g, 0.22 mmol) and 2,6-lutidine (77 µL, 0.66 mmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (4.4 mL) at –78 °C was treated with TBSOTf (50 µL, 0.22 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred at –78 °C for 0.5 h and at 0 °C for 1 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of sat. aq. NaHCO\(_3\) (5 mL), the mixture was extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 5 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO\(_4\)) and concentrated. Purification by column
chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (0.19 g, 85%) as a colorless oil: IR (NaCl) 2956, 2930, 2857, 1722, 1462, 1254, 1089 cm\(^{-1}\); \(^1\)H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.39 (dd, \(J = 11.7, 14.7\) Hz, 1H), 6.65–6.52 (m, 2H), 6.21 (dd, \(J = 5.7, 15.6\) Hz, 1H), 6.11 (t, \(J = 10.8\) Hz, 1H), 5.56 (d, \(J = 11.1\) Hz, 1H), 5.45–5.32 (m, 2H), 5.30–5.15 (m, 2H), 5.10 (d, \(J = 9.9\) Hz, 1H), 4.54 (t, \(J = 8.4\) Hz, 1H), 3.94 (d, \(J = 5.4\) Hz, 1H), 3.56–3.52 (m, 4H), 3.47 (d, \(J = 4.5\) Hz, 1H), 3.35 (m, 1H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.60–2.50 (m, 2H), 2.33 (s, 1H), 1.60–1.52 (m, 3H), 1.50–1.21 (m, 7H), 1.10–0.75 (m, 55H), 0.15–0.00 (m, 24H); \(^1\)C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 166.8, 147.1, 145.7, 135.2, 132.6, 132.5, 132.2, 129.9, 126.4, 117.7, 115.0, 79.9, 76.5, 72.7, 66.4, 50.9, 42.9, 42.1, 41.1, 37.7, 36.0, 35.5, 35.0, 32.0, 31.3, 30.5, 26.2, 25.9, 20.4, 19.4, 18.4, 18.1, 18.0, 17.6, 15.3, 14.5, 6.9, –2.8, –3.4, –3.7, –4.1, –4.4; LRMS (ESI) 1043 [M + Na]\(^{+}\); HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C\(_{57}\)H\(_{112}\)O\(_7\)Si\(_4\)Na 1043.7383, found 1043.7358; \([\alpha]\)\(_D\)\(^{20}\) –62.2 (c 0.37, CHCl\(_3\)).

(3\(Z\),5\(E\),7\(S\),8\(S\),10\(S\),11\(Z\),13\(S\),14\(R\),15\(S\),17\(S\),20\(R\),21\(S\),22\(S\))-22-((S,Z)-Hexa-3,5-dien-2-yl)-8,10,14,20-tetrahydroxy-7,13,15,17,21-pentamethyloxacyclodocosa-3,5,11-trien-2-one (101):

The seco-acid 169. A solution of the ester 168 (0.14 g, 0.14 mmol) in ethanol (15 mL) and THF (3 mL) at room temperature was treated with a 1.0 M solution of KOH (aqueous, 1.47 mL, 1.47 mmol). The mixture was warmed to 80 °C and stirred for 5 h. After concentration under vacuum, the residue was acidified with 0.1 M HCl to pH 4. The mixture was extracted with EtOAc (4 × 5 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO\(_4\)) 146
and concentrated after addition of triethylamine (1 mL). The residue was dissolved in toluene (3 mL), and the solution was evaporated under vacuum. This process was repeated two more times to give a Et₃N salt of the seco-acid 169 (0.16 g). This was used for the next reaction without further purification; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.33 (dd, J = 11.4, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 6.68–6.58 (m, 2H), 6.25 (dd, J = 6.0, 15.6 Hz, 1H), 6.10 (t, J = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.58 (d, J = 11.4 Hz, 1H), 5.45–5.37 (m, 2H), 5.26 (dd, J = 8.4, 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.20 (d, J = 16.8 Hz, 1H), 5.12 (d, J = 10.2 Hz, 1H), 4.57 (t, J = 9.6 Hz, 1H), 3.94 (dd, J = 3.0, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 3.75 (m, 1H), 3.49 (dd, J = 2.4, 7.8 Hz, 1H), 3.36 (t, J = 3.6 Hz, 1H), 3.31 (q, J = 7.2 Hz, 5H), 2.80 (m, 1H), 2.60–2.51 (m, 2H), 1.75–1.50 (m, 6H), 1.42 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 7.5 H), 1.40–1.20 (m, 4H), 1.04 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 0.96 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 6H), 0.94–0.87 (m, 40H), 0.83 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H), 0.81 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H), 0.13–0.00 (m, 24H).

**Macrolactonization.** The seco-acid 169 (0.14 g) was divided into four fractions. Each fraction (0.034 mmol, assumed) was dissolved in toluene (17 mL), to which triethylamine (0.18 mL, 0.34 mmol), (2,6-Me(NO₂)PhCO)₂O (35 mg, 0.10 mmol), and DMAP (4.2 mg, 0.034 mmol) were added at room temperature. The mixture was stirred for 48 h. After quenching the reaction by addition of a sat. aq. NaHCO₃ (2 mL), the mixture was stirred for 1 h. The separated organic layer was washed with 0.1 M HCl (2 × 5 mL) and brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Four fractions were combined and purified by column chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the TBS-protected macrolactone (0.12 g) contaminated with impurities. This was used for the next reaction without further purification; ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.07 (m, 1H), 6.68 (dt, J = 10.5, 17.0 Hz, 1H), 6.51 (t, J = 11.5 Hz, 1H), 6.15 (m, 1H), 6.01 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.58–5.50 (m, 2H), 5.41 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.32–5.26 (m, 2H), 5.19 (d, J = 16.5 Hz, 1H),
5.08 (d, \( J = 10.5 \) Hz, 1H), 4.57 (t, \( J = 8.5 \) Hz, 1H), 3.92 (m, 1H), 3.43 (m, 1H), 3.37 (m, 1H), 3.04 (m, 1H), 2.60–2.51 (m, 2H), 1.96 (m, 1H), 1.80–1.20 (m, 9H), 1.06–1.00 (m, 9H), 0.94–0.87 (m, 40H), 0.82 (d, \( J = 7.0 \) Hz, 3H), 0.73 (d, \( J = 6.5 \) Hz, 3H), 0.14–0.04 (m, 24H).

The C2 E-isomer of the TBS-protected macrolactone. This was obtained from the reaction of the crude seco-acid 169 (1.5 mg, 1.49 µmol) with triethylamine (2.1 µL, 14.88 µmol), 2,4,6-trichlorobenzoyl chloride (1 M solution in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), 4.5 µL, 4.46 mol) and DMAP (1 M solution in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), 7.5 µL, 7.44 µmol) in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (0.7 mL). After preparative thin layer chromatography (95:5 hexanes/EtOAc), the C2 E-isomer of the TBS-protected macrolactone (1.0 g, 67% from the ester 168) was obtained as a colorless oil: \(^1\)H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 7.20 (dd, \( J = 10.8, 15.0 \) Hz, 1H), 6.61 (dt, \( J = 10.2, 16.8 \) Hz, 1H), 6.40 (dd, \( J = 4.2, 15.6 \) Hz, 1H), 6.10 (dd, \( J = 11.4, 15.6 \) Hz, 1H), 5.94 (t, \( J = 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.73 (d, \( J = 15.6 \) Hz, 1H), 5.42 (t, \( J = 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.36 (t, \( J = 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.27–5.23 (m, 2H), 5.16 (d, \( J = 16.8 \) Hz, 1H), 5.07 (d, \( J = 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 4.60 (t, \( J = 9.0 \) Hz, 1H), 3.97 (dd, \( J = 4.8, 10.2 \) Hz, 1H), 3.45–3.40 (m, 2H), 2.94 (m, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 2.53 (m, 1H), 1.94 (m, 1H), 1.76 (m, 1H), 1.58–1.49 (m, 2H), 1.40–1.35 (m, 2H), 1.15–1.11 (m, 2H), 1.05 (m, 1H), 1.02–0.95 (m, 12H), 0.94–0.87 (m, 36H), 0.77 (d, \( J = 6.6 \) Hz, 3H), 0.67 (d, \( J = 6.0 \) Hz, 3H), 0.40 (m, 1H), 0.11–0.00 (m, 24H).

Global deprotection. The TBS-protected macrolactone (0.12 g) was divided into three fractions. The first fraction (0.046 mmol, assumed) was dissolved in THF (1 mL) and MeOH (1 mL). The mixture was cooled to 0 °C, and then a 3 M solution of HCl in H\(_2\)O/MeOH (0.43 mL, 1.29 mmol, prepared by slow addition of conc. HCl to MeOH) was added. The mixture was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 16 h. Solid NaHCO\(_3\) was added to the reaction mixture until no gas evolved. After concentration under vacuum, the residue was diluted with...
H₂O (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (4 × 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine, dried (MgSO₄) and concentrated. Purification by column chromatography (3:7 hexanes/EtOAc) provided the title compound (12 mg, 49% over three steps) as a white powder. The second and third fractions were combined (0.092 mmol, assumed), and submitted to the reaction conditions (0.86 mL of 3M HCl). This provided 21 mg of the title compound. The combined amount was 33 mg and an overall yield was 45%, starting from the ester 168 (0.14 g, 0.14 mmol): IR (NaCl) 3365, 2958, 2924, 1706, 1181, 965 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CD₃OD) δ 7.26 (dd, J = 11.5, 15.0 Hz, 1H), 6.71 (dt, J = 11.0, 16.5 Hz, 1H), 6.59 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 6.03 (t, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.82 (dd, J = 10.0, 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.54 (d, J = 11.0 Hz, 1H), 5.49 (t, J = 10.0 Hz, 1H), 5.35 (dd, J = 8.5, 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.26 (t, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.22 (t, J = 18.5 Hz, 1H), 5.13 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1H), 5.07 (dd, J = 3.0, 9.5 Hz, 1H), 4.69 (t, J = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.60 (dt, J = 3.0, 9.5 Hz, 1H), 3.11–3.02 (m, 2H), 2.98 (t, J = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 2.71 (m, 1H), 2.23–2.14 (m, 2H), 1.89 (t, J = 13.0 Hz, 1H), 1.74 (m, 1H), 1.65–1.53 (m, 2H), 1.49 (m, 1H), 1.36 (m, 1H), 1.24 (m, 1H), 1.19 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 1.11 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 1.09 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H), 1.01 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 6H), 0.97 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.95–0.86 (m, 2H), 0.41 (m, 1H); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CD₃OD) δ 165.8, 145.9, 143.5, 133.9, 133.5, 132.2, 129.8, 128.6, 127.0, 116.8, 116.3, 79.1, 75.8, 73.5, 70.1, 63.7, 46.7, 43.2, 40.4, 40.3, 34.3, 33.9, 33.8, 32.2, 31.2, 30.1, 20.8, 17.8, 16.8, 15.9, 14.8, 8.6; LRMS (ESI) 555 [M + Na]⁺; HRMS (ESI) calcd. for C₃₂H₅₂O₆Na 555.3662, found 555.3662; [α]²⁰D −54.0 (c 0.10, MeOH).
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APPENDIX

Selected $^1\text{H}$ and $^{13}\text{C}$ NMR spectra
C9S, β: 155
C9R, α: 166
(155/156, 5:1)
C9S, $\beta$: 155
C9R, $\alpha$: 156
(155/156, 5:1)
150 (C9 R/S mixture)