

bicyclo[4.4.3] (**6**), and bicyclo[5.3.3] (**10**) systems). In fact, the major contribution to polycyclic alkene stability is suggested to arise from sp^2 flattening at the bridgehead carbon, which provides significant reductions in angle and torsional strain and in non-bonded interactions (*e.g.*, van der Waals forces), all controlled by changes in ring size.^{7,8} That is, combinations of much larger rings (or bicyclic bridges) do not provide additional stabilisation, while smaller ring sizes give rise to unstable bridgehead double bonds and/or anti-Bredt systems.^{3,4}

Despite putative hyperstable systems being identified through Maier-Schleyer-Kim *in silico* studies, a substantial limitation preventing the interrogation of alkene hyperstability has been an inability to readily synthesise the computationally predicted targets. To highlight this point only three examples that lie in the hyperstability optimal zone have been synthesised previously (*i.e.*, **2**, **4** and **8**). In 1979, Becker *et al.*⁹ reported the synthesis of bicyclo[4.4.1]undec-1-ene (**2**), but it predated the hyperstability hypothesis by two years, and was detected as a serendipitous side product in pursuit of anti-Bredt systems. Similarly, a few years later de Meijere *et al.*¹⁰ reported having unexpectedly obtained bicyclo[4.4.2]dodeca-1-ene (**4**), while working with *exo,exo*-bishomobullvalene **11**, but subsequently demonstrated **4** was a hyperstable alkene system. Lastly, in the course of pursuing stable three-center, two-electron C–H–C bonds McMurry *et al.* reported the synthesis of hyperstable bridgehead alkene, *in*-bicyclo[4.4.4]tetradec-1-ene (**8**), in 6 steps commencing from 6-hydroxy-cyclodecan-1-one (**12**).^{11,12} Interestingly, in the case of **2**, **4** and **8**, all could be hydrogenated, but conditions ranged from mild to forcing.^{9,10,11b} Unfortunately, however, in the intervening years there have been no attempts to access the systems with even greater predicted stability,¹³ *i.e.*, **5**, **6** and **10** (Fig. 1).

Disclosed herein are efficient methods to access these cage bicyclic systems, which has enabled refinement of the “unreactive” definition, and determination of whether the term hyperstable alkene is more broadly applicable.

Results and discussion

Alkene synthesis


Brown *et al.* demonstrated that boracyclanes (*e.g.*, *B*-methoxy-9-borabicyclo[3.3.1]nonane, **14**) (Scheme 1) undergo facile ring enlargement.¹⁴ Expanding upon the methodology of Matteson,¹⁵



Scheme 1 The Matteson homologation-based boracyclane homologation methodology developed by Brown *et al.*¹⁶

treatment with (dichloromethyl)lithium (*i.e.*, $LiCHCl_2$) was shown to give the corresponding (α -haloalkyl)borinic ester homologue (**15**), *via* boronate **16**. Subsequently, Brown *et al.* developed a procedure utilising (chloromethyl)lithium (*i.e.*, $LiCH_2Cl$),¹⁶ which enabled sequential formation of the unsubstituted *B*-methoxy-9-borabicyclo[3.3.2]decane (**17**), *via* boronate **19**, or *B*-methoxy-2-borabicyclo[3.3.3]undecane (**18**) on addition of a second equivalent (Scheme 1). Only in the case of **17** was the boracyclane used synthetically, whereas the other borabicycles have remained unexplored. Inspired by the boracyclane chemistry, synthesis of the proposed hyperstable alkenes bicyclo[5.3.3]tridec-1-ene (**10**) and bicyclo[4.3.3]dodec-1-ene (**13**) (Fig. 1), were attempted using this synthetic methodological approach.

In the course of preparing fresh 9-BBN (**20**), *via* cyclooctadiene (**21**) (Scheme 2),¹⁷ to investigate the first homologation, it soon became apparent that the entire process to access the desired carbocycles might be feasible through a one-pot sequence.¹⁸ That is, synthesis of 9-BBN provided a clean precipitate that could be used directly to afford the borinic ester **14** (δ_B 57.2 ppm). In pursuit of the first ring expansion, (bromomethyl)lithium was selected as the α -halomethyl lithium nucleophile of choice, leveraging the widespread availability of dibromomethane and straightforward lithium–halogen exchange.¹⁹ Homologation was achieved through addition of *n*-butyllithium to a solution of dibromomethane and **14** at $-78^\circ C$, with formation of the ring-expanded borinic ester **17** visible by ^{11}B NMR (δ_B 55.3 ppm) upon warming. Essential to maintaining the one-pot procedure was adjustment for the growing



Scheme 2 One-pot synthesis of bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-ol (**24**).



volume of the solution (*i.e.*, all depending on reaction scale). However, the hexanes introduced alongside the *n*-butyllithium could be carefully removed under reduced pressure, in addition to a small quantity of tetrahydrofuran (THF), whereupon the solution was diluted to approximately 1 M by the addition of anhydrous THF.

Following the formation of **17**, further homologation could be achieved utilising (bromomethyl)lithium, but this transformation required significantly reduced temperatures to prevent over-homologation, suggesting that the 1,2-migration responsible for ring expansion occurs at temperatures as low as $-78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ within this system (Scheme 2). Formation of (bromomethyl)lithium at $-110\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ saw significantly improved selectivity during the second homologation, with formation of the ring-expanded borinic ester **18** observed within 2 hours of stirring at room temperature (δ_{B} 56.7 ppm). Formation of the tri-homologated *B*-methoxy-2-borabicyclo[4.3.3]dodecane (**22**) was achieved on repetition of this procedure (δ_{B} 55.2 ppm), however formation of the all-carbon framework necessitated the use of LiCHCl_2 , in order to facilitate migration of the boron atom out of the ring. Lithium *N,N*-diisopropylamide (LDA) was the optimum base in this regard and was added to a solution of **22** and dichloromethane (DCM) at $-78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ [Note: typically prompting a slow colour change on, or when, approaching the completion of addition]. Workup of the α -chloroborane (**23**), on sequential treatment with aqueous sodium hydroxide and hydrogen peroxide, furnished the secondary alcohol bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-ol (**24**) in 30% overall yield ($\sim 80\%$ yield for each step following methanolysis) (Scheme 2).

With alcohol **24** in hand, elimination reactions could be explored in an attempt to access the first target, *i.e.*, bicyclo[4.3.3]dodec-1-ene (**13**). Simple treatment of the alcohol with mesyl chloride (MsCl) in the presence of base at room temperature gave bridgehead alkene **13**, and traces of **25**. However, while dissolved in deuterated chloroform **13** fully converted into the bridgehead alkene, bicyclo[4.3.3]dodec-6-ene (**25**), within 24 hours, suggesting a more stable system. This unexpected transformation likely occurs *via* carbocation formation (*i.e.*, **26**), mediated by the presence of traces of acid in the CDCl_3 (Scheme 3).

With an iterative homologation strategy in place, further ring expansion was explored in an effort to access the larger bicyclo[5.3.3]tridecane system, and to determine the upper limit of the methodology. Therefore, the same homologation sequence was utilised to access the previously generated boracyclane **22** [*i.e.*, starting from cyclooctadiene (**21**)], whereupon further treatment

with (bromomethyl)lithium was expected to give the ring enlarged boracyclane (**27**). Interestingly, on subsequent treatment with (dichloromethyl)lithium, followed by oxidative workup, not only was the desired bicyclo[5.3.3]tridecan-2-ol (**28**) obtained, but also bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-ol (**24**) and cyclooctanol derivative **29** in an inseparable 2 : 1 : 3 ratio, respectively (Scheme 4). This observation suggested that controlling the formation of boracyclane **27** is more difficult compared with the preceding boracyclanes **17**, **18** and **22**, especially given the developing excess of (bromomethyl)lithium through each iterative homologation. This was particularly evident through the isolation of the ring-opened cyclooctanol **29**, which is a result of undesired over-homologation of boracyclane **27** giving boracyclane **30** (Path A, Scheme 4). However, in this case the preference for the carbon–boron bond migration switched to the bridgehead carbon of boronate complex **31**, which then underwent dehydroboration²⁰ to afford **32**, and subsequently **29** on oxidation. Brown has suggested that increasing ring size within medium-ring boracyclanes can encroach the strain limits of the labile carbon–boron bond.^{16a} This notion is supported by conformational analysis of **31** whereby conformer **31a**, required for the desired homologation *via* a staggered conformation, shows that the bromine atom approaches the bicyclic ring hydrogens as the ring



Scheme 3 Elimination of bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-ol (**24**) to give bicyclo[4.3.3]dodec-1-ene (**13**) and bicyclo[4.3.3]dodec-6-ene (**25**).



Scheme 4 One-pot synthesis of bicyclo[5.3.3]tridecan-2-ol (**28**).





Scheme 5 Synthetic route affording bicyclo[5.3.3]tridec-1-ene (10) and *E*-bicyclo[4.4.3]tridec-1-ene (6) and proposed mechanistic pathway of formation.

expands. To avoid the ensuing steric clash the alternate anti-periplanar conformer **31b** is adopted, and this change in conformation facilitates the observed bridgehead carbon-boron migration to give boracyclane **30** (Scheme 4). The formation of undesired bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-ol (**24**) arose from under homologation of boracyclane **22** (Path B, Scheme 4), whereas desired product bicyclo[5.3.3]tridecan-2-ol (**28**) was obtained *via* boracyclane **27** (Path C, Scheme 4).

Treating the mixture of **24**, **28** and **29** with *t*-butyldimethylsilyl chloride (TBSCl) enabled removal of the corresponding bicyclo[4.3.3]dodecan-2-yl (not shown) and cyclooctanyl silyl ethers (**33**), to deliver the desired TBS-protected bicyclo[5.3.3]tridecane **34** (Scheme 5). Exposure of **34** to a catalytic amount of methanesulfonic acid (MsOH) afforded a mixture of the bicyclo[5.3.3]alkene (**10**), and unexpectedly the rearranged bicyclo[4.4.3]alkene **6** as a minor product (Scheme 5). The ratio of alkene isomers could be improved from a ratio $\sim 4 : 1$ to $\sim 9 : 1$ in favour of **10** by lowering the temperature of the reaction from room temperature to -78 °C. The competing elimination and rearrangement pathways can be envisaged as arising from carbocation **35** (Scheme 5). The major product is derived from elimination of a proton to afford the Kim system, *i.e.*, bicyclo[5.3.3]tridec-1-ene (**10**). Carbocation **35** also undergoes a Wagner-Meerwein rearrangement to **36**. This is followed by a conformational change to give **37**, that relieves steric clashing, and then loss of a proton to afford the McEwen-Schleyer system *i.e.*, *E*-bicyclo[4.4.3]tridec-1-ene (**6**) (Scheme 5).

Hydrogenation

The sole experimental criteria put in place by Maier and Schleyer to determine alkene hyperstability status (*i.e.*, “unreactive”) resides on whether the alkene resists catalytic

hydrogenation. However, Maier and Schleyer did not detail specific hydrogenation conditions. Simply, the bicyclo[4.4.4] system **5** (Fig. 1) was described as thus: “Therefore, [5] should be an unusually unreactive olefin and may even resist hydrogenation under normal conditions”.^{1a} Although, it would not be unreasonable to consider normal conditions to consist of palladium suspended on carbon under one atmosphere of hydrogen gas overnight, a variety of conditions could be imagined. With that in mind, previous work by Becker *et al.* demonstrated that bicyclo[4.4.1]undec-1-ene (**2**) could be successfully hydrogenated using palladium on carbon under a hydrogen atmosphere (*i.e.*, say normal conditions) to give **38**,⁹ whereas the bicyclo[4.4.2]dodeca-1-ene (**4**) system reported by de Meijere *et al.* required Adam’s catalyst (platinum oxide) over a three day duration (*i.e.*, slightly harsher conditions) to afford **39**,¹⁰ and lastly McMurry *et al.*¹¹ showed that *in,out*-bicyclo[4.4.4]tetradec-1-ene (**8**) required more forcing conditions (platinum oxide and 50 psi of pressure) to access **40** (Scheme 6).

Concerning the alkenes investigated herein, the bicyclo[4.3.3]alkene **25** did not undergo hydrogenation using Pd/C/H₂, and only provided trace amounts of the fully saturated alkane **41** when applying slightly harsher conditions (PtO₂/H₂). For the major and minor mixture of bicyclo[5.3.3] (**10**) and bicyclo[4.4.3] (**6**) alkenes ($\sim 4 : 1$), both of these completely resisted hydrogenation using platinum oxide at atmospheric pressure, but also on hydrogenation under more forcing conditions (PtO₂/H₂ at 50



Scheme 6 Hydrogenation outcomes for known and new bridgehead alkenes.



psi), with no detection of the corresponding alkanes **42** and **43** by ^1H NMR or GC/MS (Scheme 6). Furthermore, when alkene **25** was exposed to *in situ* generated diimide ($\text{HN}=\text{NH}$)²¹ no reduction was observed.

Computational investigations

Density functional theory²² calculations with M06-2X/def2-TZVPP²³ were performed to investigate the stabilities and reactivities of the four new alkenes, **6**, **10**, **13**, and **25** (Fig. 2). [Note: calculated heats of hydrogenation are used *in lieu* of experimentally determined values, because the rate of hyperstable alkene hydrogenation is too slow to measure, as reported by Roth.²⁴] In the case of the **13/25** pair, alkene **25** was found to be 4.3 kcal mol⁻¹ lower in energy than **13** (Fig. 2A). The result is consistent with the observed formation of **25** from **13** upon standing in CDCl_3 .

The original hyperstability predictions proposed by Maier, Schleyer, and Kim, were established on the basis of olefin strain energies (OSE) as calculated with molecular mechanics. In the present study, however, DFT-computed free energies of hydrogenation (ΔG_{hydrog} , Fig. 2B) were used as a direct measure of the propensities of the alkenes to undergo hydrogenation. For comparison, OSEs were also calculated, using Rablen's recently reported quantum mechanical group increment method²⁵ (see ESI†). The ΔG_{hydrog} and OSE values were found to be linearly correlated ($R^2 = 0.98$). A linear correlation was also detected between OSE and the enthalpy of hydrogenation, ΔH_{hydrog} , a quantity considered by Maier and Schleyer in their original study^{1a} (see ESI†).

The two simple alkenes **44** and **45** represent relatively strain-free trisubstituted systems lacking a bicyclic ring system. Their hydrogenation energies (both -18 kcal mol⁻¹) provide

reference values against which the new and previously synthesised bridgehead alkenes can be compared (Fig. 2). In general, a hyperstable alkene would be expected to release less energy upon hydrogenation than a strain-free reference alkene, and its ΔG_{hydrog} would therefore be expected to be less negative than those of **44** and **45**. This was observed to be the case with all three of the previously synthesised hyperstable alkenes, for which the hydrogenation energies range from -15 kcal mol⁻¹ (**2**) to -9 kcal mol⁻¹ (**4**) to -7 kcal mol⁻¹ (**8**). This trend in energies mirrors the trend in reactivity toward hydrogenation observed experimentally by others, *viz.* **2** > **4** > **8** (Scheme 6).

For the series of alkenes **6**, **10**, **13**, and **25**, the hydrogenation energies range from -2 kcal mol⁻¹ to -13 kcal mol⁻¹ (Fig. 2). These values follow the same trend as observed experimentally: the theoretically least hyperstable alkene that was studied in hydrogenation experiments, **25** ($\Delta G_{\text{hydrog}} = -9$ kcal mol⁻¹), gave trace amounts of hydrogenated product under harsher conditions, while the theoretically more hyperstable alkenes in the series, **6** and **10** ($\Delta G_{\text{hydrog}} = -4$ and -2 kcal mol⁻¹, respectively), failed to undergo hydrogenation even under forcing conditions. There are some variations between the series worth noting. Firstly, theory predicts that alkene **25** has a smaller driving force for hydrogenation than the Becker *et al.*⁹ alkene **2**, consistent with the observation that experimentally **25** required harsher conditions than reported for **2**, and only afforded trace amounts of product (*i.e.*, **41**) (Scheme 6). Furthermore, the hydrogenation energies do not provide information about the barrier heights for the hydrogenation processes, nor do they take into account any differences between the mechanisms of the hydrogenations catalysed by different heterogeneous catalysts in the different solvents used experimentally. Secondly, the McMurry *et al.*¹¹ *in-bicyclo[4.4.4]tetradec-1-ene* (**8**) system has a 7 kcal mol⁻¹ driving force for hydrogenation according to theory, but unlike alkenes **6** and **10**, it does not survive hydrogenation conditions involving platinum oxide at a pressure of 50 psi. Beyond the potential limitations of utilising thermodynamic hydrogenation energies, however, the McMurry *et al.* case is considerably different due to the *in-bridgehead* hydrogen atom (*i.e.*, all other systems are *out-bridgehead* hydrogen atoms). Such systems can stabilise any developing δ^+ charge through contact with the catalyst and the double bond (*i.e.*, lowering the energy barrier of hydrogenation).



Fig. 2 Density functional theory computations of (A) alkene isomerisations and (B) alkene hydrogenations. ΔG in kcal mol⁻¹ (M06-2X/def2-TZVPP).

Osmylation and X-ray crystallography

In an effort to gain an understanding of whether bridgehead alkenes **6**, **10**, and **25**, could be considered hyperstable alkenes more broadly (*i.e.*, in the context of resisting other alkene reaction conditions), they were subjected to osmylation. Donohoe *et al.*²⁶ have shown that the combination of osmium tetroxide (OsO_4), and *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA), is a very reactive and efficient oxidant of a wide range of alkenes. Furthermore, Rychnovsky *et al.*,²⁷ have demonstrated that the method can be utilised for structure determination by X-ray crystallography, as the TMEDA-osmium(vi) complex of the vicinal diol product is typically crystalline.

Therefore, alkene **25** was treated with OsO_4 , and TMEDA at -78 °C, which afforded **46**. The X-ray crystal structure of **46** was





Fig. 3 X-ray crystal structures of the Os(vi) complexes **46** (A), **47** (B) and **48** (C).

determined (Fig. 3A), and although disordered, the C-atom positions and connectivity were all clearly resolved (see ESI†). This analysis also confirmed the structure of the parent [4.3.3] alkene **25** and revealed that the bridgehead alkene was susceptible to attack by OsO₄ in the usual manner. In light of these results the isomeric mixture of **10** and **6** was similarly reacted with OsO₄/TMEDA, which afforded osmium(vi) complexes **47** and **48**. Recrystallisation gave a co-crystal comprising both isomers **47** and **48** (in a ratio of 62 : 38 respectively) where the Os, TMEDA and all O-donor atoms occupy identical positions within the structure, but the C-atoms of the bicyclic cages are disordered between positions corresponding to their [5.3.3] or [4.4.3] parent (see ESI† for a more detailed discussion). The Os(vi)-coordinated [5.3.3] bicycle **47** is shown in Fig. 3B (derived from **10**) and the [4.4.3] isomer **48** (derived from **6**) is shown in Fig. 3C.

Epoxidation

Given that the OsO₄/TMEDA oxidant system is reported to be 10 000 times more reactive than OsO₄,^{24a} it was deemed instructive



Scheme 7 Reaction of bridgehead alkenes **6**, **10**, and **25** with the common oxidants *m*CPBA and DMDO.

to explore whether a less reactive oxidant would oxidise the bridgehead alkenes **6**, **10**, and **25**. Although, a number of oxidants could be envisaged, *meta*-chloroperbenzoic acid (*m*CPBA) was first chosen, and was found to afford the corresponding epoxides **49**, **50** and **51**. However, **49** was found to be quite unstable to moisture, and could not be sufficiently purified, although it could be obtained in high purity using the oxidant dimethyldioxirane (DMDO) (Scheme 7).

Interestingly, the structure of cerorubicin acid-I, which contains a bicyclo[4.4.1] hyperstable alkene skeleton (see **2** in Fig. 1), slowly oxidises in air to give the corresponding epoxide²⁸ (*i.e.*, a result of the oxidant triplet oxygen²⁹). Therefore, as a class, hyperstable alkenes are seemingly not resistant to oxidation. These observations are not too surprising given that oxidants (oxidation reagents) are highly reactive species, that operate *via* a redox mechanism, which transfers an electronegative oxygen atom(s).³⁰ This process is in stark contrast to hydrogenation.

Conclusions

In summary, while developing predictive theoretical methods to classify the stability of cage bicyclic bridgehead alkenes, Schleyer, Maier and McEwen introduced the term “hyperstable alkene”,^{1a,6} followed by Kim some years later.⁷ Together, they predicted over 60 bicyclo[*m.n.o*] alkenes to be hyperstable, using as their criteria olefin strain energy calculations, in addition to predicting resistance of these alkenes to hydrogenation under normal conditions. Of these 60 theoretical examples the syntheses of only three alkenes (*i.e.*, **2**, **4** and **8**) that resided in this theoretical optimal hyperstability zone had been reported, albeit independently; **2** being reported before the term hyperstable alkene was even developed. A major limitation to testing this theory more extensively was the inability to access bridgehead double bond containing systems which matched the Schleyer–Maier–McEwen–Kim predicted hyperstable alkenes.

Herein described are further examples of hyperstable systems (*i.e.*, **6**, **10**, **13**, and **25**) obtained *via* an optimised Brown–Matteson homologation sequence. Three of these were found to be isolable (*i.e.*, **6**, **10**, and **25**) and resistant to hydrogenation under a variety of conditions, consistent with the previously reported Schleyer and Maier definition of an “unreactive” hyperstable alkene *i.e.*, **6** and **10** represent the most stable hyperstable systems reported to-date. However, the bridgehead alkenes **6**, **10**, and **25** were observed to undergo reaction with both strong and mild oxidants to afford osmate esters and epoxides, respectively. As a result of these studies, it is apparent that the computationally derived term “hyperstable alkene” only applies to resistance of hydrogenation, whether it be normal transition metal catalysed hydrogenation or non-metal based conditions. Lastly, it is important to recognise that alkene hyperstability is not a blanket term for all reaction conditions, and that bridgehead alkenes continue to be reported in the natural product literature that can likely attribute their stability to unique cage bicyclic structure *i.e.*, “Such olefins should be very unreactive-not due to steric hindrance or to enhanced π -bond strength but due to



special stability afforded by the cage structure of the olefin and to the greater strain of the parent polycycloalkane".¹⁴

Data availability

All experimental data are provided in the ESI.†

Author contributions

M. D. S. and S. C. performed chemical synthesis. L. R. G. and E. H. K. carried out *in silico* calculations. G. K. P. performed high field NMR measurements of target alkenes and associated osmium complexes. P. V. B. acquired the X-ray crystallographic data and performed the analysis. C. M. W. conceived the project, coordinated the study, assisted in analysing and interpreting the data, and wrote the manuscript. All authors read and agreed on the content of the paper.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

We thank the University of Queensland (UQ) and the Australian Research Council for funding to C. M. W. (FT110100851, DP180103004 and LE190100106) and E. H. K (FT120100632 and 180103047). M. D. S. is grateful for Research Training Program Scholarship from UQ (UQ RTP). The Australian National Computational Infrastructure and the UQ Research Computing Centre are gratefully acknowledged for computational resources. Dr Michael Gallen (QAEHS, UQ) is gratefully acknowledged for performing GC/MS accurate mass measurements.

Notes and references

- (a) W. F. Maier and P. v. R. Schleyer, Evaluation and prediction of the stability of bridgehead olefins, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1981, **103**, 1891–1900; (b) See also, P. M. Warner and S. Peacock, Strain energies of some bridgehead olefins as calculated with the MM2 force field, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 1982, **3**, 417–420.
- For a recent discussion of the meaning of “stability” see: R. Hoffmann, P. v. R. Schleyer and H. F. Schaefer III, Predicting Molecules—More Realism, Please!, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2008, **47**, 7164–7167.
- (a) J. Y. W. Mak, R. H. Pouwer and C. M. Williams, Natural Products with Anti-Bredt and Bridgehead Double Bonds, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2014, **53**, 13664–13688; (b) E. H. Krenske and C. M. Williams, Do Anti-Bredt Natural Products Exist? Olefin Strain Energy as a Predictor of Isolability, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2015, **54**, 10608–10612; (c) A. G. Kutateladze, E. H. Krenske and C. M. Williams, Reassignments and Corroborations of Oxo-Bridged Natural Products Directed by OSE and DU8+ NMR Computation, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2019, **58**, 7107–7112; (d) J. Liu, X. Liu, J. Wu and C.-C. Li, *Chem*, 2020, **6**, 579–615; (e) L. McDermott, Z. G. Walters, S. A. French, A. M. Clark, J. Ding, A. V. Kelleghan, K. N. Houk and N. K. Garg, A solution to the anti-Bredt olefin synthesis problem, *Science*, 2024, **386**, eadq3519.
- C. S. Swindell, T. F. Isaacs and K. J. Kanen, Bicyclo[5.3.1]Undec-1(10)-Ene Bridgehead Olefin Stability and the Taxane Bridgehead Olefin, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1985, **26**, 289–292.
- OSE discrepancies between the work of Schleyer and Kim for the bicyclo[4.4.3]tridec-1(11)-ene systems were noted by Kim, but Kim seemed not to have evaluated *E*- and *Z*-isomers (see ref. 6). Therefore, although **6** and **9** are drawn the same they are numbered differently for this reason.
- A. B. McEwen and P. v. R. Schleyer, Hyperstable olefins: further calculational explorations and predictions, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1986, **108**, 3951–3960.
- J.-S. Kim, The Molecular Mechanics Evaluation of the Stability of Bridgehead Olefins Containing Medium Rings, *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.*, 1997, **18**, 488–495.
- W. Parker, R. L. Tranter, C. I. F. Watt, L. W. K. Chang and P. v. R. Schleyer, Enhancement of reactivity at bridgehead positions, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1974, **96**, 7121–7122.
- K. B. Becker and J. L. Chappuis, Synthesis and Dimerization of Bicyclo [4.4.1]undec-1(11)-ene, a Bridged trans-Cycloheptene, *Helv. Chim. Acta*, 1979, **62**, 34–43.
- H. Kukuk, E. Proksch and A. de Meijere, Bicyclo[4.4.2]dodeca-1-ene – The First “Hyperstable” Bridgehead Olefin, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 1982, **21**, 306.
- (a) J. E. McMurry and C. N. Hodge, Synthesis of *in,out*-Bicyclo [4.4.4]tetradecane. Generation of a Stable μ -Hydrido-Bridged Carbocation, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1984, **106**, 6450–6451; (b) J. E. McMurry, T. Lectka and C. N. Hodge, The *in*-bicyclo [4.4.4]-1-tetradecyl cation: a stable substance with a three-center, two-electron carbon-hydrogen-carbon bond, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1989, **111**, 8867–8872.
- Larger *in,out*-systems were later reported, see J. E. McMurry and T. Lectka, Carbocations with bent three-center, two-electron carbon-hydrogen-carbon bonds, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1993, **115**, 10167–10173.
- Bicyclo[*n*.2.2] hyperstable systems have been prepared although these lie outside the computed optimal zone, see, (a) S. Yasuo, T. Shingo, O. Masaru, M. Masaharu, T. Yoshito and O. Yoshinobu, Synthesis and Properties of Bridgehead-substituted Bicyclo[*n*.2.2] Bridgehead Alkenes, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.*, 1981, **54**, 1474–1480; (b) K.-L. Noble, H. Hopf and L. Ernst, Cyclophane XXI, Über das chemische Verhalten von [8]Paracyclophan: Reaktionen des Benzolrings, *Chem. Ber.*, 1984, **117**, 455–473; (c) W. Grimme, A. Bertsch, H. Flock, T. Noack and S. Krauthäuser, Bridged Medium Rings with Hyperstable Double Bonds - Syntheses and Reactions, *Synlett*, 1998, 1175–1181.
- H. C. Brown, T. Imai, P. T. Perumal and B. Singaram, Organoboranes. 41. Reaction of organoboranes with (dichloromethyl)lithium. Scope and limitations. Synthesis



- of homologated primary and secondary alcohols, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1985, **50**, 4032–4036.
- 15 (a) D. S. Matteson and R. Ray, Directed chiral synthesis with pinenediol boronic esters, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1980, **102**, 7590–7591; (b) D. S. Matteson, Boronic Esters in Asymmetric Synthesis, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2013, **78**, 10009–10023.
- 16 (a) H. C. Brown, A. S. Phadke and M. V. Rangaishenvi, Ring enlargement of boracyclanes via sequential one carbon homologation. The first synthesis of boracyclanes in the strained medium ring range, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1988, **110**, 6263–6264; (b) H. C. Brown and M. V. Rangaishenvi, Some recent applications of hydroboration/organoborane chemistry to heterocycles, *J. Heterocycl. Chem.*, 1990, **27**, 13–24; (c) H. C. Brown and S. Jayaraman, Organoboranes. 57. Relative efficacy of representative lithium dialkylamide bases for the in situ metalation of allyl chloride to produce (α -chloroallyl)lithium. Application of the reagent to B-alkoxy-9-borabicyclononanes producing new routes to interesting cyclooctane derivatives, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1993, **58**, 6791–6794.
- 17 H. C. Brown, A. K. Mandal and S. U. Kulkarni, Hydroboration. 45. New, convenient preparations of representative borane reagents utilizing borane-methyl sulfide, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1977, **42**, 1392–1398.
- 18 Matteson homologations have previously been used in a one pot sequence to construct acyclic (linear) systems using boronic esters, see for example, M. Burns, S. Essafi, J. R. Bame, S. P. Bull, M. P. Webster, S. Balieu, J. W. Dale, C. P. Butts, J. N. Harvey and V. K. Aggarwal, Assembly-line synthesis of organic molecules with tailored shapes, *Nature*, 2014, **513**, 183–188.
- 19 T. J. Michnick and D. S. Matteson, (Bromomethyl) lithium: Efficient in situ Reactions, *Synlett*, 1991, **31**, 631–632.
- 20 N. M. Welianje, D. S. McGuinness and J. Patel, Thermal Dehydroboration: Experimental and Theoretical Studies of Olefin Elimination from Trialkylboranes and Its Relationship to Alkylborane Isomerization and Transalkylation, *Organometallics*, 2014, **33**, 4251–4259.
- 21 N. J. Cusack, C. B. Reese, A. C. Risius and B. Roozpeikar, 2,4,6-Tri-isopropylbenzenesulphonyl Hydrazide: A Convenient Source of Di-imide, *Tetrahedron*, 1976, **32**, 2157–2162.
- 22 M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, X. Li, M. Caricato, A. V. Marenich, J. Bloino, B. G. Janesko, R. Gomperts, B. Mennucci, H. P. Hratchian, J. V. Ortiz, A. F. Izmaylov, J. L. Sonnenberg, D. Williams-Young, F. Ding, F. Lipparini, F. Egidi, J. Goings, B. Peng, A. Petrone, T. Henderson, D. Ranasinghe, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. Gao, N. Rega, G. Zheng, W. Liang, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, K. Throssell, J. A. Montgomery Jr, J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. J. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. N. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, T. A. Keith, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. P. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, C. Adamo, R. Cammi, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman and D. J. Fox, *Gaussian 16, Revision C.01*, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2016.
- 23 Y. Zhao and D. G. Truhlar, The M06 suite of density functionals for main group thermochemistry, thermochemical kinetics, noncovalent interactions, excited states, and transition elements: two new functionals and systematic testing of four M06-class functionals and 12 other functionals, *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, 2008, **120**, 215–241.
- 24 (a) W. R. Roth, Hydrierwärmern, *Nachr. Chem., Tech. Lab.*, 1983, **31**, 964–968; (b) See also, Z.-H. Li and M. Jones Jr, Hydrogenation of [7]Paracyclophane. Formation of a Hyperstable Bridgehead Olefin, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1987, **28**, 753–754.
- 25 P. R. Rablen, A Procedure for Computing Hydrocarbon Strain Energies Using Computational Group Equivalents, with Application to 66 Molecules, *Chemistry*, 2020, **2**, 347–360.
- 26 (a) T. J. Donohoe, K. Blades, P. R. Moore, M. J. Waring, J. J. G. Winter, M. Helliwell, N. J. Newcombe and G. Stemp, Directed Dihydroxylation of Cyclic Allylic Alcohols and Trichloroacetamides Using OsO₄/TMEDA, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2002, **67**, 7946–7956; (b) T. J. Donohoe, L. Mitchell, M. J. Waring, M. Helliwell, A. Bell and N. J. Newcombe, Scope of the directed dihydroxylation: application to cyclic homoallylic alcohols and trihaloacetamides, *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 2003, **1**, 2173–2186.
- 27 A. S. Burns, C. Dooley III, P. R. Carlson, J. W. Ziller and S. D. Rychnovsky, Relative and Absolute Structure Assignments of Alkenes Using Crystalline Osmate Derivatives for X-ray Analysis, *Org. Lett.*, 2019, **21**, 10125–10129.
- 28 M. S. Tempesta, T. Iwashita, F. Miyamoto, K. Yoshihara and Y. Naya, A New Class of Sesterterpenoids from the Secretion of *Ceropiastes rubens* (Coccidae), *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.*, 1983, 1182–1183.
- 29 P. D. Bartlett and R. Banavali, Spontaneous Oxygenation of Cyclic Olefins: Effects of Strain, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1991, **56**, 6043–6050.
- 30 *Modern Oxidation Methods*, ed. J.-E. Bäckvall, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, 2nd edn, 2010.

