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Hydrogen bonding has been widely observed in biosynthesis and enzyme catalysis. It plays an important role in such fields as molecular recognition, supramolecular chemistry and small molecule catalysis. A new concept of organocatalysis emerged in recent two decades. Hydrogen bonding is the keystone for thiourea catalysis or phosphoric acid catalysis. With high turnover numbers and excellent enantioselectivity, transition metal catalysis not only is the arts in academia, but also find its merit in industrial application. Homogeneous hydrogenation, among many successful transition metal catalyzed reactions, has been serving the synthetic communities for many years, both in academia or in industry. The success of secondary interaction and hydrogen bonding offer us an alternative: the combination of hydrogen bonding and steric hindrance help to create a chiral environment in which substrates could be reduced efficiently.
Guided by this rationale, a ferrocene-based bisphosphine/thiourea ligand, ZhaoPhos was synthesized in our group. It was applied in the asymmetric hydrogenation of nitroolefins with hydrogen bonding between the ligand and substrates. Thiourea-carbonyl hydrogen bonding is another model of non-covalent interaction. Therefore, the asymmetric hydrogenation of unsaturated carbonyl compounds is also practical. Besides neutral compounds, ionic unsaturated substrates could form non-covalent interactions with thiourea through anion binding as well. It makes the asymmetric reduction of iminium ions and $N$-heteroaromatics (quinolines, isoquinolines and indoles) possible. These type of unsaturated compounds were challenging for traditional transition metal catalyzed hydrogenation. They could now be achieved with high enantioselectivity with a rhodium/ZhaoPhos complex. An outer-sphere mechanism involving hydride transfer was proposed since these substrates were thought to lack of coordinating ability to the metal center.

As a traditional catalytic system, rhodium/bisphosphine complexes have been applied to catalyze hydrogenation of $C=\text{C}$ bonds in a long time. The application in hydrogenation of non- or weak coordinating unsaturated compounds changed our view towards of this class of complexes. In the meanwhile, the role of hydrogen bonding is still a mechanistically unexplored area: what is the geometry of the ligand-substrate complex? How does the hydrogen bonding influence the activation energy in the transition state? Many in-depth studies are needed in the future.
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Chapter One

Background introduction: the development of bisphosphine ligands for asymmetric hydrogenation and hydrogen bonding in asymmetric catalysis

1.1 Introduction to the development of bisphosphine ligands for asymmetric hydrogenation

1.1.1 Brief history of ligands for asymmetric hydrogenation

Asymmetric hydrogenation has been proved one of the most powerful methods for chiral synthesis. Since the discovery of Wilkinson’s complex, organometallic complexes have shown great potential and practical application in hydrogenation, both in academia and in industry. The step of theoretical study and discovery of ligands has been boosted especially in last 20 years. Although the neutral Wilkinson’s catalyst [RhCl(PPh₃)₃] and the cationic RhL₂⁺ catalyst (developed by Schrock and Osborn later) showed impressive activity in hydrogenation of unsaturated organic compounds, enantioselectivity remained a problem in front of increasing demands of chiral bio-active molecules. In 1968, Knowles and Horner opened the door of asymmetric hydrogenation by replacing the triphenylphosphine of the Wilkinson’s catalyst with chiral
monophosphines. The enantioselectivity of their attempt, however, was poor. Later, Kagan developed first bisphosphine ligand DIOP with several significant applications in asymmetric hydrogenation, proving that chirality from the backbone could offer better selectivity\textsuperscript{2-4}. DIOP was a milestone for C2-symmetry ligand. Sooner afterwards, Knowles discovered DIPAMP\textsuperscript{5-6}, which was successfully applied in industrial synthesis of L-DOPA\textsuperscript{7}.

![Wilkinson's complex](image1.png) ![DIOP](image2.png) ![L-DOPA](image3.png)

**Figure 1.1** Early milestones in asymmetric hydrogenation

Another milestone of asymmetric hydrogenation is the discovery of BINAP. In 1980s, Noyori reported an atropisomeric bisphosphine ligand BINAP with C2-symmetry\textsuperscript{8}. It was firstly applied in Rh-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of \(\alpha\)-(acylamino)acrylic acids\textsuperscript{9}. The real breakthrough, however, was its application in Ru chemistry. Noyori and Takaya developed BINAP-Ru dicarboxylic acid complex and applied it in hydrogenation of various functionalized olefins\textsuperscript{10}. Another breakthrough of BINAP was made in 1990s, when Noyori discovered that BINAP-Ru diamine complexes were efficient catalyst for asymmetric hydrogenation of unfunctionalized ketones\textsuperscript{11}. Inspired by Noyori’s outstanding work, chemists made a series of modifications on the BINAP system. Many excellent ligands were reported in the meanwhile or afterwards, like H8-BINAP\textsuperscript{12-13}, SEGPHOS\textsuperscript{14}, BIFAP\textsuperscript{15}. Zhang’s group developed a series of TunaPhos\textsuperscript{16}, and thoroughly studied the relationship of dihedral angel and the enantioselectivity.
Many other bisphosphine ligands have been developed in the asymmetric hydrogenation history. One of the most famous ligands is DuPhos\textsuperscript{17}, which was first reported by Burk in early 1990’s. DuPhos and its analogue BPE could catalyze Rh-hydrogenation of many substrates with extremely high efficiency and impressive enantioselectivity, such as \(\alpha\)-(acylamino)acrylic acids, enol acetates, \(\beta\)-keto esters, unsaturated carboxylic acids and itaconic acids\textsuperscript{18}. Afterwards, chemists have developed a series of modified DuPhos ligands. BASPHOS\textsuperscript{19}, CnrPhos\textsuperscript{20}, BINAPHANE\textsuperscript{21} and PennPhos\textsuperscript{22} are good examples of them.

Another class of chiral ligands are P-chiral phosphine ligands. The discovery of new P-chiral phosphine ligands has been very slow since the first discover of DIPAMP\textsuperscript{5},

Figure 1.2 Atropisometric biaryl bisphosphine ligands

Figure 1.3 Some successful chiral bisphosphine ligands before 2000.
which was developed by Knowles over 30 years ago. This is mainly due to the difficulty of synthesis. However, several excellent ligands with P-chirality have shown huge potential use in synthesis. From BisP*\(^{23}\), MiniPhos\(^{24}\), BIPNOR\(^{25}\), they show good enantioselectivity in asymmetric Rh-hydrogenation of useful substrates, such as \(\alpha\)-dehydroamino acids, enamides, \(\alpha\)-(acylamino)cinnamic acids, and \(\beta\)-(acylamino)acrylates. Zhang’s group have developed a series of rigid P-chiral phosphine ligands. TangPhos\(^{26}\), DuanPhos\(^{27}\) and ZhangPhos\(^{28}\), bearing similar structure, could render different performance towards various substrates due to different steric and electronic effects.

![Figure 1.4 Successful P-chiral ligands](image)

Another group are ligands with ferrocene backbone. The first ferrocene-based ligand, TRAP\(^{29-30}\), was developed by Ito. Modification was done on TRAP, which led to a series of efficient ligands. Togni and Spindler reported a class of non-C2-symmetrical ferrocene-based bisphosphine ligand: Josiphos\(^{31}\). This family of ligands not only show effectiveness in academic research, but have excellent industrial application. PPF-tBu has been applied in commercial asymmetric hydrogenation for (+)-biotin\(^{32}\), while XyliPhos in Ir-catalyzed hydrogenation for synthesis of (S)-metolachlor\(^{33}\). Zhang has
reported several C2-symmetric ferrocene-base ligands, such as f-binaphane\textsuperscript{34}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{ligand.fig15}
\caption{Ferrocene-based chiral bisphosphine ligands}
\end{figure}

1.1.2 Trends in ligand design

The pillar of asymmetric hydrogenation is chiral ligands and therefore the design of new ligand is always a demand. Today, chemists have developed thousands of chiral ligands. However, only a few of these ligands could offer both efficiency and selectivity for industrial application. In addition, there are no universal excellent catalysts for all different types of substrates. Two main problems manacle the application of transition metal catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation: (1) limited substrate scope, (2) high catalyst loading. The demand of new effective ligands is greatly in need.

In order to create suitable chiral environment, ligand designers have been sailing towards two different directions to achieving high enantioselectivity: 1) increasing the steric hindrance and the rigidity of the ligand skeleton; 2) introducing secondary interaction to enlarge the energetic difference of two diastereomeric catalyst-substrate complexes in the transition state.

In a long time, the strategy for ligand design has been focused on steric effect: by introducing proper steric hindrance, high enantioselectivity is achieved. A good example of the first strategy is the development of spiro scaffold. The success of BINAP inspired chemists to develop a new generation of bisphosphine ligands with large steric
hindrance. Bisphosphine ligands with spirobiindane and spirobifluorene\textsuperscript{35} scaffolds were synthesized in the recent decade. Crystalline analysis\textsuperscript{35} of palladium/bisphosphine complex Pd(II)Cl\textsubscript{2}(P-P) revealed the tendency of increasing P-Pd-P bite angles from BIANP to SDP and SFDP (Scheme 1.1). Another benefit from large steric hindrance is the rigidity of ligands. Like the evolution from TangPhos to DuanPhos and then ZhangPhos, increasing steric hindrance renders high rigidity of the ligand, thus strengthening the coordinating ability and increasing enantioselectivity. In the case of ruthenium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of α,β-unsaturated carboxylic acid, we could clearly observe the positive correlation of the enantioselectivity with steric hindrance\textsuperscript{35}.

\begin{equation*}
\text{Scheme 1.1 Steric hindrance as an important factor that controls enantioselectivity.}
\end{equation*}

Another guideline is secondary interaction. Secondary interaction is not rare in asymmetric hydrogenation. In the classic Rh catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of
ethyl-\(\alpha\)-acetamidocinnamate, Halpern\textsuperscript{36} conducted a series of experimental research to explore the origin of enantioselectivity. Solid evidence from X-ray crystal structure of the Rh(I)(P-P)/enamide complex revealed the existence of secondary interaction: the oxygen atom from the acetyl group coordinates with the cationic Rh(I) metal while the C=C bond coordinates, forming a co-planar complex. Other than Rh catalyzed hydrogenation of acetamides, this type of bischelate coordination of substrate to the transition metal has been found in many hydrogenation cases, such as Ir or Ru catalyzed hydrogenation of unsaturated carboxylic acids.

**Scheme 1.2** Two diastereomers of catalyst-substrate complexes: secondary coordination.

Ligand-substrate interaction is another strategy for high enantioselectivity. With this type of interaction, the difference in energy of different conformers that coordinate with the metal center is enlarged. Trifer\textsuperscript{37} and ChenPhos\textsuperscript{38}, which were developed by Chen, are good examples of non-covalent secondary interaction. When catalyzing the hydrogenation of \(\alpha\)-substituted carboxylic acids, a charge-charge interaction is formed between the tertiary ammonium on TriFer and ChenPhos and the carboxylate anion.\textsuperscript{39} Hydrogen bond is also believed to be responsible for the remarkable enantioselectivity
in Rh catalyzed hydrogenation of allylic alcohol.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 1.6** Secondary interaction between ligand and substrate via electrostatics.

The pursuit of high rigidity and large steric hindrance will bring a problem: the synthetic difficulty and long synthetic route of the ligand will dramatically increase its cost for application. Poor accessibility becomes a major obstacle for many synthetic methodologies. Zhou developed a series of spiro-based ligands: C2-bisphosphine ligands, P-N ligands and tri-dented P-N-N ligands. They highly efficient for the asymmetric hydrogenation of simple ketones and imines with remarkable enantioselectivities. The major problem that keeps the catalysts from being widely applied is the accessibility. The key precursor of spiro-base ligands is the optically pure SPINOL, which requires seven steps in the synthetic route. In addition, resolution with a cinchonidine derivative is needed. The optimized overall yield is about 11%. From chiral SPINOL, many steps lead to the reactive ligands. Industry is seeking for efficient catalysts with low cost and this is why chemical practitioners are keeping developing novel catalytic methods.

### 1.2 Hydrogen bonding as a secondary interaction in catalyst design

Hydrogen bond (H-bond) is one of the most commonly observed and studied non-covalent interaction in nature. Recent two decades have seen the boost of the application
of H-bonding in small molecule catalysis. A concept of organocatalysis emerged in recent years and the core idea of this transition metal-free lies on non-covalent interactions, such as electrostatics, H-bonding, cation-π interaction or π-π stacking. Pioneering studies involving hydrogen donor catalysts revealed an interesting conclusion that in some cases, H-bonding shows comparative activating ability to Lewis acids. Aimed to develop a strategy to activate the electrophile for the electrophile-nucleophile reactions, H-bonding is designed to lowering the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO), and therefore decrease the energy barrier in the transition states.

Two families of organocatalysis involving this non-covalent interaction are thiourea and phosphoric acid. While the bifunctional activation sites within phosphoric acids are the P=O and O-H group, thiourea is highly tunable: many secondary interactions could be incorporated with covalent bonds (Figure). We envision that the incorporation of transition metal and thiourea will be a good solution for a bifunctional catalysis. In thiourea organocatalysis, other non-covalent interaction, such as electrostatics or cation-π, serves as a secondary interaction. We attempt to apply thiourea H-bonding as a secondary interaction. It seems to be meaningless to distinguish the primary or the secondary interaction.

Many non-covalent interaction models have been established in the mechanistic studies of thiourea catalyzed organic reactions. Carbonyl, imine, halide anion, sulfonate and phosphonate anion are good hydrogen acceptors and their binding with thiourea has been studied, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Nucleophilic addition, conjugate
addition, ring opening, rearrangement, Friedel-Crafts Reaction, Diels-Alder reaction are among successful examples of small molecule catalysis with thiourea as the hydrogen donor. Although the activating potency and directionality is weaker than metal Lewis acids, hydrogen bond is softer and more tolerate to functional groups. With appropriate conformation and geometry, H-bonding can also activate electrophiles efficiently.

Anion binding, a subsidiary of H-bonding, originated in anion recognition and supramolecular chemistry, has been employed in asymmetric catalysis. Not like the pattern of activating the electrophile in thiourea-carbonyl H-bonding, anion binding behaves differently: it establishes an association between an active reactant and the thiourea catalyst. Electrostatics usually connects the cationic reactant and the chiral catalyst, thus introducing chirality in the product. Similarly, a secondary interaction is commonly responsible for high enantioselectivity and reactivity.

Figure 1.7 Chiral phosphoric acid and thiourea: two wide-applied motives in small-molecule catalysis.

The strategy of cooperative catalysis emerged in recent years, aiming to combine two or more catalytic centers to achieve a single reaction. Recently, several breakthroughs were made with the application of this strategy in several kinds of reactions, such as Pararov reaction, hydrogenation, hydroformylation and Diels-
Alder reaction. The combination of thiourea/urea derivatives and simple Brønsted acids offers a similar effect to chiral phosphoric acids, but it can render a broader acidity range. Moreover, tunable substituents on bifunctional thiourea/urea catalysts can introduce many kinds of secondary interactions. By establishing a bridge between the thiourea and the conjugate base anion of the Brønsted acid, anion binding makes the chiral catalyst associate with a protonated substrate. This strategy combines the essences of both approaches. Transition metal catalysis, with high turnover numbers and potent reactivity, plays a crucial role in synthetic chemistry. It shows a very broad application in pharmaceutical and fine chemical industries. The integration of transition metal catalysis and small molecule organocatalysis has shown its potential in the synthetic chemistry communities. We envision that certain kinds of reactions could be catalyzed by the cooperative catalysis of transition metal, Brønsted acid and thiourea anion binding.

As quoted by R. Knowles and E. Jacobsen, in order to achieve high enantioselectivity, “small molecule catalysts are designed to introduce steric hindrance to increase the transition state energy of one diastereomer of the two catalyst-substrate complexes; while macromolecule catalysis is to lowering the energy of transition state for one enantiomer.” Non-covalent interactions, such as hydrogen bonding, cation-π or anion-π interaction, π-π stacking are easily found in enzyme catalysis. With remarkably high enantioselectivity and efficiency, the latter strategy deserves more attention in catalytic organic reactions.

This thesis is mainly focused on H-bonding as a second interaction, aiming to explore
its application of in asymmetric hydrogenation.

1.3 The development of a novel bisphosphine-thiourea catalyst and the preliminary examples of its application.

Scheme 1.3 A novel thiourea-bisphosphine ligand: strategy of hydrogen bonding and cooperative catalysis.

Guided by such strategies as cooperative catalysis and H-bonding effect, we recently designed and synthesized a ferrocene-based bisphosphine-thiourea catalyst, ZhaoPhos\(^67\). Previous successful examples involved non-covalent interactions between catalytically reactive units, such as ion pair and hydrogen bond. Within ZhaoPhos, a covalent linker connects the transition metal unit and the thiourea moiety. The length the linker is believed to be crucial for high efficiency and selectivity.
Scheme 1.4 Synthetic route to prepare ZhaoPhos.

Preparation of ZhaoPhos is readily reported in the preliminary work in our group by Dr. Qingyang Zhao. From commercially available chiral Ugi’s amine, only four steps are required to synthesize this ligand (Scheme 1.4). This route is mature: a 10-gram-scale preparation can easily proceed with good repeatability.

ZhaoPhos has been successfully applied in asymmetric hydrogenation of nitroolefins with remarkable enantioselectivity. Control experiments were conducted to confirm the cooperation of thiourea and the ferrocene-based bisphosphine ligand. Based on reports in organocatalysis, a thiourea-nitro interaction was proposed. This secondary interaction was believed to bring dual benefit: (1) activate the conjugate C= bonding by hydrogen bonding; (2) create a suitable chiral environment and therefore help to obtain good enantioselectivity.

Scheme 1.5 Asymmetric hydrogenation of nitroolefins: a preliminary example of ZhaoPhos.
By applying this synthetic route, a series of ferrocene-based bisphosphine-thiourea ligands have been successfully prepared. Conjugate nitroolefins with various substituents on β-position have been successfully reduced. Control experiments support the assumption that thiourea and bisphosphine cooperate within a catalyst molecule. The covalent linker is crucial for effective catalysis.

The preliminary results inspired us to explore its broader application of this strategy in asymmetric catalysis.
116, 4062.
45. Zhang, Z.; Schreiner, P. R., (Thio)urea organocatalysis-What can be learnt from anion recognition? *Chemical Society Reviews* 2009, 38 (4), 1187-1198.
2012, 134 (38), 15621-15623.
Chapter two

Rhodium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of \( N \)-unprotected iminiums via thiourea-chloride anion binding

2.1 Introduction

Chiral amines are powerful pharmacophores of biologically active molecules for pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals.\(^1\) In 2010, 45 out of the top 200 brand name drugs contained chiral amines.\(^2\) The elastase inhibitor DMP 777, calcimimetic agent Sensipar (Cinacalcet), and type II calcimimetics NPS R-568 are the representatives of bio-active molecules (Scheme 2.1).

As one of most efficient approaches to prepare chiral amines, the asymmetric hydrogenation of enamines and imines has received particular attention. To date, although a number catalytic systems has been successfully applied to their industrial production, it is still a largely underdeveloped area in contrast to the great advances in asymmetric hydrogenation of olefins and ketones.\(^3-5\) Compared with enamines and N-protected imines, asymmetric hydrogenation of prochiral iminium salts is a more atom economical and challenging method, which eliminates the extra steps of protection and deprotection of the \( \text{NH}_2 \) group. The first example of asymmetric hydrogenation of \( N \)-unprotected imines with high enantioselectivity was reported by our group with well-established Ir-f-BINAPHINE catalysts.\(^6-8\) High catalyst loading (5\%), however, still
limits its application for large-scale application. We aimed to develop a novel and efficient catalytic system for this transformation.

![Scheme 2.1 Chiral amine in drugs and asymmetric hydrogenation of unprotected imines with iridium/f-BINAPHINE](image)

Thiourea as have been widely used as a H-bond donor in organocatalysis.\textsuperscript{9-11} Most research focuses on the direct activation of neutral substrates by H-bonding while more recent studies take advantage of the anion binding of ion-pairing intermediates.\textsuperscript{12-14} Our initial work explored the activation of nitroalkenes by thioureas \textit{via} proposed H-bonding interactions in the enantioselective hydrogenation (Scheme 2.2).\textsuperscript{15} Inspired by the powerful strategies developed in ion-pairing catalysis,\textsuperscript{16-24} we sought to extend the anion-binding catalysis concept to the field of asymmetric hydrogenation. Based on the reports in anion-binding catalysis, especially the enantioselective reactions of iminium ions\textsuperscript{25} and the mechanism study\textsuperscript{26}, we envisioned that the thiourea could interact with the counteranion in the catalytic pathway (Scheme 2.2). We are looking forward to exploring the application of this Rh/bisphosphine-thiourea catalyst in asymmetric hydrogenation of N-H imines assisted by anion binding.
Scheme 2.2 Extension of our Rh/Bisphosphine-Thiourea catalytic system.

2.2 Method development

To evaluate the synthetic protocols, we carried out measurement of ee's by chiral HPLC. In accordance with the hydrogenation of nitroolefins, after careful screening of various of metal precursors, [Rh(COD)Cl]₂ afforded the best results and the catalytic system was solvent dependent (Table 1, entries 1-9). Excellent results were observed when the [Rh(COD)Cl]₂ and ZhaoPhos was used in protic solvents. 99% Conversion and 92% ee were obtained in i-PrOH (Table 2.1, entries 3).

Table 2.1 Optimization of conditions. [a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Metal Source</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>Conversion [b]</th>
<th>ee [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl]₂BF₄</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>[Rh(NBD)Cl]₂SbF₆</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl]₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>[Ir(COD)Cl]₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>Pd(OAc)₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>Pd(TFA)₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>[RuCl₂(p-cymene)]₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8  CH₂Cl₂  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  91%  30%
9  Toluene  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  60%  15%
10 THF  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  76%  60%
11 MeOH  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  99%  73%
12 EtOH  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  92%  89%
13 t-BuOH  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  25  84%  91%
14 i-PrOH  [Rh(COD)Cl]₂  100  99%  93%

[a] Unless otherwise mentioned, reactions were performed with 1a (0.1 mmol) and a Rh/L/1a ratio of 1/1.1/25 in 1.0 mL solvent at 35 °C under 20 atm H₂. [b] Determined by GC and NMR. [c] Determined by GC analysis of the corresponding acetamides. [d] 25 °C, 10 atm H₂.

In addition, pressures, temperatures and additives were examined to optimize the reaction. The best result was observed at 25°C under 10 atm H₂ with 1 mol % catalyst (Table 2.2, entry 4). The substrate/catalyst ratio can be up to 400 with >90 % conversion and a retention of high enantiometric excess. Addition of base (triethylamine) and molecular seive resulted a poor conversion with low enantioselectivity, while acids influence the enantioselectivity in a negative way (Table 2.3). This might be caused by a interference of the anion binding of original chloride ion with thiourea ligand.

**Table 2.2 Hydrogen pressure, temperature and catalyst loading.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>H₂[atm]</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>T [ °C]</th>
<th>Conversion[b]</th>
<th>ee[c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Influence from additives \([a]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>T [ °C]</th>
<th>Conversion([b])</th>
<th>ee([c])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4A MS (100mg)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CF₃COOH (10 mmol %)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CH₃COOH (10 mmol %)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Et₃N (10 mmol %)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Reactions were performed in i-PrOH with 1a (0.1 mmol) and a 1a/[Rh(COD)Cl]/L6 ratio of 100/1/2.2. [b] NMR analysis; [c] Determined by GC analysis of the corresponding acetamides.

2.3 Substrate scope of N-unprotected imines

Under the optimized conditions, a variety of N-H imines were tested (Table 2.4). Mostly substrates with meta and para substitutions on the phenyl ring afforded high yields and enantioselectivities (96-99% yield and 90-94% ee). However, the chloro group and methoxy group resulted in an obvious decrease of the yields (2d, 2e and 2g). The ortho-methoxy group on the phenyl ring resulted in 34% yield and 84% ee (2h). 1- and 2-naphthyl products were obtained with 92% ee and 93% ee respectively. The R₂ group had a significant effect on the outcome. When R₂ was ethyl group, lower conversion and enantioselectivity were observed (2k). As the R₂ group changed to butyl, the conversion and enantioselectivity of the product gradually decreased to 70% and 75% (2l).
Table 2.4 Substrates Scope Screening.\textsuperscript{[a]}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>R&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>[Rh(COD/Cl)]&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; ZhaoPhos, 10 atm H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>IP&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;, 24 h, 25 °C</td>
<td>100/1</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>IP&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;, 24 h, 25 °C</td>
<td>100/1</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>IP&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;, 24 h, 25 °C</td>
<td>50/1</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl</td>
<td>IP&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;, 24 h, 25 °C</td>
<td>50/1</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] 1 (0.2 mmol) and a Rh/L ratio of 1/1.1 in 2.0 mL solvent at 25°C under 10 atm H<sub>2</sub>. \textsuperscript{b} Isolated yield. \textsuperscript{c} ee was determined by chiral by GC analysis of the corresponding acetamides.

2.4 Mechanistic study

To obtain insight of this catalytic system, a series of chiral ligands were prepared and some control experiments were undertaken (Table 2.5). The urea L1 provided 22% conversion and 66% ee in sharp contrast with the more acidic and less self-assembling thiourea ZhaoPhos (Table 2.5, entry 1 vs 2).\textsuperscript{27} The CF<sub>3</sub> group on the 3,5-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl moiety remained important in the catalytic system (Table 2.5, entries 3-5).\textsuperscript{28} For further research, several
modified ligands were prepared and screened. The methylation of ZhaoPhos led to a dramatic decrease of the conversion and enantioselectivity (Table 2.5, entry 6). This finding suggested that the NH may be involved in the activation of iminium salts and the stereoselectivity of hydrogenation. The low conversion and enantioselectivity obtained with monodentated phosphorus ligand proved that the bisphosphine was essential (Table 2.5, entry 7). Neither the combination of the chiral phosphine with the simple thiourea nor the combination of the simple phosphine with the chiral thiourea improved the activity and enantioselectivity of this reaction (Table 2.5, entry 8 and 9), which pointed to the importance of a covalent linker.

Table 2.5 Ligands study and control experiments. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Ligands</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>ee [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L4 + 2PPh3</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, different substrates and additives were investigated. When the chloride counterion in 1a was replaced with trifluoromethanesulfonate, only 20% conversion and 53% ee was observed (Table 2.6, entries 1). Interestingly, the addition of chloride counterion increased the conversions and enantioselectivities (Table 2.6, entries 2 and 3). However, the addition of bromide counterion and iodide counterion decreased the conversions and enantioselectivities (Table 2.6, entries 4-6). This finding implied that the chloride counterion played an important role in this catalytic system. We tried activated imine 1q and iminium salts 1q•HCl but no desired product was obtained.

Table 2.6 Substrates study and control experiments.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Conversion[b]</th>
<th>ee[c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1p</td>
<td>TBAC</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1p</td>
<td>LiCl</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>TBAB</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>TBAI</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7[d]</td>
<td>1q</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Unless otherwise mentioned, reactions were performed with 1a (0.1 mmol) and a Rh/L/1a ratio of 1/1.1/100 in 1.0 mL solvent at 25 °C under 10 atm H₂. [b] Determined by NMR. [c] Determined by GC analysis of the corresponding acetamides. [d] Rh/L6/1a/Ph₃P ratio of 1/1.1/100/1.1. [e] Rh/L7/1a/Ph₃P ratio of 1/1.1/100/2.2. [f] Rh/L8/1a/thiourea ratio of 1/1.1/100/1.1.
Further information about the reaction was obtained by $^1$H NMR studies of mixtures generated from ligands and tetrabutylammonium chloride (TBAC). The addition of varying amounts of tetrabutylammonium chloride (TBAC) to ZhaoPhos in CDCl$_3$ resulted in a downfield shift of the NH proton signals (Figure 2.1). As 1 equivalent of TBAC was added, the signal for NH was at 9.73 ppm. When 3 equivalents of TBAC were added, the NH signal appeared at 10.16 ppm. Analogous experiments employing different ligands and TBAC gave similar result.\textsuperscript{29} This finding was consistent with a dual H-bond interaction\textsuperscript{19, 22, 30-31} and indicated that the reaction may involve the recognition of chloride ions. Based on well-established anion-binding properties of thiourea, we proposed this catalytic intermediates were responsible for the anion binding.

\textbf{2.5 Summary}

In conclusion, asymmetric hydrogenation of N-H iminiums could be catalyzed by a Rh/bisphosphine-thiourea complex. The chiral amines were obtained in high yields and enantioselectivities. Based on the control experiments and $^1$H NMR studies, we proposed that the anion binding interaction between thiourea and chloride counterion played an important role in the catalytic system. Further research on the mechanism and application is currently under way.
Figure 2.1 $^1$H NMR spectra of ZhaoPhos with tetrabutylammonium chloride (TBAC). The NH were marked.

2.6 Experimental section

2.6.1 Synthesis of N-H imines.

All the N-H imines were prepared according the literature.\textsuperscript{6}

A round-bottom flask was charged with nitrile (50.0 mmol) and THF (50 mL). The mixture was cooled to $-78 \, ^\circ C$ and MeLi (50.0 mL, 1.6 M in diethyl ether) was added dropwise over 1h. After addition, the resulting mixture was stirred for 2 h and quenched with anhydrous MeOH (12 mL). The mixture was then stirred at rt for 2 h. The suspension was filtered on a Celite pad and the filtrate was concentrated under vacuum. The residue was dissolved in MTBE (50 mL) and treated with HCl/Et$_2$O (50.0 mL, 1 M). The slurry was stirred for 30 min and filtered to obtain the product as free-flowing white to yellow solids.

All the spectral data are consistent with the literature values.\textsuperscript{6}
1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 11.46 (s, 2H), 8.20–7.91 (m, 2H), 7.78 (t, $J$ = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.61 (dd, $J$ = 17.7, 9.6 Hz, 2H), 2.94 (d, $J$ = 5.2 Hz, 3H).

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 186.36 (s), 136.95 (s), 129.92 (s), 129.35 (s), 129.33 (s), 21.73 (s).

2.6.2 General Procedure for asymmetric hydrogenation of N-H imines:

In the nitrogen-filled glovebox. A solution of L (2.2 eqv.) and [Rh(COD)Cl]$_2$ (3.0 mg, 0.006 mmol) in 6.0 mL anhydrous i-PrOH was stirred at room temperature for 30 min. A specified amount of the resulting solution (1 mL) was transferred to a vial charged with 1a (0.1 mmol) by syringe. The vials were transferred to an autoclave, which was then charged with 10 atm of H$_2$ and stirred at 25 °C for 24 h. The resulting mixture was concentrated under vacuum and dissolved in saturated aqueous NaHCO$_3$ (5 mL). After stirring for 10 min, the mixture was extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (3×2 mL) and dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$. To the resulting solution was added Ac$_2$O (300 μL) and stirred for 30 min. The resulting solution was then analyzed for conversion and ee directly by GC. The product was purified by chromatography on silica gel column with dichloromethane/methanol (90:10).

All the spectral data are consistent with the literature values.$^6$

2.6.3 Characterization data for chiral amines.

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.53 (s, 3H), 7.45 (d, $J$ = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (m, 3H), 4.29 (d, $J$ = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 1.59 (d, $J$ = 6.4 Hz, 3H).
$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 138.79 (s), 128.96 (s), 128.63 (s), 126.91 (s), 51.74 (s), 21.01 (s).

Supelco gama Dex$^{\text{TM}}$ 225 column (30 m x 0.25 mm x 0.25 $\mu$m), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, $t_R$ (major) = 16.3 min, $t_R$ (minor) = 17.9 min.  

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.32 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.14 (d, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 2H), 6.57 (s, 3H), 4.23 (d, $J = 6.0$ Hz, 1H), 2.32 (s, 3H), 1.55 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 138.13 (s), 137.05 (s), 129.56 (s), 126.60 (s), 51.38 (s), 21.58 (s), 21.11 (s).
Supelco gama Dex\textsuperscript{TM} 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, 
\( t_R \) (major) = 23.6 min, \( t_R \) (minor) = 25.6 min. \textsuperscript{2,6}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RetTime</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.561</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.2738</td>
<td>3293.35986</td>
<td>200.45435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.622</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.2119</td>
<td>95.80892</td>
<td>7.53432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^1H \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 7.50 – 7.36 (m, 2H), 7.13 (s, 3H), 7.06 – 6.94 (m, 2H), 4.30 (d, \( J = 6.0 \) Hz, 1H), 1.58 (d, \( J = 6.4 \) Hz, 3H).
\( ^13C \) NMR (100 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 162.72 (d, \( J = 246 \) Hz), 134.86 (s), 128.79 (d, \( J = 8.2 \) Hz), 115.87 (d, \( J = 21.6 \) Hz), 51.06 (s), 21.17 (s).

Supelco gama Dex\textsuperscript{TM} 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, 
\( t_R \) (major) = 19.7 min, \( t_R \) (minor) = 21.9 min. \textsuperscript{2,6}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RetTime</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.719</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.5803</td>
<td>3950.08472</td>
<td>113.45764</td>
<td>95.11063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.901</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.3178</td>
<td>203.06262</td>
<td>10.64807</td>
<td>4.88937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.30 (d, $J = 10.0$ Hz, 4H), 4.17 (d, $J = 6.1$ Hz, 1H), 3.85 (s, 3H), 1.44 (d, $J = 6.4$ Hz, 3H).

C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 142.90 (s), 133.26 (s), 128.81 (s), 127.60 (s), 50.89 (s), 24.02 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, $t_R$ (major) = 55.5 min, $t_R$ (minor) = 61.8 min. 2,6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.524 MM</td>
<td>1.7378</td>
<td>2691.72803</td>
<td>25.81494</td>
<td>94.77756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.750 MM</td>
<td>0.8877</td>
<td>148.31989</td>
<td>2.78473</td>
<td>5.22244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.37 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 6.86 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 6.62 (s, 1H), 4.25 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 1.57 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 2H).

C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 159.66 (s), 131.65 (s), 128.09 (s), 114.28 (s), 55.26 (s), 51.18 (s), 21.39 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, $t_R$ (major) =53.4 min, $t_R$ (minor) =57.5 min.  

![Diagram](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RetTime</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.378</td>
<td>MM 0.6950</td>
<td>1923.21802</td>
<td>46.12228</td>
<td>96.39646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.485</td>
<td>MM 0.4483</td>
<td>71.89476</td>
<td>2.67307</td>
<td>3.60354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃)** δ 7.28 – 7.15 (m, 3H), 7.09 (dd, J = 5.8, 3.8 Hz, 1H), 5.52 (s, 3H), 4.20 (q, J = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 2.33 (s, 3H), 1.54 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H).

**¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃)** δ 140.90 (s), 138.54 (s), 128.88 (d, J = 18.3 Hz), 127.29 (s), 123.52 (s), 51.58 (s), 22.07 (s), 21.39 (s).

Supelco beta Dex™ 390 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column programmed from 100 °C to 180 °C at 1.0 °C/min, tᵣ (major) = 59.5 min, tᵣ (minor) = 60.0 min.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RetTime</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[pA*s]</td>
<td>[pA]</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.533</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.5347</td>
<td>6001.59375</td>
<td>187.05707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.965</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.1460</td>
<td>232.04152</td>
<td>26.49493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.25 (dd, $J = 14.0, 6.2$ Hz, 1H), 7.04 (s, 1H), 6.98 (d, $J = 7.4$ Hz, 1H), 6.83 (dd, $J = 8.2, 2.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.57 (s, 3H), 4.25 (dd, $J = 13.0, 6.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.75 (s, 3H), 1.57 (d, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 159.97 (s), 141.59 (s), 129.96 (s), 118.79 (s), 114.42 (s), 111.80 (s), 55.35 (s), 51.71 (s), 21.68 (s).

Supelco gama Dex$^{\text{TM}}$ 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, $t_R$ (major) =44.9 min, $t_R$ (minor) =48.5 min.$^{2,6}$
H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.39 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.33 – 7.27 (m, 1H), 6.94 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 6.87 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 6.15 (s, 3H), 4.64 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 3.83 (s, 3H), 1.65 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H).

¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 156.77 (s), 129.74 (s), 127.50 (s), 126.68 (s), 120.92 (s), 110.67 (s), 55.43 (s), 47.13 (s), 19.02 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, tᵣ (major) =27.9 min, tᵣ (minor) =28.4 min. ², ⁶
Peak RetTime Type Width Area Height Area

# [min] [min] mAU*s [mAU ] %

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1188.6</td>
<td>61.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.405</td>
<td>0.1863</td>
<td>105.022</td>
<td>9.39646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.08 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.87 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.76 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (s, 1H), 7.60 – 7.40 (m, 3H), 5.94 (s, 3H), 5.03 (s, 1H), 1.61 (d, J = 6.4 Hz, 3H).

°C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 133.90 (s), 130.54 (s), 129.02 (s), 127.68 (s), 126.19 (s), 125.63 (s), 125.58 (s), 122.70 (s), 121.77 (s), 46.68 (s), 24.04 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, tᵣ (major) = 69.2 min, tᵣ (minor) = 76.9 min.² ⁶
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RetTime [min]</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width [pA*s]</th>
<th>Area [pA]</th>
<th>% Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.203</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>0.5190</td>
<td>1042.84412</td>
<td>25.65778</td>
<td>97.39758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.944</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.5035</td>
<td>27.86432</td>
<td>9.22378e-1</td>
<td>2.60242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.85 – 7.60 (m, 4H), 7.47 (dd, J = 8.5, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.45 – 7.32 (m, 2H), 6.87 (s, 1H), 4.27 (dd, J = 13.3, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 1.51 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H).

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 137.68 (s), 133.18 (s), 133.09 (s), 128.69 (s), 128.18 (s), 127.61 (s), 126.29 (s), 126.26 (s), 125.81 (s), 124.40 (s), 51.75 (s), 21.75 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, tᵣ (major) = 95.6 min, tᵣ (minor) = 103.8 min. ² ⁶
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Ret Time [min]</th>
<th>Type Width [min]</th>
<th>Area [pA·s]</th>
<th>Height [pA]</th>
<th>Area %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.577</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1.0421</td>
<td>4916.0371</td>
<td>78.62239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103.830</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.7545</td>
<td>220.49457</td>
<td>4.87091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.56 – 7.35 (m, 2H), 7.35 – 7.20 (m, 3H), 6.48 (s, 1H), 4.05 – 3.89 (m, 1H), 2.12 – 1.75 (m, 2H), 0.82 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H).

C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 138.76 (s), 128.87 (s), 128.39 (s), 127.27 (s), 57.82 (s), 28.96 (s), 10.46 (s).

Supelco beta Dex™ 390 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 140 °C, tᵣ (major) = 41.5 min, tᵣ (minor) = 42.7 min. ² ⁶
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RetTime</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># [min]</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[pA*s]</td>
<td>[pA]</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.547</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.6948</td>
<td>1812.0675</td>
<td>43.46968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.668</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.3346</td>
<td>131.7888</td>
<td>6.56533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.47 – 7.38 (m, 2H), 7.37 – 7.29 (m, 3H), 6.87 (s, 1H), 4.06 (dd, $J = 8.5, 5.8$ Hz, 1H), 2.10 – 1.82 (m, 2H), 1.37 – 1.17 (m, 3H), 1.14 – 1.04 (m, 1H), 0.82 (t, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 3H).

13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 136.44 (s), 129.03 (s), 128.87 (s), 127.45 (s), 56.40 (s), 34.23 (s), 27.74 (s), 22.06 (s), 13.77 (s).

Supelco gama Dex™ 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column programmed from 100 °C to 150 °C at 1.0 °C/min, $t_R$ (major) = 87.5 min, $t_R$ (minor) = 90.4 min.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.484</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.7369</td>
<td>990.01672</td>
<td>22.39206</td>
<td>12.04985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.419</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1.1909</td>
<td>7225.99023</td>
<td>101.12375</td>
<td>87.95015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows the time series data with a plot of the signal over time. Each point on the graph corresponds to a measurement with specific RetTime, Type (MF or FM), Width, Area, Height, and Area percentage.
Reference:


29. , For more details, see supplementary information.


Chapter three

Strong Brønsted acid promoted asymmetric hydrogenation of isoquinolines and quinolines catalyzed by a Rh-thiourea chiral phosphine complex via anion binding

3.1 introduction

As continuing research on the ferrocene-based thiourea chiral phosphine system, we sought to expand the success of asymmetric hydrogenation of unprotected iminium to a broad field in organic synthesis methodology. N-heterocycles would be a good target since they are a class of very important organic compounds both in nature and in pharma.

Tetrahydroquinolines (THQs) and tetrahydroisoquinolines (THIQs) are an important family of biologically active molecules, including natural alkaloids and important pharmaceutical products. 1-3 Among various synthetic approaches to synthesizing chiral THQs and THIQs, direct hydrogenation, with high atom economy, relatively simple procedure and easy work-up, deserves special attention. To our best knowledge, however, asymmetric hydrogenation of N-heteroaromatics, especially isoquinolines, remains a challenging task. 4-5 Although quinolines have been successfully hydrogenated in several cases (Scheme 3.1), 6-13 there were only few examples of isoquinolines. Zhou’s
group used iridium-bisphosphine catalyst to obtain high enantioselectivity, but this transformation needs activation by chloroformate or addition of BCDMH. By introducing chiral phosphoric acid, transfer hydrogenation of isoquinoline was achieved by Zhou in 2014 and N-protected 1,2-dihydroisoquinolines were synthesized with moderate enantioselectivities. In 2013, Mashima’s group synthesized chiral THIQ using a dinuclear iridium(III)-bisphosphine complex, but the substrate scope is still limited to aromatic or bulky substituents (scheme 3.1). Isoquinolines with less hindered alkyl substituents on the prochiral carbons are still challenging. Most of these catalysis cases for N-heteroaromatics are performed with ruthenium, iridium and palladium complexes. Rhodium was rarely reported in direct asymmetric hydrogenation of N-heteroaromatics with high turnovers and ee’s. This is in sharp contrast to the broad application of Rh complex in asymmetric hydrogenation of olefins, enamides and imines.

After introducing strong Brønsted acid such as HCl, we were looking forward to developing a highly reactive and enantioselective example of rhodium/bisphosphine-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of N-heteroaromatics. In this catalysis system, a secondary interaction between the catalyst and the substrates was believed to occur via anion binding of ion-pair intermediates. We envision that the strong Brønsted acid such as HCl, brings dual benefits: (1) activating the aromatic ring, (2) establishing a salt bridge between the catalyst and the substrates.
3.2 Method development

Our study was initiated with 3-methylisoquinoline hydrochloride as a model substrate. The Rh catalyst was prepared \textit{in situ} by mixing the metal precursor $[\text{Rh(COD)Cl}]_2$ with (S,R)-ZhaoPhos. In accordance with our previous reports, this catalysis system is solvent-dependent. After screening of alkyl halide, alcohols and ethers, we found that
under 40 atm H\(_2\) pressure at 40 °C, dichloromethane gives the best result (>99% conversion and 92% ee were observed with 1% catalyst loading). In addition to using single solvents, solvent pairs were also tested. The mixture of dichloromethane and isopropanol (2:1, v/v) at 25 °C gives the optimal condition with 99% ee and full conversion. Iridium complex [Ir(COD)Cl]\(_2\)/ZhaoPhos also shows high activity with, but lower enantioselectivity than its Rh counterpart (table 3.1, entry 5 vs entry 8). Halide effect, which causes considerable difference in some cases,\(^{23}\) was evaluated as well. Using [Rh(COD)I]\(_2\) as a metal precursor resulted in small changes in conversion and enantioselectivity (table 3.1, entry 6 vs entry 7).

**Table 3.1. Optimization of condition.**\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>conversion(^b)</th>
<th>ee(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>Dioxane</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>Dioxane/i-PrOH=2:1</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(^d)</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH=2:1</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(^d)</td>
<td>[Rh(COD)I](_2)</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH=2:1</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Ir(COD)Cl](_2)</td>
<td>Dioxane/i-PrOH=2:1</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reaction condition: 3a (0.1 mmol) in 1.0 ml solvent, 3/[Rh(COD)Cl]\(_2\)/L ratio=100/0.5/1, 40 atm H\(_2\), 40 °C, 24 h; \(^b\) conversion was determined by \(^1\)H NMR analysis, no by product was observed; \(^c\) ee was determined by GC with a chiral stationary phase; \(^d\) performed at 25 °C.
Counterion effects were also investigated. When tetrabutylammonium chloride (TBAC) was added, no significant changes in conversion and enantioselectivity was observed (Table 3.2, entry 2 vs 1). This suggests the spectator role of tetrabutylammonium cation. The introduction of bromide anion from TBAB does not influence this catalytic reaction (entry 3 vs 2). The presence of Iodide anion decreases the conversion, but it shows trace influence on the enantioselectivity (entry 4 vs 2). Fluoride anion, however, inhibits this catalytic reaction dramatically: no product was observed after adding TBAF (entry 5). To gain plausible explanation of these observations, further study will be needed in the future.

Table 3.2 Counterion effect. a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>additive</th>
<th>conversion b</th>
<th>ee c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TBAC (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBAB (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TBAI (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBAF (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aReaction condition: 3a (0.1 mmol) in 0.6 ml solvent, 1/[Rh(COD)Cl]/L1 ratio=100/0.5/1, 40 atm H2, 25 oC, 48 h; bconversion was determined by 1H NMR analysis, no by product was observed; cee was determined by GC with a chiral stationary phase.

3.3 Substrate scope

Then we applied this method to synthesize various chiral THIQs. Different alkyl substituents at 3-position or benzo ring do not show obvious changes in yields and
enantioselectivities. Aryl substituent, such as phenyl group, on 3- position leads to full conversion and moderate enantioselectivity (76% ee). In addition to 3-alkyl isoquinolines, 1-methylisouinoline was also hydrogenated with high enantioselectivity (Table 3.3).

**Table 3.3** Substrate scope for isoquinolines. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Reaction Condition</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
<th>Enantiomeric Excess (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>1 (0.2 mmol) in 1.2 ml solvent, 1/[Rh(COD)Cl]2/L ratio = 100/0.5/1; yield was determined with isolated THIQ products; ee was determined by GC or HPLC with a chiral stationary phase</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>99% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>performed in Dioxane/iPrOH = 2:1(v/v) at 60 °C under 60 atm H2 with 2% catalyst</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>yield: 99% ee: 92% (S)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>yield: 95% ee: 99% (S)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>yield: 98% ee: 99% (S)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>yield: 97% ee: 99% (S)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>yield: 98% ee: 99% (S)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>99% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>yield: 96% ee: 95% (R)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97% (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as we know, few catalysis systems can be applied in asymmetric hydrogenation of both isoquinolines and quinolines with both high turn-overs and excellent enantioselectivities.\(^6\)\(^-\)\(^13\) Then a question merged to us: can this synthetic protocol be used to synthesize chiral THQs with high ee? By employing the optimized condition (DCM/iPrOH=2:1, v/v) in the case asymmetric hydrogenation of isoquinolines, we found that the enantioselectivity was dramatically increased to 99% ee. This observation,
in return, suggests that this thiourea-Rh-bisphosphine catalysis system is highly solvent-dependent. Substrate scope of asymmetric hydrogenation of quinolines is broad. High enantioselectivities have been obtained with various substituents (Table 3.4).

**Table 3.4 Substrate scope for quinolines.** [a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Enantiomeric Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>99%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>97%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6i</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6j</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6k</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6l</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%(S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] reaction condition: 5 (0.2 mmol) in 1.2 ml solvent, 5/[Rh(COD)Cl]/L ratio = 100/0.5/1; yield was determined with isolated THQ products; ee was determined by GC or HPLC with a chiral stationary phase.

The potential application of this synthetic protocol was estimated: we have scaled up this asymmetric hydrogenation reaction into gram scale. No significant sign of changes in conversion or enantioselectivity was observed with 0.5% catalyst loading. 99% Yield and 98% ee was obtain in asymmetric hydrogenation of 5 mmol 2-methylisoquinolinium chloride with 0.5% catalyst. In addition, the role of strong Brønsted acid HCl is essential
in this chemical transformation. Without HCl, no hydrogenation product was observed.

3.4 NMR study for evidence of interaction between ligand and substrate

To gain evidence of a secondary interaction of ZhaoPhos with chloride anion of substrates, we mixed ZhaoPhos and 3a (3 eq.) in CDCl₃. The ¹H NMR showed similar obvious changes of chemical shifts (Figure 3.1). The original thiourea N-H peaks (hidden in the aromatic peaks within 7.3~7.0 ppm) shift downfield to 9.10 and 7.62 (marked with red circles in Figure 3.1). In addition, the three protons on the 3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl group also shift downfield a little by 0.19 ppm (marked by arrow). These changes of chemical shifts, consistent with the case of ZhaoPhos with Cl⁻ from TBAC, ²² suggest the anion binding between the ligand and the substrate.

Figure 3.1 NMR study for the interaction of ZhaoPhos and 3a.
3.5 Control experiments to evaluate each unit in ZhaoPhos

We conducted control experiments to evaluate the collaboration manner of each unit of ZhaoPhos in asymmetric hydrogenation of 3-methylisoquinolines (Table 3.5). Urea bisphosphine ligand L1 only gives trace product, and this sharp contrast suggests the crucial role of thiourea moiety. Compared to H (L2) and methyl (L3), more electron-withdrawing trifluoromethyl group at 3- and 5- position on the phenyl ring increases the enantioselectivity, which is probably due to the stronger acidity of N-H proton on the thiourea. After N-methylation of the less acidic thiourea N-H proton, enantioselectivity results in a minor decrease. This observation reveals that the more acidic thiourea N-H proton contributes mostly in anion binding with chloride. Furthermore, monophosphine ligand L6 and the mixture of ferrocene-thiourea compound L7 with triphenylphosphine can hardly catalyzed the hydrogenation reaction. On the other hand, the mixture of thiourea molecule and bisphosphine-Ugi’s amine L8 failed to show catalytic activity. These results (ZhaoPhos vs L7/PPh₃ and L8/thiourea) demonstrate the importance of a covalent incorporation of bisphosphine moiety and thiourea. The idea of secondary offers an alternative strategy for asymmetric hydrogenation.
Table 3.5. Ligand evaluation and control experiment.

3.6 Deuterium labelling experiments and proposed mechanism

In order to obtain insight of this transformation, deuterium labeling experiments was conducted. First, 3-methylisoquinoline hydrochloride was reduced by deuterium gas in methanol (Scheme 3.2, Eq. 1). D atoms are added only at 1- and 3- position respectively. This indicates that the hydrogen atom at 4- position of the product comes from the methanol solvent. Second, 3-methylisoquinoline deuterochloride was reduced with hydrogen gas in deuterated methanol (Scheme 3.2, Eq. 2). Hydrogen atoms are added at 1- and 3- position. The original H at 4- position, however, was exchanged with D, resulting two D atoms at 4- position. This indicates that D atoms at 4- position come
from the Methanol-d₄ solvent. A tautomerization is probably responsible for this H-D exchange. Interestingly, H-D exchange also occurs on the methyl group (53% original H was replaced by D). This observation, in return, proves the existence of tautomerization. Based on this results, we proposed a possible path in this transformation (Scheme 3.2). After addition of a hydrogen at 1-position, the substrate is partially reduced, leading to conjugate enamine, which could not be further reduced in this rhodium-thiourea-bisphosphine catalytic system. After a tautomerization follows, giving an iminiums intermediate, which could be easily hydrogenated. Another tautomer, a terminal enamine is less preferred than its conjugate counterpart, because the latter is more stable. This explains why H atoms on methyl group was partially replaced by D (but H at 4-position is almost replaced by D). (For details, please see supporting information.)
Recent reports revealed an outer-sphere mechanism for bisphosphine-transition metal catalyzed hydrogenation. In 2014, Zhou reported a series of detailed studies on palladium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of protonated indoles. After careful evaluation, hydride transfer from a Pd-H complex to an iminium intermediate was proposed. (Scheme 3.3, Eq. 1) In 2015, Mashima’s group proposed a mechanism on iridium-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of isoquinoline hydrogen halide salts. Strong experimental evidence was presented to favor an outer-sphere mechanism, in which hydrogen bonding between Ir-Cl complex and N-H proton was proposed. (Scheme 3.3, Eq. 2) Both of these mechanism studies above were focused on hydrogenation of the halide salts of aromatic compounds.
Similarly, the nature of protonated (iso)quinolines suggests that it seems not possible for the substrates to coordinate to the rhodium complex in this case, no matter in a σ-bonding or a π-bonding manner. A hydride transfer mechanism is more possible in this catalytic case, instead of the traditional inner-sphere mechanism that involves the direct coordination of unsaturated bonds to the metal. Based on previous reports and our deuterium labeling experiments, we propose a catalytic cycle to explain a plausible outer-sphere mechanism (scheme 3). After oxidative addition of H₂, a dihydride rhodium (III) complex is formed. The chloride anion of the isoquinolinium salt will bind with the hydrogen of thiourea, forming a Rh dichloro-dihydride anionic complex. The equatorial hydride of the active rhodium complex will be transferred to the isoquinolinium due to strong trans effect of a phosphine. After this 1,2-addition, a tautomerization step will follow, giving an iminium intermediate. The iminium, instead of an enamine, will undergo the insertion of hydride from a rhodium dihydride complex. The chirality of the product is originated in this step. Another molecule of hydrogen will react and form the active rhodium dihydride species, finishing the catalytic cycle. In order to approve the mechanism of this rhodium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of (iso)quinolinium salts, further study is needed in the future.
Scheme 3.3 Outer-sphere mechanism for hydrogenation of N-heteroaromatics.

3.7 Conclusions

In summary, we report a successful example of Rh-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of both isoquinolines and quinolines. Compared with previous catalysis systems, this method has broader substrates scope. The strong Brønsted acid HCl activates the N-heteroaromatic substrates and introduces anion binding into the catalysis system, which played an important role in this transformation. Deuterium labeling
experiments revealed an enamine-iminium tautomerization equilibrium after the first hydride transfer step.

3.8 Experimental Section

3.8.1 Synthesis of isoquinolines and quinolines

3-substituted isoquinolines were synthesized according to literature with modification:26

A round-bottom flask was charged with benzylamine (10 mmol) and glyoxal 1,1-dimethyl acetal (1.1 eq., 60% solution in water) was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight and two layers were separated. After removal of the aqueous layer, trace water was removed by azeotropic distillation with toluene. The crude imine was used for next step without purification.

To the solution of this imine in dry THF was added Grignard reagent dropwise at 0°C. The mixture was then stirred at room temperature. Once TLC showed the completion of the reaction (usually overnight), saturated aqueous NH4Cl was added at 0°C. The mixture was extracted with ether and the organic layer was dried with anhydrous sodium sulfate. After removal of solvent, the crude product was obtained as yellow or orange oil. After 1H NMR shows the majority of the desired amine in the crude product, it is used for next step without purification.

A round-bottom flask was filled with nitrogen and charged with chlorosulfuric acid (5 ml). The mixture was cooled at 0 °C and the crude amine was added dropwise. The mixture was heated at 100 °C for 15 min and then cooled to 0 °C. The resulting mixture
was poured on ice and the neutralized carefully with 40% NaOH solution. After the mixture turned to alkaline, ether was added to extract. The organic phase was dried with sodium sulfate and the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (on silica gel, eluent: hexane/ethyl acetate). 3-alkylisoquinoline was obtained as yellow oils.

**3-ethylisoquinoline**

Yellow oil. 43% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 9.06 (s, 1H), 7.75 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.58 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.47 (t, J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 7.35 (t, J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 7.31 (s, 1H), 2.84 (q, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 1.27 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 155.92, 150.95, 135.55, 129.08, 126.37, 126.02, 125.16, 125.02, 115.98, 30.06, 13.02. m/z (ESI–MS) 158.04 [M + H]$^+$. 

**3-butyridisoquinoline**

Yellow oil. 38% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 9.19 (s, 1H), 7.90 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.72 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.62 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.50 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.45 (s, 1H), 2.94 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 1.80 (m, 2H), 1.43 (m, 2H), 0.96 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 155.88, 152.04, 136.54, 130.14, 127.46, 127.07, 126.22, 126.06, 117.87, 37.84, 32.14, 22.50, 13.97. m/z (ESI–MS) 186.06 [M + H]$^+$. 

**3,6-dimethylisoquinoline**

White solid. 38% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 9.10 (s, 1H), 7.81 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.48 (s, 1H), 7.38 (s, 1H), 7.34 (dd, J = 8.4, 1.4 Hz, 1H), 2.38 (s, 3H), 2.52 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 151.67, 151.51, 140.56, 136.92, 128.56, 127.28, 125.37, 124.80, 117.93, 24.18, 22.05.

MP: m/z (ESI–MS) 158.14 [M + H]$^+$. 

**6-chloro-3-methylisoquinoline**

Yellow oil. 56% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 9.14 (s, 1H), 7.85 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 7.69 (d, J = 1.8 Hz, 1H), 7.45 (dd, J = 8.7, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.38 (s, 1H),
2.69 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 152.99, 151.72, 137.26, 129.15, 127.41, 125.04, 124.80, 117.53, 24.25. m/z (ESI–MS) 178.14 [M + H]+.

6-fluoro-3-methylisoquinoline

Yellow oil. 34% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 9.12 (s, 1H), 7.91 (dd, J = 8.9, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 7.41 (s, 1H), 7.30 (dd, J = 10.1, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.25 (dd, J = 8.7, 2.5 Hz, 1H), 2.68 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 163.28 (d, J = 251.9 Hz), 152.66, 151.52, 137.94 (d, J = 10.5 Hz), 130.43 (d, J = 9.9 Hz), 124.04, 118.01 (d, J = 5.3 Hz), 116.81 (d, J = 25.8 Hz), 109.14 (d, J = 20.9 Hz). m/z (ESI–MS) 162.04 [M + H]+.

6-trifluoromethyl-3-methylisoquinoline

Yellow oil. 27% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 9.26 (s, 1H), 8.05 (s, 1H), 8.03 (s, 2H), 7.68 (dd, J = 8.4, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 7.56 (s, 1H), 2.74 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 153.40, 151.92, 144.38, 135.56, 131.90 (q, J = 128.4 Hz), 128.69, 127.47, 123.79 (q, J = 18.1 Hz), 121.96 (q, J = 12.1 Hz), 118.98, 24.20. m/z (ESI–MS) 211.97 [M + H]+.

8-chloro-3-methylisoquinoline

Yellow oil. 41% yield for 3 steps. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 9.56 (s, 1H), 7.64 (dd, J = 5.5, 3.7 Hz, 1H), 7.54 (s, 1H), 7.53 (d, J = 2.3 Hz, 1H), 7.47 (s, 1H), 2.72 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 152.79, 148.94, 137.89, 132.52, 130.19, 126.52, 125.14, 124.01, 118.15, 24.08. m/z (ESI–MS) 178.16 [M + H]+.

2-substituted quinolines were synthesized according to literature:

![Diagram](image)

To a solution of 1-methylquinoline (10 mmol) in dry THF (20 ml) at 0°C was added n-butyllithium in THF solution (2.5M) dropwise. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1.5h and was cooled back to 0°C. Iodomethane was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred overnight. Water was added carefully to quench the reaction and the mixture was extracted by ethyl acetate (20 ml*3). Organic phases were combined and dried with sodium sulfate. After
removing solvent, the crude product was purified by flash chromatography (on silica gel, eluent: hexanes/ethyl acetate). 2-methylquinoline was obtained as yellow oil with 95% yield.

All characterization data are consistent with literature. 12, 27

2-ethylquinoline

Known compound. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 8.04 (dd, $J = 11.8, 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 7.74 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.65 (ddd, $J = 8.3, 6.9, 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.45 (dd, $J = 11.0, 4.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.28 – 7.25 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 2.99 (q, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 2H), 1.39 (dd, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 163.97, 147.87, 136.31, 129.30, 128.79, 127.46, 126.37, 125.63, 120.81, 32.28, 13.97

2-isopropylquinoline

Followed the standard procedure above, using 2-ethylquinoline and iodomethane, 2-isopropylquinoline was abotained as yellow oil with 76% yield. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 8.05 (dd, $J = 8.2, 6.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.74 (dd, $J = 8.1, 1.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.65 (ddd, $J = 8.4, 6.9, 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.45 (ddd, $J = 8.1, 7.0, 1.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.30 (t, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 1H), 3.26 (hept, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 1H), 1.38 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 167.63, 147.79, 136.36, 129.21, 129.04, 127.42, 126.95, 125.62, 119.16, 37.29, 22.52.

2-pentylquinoline

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 8.04 (t, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 2H), 7.75 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.66 (t, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 7.45 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 7.27 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 2.99 – 2.94 (m, 2H), 1.86 – 1.77 (m, 2H), 1.37 (m, 2H), 0.90 (t, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 163.10, 147.97, 136.10, 129.25, 128.88, 127.45, 126.72, 125.59, 121.34, 39.35, 31.76, 29.71, 22.56, 14.00.

2-undecylquinoline

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.76 (dd, $J = 8.1, 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.67 (ddd, $J = 8.3, 6.9, 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.46 (ddd, $J = 8.0, 7.0, 1.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.28 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 2.96 (t, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 1.86 – 1.76 (m, 2H), 1.46 – 1.19 (m, 16H), 0.90 – 0.85 (m, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 163.12, 147.97, 136.09, 129.25, 128.88, 127.44, 126.72, 125.58, 121.34, 39.40, 31.68, 30.03, 29.58, 29.56, 29.52, 29.30, 22.66, 14.09.
2-(3,4-dimethoxyphenethyl)quinoline

Yellow oil. $^1\text{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 8.07 (d, $J = 8.4$, 1H), 8.03 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.77 (dd, $J = 8.1$, 0.8 Hz, 1H), 7.69 (ddd, $J = 8.4$, 6.9, 1.4 Hz, 1H), 7.49 (d, $J = 8.4$, 6.9, 1.4 Hz, 1H), 7.22 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 6.78 (d, $J = 1.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.75 (s, 1H), 3.84 (s, 1H), 3.79 (s, 1H), 3.27 (dd, $J = 9.6$, 6.2 Hz, 1H), 3.10 (dd, $J = 9.5$, 6.4 Hz, 1H). $^{13}\text{C}$ NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 161.84, 148.83, 148.01, 147.34, 136.16, 134.17, 129.40, 128.86, 127.52, 126.60, 125.79, 121.62, 120.34, 112.01, 111.34, 55.92, 55.77, 41.23, 35.54.

3.8.2 General procedure for asymmetric hydrogenation of isoquinolines and quinolines

In the nitrogen-filled glovebox, solution of [Rh(COD)Cl]$_2$ (4.9 mg, 0.01 mmol) and ligand (2.1 eq.) in 5.0 ml anhydrous solvent was stirred at room temperature for 30 min. A specified volume of the resulting solution (0.5 ml, 1% Rh catalyst) was transferred by syringe to a Score-Break ampule charged with substrate solution (0.2 mmol in 0.5 ml). The ampule was placed into an autoclave, which was then charged with 40 atm H$_2$. The autoclave was stirred at desired temperature for the indicated period of time. After release of H$_2$, the resulting mixture was concentrated under vacuum. Saturated potassium carbonate solution and dichloromethane was added and the mixture was stirred for 30 min. The organic layer was dried with anhydrous sodium sulfate. After removal of solvent, the crude product was analysed by $^1\text{H}$ NMR to determine the conversion. The enantiomeric excess was determined by GC or HPLC analysis of the crude product or its corresponding trifluoroacetamides. The absolute configurations were assigned according to literature $^{11, 28-30}$ and their analogues.

3.8.3 Result of deuterium labeling experiments

Following standard hydrogenation procedure, deuterium labeling experiments were conducted with specific modification.
\[
\text{Rh-L1(2%), D}_2, \text{CH}_3\text{OH} \quad \text{then basic work-up}
\]

(1)

\[
\text{Rh-L1(2%), H}_2, \text{CD}_3\text{OD} \quad \text{then basic work-up}
\]

(2)
For clarity, combined spectrum for the original 2a and the two deuterated 2a were shown as below:

3.8.4 Characterization data of chiral THQs and THIQs
3-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4a)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 7.11 (m, 2H), 7.06 (m, 1H), 7.01 (t, 1H), 4.11 (d, $J$ = 16.0 Hz, 1H), 4.02 (d, $J$ = 16.0 Hz, 1H), 3.02 (dqd, $J$ = 10.3, 6.3, 4.0 Hz, 1H), 2.78 (dd, $J$ = 16.4, 3.8 Hz, 1H), 2.51 (dd, $J$ = 16.3, 10.7 Hz, 1H), 1.73 (br, 1H), 1.24 (d, $J$ = 6.3 Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 135.39, 134.92, 129.11, 126.01, 126.00, 125.70, 49.25, 48.59, 37.26, 22.50.

$[^{[\alpha]}]_{D}^{22}$ $+$103.6 (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

$m/z$ (ESI–MS) 148.22 [M + H]$^+$. 

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, $t_1$ =46.3 min, $t_2$ =47.7 min.

3-ethyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4b)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 7.12 (m, 3H), 7.02 (m, 1H), 4.09 (d, $J$ = 12.0 Hz, 1H), 4.03 (d, $J$ = 12.0 Hz, 2H), 2.79 (tdd, $J$ = 10.4, 6.8, 3.8 Hz, 1H), 2.50 (dd, $J$ = 17.0, 11.5 Hz, 1H), 1.74 (br, 1H), 1.64-1.47 (m, 2H), 1.02 (t, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 135.76, 134.92, 129.46, 126.01, 125.99, 125.65, 55.25, 48.62,
35.11, 29.61, 10.39.
\([\alpha]^{22}_{D} +97.3 \text{ (c 0.5, CHCl}_3\).}

\(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 162.09 [M + H]^+.

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m \(\times\) 0.25 mm \(\times\) 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, 
\(t_1 = 83.2\) min, \(t_2 = 85.3\) min.

3-butyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4c)

Yellow oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 7.11 (m, 3H), 7.02 (m, 1H), 4.08 (d, \(J = 16.0\) Hz, 2H), 4.03 (d, \(J = 16.0\) Hz, 2H), 2.82 (comp., 2H), 2.50 (dd, \(J = 16.1, 10.4\) Hz, 1H), 1.50 (br, 1H), 1.30-1.60 (m, 6H), 1.02 (t, \(J = 3.2\) Hz, 3H).

\(^{13}\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ 135.78, 134.97, 129.22, 125.99, 125.66, 57.72, 48.60, 36.60, 35.58, 28.19, 22.86, 14.06.

\([\alpha]^{22}_{D} +81.8 \text{ (c 0.5, CHCl}_3\).}

\(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 190.17 [M + H]^+.

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m \(\times\) 0.25 mm \(\times\) 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, 
\(t_1 = 278.3\) min, \(t_2 = 285.0\) min.
3,6-dimethyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4d)

Yellow oil. \( ^1H \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): \( \delta 7.00 – 6.77 \) (m, 3H), 4.06 (d, \( J = 15.7 \) Hz, 1H), 3.99 (d, \( J = 15.8 \) Hz, 1H), 3.05–2.94 (m, 1H), 2.73 (dd, \( J = 16.3, 3.4 \) Hz, 1H), 2.46 (dd, \( J = 16.0, 10.8 \) Hz, 1H), 2.29 (s, 3H), 1.69 (s, 1H), 1.23 (d, \( J = 6.3 \) Hz, 3H).

\( ^{13}C \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): \( \delta 135.45, 134.76, 132.38, 129.60, 126.65, 125.88, 49.28, 48.33, 37.27, 22.49, 20.98.\)

\([\alpha]_{D}^{22} +87.4 \) (c 0.5, CHCl₃).

\( m/z \) (ESI–MS) 162.08 [M + H]⁺.

Supelco Chiral Select 1000 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm) for its corresponding trifluoroacetamide, He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, \( t_1 = 91.4 \) min, \( t_2 = 93.0 \) min.
6-trifluoromethyl-3-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4e)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 7.36 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.32 (s, 1H), 7.12 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.14 (d, $J = 16.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.09 (d, $J = 16.4$ Hz, 1H), 2.83 (dd, $J = 16.5$, 3.7 Hz, 1H), 2.54 (dd, $J = 16.4$, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 1.26 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 139.32, 135.72, 128.46 (q, $J = 127.6$ Hz), 126.46, 125.96 (q, $J = 15.2$ Hz), 122.97, 122.48 (q, $J = 7.0$ Hz), 49.03, 48.44, 37.13, 22.27.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D +80.2$ (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

$m/z$ (ESI–MS) 216.01 [M + H]$^+$. 

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, $t_1 = 60.8$ min, $t_2 = 64.7$ min.
6-chloro-3-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4f)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 7.07 (t, 2H), 6.94 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 4.05 (d, $J = 16.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.99 (d, $J = 16.0$ Hz, 1H), 2.99 (dqd, $J = 12.6$, 6.3, 4.0 Hz, 1H), 2.74 (dd, $J = 16.5$, 3.7 Hz, 1H), 2.48 (dd, $J = 16.5$, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 1.71 (br, 1H), 1.24 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 136.86, 133.77, 131.48, 128.83, 127.33, 125.87, 48.92, 48.09, 37.04, 29.29.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D +72.1$ (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

$m/z$ (ESI–MS) 182.15, 184.02 [M + H]$^+$.  

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1 = 67.5$ min, $t_2 = 69.4$ min.
6-fluoro-3-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4g)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.96 (dd, $J = 8.3, 5.8$ Hz, 1H), 6.81 (td, $J = 8.5, 2.6$ Hz, 1H), 6.76 (dd, $J = 9.6, 2.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.05 (d, $J = 15.6$ Hz, 2H), 4.00 (d, $J = 15.6$ Hz, 2H), 2.99 (dd, $J = 10.3, 6.3, 4.0$ Hz, 1H), 2.75 (dd, $J = 16.5, 3.8$ Hz, 1H), 2.49 (dd, $J = 16.5, 10.7$ Hz, 1H), 1.24 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 161.18 (d, $J = 964.4$ Hz), 137.00 (d, $J = 29.4$ Hz), 130.90 (d, $J = 11.6$ Hz), 127.35 (d, $J = 32.4$ Hz), 115.34 (d, $J = 81.2$ Hz), 112.79 (d, $J = 86.0$ Hz), 48.93, 48.05, 37.32, 22.30.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D +82.1$ (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

$m/z$ (ESI–MS) 166.24 [M + H]$^+$. 

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, $t_1$ =58.0 min, $t_2$ =60.0 min.

8-chloro-3-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4h)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 7.16 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 1H), 7.06 (t, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H),
6.97 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 4.20 (d, J = 16.9 Hz, 1H), 3.94 (d, J = 16.9 Hz, 1H), 2.97 (dq, J = 10.1, 6.3, 3.8 Hz, 1H), 2.77 (dd, J = 16.3, 3.5 Hz, 1H), 2.50 (dd, J = 16.3, 10.6 Hz, 1H), 1.67 (s, 1H), 1.24 (d, J = 6.3 Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 137.42, 133.23, 132.21, 127.52, 126.84, 126.52, 48.57, 46.79, 37.36, 22.19.

$[\alpha]_{D}^{22}$ = +117.7 (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

$m/z$ (ESI–MS) 182.09, 184.01 [M + H]$^+$. 

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 100 °C, $t_1$ = 158.2 min, $t_2$ = 160.4 min.

### 1-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4i)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.22 – 7.03 (m, 4H), 4.14 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 3.31 (M, 1H), 3.03 (m, 1H), 2.92 (m, 1H), 2.82 – 2.60 (m, 1H), 2.25 (br, 1H), 1.47 (d, J = 5.6 Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 140.32, 134.68, 129.20, 125.99, 129.90 (overlap), 51.57, 41.71, 29.91, 22.63.
\([\alpha]^D_{22} -77.0 \ (c \ 0.5, \text{CHCl}_3)\).

Supelco Chiral Select 1000 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm) for its corresponding trifluoroacetamide, He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, \(t_1 = 56.8\) min, \(t_2 = 58.3\) min.

- **3-phenyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline (4j)**

Yellow oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.43 (d, \(J = 7.9\) Hz, 2H), 7.36 (dd, \(J = 8.0, 6.5\) Hz, 2H), 7.28 (t, \(J = 7.2\) Hz, 1H), 7.18-7.05 (m, 4H), 4.26 (d, \(J = 15.6\) Hz, 1H), 4.16 (d, \(J = 15.6\) Hz, 1H), 4.00 (t, \(J = 7.3\) Hz, 2H), 2.97 (d, \(J = 7.3\) Hz, 2H), 1.93 (br, 1H).

\(^{13}\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \(\delta\) 144.33, 135.04, 134.92, 129.10, 128.63, 127.39, 126.55, 126.26, 126.18, 125.90, 58.61, 49.27, 37.73.

Daicel Chiralpak OD-H for its corresponding trifluoroacetamide, hexanes/i-ProOH = 98/2, Flow rate = 1.0 ml/min, UV = 220 nm, \(t_1 = 10.4\) min, \(t_2 = 13.1\) min.

\([\alpha]^D_{22} -77.0 \ (c \ 0.5, \text{CHCl}_3)\).
2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6a)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.98 – 6.92 (m, 2H), 6.59 (td, $J = 7.4, 1.1$ Hz, 1H), 6.45 (dd, $J = 5.2, 3.2$ Hz, 1H), 3.67 (b, 1H), 3.43 – 3.35 (m, 1H), 2.83 (ddd, $J = 16.9, 11.5, 5.6$ Hz, 1H), 2.75 – 2.68 (m, 1H), 1.95 – 1.88 (m, 1H), 1.58 (dddd, $J = 12.8, 11.6, 10.0, 5.4$ Hz, 1H), 1.20 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 143.73, 128.22, 125.65, 120.09, 115.97, 112.98, 46.15, 29.12, 25.55, 21.56.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D -44.3$ (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1$ =30.5 min, $t_2$ =31.3 min.
Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 6.95 (t, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 2H), 6.59 (t, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 1H), 6.47 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 3.76 (br, 1H), 3.20 – 3.12 (m, 1H), 2.81 (ddd, $J = 16.4$, 11.0, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 2.76 – 2.68 (m, 1H), 2.00 – 1.92 (m, 1H), 1.65 – 1.55 (m, 1H), 1.51 (dd, $J = 14.3$, 7.2 Hz, 2H), 0.98 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): δ 143.72, 128.18, 125.66, 120.36, 115.84, 112.96, 52.03, 28.73, 26.57, 25.38, 8.98.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D$ -74.4 (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1$ = 51.3 min, $t_2$ = 53.7 min.
2-isopropyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6c)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.95 (t, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.58 (t, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 1H), 6.47 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.75 (s, 1H), 3.05 – 3.00 (m, 1H), 2.80 (ddd, $J = 14.0$, 9.9, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 2.76 – 2.68 (m, 1H), 1.91 (ddt, $J = 5.9$, 4.5, 3.2 Hz, 1H), 1.76 – 1.58 (m, 2iH), 0.98 (dd, $J = 10.2$, 6.8 Hz, 6H). $\delta$ 6.95 (t, 2H), 6.58 (t, 1H), 6.47 (d, 1H), 3.03 (m, 1H), 2.75 (m, 2H), 1.91 (m, 1H), 1.69 (m, 2H), 0.98 (dd, 6H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 144.00, 128.08, 125.66, 120.40, 115.70, 112.93, 56.29, 31.51, 25.61, 23.53, 17.38 (d).

$\left[\alpha\right]_{D}^{22D} -44.0$ (c 0.5, CHCl₃).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 140 °C, $t_1$ =27.9 min, $t_2$ =29.4 min.
2-pentyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6d)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.95 (t, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 2H), 6.58 (t, $J = 7.4$, 1H), 6.46 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 3.75 (br, 1H), 3.22 (dtd, $J = 9.4$, 6.3, 2.9 Hz, 1H), 2.86 – 2.75 (m, 1H), 2.71 (dt, $J = 16.3$, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 1.99 – 1.91 (m, 1H), 1.64 – 1.53 (m, 1H), 1.47 (t, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 2H), 1.42 – 1.27 (m, 6H), 0.90 (t, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 143.71, 128.19, 125.65, 120.36, 115.84, 112.99, 50.58, 35.66, 30.93, 27.11, 25.40, 24.36, 21.59, 12.98 (d).

$[\alpha]_{D}^{22}$ -78.2 (c 0.5, CHCl3).

Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 99/1, Flow rate = 1.0 ml/min, UV = 254 nm, $t_1 = 6.9$ min, $t_2 = 8.0$ min.
2-undecyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6e)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.95 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 6.58 (td, $J = 7.4, 1.1$ Hz, 1H), 6.47 (dd, $J = 9.0, 8.2$ Hz, 1H), 3.74 (br, 1H), 3.27 – 3.18 (m, 1H), 2.80 (ddd, $J = 16.4, 10.9, 5.5$ Hz, 1H), 2.71 (dt, $J = 16.3, 4.7$ Hz, 1H), 1.95 (ddt, $J = 6.9, 5.5, 4.0$ Hz, 1H), 1.65 – 1.53 (m, 1H), 1.43 – 1.51 (m, 2H), 1.34 (dd, $J = 45.4, 7.5$ Hz, 18H), 0.88 (t, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 143.71, 128.19, 125.65, 120.35, 115.84, 112.99, 50.59, 35.71, 30.88, 28.74, 28.59, 28.30, 27.12, 25.41, 24.70, 21.65, 13.05 (d).

Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 98/2, Flow rate = 1.0 ml/min, UV = 254 nm, $t_1 = 5.2$ min, $t_2 = 6.2$ min.

$[\alpha]_{D}^{22} = -55.1$ (c 0.5, CHCl3).
2,6-dimethyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6f)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): 6.77 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 2H), 6.39 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.35 (ddq, $J = 12.5$, 6.3, 2.8 Hz, 1H), 2.80 (ddd, $J = 17.1$, 11.5, 5.8 Hz, 1H), 2.68 (dddd, $J = 16.4$, 5.3, 3.5 Hz, 1H), 2.19 (s, 3H), 1.94 – 1.86 (m, 1H), 1.56 (dddd, $J = 12.8$, 11.5, 10.0, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 1.18 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 142.46, 129.83, 127.23, 126.26, 121.24, 114.27, 47.35, 30.39, 26.59, 22.59, 20.40.

$[\alpha]_{D}^{22}$ = -44.8 (c 0.5, CHCl₃).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1$ =47.8 min, $t_2$ =48.8 min.
6-methoxy-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6g)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 6.58 (m, 2H), 6.44 (d, $J$ = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 3.72 (s, 3H), 3.37 – 3.27 (m, 1H), 3.17 (br, 1H), 2.83 (ddd, $J$ = 17.3, 11.6, 5.9 Hz, 1H), 2.70 (ddd, $J$ = 16.6, 5.4, 3.2 Hz, 1H), 1.90 (ddt, $J$ = 12.6, 5.9, 2.9 Hz, 1H), 1.56 (ddddd, $J$ = 12.8, 11.6, 10.2, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 1.19 (d, $J$ = 6.3 Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 151.92, 138.93, 122.53, 115.33, 114.72, 112.91, 55.83, 47.50, 30.34, 26.91, 22.54.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D$ -34.7 (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m ×0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1$ =121.3 min, $t_2$ =124.5 min.
6-chloro-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6h)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 6.93 – 6.86 (m, 2H), 6.37 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.68 (br, 1H), 3.41 – 3.32 (m, 1H), 2.84 – 2.72 (m, 1H), 2.72 – 2.63 (m, 1H), 1.95 – 1.87 (m, 1H), 1.54 (dddd, $J = 12.9, 11.4, 9.9, 5.4$ Hz, 1H), 1.20 (t, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 142.29, 127.78, 125.45, 121.56, 120.25, 113.90, 46.12, 28.67, 25.41, 21.41.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D$ -81.4 (c 0.5, CHCl₃).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 140 °C, $t_1$ = 55.9 min, $t_2$ = 58.0 min.
6-fluoro-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6i)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 6.64 – 6.70 (m, 5.8 Hz, 2H), 6.42 – 6.35 (m, 1H), 3.57 (br, 1H), 3.34 (dqd, $J = 12.6, 6.2, 2.7$ Hz, 1H), 2.81 (ddd, $J = 11.6, 8.7, 5.6$ Hz, 1H), 2.69 (ddd, $J = 16.6, 5.3, 3.4$ Hz, 1H), 1.91 (dtd, $J = 8.8, 5.9, 3.0$ Hz, 1H), 1.55 (ddddd, $J = 12.9, 11.6, 10.1, 5.5$ Hz, 1H), 1.20 (d, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 154.51 (d, $J = 938.4$ Hz), 139.95, 121.44 (d, $J = 26.4$ Hz), 114.34 (d, $J = 86.4$ Hz), 113.68 (d, $J = 30.4$ Hz), 112.12 (d, $J = 89.6$ Hz), 46.29, 28.87, 25.67, 21.44.

$\left[\alpha\right]_{D}^{22}$ $–$63.84 (c 0.5, CHCl₃).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, $t_1$ =39.0 min, $t_2$ =40.7 min.
6-bromo-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6j)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 7.05 (d, $J = 1.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.02 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 6.32 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 3.69 (s, 1H), 3.41 – 3.31 (m, 1H), 2.84 – 2.73 (m, 1H), 2.72 – 2.64 (m, 1H), 1.90 (dtd, $J = 8.4, 5.6, 2.8$ Hz, 1H), 1.53 (dtd, $J = 11.8, 10.7, 5.3$ Hz, 2H), 1.19 (d, $J = 6.4$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$): $\delta$ 142.73, 130.62, 128.30, 122.08, 114.33, 107.25, 46.06, 28.60, 25.35, 21.40.

$[\alpha]^{22}_D = -66.7$ (c 0.5, CHCl$_3$).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 160 °C, $t_1 = 36.6$ min, $t_2 = 37.6$ min.
7-chloro-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6k)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 6.84 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.53 (dd, $J = 8.0$, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 6.42 (d, $J = 2.0$ Hz, 1H), 3.72 (br, 1H), 3.38 (ddqd, $J = 9.3$, 6.3, 3.0 Hz, 1H), 2.81 – 2.61 (m, 1H), 1.97 – 1.82 (m, 1H), 1.54 (ddddd, $J = 12.9$, 11.1, 9.8, 5.5 Hz, 1H), 1.18 (t, $J = 10.1$ Hz, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 144.89, 130.89, 129.11, 118.28, 115.55, 112.24, 45.96, 28.75, 25.01, 21.41.

$[\alpha]_{D}^{22}$ -73.3 (c 0.5, CHCl3).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m $\times$ 0.25 mm $\times$ 0.25 μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 140 °C, $t_1 =$49.8 min, $t_2 =$50.7 min.

8-chloro-2-methyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6l)

Yellow oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): $\delta$ 7.05 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 6.86 (dd, $J = 7.4$, 0.9 Hz, 1H), 6.50 (t, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 4.25 (br, 1H), 3.46 (ddqd, $J = 9.4$, 6.3, 3.1 Hz, 1H), 2.83 (ddddd, $J = 16.6$, 11.2, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.78 – 2.70 (m, 1H), 1.98 – 1.90 (m, 1H), 1.58 (ddddd, $J = 12.9$, 11.2,
9.8, 5.3 Hz, 1H), 1.27 (d, \( J = 6.3 \) Hz, 3H).

\( ^{13}C \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \( \delta \) 143.9, 127.4, 126.7, 122.4, 117.8, 116.3, 47.2, 29.6, 26.7, 22.5.

\([\alpha]^{22}_D -68.7 \) (c 0.5, CHCl\(_3\)).

Supelco gama Dex 225 column (30 m \( \times 0.25 \) mm \( \times 0.25 \) μm), He 1.0 mL/min, column 120 °C, \( t_1 = 52.9 \) min, \( t_2 = 54.0 \) min.

\( ^1H \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 6.95 (t, \( J = 7.1 \) Hz, 2H), 6.83–6.77 (m, 1H), 6.77–6.71 (m, 2H), 6.60 (td, \( J = 7.4, 0.9 \) Hz, 1H), 6.44 (dd, \( J = 8.4, 0.9 \) Hz, 1H), 3.87 (s, 3H), 3.85 (s, 3H), 3.77 (br, 1H), 3.30 (dt, \( J = 9.3, 6.3, 3.0 \) Hz, 1H), 2.81 (ddd, \( J = 13.1, 9.0, 4.1 \) Hz, 1H), 2.73–2.64 (m, 2H), 2.03–1.95 (m, 1H), 1.81 (ddd, \( J = 10.2, 7.2, 1.2 \) Hz, 2H), 1.72–1.61 (m, 1H).

\( ^{13}C \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \( \delta \) 144.5, 143.5, 142.9, 127.9, 126.7, 121.3, 120.2, 117.0, 114.5, 111.7, 111.4, 56.0, 55.9, 51.2, 38.4, 31.8, 28.0, 26.2.

\([\alpha]^{22}_D -60.8 \) (c 0.5, CHCl\(_3\)).

\( ^{2-}(3,4\text{-dimethoxyphenethyl})\)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (6m)

Yellow oil. \( ^1H \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \( \delta \) 6.95 (t, \( J = 7.1 \) Hz, 2H), 6.83–6.77 (m, 1H), 6.77–6.71 (m, 2H), 6.60 (td, \( J = 7.4, 0.9 \) Hz, 1H), 6.44 (dd, \( J = 8.4, 0.9 \) Hz, 1H), 3.87 (s, 3H), 3.85 (s, 3H), 3.77 (br, 1H), 3.30 (dt, \( J = 9.3, 6.3, 3.0 \) Hz, 1H), 2.81 (ddd, \( J = 13.1, 9.0, 4.1 \) Hz, 1H), 2.73–2.64 (m, 2H), 2.03–1.95 (m, 1H), 1.81 (ddd, \( J = 10.2, 7.2, 1.2 \) Hz, 2H), 1.72–1.61 (m, 1H).

\( ^{13}C \) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \( \delta \) 149.0, 147.3, 144.5, 134.5, 129.2, 126.7, 121.3, 120.2, 117.0, 114.5, 111.7, 111.4, 56.0, 55.9, 51.2, 38.4, 31.8, 28.0, 26.2.

\([\alpha]^{22}_D -60.8 \) (c 0.5, CHCl\(_3\)).
Daicel Chiralpak AS-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 95/5, Flow rate = 0.5 ml/min, UV = 254 nm, $t_1 = 24.4$ min, $t_2 = 27.0$ min.

Signal 1: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak RetTime Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0159</td>
<td>1.00159e5</td>
<td>1565.49924</td>
<td>97.6013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7352</td>
<td>2461.57397</td>
<td>51.10365</td>
<td>2.3907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 1.0262e5 1616.57289
17. Xie, J.-H.; Zhu, S.-F.; Zhou, Q.-L., Transition Metal-Catalyzed Enantioselective Hydrogenation of...


Chapter Four

Rhodium catalyzed asymmetric synthesis of chiral indolines: the cooperation of transition metal, Brønsted acid and thiourea anion binding

4.1 Introduction

Proton is the simplest and most efficient catalyst. Recent two decades have witnessed the prosperous development of chiral Brønsted acid catalysis.\textsuperscript{1-2} Chiral Brønsted acid catalysis has been demonstrated as a powerful tool in organic synthetic methodologies.\textsuperscript{3-5} Anion binding, on the other hand, commonly exists in bio-system and enzyme catalysis. As a non-covalent interaction, hydrogen bonding has some unique characteristics, such as moderate bond energy and directionality.\textsuperscript{6-11} However, each of these kinds of catalysis systems has some limitations: the pKa’s of phosphoric acids are in a certain range of 1–3, which can hardly catalyze reactions that require more potent activating reagents; chiral thiourea catalysts with anion binding usually require a high catalyst loading (5%–20%). These drawbacks limit their application in large-scale synthesis.
The strategy of cooperative catalysis emerged in recent years, aiming to combine two or more catalytic centers to achieve a single reaction.\textsuperscript{12-16} Recently, several breakthroughs were made with the application of this strategy in several kinds of reactions, such as Pararov reaction\textsuperscript{17}, hydrogenation\textsuperscript{18}, hydroformylation\textsuperscript{19-21} and Diels-Alder reaction\textsuperscript{22}. The combination of thiourea/urea derivatives and simple Brønsted acids offers a similar effect to chiral phosphoric acids, but it can render a broader acidity range. Moreover, tunable substituents on bifunctional thiourea/urea catalysts can introduce many kinds of secondary interactions, such as charge-charge electrostatics, cation-π interaction, π-π stacking, etc.\textsuperscript{8-9, 23-25} By establishing a bridge between the thiourea and the conjugate base anion of the Brønsted acid, anion binding makes the chiral catalyst associate with a protonated substrate. This strategy combines the essences of both approaches (Figure 4.1). Transition metal catalysis, with high turnover numbers and potent reactivity, plays a crucial role in synthetic chemistry. It shows a very broad application in pharmaceutical and fine chemical industries. The integration of transition metal catalysis and small molecule organocatalysis has shown its potential in the synthetic chemistry communities.\textsuperscript{15-16} We envision that certain kinds of reactions could
be catalyzed by the cooperative catalysis of transition metal, Brønsted acid and thiourea
anion binding.

**Scheme 4.1** Asymmetric hydrogenation of unprotected indole

Chiral indolines are ubiquitous N-heterocycles. This structural motif could be found in natural alkaloids and drugs. Comparing with other synthetic approaches, hydrogenation is the most straightforward method to obtain chiral indolines because of its 100% atom efficiency. N-protected indoles have been successfully reduced with Ru, Ir or Rh complexes. The protecting groups lower the aromaticity of indoles, and therefore enable the asymmetric reduction on enamide C=C bonds. However, the removal of protecting groups requires extra steps and leads to loss of yields, thus increasing the cost for synthetic chemistry. The only successful example of asymmetric hydrogenation of unprotected indoles was reported by Zhang and Zhou group with a palladium/H8-BINAP complex. In this case, good enantioselectivity (91% ee) was achieved in hydrogenation of 2-methylindole, but it requires the addition of a chiral auxiliary, camphorsulfonic acid. Moreover, the use of expensive trifluoroethanol increases the cost in its industrial application. So we were looking forward to developing a new synthetic method to approach chiral indoles with excellent enantioselectivity and lower cost.
We aimed to utilize the strategy of cooperative catalysis to achieve this goal. Strong Brønsted acid such as HCl was introduced to activate the aromatic substrates, while the thiourea (linked to the bisphosphine ligand) formed a secondary interaction with the substrates. Rhodium/bisphosphine complex delivers a potent hydride to reduce the C=N bond after a tautomerization. Based on these theoretical reasoning, we initiated our research with asymmetric hydrogenation of 2-methylindole.

**Figure 4.2** ZhaoPhos and cooperative catalysis of transition metal, Brønsted acid and thiourea anion binding.

4.2 Method development

We conducted hydrogenation reactions with (S,R)-ZhaoPhos and used [Rh(COD)Cl]2 as the metal precursor since this rhodium(I) dimer gave excellent results in the previous examples. We introduced strong Brønsted HCl by adding its diethyl ether solution. After screening solvents from alcohols, alkyl chlorides, ethers and toluene, we found that dichloromethane and 1,2-dichloroethane gave the highest conversion with the highest enantiomeric excess (Table 4.1, entry 7 and 8). 1H NMR study showed no dimer or other byproducts which could be usually found in acidic conditions. Application of HCl ether solution leads to mixed solvents. Diethyl ether is extraordinarily volatile and therefore its HCl solution is difficult to handle and measure, especially in a sealed container like
a glovebox. The concentration of HCl in reaction mixture can hardly maintain since it is a gas-liquid bi-phase system. Isopropanol, with much higher boiling point and better solubility with HCl, might be a desirable alternative. Another reason for isopropanol is that this solvent gives very good results in hydrogenation of nitroolefins and iminium with Rh/ZhaoPhos.\textsuperscript{33-34} When we applied HCl (5M) in isopropanol, the conversion was driven to nearly 100% with the retention of high enantioselectivity (Table 4.1, entry 9).

**Table 4.1** Condition optimization for 2-methylindole.\textsuperscript{[a]}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>solvent</th>
<th>conversion\textsuperscript{[b]}</th>
<th>ee\textsuperscript{[c]}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>CF3CH2OH</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>1,4-dioxane</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>1,2-DCE</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9\textsuperscript{[d]}</td>
<td>(S,R)-ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10\textsuperscript{[d]}</td>
<td>(S,R)-L11</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11\textsuperscript{[d]}</td>
<td>(S,R)-L12</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12\textsuperscript{[d]}</td>
<td>(S,R)-L13</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A series of analogues of ZhaoPhos were prepared. Multi-hydrogen-donor ligand L11 could not catalyze this hydrogenation efficiently under the optimized condition (Table 4.1, entry 10). Sulfonyl urea catalyst L12 does not give hydrogenation product at all (entry 11). A more bulky substituent on the phosphorus atom failed to improve neither reactivity nor enantioselectivity (entry 12). Compared to thiourea, a squaramide analogue L4 does not show any catalytic activity (entry 13).

**Table 4.2** Brønsted acid screening for 2,3-disubstituted indole. [a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>Brønsted acid</th>
<th>actual solvent</th>
<th>conversion [b]</th>
<th>ee [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH = 10:1</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TfOH (1 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>p-TsOH+H2O (1 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CF3COOH (1 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 HCl + 1 TfOH</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH = 10:1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 HCl + 1 p-TsOH+H2O</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH = 10:1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 HCl + 1 CF3COOH</td>
<td>DCM/i-PrOH = 10:1</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/AcOH = 10:1</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/AcOH = 5:1</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/AcOH = 2:1</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/AcOH = 1:1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] reaction condition: 7a (0.1 mmol) in 1.0 ml solvent, 1/[Rh(COD)Cl][ligand] = 100/0.50/1.0, 0.1 ml of HCl (2 M) in Et2O solution was added; [b] conversion was determined by 1H NMR analysis, no side product was observed; [c] ee was determined by GC with a chiral stationary phase; [d] 0.04 ml of HCl (5 M) in i-PrOH solution was added; [e] 0.1 ml of HCl (1 M) in AcOH solution was applied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HCl (2 eq.)</th>
<th>DCM/AcOH = 1:2</th>
<th>93%</th>
<th>93%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HCl (2 eq.)</td>
<td>DCM/AcOH = 1:5</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] reaction condition: 7m (0.1 mmol) in 1.0 ml solvent, 1/[Rh(COD)Cl]/ligand ratio=100/0.50/1.0; [b] conversion was determined by 1H NMR analysis, no side product was observed; [c] ee was determined by HPLC with a chiral stationary phase.

We applied the optimized condition to hydrogenate 2,3-disubstituted indole (2-methyl-3-benzyl indole), moderate conversion was observed while high enantioselectivity was obtained (Table 4.2, entry 1). Only one diastereomer was observed. Lower conversion was probably caused by the difficulty in protonation. In order to achieve higher yield, altering the acidity of the protonation reagent would be a plausible solution. A series of strong Brønsted acids was applied in this reaction since the anion binding between the thiourea/urea and sulfonate anions was well studied.\(^{35}\) Triflic acid gave no hydrogenation product and lead to full recovery of starting material. This might be due to its extraordinarily strong acidity (pKa = -12\(^{36}\)), which would probably protonate the catalyst and therefore inhibits the reaction.\(^{37}\) p-Toluenesulfonic acid also works for this catalysis, giving higher conversion and moderate enantioselectivity. Trifluoroacetic acid, on the other hand, gives higher ee but low conversion. When combined with HCl in isopropanol, these strong Brønsted acids improved the performance of HCl (entry 5, 6, 7).
Another factor that influences the acidity of Brønsted acid is the solvation effect. In water or alcohols, the strongest species in acidity is protonated hydroxyl group, whose pKa’s are around -1. Protonated ethers offer similar pKa (~ -3). Due to leveling effect, HCl in such solutions as alcohols or ethers cannot provide stronger acidity. If the solvent media is altered to acetic acid, we believed the protonation step would be more efficient. Guided by this qualitative reasoning, we use HCl in acetic acid solution. It turned out that both of the conversion and ee were increased. The ratio of acetic acid and dichloromethane is tricky: higher proportion of acetic acid leads to higher conversion but lower ee’s (Table 4.2, entry 8~13). Then we apply this Brønsted acid source in the hydrogenation of the standard substrate 2-methylindole, the ee increased up to 98% with full conversion (Table 4.1, entry 14). Again, no significant sign of by-products was observed by 1H NMR study on the crude products. These results suggest that Rh/ZhaoPhos complex could tolerate highly acidic reaction condition.

Stereoselectivity in hydrogenation of 2,3-disubstituted indoles could be explained as a result of a dynamic kinetic resolution. After a protonation, two enantiomers both exist in the solution. Due to the chirality of the ligand, only one isomer could be reduced efficiently ($k_1 >> k_3 >> k_2$). In the hydride transfer step, Due to the steric effect, addition
of hydride could only be conducted at one side, resulting in trans-addition and a cis-product.

The ligand/metal ratio could be wide-ranging for both high conversion and high enantioselectivity. Good performance (>95% conv. and 97% ee for chiral 2-methylindoline) was retained with a ligand/Rh ratio from 0.5 to 2.0. In addition, the equivalent of hydrogen chloride to indole substrate is also wide-ranging.\textsuperscript{38} This advantage makes the ZhaoPhos/Rh catalytic system an ease in organic synthesis communities. However, without Brønsted acid HCl, no product was observed, leading to almost 100% recovery of starting material.

**Scheme 4.2.** Origin of stereoselectivity in the hydrogenation of disubstituted indoles.

4.3 Substrate scope

The substrate scope with this optimal condition was examined (Table 3). By adding hydrogen chloride in acetic acid solution as the Brønsted acid source, 2-monosubstituted indoles and 2,3-disubstituted indoles were hydrogenated with high enantioselectivities (94%–99% ee). Various substituents on 2-position or on the benzo ring bring no significant influence on the enantioselectivity while the yields vary from case to case.
Phenyl substituent on the 2-position remains a challenge and this might be caused by a more stable conjugate enamine C=C bond, which is more difficult for protonation. 2,3-Disubstituted indoles were also hydrogenated successfully with both high diastereoselectivities (>25:1) and high enantioselectivities.

### Table 4.3 Substrate scope for asymmetric hydrogenation of indoles. [a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>R&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>R&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>R&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield 98%,</td>
<td>yield 94%,</td>
<td>yield 86%,</td>
<td>yield 90%,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee 97% (S)</td>
<td>ee 97% (S)</td>
<td>ee 97% (S)</td>
<td>ee 97% (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield 85%,</td>
<td>yield 76%,</td>
<td>yield 74%,</td>
<td>yield 82%,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee 96% (S)</td>
<td>ee 96% (S)</td>
<td>ee 98% (S)</td>
<td>ee 98% (S,S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield 85%,</td>
<td>yield 85%,</td>
<td>yield 62%,</td>
<td>yield 97%,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee 97% (S,S)</td>
<td>ee 99% (S,S)</td>
<td>ee 98% (S,S)</td>
<td>ee 94% (S,S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] reaction condition: 7 (0.2 mmol) in 2.0 ml solvent, 7/[Rh(COD)Cl]2/ligand ratio=100/0.50/1.0, 0.4 ml of HCl (1.0 M) in AcOH solution was added; isolation yield, no significant sign of side product was observed; ee was determined by HPLC or GC with a chiral stationary phase

### 4.4 Mechanistic study

The anion binding effect of ZhaoPhos with chloride ion was already observed in previous studies. Control experiments were conducted to proof the cooperation of
thiourea moiety and the bisphosphine scaffold. Each unit within ZhaoPhos was demonstrated to be necessary for an efficient asymmetric hydrogenation of 2-methylindole. We synthesized a series of analogues of ZhaoPhos and conducted control experiments to evaluate the collaboration manner of each unit of ZhaoPhos. Urea bisphosphine ligand L2 only gives no product, and this sharp contrast suggests the crucial role of thiourea moiety. Compared to H (L2) and methyl (L3), more electron-withdrawing trifluoromethyl group at 3- and 5- position on the phenyl ring increases the enantioselectivity, which is probably due to the stronger acidity of N-H proton on the thiourea. After N-methylation of the less acidic thiourea N-H proton, enantioselectivity results in a minor decrease. This observation reveals that the more acidic thiourea N-H proton contributes mostly in anion binding with chloride. Furthermore, monophosphine ligand L6 and the mixture of ferrocene-thiourea compound L7 with triphenylphosphine can hardly catalyzed the hydrogenation reaction. On the other hand, the mixture of thiourea molecule and bisphosphine-Ugi’s amine L8 failed to show catalytic activity. These results (ZhaoPhos vs L6 or L7 with PPh3 and L8/thiourea) demonstrate the importance of a covalent incorporation of bisphosphine moiety and thiourea. The idea of secondary offers an alternative strategy for asymmetric hydrogenation.

**Table 4.4** Control experiments and ligand evaluation. [a]
Counterion effect was also examined. When tetrabutylammonium chloride (TBAC) was added, no significant changes in conversion and enantioselectivity was observed (Table 4.5, entry 2 vs 1). This suggests the spectator role of tetrabutylammonium cation. The introduction of fluoride anion from TBAF does not influence this catalytic reaction (entry 3 vs 2). The presence of bromide anion decreases the conversion, but it shows trace influence on the enantioselectivity (entry 4 vs 2). Iodide, however, lowers the both of the conversion and enantioselectivity dramatically (entry 5 vs 2).

Table 4.5 Counterion effects. \(^{[a]}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>additive</th>
<th>conversion(^{[b]})</th>
<th>ee(^{[c]})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TBAC (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBAF (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{[a]}\) reaction condition: 7a (0.2 mmol) in 2.0 ml solvent, \(\text{7a}/[\text{Rh(COD)}\text{Cl}]_2/\text{ligand ratio}=100/0.50/1.0, 0.4\ ml\) of HCl (1.0 M) in AcOH solution was added; conversion was determined by \(^1\)H NMR analysis, no side product was observed; ee was determined by HPLC or GC with a chiral stationary phase.
In order to get insight of this reaction progress, isotope labeling experiments (scheme 3) were conducted. When the reaction was performed in deuterated solvent (CD3OD/CD2Cl2) with hydrogen gas, D atoms were added only at 3-position while H atom is added at 2-position. When regular solvent and deuterium gas were applied, D atom was added exclusively at 2-position, no significant sign of D atom was observed at 3-position. This result suggests that it is C=N bond, rather than C=C, to be hydrogenated. A protonation and the following enamine-imine tautomerization probably occurs prior to the hydrogenation. The low abundance (32%) of deuterium at 2-position in experiment 2 seems to suggest an H-D exchange before the hydrogenation step. In order to gain a plausible explanation, systematic kinetic studies are in need in the future.

**Scheme 4.3.** Deuterium labeling experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TBAB (1.0 eq.)</th>
<th>61%</th>
<th>92%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBAI (1.0 eq.)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] reaction condition: 7a (0.2 mmol) in 2.0 ml solvent, 7/[Rh(COD)Cl]2/ligand ratio=100/0.50/1.0, 0.4 ml of HCl (1.0 M) in AcOH solution was added; [b] conversion was determined by 1H NMR analysis, no side product was observed; [c] ee was determined by HPLC or GC with a chiral stationary phase.
4.5 Nonlinear effect

The hydrogen bonding between (thio)urea molecules in supramolecular chemistry promoted us to investigate the potential dimerization or high-order aggregation of this thiourea-containing catalyst. Quantitative nonlinear effect (NLE) was carried out and we observed an obvious positive NLE in hydrogenation of 2-methylindole with ZhaoPhos/Rh complex (Table 4.6).

**Table 4.6.** Nonlinear effects for asymmetric hydrogenation of indole. \[\text{[a]}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>ee fo ZhaoPhos</th>
<th>conversion[^b]</th>
<th>ee[^c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[a] reaction condition: 7a (0.2 mmol) in 2.0 ml solvent, 7a/[Rh(COD)Cl]/ligand ratio=100/0.50/1.0, 0.4 ml of HCl (1.0 M) in AcOH solution was added; [b] conversion was determined by $^1$H NMR analysis, no side product was observed; [c] ee was determined by HPLC or GC with a chiral stationary phase.

A non-covalent interaction between thiourea ligands might be responsible for this phenomenon. This bisphosphine/rhodium complex, categorized in bidentate L-L/M system, is not suitable for Kagan’s classic ML$_1$L$_2$ model or “Reservoir Model”. So another mechanism may explain this phenomenon. When the Hayashi group studied the rhodium catalyzed 1,4-addition of phenylboronic acid to enones, they observed an negative NLE. With kinetic and NMR studies, they proposed that a dimeric rhodium complex serves as the precursor of the catalytically active Rh complex. Only homochiral dimer was observed. Similarly, in Wilkinson’s Rh-catalyzed hydrogenation system, a $\mu$-chloro-bridged dimeric complex is in a great population prior to the hydrogenation catalytic cycle (Scheme 4). Based on Hayashi’s studies, we proposed that this dimer is responsible for this NLE. After treating the metal precursor [Rh(COD)Cl]$_2$ with enantiopure ZhaoPhos, a homochiral dimer is formed, which will sequentially dissociate to form a monomer. Once reacting with hydrogen gas, an oxidative addition will change this square planar monomer into a reactive octahedral complex. On the other hand, if the precursor is treated with mixed ZhaoPhos, both homochiral and heterochiral dimers are formed. The heterochiral dimer is possibly more stable than the homochiral ones, resulting in an enantiomeric enrichment for the reactive dihydro-rhodium complexes. A positive NLE will be therefore observed in hydrogenation of 2-methylindole.
### 4.5 Summary

In summary, we developed an efficient method to synthesize chiral indolines. By employing a cooperative catalysis of transition metal, Brønsted acid and anion binding, prochiral indoles are successfully hydrogenated with high enantioselectivities. After introducing strong Brønsted acid HCl, protonation of indole leads to an enamine-imine tautomerization equilibrium. This resulting iminium was reduced by a rhodium-ZhaoPhos complex. Isotope labeling experiments supported this chemical process. Nonlinear effect was observed in this catalysis.

### 4.6 Experimental Section

#### 4.6.1 Synthesis of indole substrates.

**Method A**

2-methylindole (10 mmol, 1.31 g) was dissolved in ether at room temperature, the mixture was...
under nitrogen protection. Butyllithium in hexane solution was added dropwise to the stirring mixture. Then potassium tert-butoxide was added in one portion. The color of the mixture became bright yellow. After stirring for 30 min, the mixture was cooled to -78°C, methyl iodide was added dropwise. After stirring for another 2 hours at -78°C, several drops of water was added to quench the reaction. Ammonium chloride solution was added to adjust the pH to neutral. After separation, the aqueous layer was washed with ether and the organic layer was combine. The ether solution was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and then the volatile was evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (hexanes/ethyl acetate).

**Method B**

A Schlenk flask was charged with indole (5 mmol, 0.65 g), alkyl bromide, norbornene, potassium carbonate and palladium(II) acetate. Water (0.1 M) in DMF was added. The mixture was frozen at -78°C and the flask was evacuated and backfilled with nitrogen for 3 times. The stoppered mixture was stirred at 70°C for 14 hours. After cooled to room temperature, the mixture was diluted with ether and washed with water. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and the volatile was evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (hexanes/ethyl acetate).

**Method C**

In a round bottom flask, a solution of 2-methylindole (5 mmol, 0.65 g) and aldehyde in dichloromethane was added to a stirring ice-cold mixture of trifluoroacetic acid and palladium on carbon in DCM. This flask was filled with hydrogen and the mixture was stirred at 0°C. After TCL monitoring showed the consumption of indole (approximately 3 h), the Pd/C was
filtered and the solvent was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by chromatography (hexane/ethyl acetate).

Method D

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NH}_2 \quad \text{R} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{AcOH, 120°C, 2 h}
\end{array}
\]

A round bottom flask was charged with 0.5 ml phenyl hydrazine, 0.78 ml cyclohexanone, 1 ml of concentrate HCl and 20 ml of acetic acid. The mixture was heated at 120°C for 2 hours and cooled back to room temperature. 2M of NaOH solution was added. After the pH became 6-7, the mixture was cooled in ice. The aqueous layer was extracted with ether 3 times and the combined mixture was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by chromatography (hexane/ethyl acetate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method A</th>
<th>Method B</th>
<th>Method C</th>
<th>Method D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Structure A" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Structure B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Structure C" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Structure D" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 General procedure for asymmetric hydrogenation of indoles.

In the nitrogen-filled glovebox, solution of [Rh(COD)Cl]₂ (2.46 mg, 0.005 mmol) and ZhaoPhos (2.1 eq.) in 5.0 ml anhydrous solvent was stirred at room temperature for 20
min. A specified volume of the resulting solution (0.50 ml, 1% Rh catalyst) was transferred to a Score-Break ampule charged with substrate solution (0.1 mmol in 0.5 ml) by syringe. 0.2 ml of hydrogen chloride in acetic acid solution (1.0 M) was added by syringe. The ampule was placed into an autoclave, which was then charged with 40 atm H2. The autoclave was stirred at desired temperature for the indicated period of time. After release of H2, saturated potassium carbonate solution and dichloromethane was added and the mixture was stirred for 30 min. The organic layer was dried with Na2SO4. After removal of solvent, the crude product was analyzed by 1H NMR to determine the conversion. The enantiomeric excess was determined by GC or HPLC analysis.

The absolute configurations were assigned according to literature. 32

4.6.3 Deuterium labeling experiments.
4.6.4 Characterization data for chiral indolines.
(S)-2-methylindoline (8a)\(^{32}\)
Colorless oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.09 (d, \(J = 7.3\) Hz, 1H), 7.02 (t, \(J = 7.6\) Hz, 1H), 6.70 (t, \(J = 7.4\) Hz, 1H), 6.62 (d, \(J = 7.7\) Hz, 1H), 4.00 (tq, \(J = 8.1, 6.2\) Hz, 1H), 3.79 (br, 1H), 3.16 (dd, \(J = 15.4, 8.5\) Hz, 1H), 2.65 (dd, \(J = 15.4, 7.8\) Hz, 1H), 1.30 (d, \(J = 6.2\) Hz, 3H). \(^{13}\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \(\delta\) 150.96, 128.89, 127.23, 124.72, 118.52, 109.16, 55.23, 37.78, 22.30. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): \(t_1\) = 12.1 min, \(t_2\) = 13.8 min.

(S)-2-ethylindoline (8b)\(^{32}\)
Colorless oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.07 (d, \(J = 7.2\) Hz, 1H), 7.01 (t, \(J = 7.6\) Hz, 1H), 6.68 (td, \(J = 7.4, 0.9\) Hz, 1H), 6.60 (d, \(J = 7.7\) Hz, 1H), 3.88 (br, 1H), 3.78 (tt, \(J = 8.5, 6.6\) Hz, 1H), 3.13 (dd, \(J = 15.5, 8.6\) Hz, 1H), 2.69 (dd, \(J = 15.5, 8.4\) Hz, 1H), 1.64 (qd, \(J = 7.5, 4.0\) Hz, 2H), 0.98 (t, \(J = 7.4\) Hz, 3H). \(^{13}\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 151.00, 128.86, 127.17, 124.62,
118.37, 108.99, 61.49, 35.72, 29.55, 10.69. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 9.5$ min, $t_2 = 11.3$ min.

(S)-2-pentyldindoline (8c)

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.07 (d, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 1H), 7.00 (t, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 1H), 6.68 (td, $J = 7.4$, 0.7 Hz, 1H), 6.60 (d, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 3.84 (dq, $J = 8.5$, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 3.35 (br, 1H), 3.12 (dd, $J = 15.5$, 8.6 Hz, 1H), 2.68 (dd, $J = 15.4$, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 1.68 – 1.53 (m, 2H), 1.47 – 1.17 (m, 6H), 0.91 (dd, $J = 8.9$, 4.8 Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 150.98, 128.91, 127.19, 124.63, 118.45, 109.08, 60.08, 36.81, 36.18, 31.87, 26.23, 22.62, 13.99. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 6.7$ min, $t_2 = 8.8$ min.
(S)-2-decyldindoline (8d)

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.07 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 7.00 (t, $J$ = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 6.68 (t, $J$ = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 6.60 (d, $J$ = 7.7 Hz, 1H), 3.83 (ddd, $J$ = 15.2, 8.5, 6.7 Hz, 2H), 3.12 (dd, $J$ = 15.4, 8.6 Hz, 1H), 2.67 (dd, $J$ = 15.4, 8.5 Hz, 1H), 1.71 – 1.55 (m, 4H), 1.30 (d, $J$ = 21.9 Hz, 14H), 0.89 (t, $J$ = 6.8 Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 150.99, 128.90, 127.17, 124.63, 118.40, 109.04, 60.09, 36.84, 36.16, 31.90, 29.63, 29.33, 26.58, 22.68, 14.10. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1$ = 6.0 min, $t_2$ = 8.2 min.
(S)-2-benzylindoline (8e) 32

Colorless oil. 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.34 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H), 7.25 (dd, J = 10.7, 7.6 Hz, 2H), 7.09 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 7.02 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 6.70 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 6.58 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 1H), 4.09 (ddd, J = 15.8, 8.4, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (br, 1H), 3.15 (dd, J = 15.5, 8.5 Hz, 1H), 3.00 – 2.74 (m, 3H). 13C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 150.53, 139.08, 129.11, 128.62, 128.35, 127.33, 126.43, 124.79, 118.51, 109.07, 60.96, 42.72, 35.94. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): t₁ = 9.8 min, t₂ = 11.1 min.
(S)-2,5-dimethylindoline (8g)

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 6.91 (s, 1H), 6.82 (d, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 6.52 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 1H), 4.09 – 3.77 (m, 1H), 3.44 (br, 1H), 3.10 (dd, $J = 15.4$, 8.4 Hz, 1H), 2.60 (dd, $J = 15.4$, 7.7 Hz, 1H), 2.25 (s, 3H), 1.28 (d, $J = 6.2$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 148.56, 129.23, 127.89, 127.48, 125.49, 109.14, 55.37, 37.85, 22.22, 20.74. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 7.2$ min, $t_2 = 9.1$ min.
Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 6.74 (dd, $J = 5.5$, 4.3 Hz, 1H), 6.60 (dd, $J = 8.3$, 2.4 Hz, 1H), 6.55 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H), 4.04 – 3.94 (m, 1H), 3.75 (s, 3H), 3.40 (br, 1H), 3.12 (dd, $J = 15.5$, 8.3 Hz, 1H), 2.63 (dd, $J = 15.5$, 7.9 Hz, 1H), 1.30 (d, $J = 6.2$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 153.47, 144.77, 130.66, 112.66, 111.71, 109.79, 55.95, 55.65, 38.29, 22.17. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 12.1$ min, $t_2 = 25.1$ min.
(S)-5-fluoro-2-methylindoline (8i)\textsuperscript{32}

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 6.87 – 6.77 (m, 1H), 6.74 – 6.66 (m, 1H), 6.50 (dd, $J = 8.4, 4.4$ Hz, 1H), 4.06 – 3.96 (m, 1H), 3.33 (br, 1H), 3.12 (dd, $J = 15.7, 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 2.62 (ddd, $J = 15.7, 7.8, 0.7$ Hz, 1H), 1.29 (d, $J = 6.2$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 156.97 (d, $J = 234.7$ Hz), 146.92 (s), 130.64 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz), 113.09 (d, $J = 23.2$ Hz), 112.11 (d, $J = 23.7$ Hz), 109.28 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz), 55.89, 38.02, 22.16. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 7.3$ min, $t_2 = 10.7$ min.
(S)-5-chloro-2-methylindoline (8j) \(^{46}\)

Colorless oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.02 (s, 1H), 6.95 (dd, \(J = 8.2, 1.8\) Hz, 1H), 6.49 (d, \(J = 8.2\) Hz, 1H), 4.01 (tt, \(J = 14.4, 6.2\) Hz, 1H), 3.76 (br, 1H), 3.12 (dd, \(J = 15.7, 8.6\) Hz, 1H), 2.61 (dd, \(J = 15.7, 7.6\) Hz, 1H), 1.28 (d, \(J = 6.2\) Hz, 3H). \(^13\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 149.50, 130.75, 126.94, 124.86, 122.93, 109.69, 55.61, 37.60, 22.16. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): \(t_1 = 8.1\) min, \(t_2 = 14.5\) min.
(S)-5-bromo-2-methylindoline (8k) 46
Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.17 – 7.14 (m, 1H), 7.09 (dd, $J$ = 8.2, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 6.45 (d, $J$ = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 4.10 – 3.91 (m, 1H), 3.76 (br, 1H), 3.12 (dd, $J$ = 15.7, 8.5 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (dd, $J$ = 15.7, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 1.27 (d, $J$ = 6.2 Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 149.95, 131.23, 129.82, 127.65, 110.25, 109.90, 55.53, 37.51, 22.15. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1$ = 8.6 min, $t_2$ = 15.4 min.
**(S,S)-2,3-dimethylindoline (8l)**

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.12 – 6.98 (m, 2H), 6.73 ($t, J = 7.4$ Hz, 1H), 6.62 ($d, J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 4.01 – 3.89 (m, 1H), 3.64 (br, 1H), 3.33 – 3.22 (m, 1H), 1.18 ($d, J = 7.2$ Hz, 3H), 1.14 ($d, J = 6.5$ Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 150.09, 134.24, 127.21, 123.75, 118.67, 109.28, 58.34, 39.43, 16.28, 13.60. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1 = 31.1$ min, $t_2 = 36.0$ min.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>RetTime (min)</th>
<th>Width (s)</th>
<th>Area [mAU]</th>
<th>Height [mAU]</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>407.97</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3127.83</td>
<td>595.09</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 3.1066246 611.81626
(S,S)-3-benzyl-2-methylindoline (8m) \(^{32}\)

Colorless oil. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.31 (t, \(J = 7.2\) Hz, 2H), 7.27 – 7.22 (m, 1H), 7.20 (t, \(J = 6.8\) Hz, 2H), 7.07 – 6.97 (m, 1H), 6.65 (d, \(J = 7.7\) Hz, 1H), 6.59 (q, \(J = 7.5\) Hz, 2H), 4.06 – 3.97 (m, 1H), 3.69 (br, 1H), 3.54 (dd, \(J = 15.9, 7.8\) Hz, 1H), 2.93 (ddd, \(J = 22.8, 13.9, 8.1\) Hz, 2H), 1.24 (d, \(J = 6.5\) Hz, 3H).

\(^{13}\)C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 150.37, 140.32, 131.90, 129.13, 128.23, 127.42, 125.96, 124.82, 118.23, 109.36, 58.43, 45.94, 34.23, 16.46. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): \(t_1\) = 14.6 min, \(t_2\) = 21.3 min.
(S,S)-3-(cyclohexylmethyl)-2-methylindoline (8n)\textsuperscript{32}

Colorless oil. \textsuperscript{1}H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 7.09 – 6.95 (m, 2H), 6.72 (td, \( J = 7.4, 0.9 \) Hz, 1H), 6.62 (d, \( J = 7.7 \) Hz, 1H), 3.94 (dq, \( J = 13.1, 6.5 \) Hz, 1H), 3.59 (br, 1H), 3.26 (dd, \( J = 15.1, 7.5 \) Hz, 1H), 1.94 – 1.82 (m, 1H), 1.82 – 1.61 (m, 4H), 1.61 – 1.48 (m, 1H), 1.50 – 1.32 (m, 2H), 1.34 – 1.15 (m, 3H), 1.13 (dd, \( J = 13.7, 4.8 \) Hz, 3H), 0.96 (ddd, \( J = 19.8, 9.7, 3.6 \) Hz, 2H). \textsuperscript{13}C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}) \( \delta \) 150.40, 132.91, 127.12, 124.16, 118.43, 109.41, 58.57, 41.55, 35.28, 33.59, 26.71, 26.35, 16.27. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): \( t_1 = \) 8.4 min, \( t_2 = \) 9.6 min.
(S,S)-3-(furan-2-ylmethyl)-2-methylindoline (8o)

Colorless oil. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.38 – 7.36 (m, 1H), 7.03 (t, $J$ = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 6.74 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 6.69 – 6.61 (m, 2H), 6.32 (dd, $J$ = 2.9, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (d, $J$ = 3.1 Hz, 1H), 4.10 – 3.99 (m, 1H), 3.68 (br, 1H), 3.60 (dd, $J$ = 15.7, 7.8 Hz, 1H), 3.03 – 2.83 (m, 2H), 1.21 (d, $J$ = 6.5 Hz, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 154.33, 150.27, 140.89, 131.49, 127.58, 124.48, 118.49, 110.22, 109.36, 106.32, 58.12, 43.55, 27.04, 16.30. HPLC (Daicel Chiralpak OD-H, hexanes/i-PrOH = 97/3, Flow rate = 0.8 ml/min, UV = 254 nm): $t_1$ = 17.1 min, $t_2$ = 21.8 min.

(S,S)-2,3,4,4a,9,9a-hexahydro-1H-carbazole (2p)

White solid. $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.09 (d, $J$ = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 7.03 (t, $J$ = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 6.75 (t, $J$ = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 6.68 (d, $J$ = 7.7 Hz, 1H), 3.74 (dd, $J$ = 11.7, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 3.65 (br, 1H),
3.11 (q, J = 6.6 Hz, 1H), 1.78 (dd, J = 12.1, 6.2 Hz, 2H), 1.70 – 1.63 (m, 1H), 1.57 (tt, J = 6.7, 4.4 Hz, 2H), 1.48 – 1.29 (m, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 150.73, 133.50, 126.96, 123.11, 118.75, 110.12, 59.61, 40.91, 29.17, 26.95, 22.50, 21.65. Chiral GC (Supelco γ-Dex225, 140°C, Flow rate = 1.0 ml/min): t$_1$ = 37.7 min, t$_2$ = 38.9 min.
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36. All pka's are data measured in water, for qualitative analysis.

37. 31P NMR study of ligand shows a significant change in chemical shift (from -25.1 and -17.9 ppm to +1.9 and +7.6 ppm). This change suggests protonation on phosphorus.

38. 1.0 eq. of HCl gives 95% conversion and 5.0 eq. HCl give 98% conversion, 97% ee was observed for both cases.


Chapter Five

Rhodium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of α, β-unsaturated carbonyl compounds via a thiourea hydrogen bonding

5.1 Introduction

As an important non-covalent interaction, hydrogen bonding plays a crucial role in bio-system and enzyme catalysis\(^1\). From the inspiration of enzyme catalysis to the prosperity of small-molecule catalysis, many studies have been elaborated in the past two decades. This strategy of hydrogen bonding has been successfully applied in numerous cases of organocatalysis, which provide the synthetic community with many solutions for enantioselective synthesis\(^2-3\). As a double hydrogen donor, thiourea could activate carbonyl compounds by lowering their LUMO energy\(^4-7\). Effective bonding with neutral functional groups, potent binding affinity and high tunability make thiourea catalysts versatile for many kinds of organic reactions\(^8-11\). Originated in serine protease (Figure 1) catalyzed hydrolysis of amides\(^1\), the interaction of a double hydrogen donor with an amide substrate became as an important paradigm for carbonyl activation in small molecule catalysis. The hydrogen bonding of (thio)urea with ketones, aldehydes and carboxylic acid derivatives enables enantioselective chemical transformations, and
therefore emerged as an effective strategy in asymmetric catalysis.

**Figure 5.1.** Double H-bonding with carbonyl.

Asymmetric hydrogenation of unsaturated carboxylic acids and esters has been developed with several systems\(^{12}\): Crabtree’s catalyst (iridium/P-N ligand) and Wilkinson-Osborn system (rhodium/bisphosphine ligand) are successful representatives. To our best knowledge, hydrogenation of unsaturated carboxamides, however, is still a less explored field yet. Successful cases of asymmetric reduction of \(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated amides mainly engaged with transition metal catalyzed conjugate addition of hydrides\(^ {13-14}\) and iridium-catalyzed direct hydrogenation by Ding\(^ {15}\). We were seeking for an efficient catalytic system to synthesize different types of chiral carboxylic acid derivatives with high enantioselectivity.

**Figure 5.2** Hydrogen bonding between ZhaoPhos and amide
The binding affinity of (thio)urea with carboxylic acid derivatives is in a similar range to that with nitro groups or sulfonates\textsuperscript{16}, which inspires us to explore the application of ZhaoPhos in homogeneous hydrogenation of unsaturated carbonyl compounds.\textsuperscript{1} H NMR study suggests hydrogen bonding between thiourea of ZhaoPhos and an unsaturated amide (Figure 2, one of the thiourea protons is marked with arrow). We envision that the secondary interaction of hydrogen bonding between thiourea and carbonyl substrates could play a dual role: (1) H-bond activates the substrate by decreasing the LOMO; (2) the binding between the ligand and substrate enhances the enantiomeric control. We report herein a successful example of rhodium/ZhaoPhos catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of $\alpha$, $\beta$-unsaturated carbonyl compounds.

5.2 Method development

**Table 5.1** Condition optimization\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>solvent</th>
<th>ligand</th>
<th>conversion\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>ee\textsuperscript{c}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MeOH</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i-PrOH</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>dioxane</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>acetone</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ethyl acetate</td>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initially we chose *trans*-β-methylcinnamamide as the target and [Rh(COD)Cl]₂ as the metal precursor, since this rhodium (I) dimer showed excellent performance in hydrogenation of nitroolefins and (iso)quinolines with ZhaoPhos in our previous studies. After screening of various types of solvent, we found that dichloromethane gave the best enantioselectivity. Solvent pairs were also tested. Solvent pairs were also tested, and we finally selected a mixture of dichloromethane and isopropanol with a volume ratio 3:1 as the solvent (Table 1, entry 9). When we increased the temperature and elongated the reaction time, desired conversion (99%) and high enantioselectivity (95%) were obtained under 50 atm hydrogen gas pressure (entry 10). Similar to the previous hydrogenation cases with Rh/ZhaoPhos system¹⁷-²⁰, this reaction is solvent-dependent. More bulky substituents on phosphine dose not bring higher enantioselectivity, but lowers conversion (entry 11). Squaramide, which usually plays a role of an alternative for (thio)urea in hydrogen bonding catalysis, fails to show any advantages over thiourea (entry 12).
5.3 Substrate scope

The substrate scope of Rh/ZhaoPhos catalyzed hydrogenation of α,β-unsaturated amides was shown in Table 2. β,β-Disubstituted acrylamides were reduced with high enantioselectivities. Various substituents with different electronic effects do not bring significant changes in enantioselectivities. Steric effects, however, shows influence on the reactivity of this chemical transformation: compared to meta- or para- position, methyl group at ortho- position on the phenyl slows down the reaction rate significantly. Thienyl group, a representative of heteroaryl, also works smoothly in this homogeneous hydrogenation reaction.

Table 5.2 Substrate scope of rhodium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of α,β-unsaturated amides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>ee (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeO</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>MeO</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>C6H5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Reaction condition: 1 (0.2 mmol) in 1.0 ml solvent, 1/[Rh(COD)Cl]2/L =100/0.50/1.0; yields were obtained after isolation; ee’s were determined by HPLC with a chiral stationary phase.*
With the success of hydrogenation of unsaturated amides in hand, we were seeking an expansion of substrate scope into other unsaturated carbonyl compounds. When applying the optimized condition in the reaction of esters, high conversions with high enatioselectivities were obtained. Scope of β,β-disubstituted ester substrates include various substituents on the β-phenyl ring with different electronic and steric effects, which is in accordance with hydrogenation of unsaturated amides. A broad substrate scope of this Rh/ZhaoPhos catalytic system suggests its potential application in synthetic chemistry.

**Table 5.3** Substrate scope of rhodium catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of α,β-unsaturated esters and ketone$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Reaction condition: 3 (0.2 mmol) in 1.0 ml solvent, 3/[Rh(COD)Cl]$_2$/L =100/0.50/1.0; yields were obtained after isolation; ee’s were determined by HPLC with a chiral stationary phase.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Mechanistic studies

Table 5.4 Ligand evaluation and control experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZhaoPhos</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95% ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57% ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65% ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 + PPh3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5% ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 + 2PPh3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To investigate the cooperation of thiourea moiety and ferrocene-based bisphosphine skeleton, we synthesized a series of analogues of ZhaoPhos and conducted control experiments to evaluate the collaboration manner of each unit of ZhaoPhos. Urea bisphosphine ligand L3 only gives both lower conversion and ee. Compared to H (L6), more electron-withdrawing trifluoromethyl group at 3- and 5- position on the phenyl ring increases the enantioselectivity, which is probably due to the stronger acidity of N-H proton on the thiourea. Furthermore, monophosphine ligand L5 and the mixture of ferrocene-thiourea compound L6 with triphenylphosphine can hardly catalyze the hydrogenation reaction. On the other hand, the mixture of thiourea molecule and bisphosphine-Ugi’s amine L7 failed to show catalytic activity. These results (ZhaoPhos vs L5 or L6 with PPh3 and L7/thiourea) demonstrate the importance of a covalent incorporation of bisphosphine moiety and thiourea. The strategy of secondary offers an
alternative strategy for asymmetric hydrogenation. In accordance with previous studies on hydrogenation of nitroolefins\textsuperscript{19}, unprotected imines\textsuperscript{20} and (iso)quinolines\textsuperscript{18}, control experiments revealed that (1) each unit within ZhaoPhos is irreplaceable for high conversion and high enantioselectivity in catalytic chemical transformation; (2) a covalent linker enables the incorporation.

**Scheme 5.2** Deuterium labeling experiment

We previously proposed a hydride transfer mechanism for asymmetric hydrogenation of (iso)quinolines with rodium/ ZhaoPhos complex\textsuperscript{18}, which involving an outer-sphere model\textsuperscript{21-22} rather than the traditional inner-sphere mechanism\textsuperscript{23}. In order to gain insight of hydrogenation of α,β-unsaturated carbonyl compounds, isotope labeling experiment was conducted. When applying deuterium gas to conduct this hydrogenation, D atoms
are added at $\alpha$- and $\beta$- position. No obvious H atoms are observed to be added to the C=C bond. This result supports a traditional inner-sphere mechanism, which was well studies and widely accepted in rhodium-catalyzed hydrogenation. Based on these results, we proposed a ligand-substrate coordinating complex involving a secondary interaction between the thiourea and the carbonyl substrate (Figure 3).

**Figure 5.3** Nonlinear effect and proposed transition state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>ee of ZhaoPhos</th>
<th>conversion</th>
<th>ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>&gt; 95%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonlinear effect, which is could be observed in catalytic asymmetric reactions, suggests potential dimerization or high-order aggregation of catalysts. In order to gain insight into this Rh/ZhaoPhos catalyzed hydrogenation of unsaturated carbonyl
compounds, we prepared a series of chiral ligands with different enantiomeric excess and applied them into hydrogenation of trans-β-methylcinnamide. However, no non-linear effect was observed (Figure 3). It supports an assumption that no catalyst self-aggregation or ligand-substrate agglomeration occur prior to the catalytic cycle.

5.4 Conclusion

In summary, we developed a synthetic method to approach β-chiral carbonyl compounds. Catalyzed by a Rh/ZhaoPhos complex, α,β-unsaturated carbonyl substrates were hydrogenated with high enantioselectivities. A secondary interaction between thiourea ligand and carbonyl of the substrates is believed to be crucial for the success. In addition, we did not observe nonlinear effect in this catalytic chemical transformation.

5.5 Experimental section

5.5.1 Typical procedure for the synthesis of α,β-unsaturated esters and amides.

To a suspension of sodium hydride (60% dispersion in mineral oil, 10 mmol) in dry THF (20 mL) trimethyl phosphonoacetate (10 mmol) was added dropwise at 0 °C under argon atmosphere. After 30 min, the appropriate ketones (8 mmol) was added dropwise at the same temperature. The reaction mixture was then allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred under reflux for 24 h. After the mixture cooling in an ice bath, saturated aqueous ammonium chloride solution (20 mL) was then added dropwise. The aqueous phase was extracted with diethyl ether (2 x 50mL) and the combined organic
phase was washed with brine (50mL), dried over sodium sulfate, and concentrated \textit{in vacuo}. Flash chromatography (hexanes/ethyl acetate, 95:5) yielded ester as a clear oil with 60-80% yields.

A schlenk tube was charged with \(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated ester (10 mmol), anhydrous calcium chloride (2 eq.). The tube was protected under nitrogen and ammonia in methanol solution (7N, 10 eq.) was added. The tube was sealed and heated at 100 \(^\circ\)C. After stirring for 24h, the mixture was cooled to room temperature. Solvent was evaporated \textit{in vacuo}. The residue was dissolved in 30ml water and extracted with dichloromethane (50ml×2). The combined organic layer was dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated. After purification by flash chromatography, \(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated amide was obtain.

\((E)-3\text{-phenylbut-2-enamide} \ 1a\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated ester} & \xrightarrow{\text{NH}_3/\text{MeOH}} \text{\(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated amide} \\
3a & \xrightarrow{\text{CaCl}_2} 1a
\end{align*}\]

White solid; 66 % yield; m.p. = 116-117 \(^\circ\)C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.49 - 7.41 (m, 2H), 7.37-7.35 (m, 3H), 6.08 (d, \(J = 1.1\) Hz, 1H), 5.81 (br, 1H), 5.62 (br, 1H), 2.56 (d, \(J = 1.2\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 168.92, 152.52, 142.52, 128.70, 128.50, 126.20, 118.74, 17.74; \(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 163.21 [M + H]\(^+\).

\((E)-3\text{-}\(\sigma\)-tolyl)but-2-enamide \ 1b\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated ester} & \xrightarrow{\text{NH}_3/\text{MeOH}} \text{\(\alpha,\beta\)-unsaturated amide} \\
3a & \xrightarrow{\text{CaCl}_2} 1b
\end{align*}\]

White solid; 42 % yield; m.p. = 92-94 \(^\circ\)C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.25 - 7.12 (m, 3H), 7.07-7.06 (m, 1H), 5.70 (d, \(J = 1.3\) Hz, 1H), 5.63 (br, 1H), 5.46 (br, 1H), 2.44 (d, \(J = 1.3\) Hz, 3H), 2.29 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 168.47, 155.46, 144.08, 133.95, 130.38, 127.57, 127.14, 125.74, 120.50, 20.38, 19.65; \(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 176.72 [M + H]\(^+\).
(E)-3-(m-tolyl)but-2-enamide 1c

White solid; 63 % yield; m.p. = 79-83 °C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.49 - 6.97 (m, 4H), 6.06 (s, 1H), 5.85 (br, 1H), 5.62 (br, 1H), 2.54 (s, 3H), 2.37 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 169.03, 152.64, 142.57, 138.09, 129.43, 128.38, 126.92, 123.33, 118.59, 21.45, 17.76; m/z (ESI–MS) 176.73 [M + H]\(^+\).

(E)-3-(p-tolyl)but-2-enamide 1d

White solid; 70 % yield; m.p. = 123-126 °C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.35 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.17 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 6.06 (d, J = 1.2 Hz, 1H), 5.61 (br, 2H), 2.55 (s, 3H), 2.36 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 168.87, 152.51, 139.56, 138.80, 129.19, 126.10, 117.81, 21.16, 17.63; (ESI–MS) 176.83 [M + H]\(^+\).

(E)-3-(4-methoxyphenyl)but-2-enamide 1e

White solid; 64 % yield; m.p. = 134-136 °C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.41 (t, J = 5.7 Hz, 2H), 6.89 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.04 (d, J = 1.0 Hz, 1H), 5.48 (br, 2H), 3.83 (s, 3H), 2.55 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 168.86, 160.20, 152.05, 134.68, 127.48, 116.89, 113.85, 55.34, 17.50; m/z (ESI–MS) 192.71 [M + H]\(^+\).

(E)-3-(4-fluorophenyl)but-2-enamide 1f

White solid; 51 % yield; m.p. = 145-155 °C; \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.42 (dd, J = 7.8, 5.6 Hz, 2H), 7.05 (t, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.03 (s, 1H), 5.56 (br, 2H), 2.54 (s, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 168.53, 164.28, 161.81, 151.41, 138.53, 127.95 (d, J = 8.2 Hz), 118.58, 115.41 (d, J = 21.5 Hz), 17.78; m/z (ESI–MS) 180.45 [M + H]\(^+\).
(E)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)but-2-enamide \textbf{1g}

White solid; 61 % yield; m.p. = 146-156 °C; $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.57 – 7.29 (m, 4H), 6.05 (d, $J$ = 1.2 Hz, 1H), 5.52 (br, 2H), 2.53 (s, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 168.31, 151.23, 140.88, 134.69, 128.68, 127.50, 118.95, 17.64; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 196.55, 198.30 [M + H$^+$].

(E)-3-(4-bromophenyl)but-2-enamide \textbf{1h}

White solid; 65 % yield; m.p. = 151-159 °C; $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.58 – 7.44 (m, 2H), 7.38 – 7.27 (m, 2H), 6.06 (d, $J$ = 1.2 Hz, 1H), 5.61 (br, 2H), 2.53 (d, $J$ = 1.2 Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 168.44, 151.25, 141.34, 131.65, 127.81, 122.88, 119.03, 17.59; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 240.92, 242.81 [M + H$^+$].

(E)-3-phenylhept-2-enamide \textbf{1i}

White solid; 33 % yield; m.p. = 56-58 °C; $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.45 – 7.16 (m, 5H), 5.87 (s, 1H), 5.44 (br, 1H), 4.92 (br, 1H), 2.41 (t, $J$ = 6.6 Hz, 2H), 1.34 (m, 4H), 0.87 (t, $J$ = 6.6 Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 168.64, 153.45, 139.45, 128.85, 128.28, 127.37, 121.62, 40.02, 29.37, 22.16, 13.79; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 205.41 [M + H$^+$].

(E)-3-(thiophen-2-yl)but-2-enamide \textbf{1j}

White solid; 47 % yield; m.p. = 125-126 °C; $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.28 (t, $J$ = 4.0 Hz, 2H), 7.04 (dd, $J$ = 5.0, 3.8 Hz, 1H), 6.20 (d, $J$ = 1.2 Hz, 1H), 5.43 (br, 2H), 2.61 (d, $J$ = 1.1 Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 168.25, 145.79, 145.34, 127.90, 126.36, 126.28, 115.67, 17.08; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 168.78 [M + H$^+$].

(E)-3-(naphthalen-2-yl)but-2-enamide \textbf{1k}
White solid; 55% yield; m.p. = 147-156 °C; $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.91 (d, $J = 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 7.89 - 7.81 (m, 3H), 7.57 (dd, $J = 8.6$, 1.9 Hz, 1H), 7.55 - 7.46 (m, 2H), 6.22 (d, $J = 1.3$ Hz, 1H), 5.56 (br, 2H), 2.68 (d, $J = 1.2$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 168.69, 152.40, 139.67, 133.37, 133.20, 128.41, 128.15, 128.60, 126.57, 126.51, 125.68, 123.99, 118.99, 17.75; m/z (ESI–MS) 213.26 [M + H]$^+$.  

5.5.2 General procedure for asymmetric hydrogenation.  

In the nitrogen-filled glovebox, solution of [Rh(COD)Cl]$_2$ (4.9 mg, 0.01 mmol) and ligand (2.1 eq.) in 5.0 ml anhydrous solvent was stirred at room temperature for 30 min. A specified volume of the resulting solution (0.5 ml, 1% Rh catalyst) was transferred by syringe to a Score-Break ampule charged with substrate solution (0.2 mmol in 0.5 ml). The ampule was placed into an autoclave, which was then charged with 50 atm H$_2$. The autoclave was stirred at desired temperature for the indicated period of time. After release of hydrogen gas, the resulting mixture was concentrated under vacuum. The residue passed through a silica plug to remove metal complex and then was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was analysed by $^1$H NMR to determine the conversion. The enantiomeric excess was determined by GC or HPLC analysis. Absolute configuration was assigned according to literatures$^{26-27}$.  

5.5.3 Characterization data for chiral carbonyl compounds.  

(R)-3-phenylbutanamide 2a  

White solid; m.p. = 69-71 °C; Yield: 97%, 95% ee; [\(\alpha\)]$_D$$^{22} = -29.0$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 220 nm; $t_R = 11.0$ min (minor), 13.3 min (major); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.33-7.29 (m, 2H), 7.26 – 7.18 (m, 3H), 5.67 (br, 1H), 5.39 (br, 1H), 3.27 (dd, $J = 14.4$, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.47 (m, 2H), 1.32 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 174.31, 145.77, 128.65, 126.76, 126.51, 44.80, 36.78, 21.77; m/z (ESI–MS) 164.0 [M + H]$^+$. 
(R)-3-(o-tolyl)butanamide 2b

White solid; m.p. = 104-105 °C; Yield: 20%, 92% ee; [α]D22 = -29.5 (c = 0.2, CHCl3); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; tR = 10.8 min (minor), 11.8 min (major); 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.19-7.10 (m, 4H), 5.58 (br, 1H), 5.31 (br, 1H), 3.55 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 2.52 (m, 1H), 2.48 - 2.30 (m, 4H), 1.28 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H); 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3) δ 174.29, 143.97, 135.54, 130.63, 126.36, 126.17, 124.95, 43.98, 31.72, 21.37, 19.51; m/z (ESI–MS) 179.27 [M + H]+.

(R)-3-(m-tolyl)butanamide 2c
White solid; m.p. = 61-64 °C; Yield: 95%, 96% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -30.0\) (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 10.4\) min (minor), 12.1 min (major); \(^1^H\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 7.19\) (m, 1H), 7.03 (m, 3H), 5.64 (br, 1H), 5.34 (br, 1H), 3.23 (d, \(J = 7.2\) Hz, 1H), 2.45 (m, 2H), 2.33 (s, 3H), 1.31 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}C\) NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 174.23, 145.74, 138.23, 128.55, 127.61, 127.28, 123.68, 44.82, 36.75, 21.86, 21.48\); \(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 179.27 [M + H]*.

\(\text{Signal 1: VGHit A, Wavelength=208 nm}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak No</th>
<th>RetTime Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.432 min</td>
<td>0.2711</td>
<td>1219.29370</td>
<td>74.343996</td>
<td>2.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.069 min</td>
<td>0.5128</td>
<td>5.63119464</td>
<td>1832.54810</td>
<td>97.6832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totaals: 5.7602e4 1007.49627

\((R)-3-(p\text{-}toly)\text{-}butanamide 2d\)

White solid; m.p. = 113-114 °C; Yield: 97%, 96% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -30.7\) (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 97:3; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 18.5\) min (minor), 24.6 min (major); \(^1^H\) NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 7.24 – 7.07\) (m, 4H), 5.54 (br, 1H), 5.30 (br, 1H), 3.23 (dd, \(J = 14.3, 7.2\) Hz, 1H), 2.57 – 2.37 (m, 2H), 2.32 (d, \(J = 6.8\) Hz, 3H), 1.31 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}C\) NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 174.21, 142.72, 136.03, 129.33, 126.62, 44.91, 36.41, 21.92, 20.99\); \(m/z\) (ESI–MS) 179.37 [M + H]*.
White solid; m.p. = 106-108 ºC; Yield: 96%, 96% ee; [α]D = -26.1 (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; t_R = 18.3 min (minor), 23.9 min (major); ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.23 – 7.04 (m, 2H), 6.96 – 6.76 (m, 2H), 5.57 (br, 1H), 5.31 (br, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.23 (dd, J = 14.3, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.44 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 174.24, 158.15, 137.81, 127.68, 114.01, 55.25, 45.09, 36.02, 21.99; m/z (ESI-MS) 194.77 [M + H]^+.

(R)-3-(4-fluorophenyl)butanamide 2f

White solid; m.p. = 106-108 ºC; Yield: 96%, 96% ee; [α]D = -26.1 (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; t_R = 18.283 min (minor), 23.855 min (major); ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.23 – 7.04 (m, 2H), 6.96 – 6.76 (m, 2H), 5.57 (br, 1H), 5.31 (br, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.23 (dd, J = 14.3, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.44 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H); ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 174.24, 158.15, 137.81, 127.68, 114.01, 55.25, 45.09, 36.02, 21.99; m/z (ESI-MS) 194.77 [M + H]^+. 
White solid; m.p. = 73-75 °C; Yield: 91%, 94% ee; [α]D22 = -30.5 (c = 0.2, CHCl3); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; tR = 13.2 min (minor), 15.0 min (major); 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.24 – 7.11 (m, 2H), 7.07 – 6.87 (m, 2H), 5.79 (br, 1H), 5.42 (br, 1H), 3.28 (dd, J = 14.3, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.63 – 2.29 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 3H); 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3) δ 174.01, 161.45 (d, J = 245.2 Hz), 141.43 (d, J = 3.2 Hz), 128.17 (d, J = 7.8 Hz), 115.34 (d, J = 21.1 Hz), 44.89, 36.02, 21.85; m/z (ESI–MS) 182.62 [M + H]+.

(R)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)butanamide 2g

White solid; m.p. = 96-97 °C; Yield: 95%, 95% ee; [α]D22 = -31.6 (c = 0.2, CHCl3); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; tR = 12.3 min (minor), 14.3 min (major); 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.33 – 7.07 (m, 4H), 5.38 (d, J = 7.45 Hz, 2H), 3.29 (dd, J = 14.3, 7.1 Hz, 1H), 2.43 (m, 2H), 1.31 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H); 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3) δ 173.56, 144.23, 132.13, 128.72, 128.17, 44.65, 36.14, 21.66; m/z (ESI–MS) 199.45, 201.76 [M + H]+.
(R)-3-(4-bromophenyl)butanamide 2h

White solid; m.p. = 93-94 °C; Yield: 61%, 90% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -28.0\) \((c = 0.2, \text{CHCl}_3)\); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 12.0\) min (minor), 15.1 min (major); \(^1\text{H} \text{NMR} (400 \text{ MHz, CDCl}_3) \delta 7.42 \text{ (m, 2H), 7.11 \text{ (m, 2H), 5.49 \text{ (br, 2H), 3.26 \text{ (dd, J = 14.1, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 2.50 – 2.36 \text{ (m, 2H), 1.30 \text{ (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H)\)}};}^{13}\text{C NMR} (101 \text{ MHz, CDCl}_3) \delta 173.68, 144.78, 131.67, 128.58, 120.15, 44.56, 36.19, 21.61; m/z (ESI–MS) 243.08, 244.56 [M + H]^+.

(S)-3-phenylheptanamide 2i

**Signal 1:** Wavelength=208 nm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak RetTime Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[nAU] *</td>
<td>[nAU]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.244</td>
<td>0.2435</td>
<td>61.14456</td>
<td>35.96681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.833</td>
<td>0.5203</td>
<td>1326.6856</td>
<td>98.5445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota</td>
<td>4.20106e4</td>
<td>1.862.0519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signal 1:** Wavelength=208 nm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak RetTime Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[min]</td>
<td>[nAU] *</td>
<td>[nAU]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.815</td>
<td>0.3324</td>
<td>1572.8233</td>
<td>78.86083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.102</td>
<td>0.5667</td>
<td>997.8368</td>
<td>95.1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota</td>
<td>3.24453e4</td>
<td>986.6056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White solid; m.p. = 65-68 °C; Yield: 31%, 89% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = 12.1$

(c = 0.1, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 8.8$ min (major), 10.9 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.30 (m, 2H), 7.25 – 7.13 (m, 3H), 5.33 (br, $J = 95.1$ Hz, 2H), 3.06 (m, 1H), 2.48 (m, 2H), 1.76 – 1.55 (m, 2H), 1.34 – 1.03 (m, 4H), 0.82 (t, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 174.19, 144.30, 128.58, 127.45, 126.50, 43.83, 42.64, 35.97, 29.54, 22.57, 13.90; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 205.19 [M + H]$^+$. 

Signal 1: Wavelength=208 nm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak No</th>
<th>Ret. Time (min)</th>
<th>Width (min)</th>
<th>Area (nA s)</th>
<th>Height (nA)</th>
<th>Area (nA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.797</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>1.4472e4</td>
<td>769.4979</td>
<td>94.5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.854</td>
<td>0.2111</td>
<td>830.6037</td>
<td>67.15085</td>
<td>99.4759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1.5695e4</td>
<td>136.6483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{(R)}$-3-(thiophen-2-yl)butanamide 2j

White solid; m.p. = 79-82 °C; Yield: 94%, 94% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -27.1$

(c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 95:5; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 12.1$ min (minor), 13.7 min (major); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.14 (m, 1H), 7.00 – 6.80 (m, 2H), 5.47 (br, 2H), 3.62 (dd, $J = 14.0$, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 2.65 – 2.54 (m, 1H), 2.46 (m, 1H), 1.41 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 173.50 (s), 149.81 (s), 126.72 (s), 123.19, 123.04, 45.67, 32.32, 22.68; $m/z$ (ESI–MS) 170.81 [M + H]$^+$. 

\[ \text{Signal 2: Wavelength=208 nm} \]
(R)-3-(naphthalen-2-yl)butanamide 2k

White solid; m.p. = 104-105 °C; Yield: 98%, 93% ee; \[\alpha\]_D^{22} = -24.1 (c = 0.2, CHCl_3); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak AD-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 97:3; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; t_R = 26.9 min (minor), 42.9 min (major); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl_3) \(\delta\) 7.92 – 7.74 (m, 3H), 7.66 (s, 1H), 7.54 – 7.34 (m, 3H), 5.48 (br, 2H), 3.44 (dd, J = 14.2, 7.1 Hz, 1H), 2.54 (m, 2H), 1.40 (d, J = 6.9 Hz, 3H); \(^13\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl_3) \(\delta\) 174.20, 143.15, 133.57, 132.34, 128.33, 127.65, 127.60, 126.09, 125.50, 125.35, 125.06, 44.78, 36.90, 21.76; \textit{m/z} (ESI–MS) 213.29 [M + H]⁺.

(R)-methyl 3-phenylbutanoate 4a
Colorless liquid; Yield: 97%, 96% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -27.3\) (c = 0.2, CHCl\(_3\)); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; t\(_R\) = 14.0 min (major), 17.3 min (minor); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.33 – 7.27 (m, 2H), 7.24 – 7.17 (m, 3H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.28 (dd, \(J = 14.9, 7.1\) Hz, 1H), 2.59 (qd, \(J = 15.2, 7.6\) Hz, 2H), 1.30 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 172.85, 145.72, 128.52, 126.72, 126.72, 126.42, 51.50, 42.75, 36.44, 21.78.

\(\text{(R)}\)-methyl 3-(m-tolyl)butanoate 4b

Colorless liquid; Yield: 91%, 97% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -16.1\) (c = 0.2, CHCl\(_3\)); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; t\(_R\) = 9.6 min (major), 11.4 min (minor); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 7.18 (m, 1H), 7.02 (m, 3H), 3.63 (s, 3H), 3.24 (dd, \(J = 15.1, 7.0\) Hz, 1H), 2.57 (m, 2H), 2.33 (s, 3H), 1.28 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 172.94, 145.72, 138.05, 128.42, 127.55, 127.18, 123.68, 51.51, 42.75, 36.36, 21.79, 21.49.
(R)-methyl 3-(p-tolyl)butanoate 4c

Colorless liquid; Yield: 97%, 95% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -16.8$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 14.5$ min (major), 16.4 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.11 (s, 4H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.25 (m, 1H), 2.57 (m, 2H), 2.31 (s, 3H), 1.28 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 172.94, 142.72, 135.90, 129.20, 126.58, 51.50, 42.84, 36.03, 21.88, 21.01.

(R)-methyl 3-(4-methoxyphenyl)butanoate 4d
Colorless liquid; Yield: 98%, 95% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -12.4\) (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 23.7\) min (major), 31.4 min (minor); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 7.21 - 7.08\) (m, 2H), 6.91 – 6.79 (m, 2H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.23 (m, 1H), 2.55 (m, 2H), 1.27 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 172.93, 158.08, 137.81, 127.63, 113.86, 77.36, 77.04, 76.72, 55.24, 51.49, 43.01, 35.66, 21.96.

(R)-methyl 3-[(4-fluorophenyl)butanoate 4e

Colorless liquid; Yield: 95%, 97% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -10.9\) (c = 0.2, CHCl₃); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 0.6 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 19.2\) min (major), 20.7 min (minor); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 7.23 - 7.14\) (m, 2H), 7.03 – 6.93 (m, 2H), 3.62 (d, \(J = 6.9\) Hz, 3H), 3.27 (dd, \(J = 14.5, 7.2\) Hz, 1H), 2.66 – 2.48 (m, 2H), 1.28 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) \(\delta 172.65, 161.45, 141.32, 128.12\) (d, \(J = 7.8\) Hz), 115.25 (d, \(J = 21.1\) Hz), 51.53, 42.85, 35.78, 21.96.
**Colorless liquid**; **Yield: 97%, 97% ee**; [$\alpha$]$_D^{22}$ = -12.7 (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 0.6 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R$ = 19.1 min (major), 20.4 min (minor); **$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$)** $\delta$ 7.34 – 7.27 (m, 2H), 7.25 – 7.19 (m, 2H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.28 (dd, $J$ = 15.0, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 2.59 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, $J$ = 7.0 Hz, 3H); **$^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$)** $\delta$ 172.86, 145.71, 128.52, 126.72, 126.43, 51.51, 42.75, 36.44, 21.78.

**(R)-methyl 3-(4-bromophenyl)butanoate 4g**

```
[Signal 1: VWD1 A, Wavelength=208 nm]

Peak RetTime Type Width Area Height Area %
# [min] [min] nAU *s [nAU ] %
---|------|--------|--------|------|-------|-------
1 19.094 0.484 4.30721e+14 1882.00610 98.4131
2 20.642 0.3806 605.75427 26.32514 1.2869
Totals: 4.26778e+15 1508.53181
```
White solid; Yield: 51%, 94% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -16.5$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 0.6 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 19.5$ min (major), 21.3 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.34 – 7.27 (m, 2H), 7.21 (m, 2H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.28 (dd, $J = 14.6$, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.59 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 172.93, 145.72, 128.54, 126.75, 126.44, 51.62, 42.79, 36.46, 21.82.

Signal 1: VWD1 A, Wavelength=208 nm

| Peak RetTime Type Width Area Height Area |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 19.548 MIN  0.5134  6.809356 2088.56860  97.9858 |
| 2 21.299 MIN  0.5588  2018.47152  61.39164  2.3442 |

Totals: 7.0154064  214.94024

$(R)$-methyl 3-(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)butanoate 4h

Colorless liquid; Yield: 97%, 96% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -12.2$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 0.6 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 11.5$ min (major), 12.7 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 7.56 (m, 2H), 7.34 (m, 2H), 3.62 (s, 3H), 3.35 (dd, $J = 14.4$, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 2.69 – 2.53 (m, 2H), 1.31 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) δ 172.37, 149.71, 128.77 (dd, $J = 65.3$, 33.1 Hz), 127.14, 125.49 (q, $J = 3.7$ Hz), 51.61, 42.27, 36.29, 21.71.
(R)-methyl 3-(thiophen-2-yl)butanoate 4i

Colorless liquid; Yield: 95%, 96% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -7.2$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 0.6 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 22.6$ min (major), 26.8 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.13 (m, 1H), 7.00 – 6.70 (m, 2H), 3.78 – 3.52 (m, 4H), 2.63 (m, 2H), 1.38 (d, $J = 6.9$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 172.37, 149.64, 126.61, 122.99, 122.88, 51.63, 43.67, 31.96, 22.63.

(S)-methyl 2-(1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalen-1-yl)acetate 4j

Colorless liquid; Yield: 72%, 96% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = 2.1$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R = 7.9$ min (major), 11.5 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.20 – 7.01 (m, 4H), 3.71 (s, 3H), 3.35 (m, 1H), 2.84 – 2.66 (m, 3H), 2.60 – 2.49 (m, 1H), 1.95 – 1.64 (m, 4H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 173.29, 139.24, 137.15, 129.31, 128.27, 126.05, 125.84, 51.61, 41.83, 34.55,

$$\text{({R})-methyl 3-(naphthalen-2-yl)butanoate 4k}$$

White solid; Yield: 97%, 96% ee; $[\alpha]_D^{22} = -19.1$ (c = 0.2, CHCl$_3$); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 99:1; flow rate = 1 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; $t_R$ = 42.7 min (major), 51.2 min (minor); $^1$H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 7.94 – 7.75 (m, 3H), 7.65 (s, 1H), 7.52 – 7.33 (m, 3H), 3.61 (s, 3H), 3.45 (dd, $J = 14.7, 7.2$ Hz, 1H), 2.68 (m, 2H), 1.38 (d, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 3H); $^{13}$C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl$_3$) $\delta$ 172.83, 143.17, 133.59, 132.35, 128.19, 127.68, 127.61, 126.00, 125.48, 125.42, 124.94, 51.55, 42.68, 36.57, 21.82.

$$\text{(R)-ethyl 3-phenylbutanoate 4l}$$
Colorless liquid; Yield: 81%, 95% ee; \([\alpha]_D^{22} = -9.0\) (c = 0.2, CHCl\(_3\)); The enantiomeric excess was determined by HPLC on Chiralpak OJ-H column, hexane: isopropanol = 98:2; flow rate = 1.0 mL/min; UV detection at 208 nm; \(t_R = 11.0\) min (major), 12.4 min (minor); \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta 7.40 - 7.12\) (m, 5H), 4.07 (q, \(J = 7.1\) Hz, 2H), 3.36 – 3.17 (m, 1H), 2.57 (m, 2H), 1.30 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 3H), 1.18 (t, \(J = 7.1\) Hz, 3H); \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta 172.41, 145.76, 128.48, 126.78, 126.39, 60.27, 43.01, 36.53, 21.82, 14.18\).
15. Shang, J.; Han, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, Z.; Ding, K., Highly enantioselective asymmetric hydrogenation of (E)-[small beta],[small beta]-disubstituted [small alpha],[small beta]-unsaturated Weinreb amides catalyzed by Ir(i) complexes of SpinPhox ligands. *Chemical Communications* 2012, 48 (42), 5172-5174.
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