NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Pipecolic Acid-Catalyzed Direct Asymmetric Mannich Reactions

Paul Ha-Yeon Cheong[†], **Haile Zhang**[§], **Rajee Thayumanavan**[§], **Fujie Tanaka**[§], **K. N. Houk**[*,†], and **Carlos F. Barbas III**[*,§]

[†]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095-1569, USA

[§]The Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology and the Departments of Chemistry and Molecular Biology, The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, California 92037, USA

Abstract

yield 77~86% (1+2)
dr syn (**1**):anti (**2**) = 1.4:1~2:1
1 >99% ee; **2** 98~99% ee

Mannich reactions between aldehydes and *N-p*-methoxyphenyl-protected α-imino ethyl glyoxylate have been performed using (*S*)-pipecolic acid as catalyst. The reactions give both *syn-* and *anti*-products (dr = 1.4–2:1) with high enantioselectivities (>98% ee). In contrast, (*S*)-proline-catalyzed reactions give mainly *syn*-products with high enantioselectivities. Computational studies reveal that the energetic preference between the transition structures involving the s-*cis*-enamine and the s-*trans*-enamine is smaller for the pipecolic acid as compared to proline, yielding the (2*S*,3*R*)-*anti*- and the (2*S*,3*S*)-*syn* Mannich product, in nearly equal amounts.

Preformed enamines of both five-membered pyrrolidine and six-membered piperidine rings have been used as nucleophiles in many reactions.[1,2] For the reactions involving in situ-generated enamines, pyrrolidine-based catalysts have been extensively examined.[3,4,5] One of the most effective routes for the synthesis of enantiomerically enriched α- and β-amino acid derivatives is pyrrolidine derivative-catalyzed Mannich-type reactions of an aldehyde donor. (*S*)-Proline and various (*S*)-proline-derivatives give the *syn*-product (2*S*,3*S*)-**1** as the major product with high diastereo- and enantioselectivity (Scheme 1).[4] The six-membered analog, pipecolic acid, has received little attention as a catalyst for asymmetric reactions, and has proven ineffective for aldol reactions involving acetone as donor.[3a,6] Here we report the experimental and computational investigation of (*S*)-pipecolic acid-catalyzed Mannich reaction between aldehydes and *N-p*-methoxyphenyl (*N*-PMP)-protected α-imino ethyl glyoxylate.[4]

Pipecolic acid catalyzed Mannich reactions provide both the *syn*-product **1** and *anti*-product **2** in good yields (Table 1). The reaction rates were similar to that of proline-catalyzed reactions under the same conditions. The enantioselectivities of the *syn*-product (2*S*,3*S*)-**1**[4]

houk@chem.ucla.edu or carlos@scripps.edu.
[†]University of California, Los Angeles
[§]The Scripps Research Institute

and *anti*-product (2*S*,3*R*)-**2**[4,6] were both typically greater than 98% ee. The diastereomeric ratio of *syn*-product **1** to *anti*-product **2** ranged from 2:1 to 1:1, regardless of the bulkiness of the aldehyde substituent (Table 1). The insensitivity of the diastereoselectivity to steric bulk is in sharp contrast to the proline-catalyzed reactions, in which a bulky R groups often led to excellent enantio- and diastereoselectivity.[4] (*S*)-Pipecolic acid catalysis provides a route to highly enantiomerically pure products of both diastereomers.

This unusual change in diastereoselectivity upon increase in the ring size of the catalyst caused us to investigate these reactions computationally. The enamine of propionaldehyde, *N*-PMP-protected α-imino methyl gloxylate and the transition structures leading to the four possible stereoisomeric products for both proline and pipecolic acid were calculated at the HF level of theory with 6-31G(d) basis set.[7] We have previously used density functional theory to study related organocatalytic reactions.[8] However, HF/6-31G(d) was used over B3LYP/6-31G(d) in this study for rapidly computing the stereoselectivity.

The s-*cis*- or s-*trans*-enamine attack on the *re* or *si* face of the imine acceptor is the stereo- and rate-determining step of this reaction. Four possible diastereomeric transition structures are possible that allow for intramolecular proton transfer. The four lowest energy transition structures involving (*S*)-proline and (*S*)-pipecolic acid are shown in Figure 1.

The *syn*-product **1** arises from the s-*trans-si* transition state and the *anti*-product **2** from the s-*cis*-si. The conformations of the proline enamine were previously discussed as *anti*- and *syn*-enamine. [8] These notations are changed to s-*trans*- and s-*cis*-enamine, respectively, in this work to distinguish from *anti* and *syn* diastereoselective products. In the proline-catalyzed reaction, the computed energy difference between these transition structures, **TS-(S,S)-4** and **T S - (R,S)-6**, is 1.0 kcal/mol. The corresponding energy difference for the pipecolic acid-catalyzed reaction between **TS-(S,S)-8** and **TS-(R,S)-10** is only 0.2 kcal/mol. This decrease in energetic difference reflects the experimentally observed decrease in diastereoselectivity for the pipecolic acid-catalyzed reaction.

The computed selectivities arising from the relative energies for all transition structures are summarized in Table 2. There is an excellent agreement between the computed stereoselectivity and the observed product ratios.

The facial *re* or *si* selectivity of the imine acceptor is governed by the necessity for intramolecular proton transfer and minimization of steric interactions between the imine and the reactive enamine. The (*E*)-imine is more stable than the (*Z*)-imine. Combined with the observation that transition structures involving intramolecular proton transfer are favored, the *re*-face attacks necessitate substantial eclipsing of the imine and enamine (**TS-(S,R)-3**, **TS-(S,R)-7**, **TS-(R,R)-5**, and **TS-(R,R)-9**, Figure 1). Consequently, as shown in Figure 1, the s-*trans-re* and s-*cis-re* transition structures are higher in energy by >1 kcal/mol than the s-*trans-si* or s-*cis-si* transition structure, for both proline and pipecolic acid.

The *re* or *si* attack on the enamine is determined by whether the s-*cis* or s-*trans* enamine conformer is favored in the transition state. In the case of proline, the transition structures involving the s-*trans*-enamine are favored over those that involve the s-*cis*-enamine. The latter involves distortions of the developing iminium from planarity to accommodate proton transfer. Thus proline provides the *syn*-product (2*S*,3*S*)-**1** as the major product.[8]

This differentiation is weakened in the case of pipecolic acid. The piperidine ring has different steric interactions with the s-*trans*- or s-*cis*-enamines than the pyrrolidine ring of proline. The relatively rigid piperidine ring holds the carboxylic acid more rigidly than the more flexible pyrrolidine. This alters electrostatic interactions with the ester of the iminoglyoxylate and with the protonated imine. These differences allow the imine to react

via both the *s-trans-* and *s-cis-*enamine, giving rise to roughly equal amounts of both *syn*-product (2*S*,3*S*)-**1** and *anti*-product (2*S*,3*R*)-**2**.

The (*S*)-pipecolic acid-catalyzed Mannich reactions of aldehydes affords ready access to both *syn-* and *anti*-products with high enantioselectivities. In contrast, proline-catalyzed reactions yield primarily the *syn* product. Work is under way to further develop *anti*-selective Mannich catalysts based on these discoveries.[9,10]

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

References

1. Kempf B, Hampel N, Ofial AR, Mayr H. Chem Eur J. 2003; 9:2209.

2. (a) Stork G, Brizzolara A, Landesman H, Szmuszkovicz J, Terrell R. J Am Chem Soc. 1963; 85:207.(b) Hickmott PW. Tetrahedron. 1982; 38:1975.

3. (a) Sakthivel K, Notz N, Bui T, Barbas CF III. J Am Chem Soc. 2001; 123:5260. [PubMed: 11457388] (b) Notz W, Tanaka F, Barbas CF III. Acc Chem Res. 2004; 37:580. [PubMed: 15311957] (c) Northrup AB, Mangion IK, Hettche F, MacMillan DWC. Angew Chem Int Ed. 2004; 43:2152.(d) Suri JT, Ramachary DB, Barbas CF III. Org Lett. 2005; 7:1383. [PubMed: 15787512] (e) Allemann C, Gordillo R, Clemente FR, Cheong PHY, Houk KN. Acc Chem Res. 2004; 37:558. [PubMed: 15311955]

4. (a) Cordova A, Watanabe S, Tanaka F, Notz W, Barbas CF III. J Am Chem Soc. 2002; 124:1866. [PubMed: 11866595] (b) Notz W, Tanaka F, Watanabe S, Chowdari NS, Turner JM, Thayumanuvan R, Barbas CF III. J Org Chem. 2003; 68:9624. [PubMed: 14656087] (c) Chowdari NS, Ramachary DB, Barbas CF III. Synlett. 2003:1906.(d) Chowdari NS, Suri JT, Barbas CF III. Org Lett. 2004; 6:2507. [PubMed: 15255677]

5. (a) List B. J Am Chem Soc. 2000; 122:9336.(b) List B, Pojarliev P, Biller WT, Martin HJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2002; 124:827. [PubMed: 11817958] (c) Cordova A, Notz W, Zhong G, Betancort JM, Barbas CF III. J Am Chem Soc. 2002; 124:1842. [PubMed: 11866583] (d) Hayashi Y, Tsuboi W, Ashimine I, Urushima T, Shoji M, Sakai K. Angew Chem, Int Ed. 2003; 42:3677.(e) Hayashi Y, Tsuboi W, Shoji M, Suzuki N. J Am Chem Soc. 2003; 125:11208. [PubMed: 16220937] (f) Notz W, Watanabe S, Chowdari NS, Zhong G, Betancort JM, Tanaka F, Barbas CF III. Adv Synth Cat. 2004; 346:1131.(g) Kumaragurubaran N, Juhl K, Zhuang W, Bogevig A, Jorgensen KA. J Am Chem Soc. 2002; 124:6254. [PubMed: 12033850] (h) Brown SP, Brochu M, Sinz CJ, MacMillan WC. J Am Chem Soc. 2003; 125:10808. [PubMed: 12952459]

6. (S)-Pipecolic acid catalyzes the Morita-Baylis-Hillman reaction. Aroyan CE, Vasbinder MM, Miller SJ. Org Lett. 2005; 7:3849. [PubMed: 16119914]

7. Q-Chem and Gaussian series of programs were used in this work. See supporting information for full authorships. (a)Frisch MJ, et al. Gaussian03. Gaussian, IncWallingford CT2004(b)Kong J, et al. Q-Chem, Version 2.0. Q-Chem, IncExport, PA2000

8. (a) Bahmanyar S, Houk KN. J Am Chem Soc. 2001; 123:12911. [PubMed: 11749554] (b) Bahmanyar S, Houk KN. Org Lett. 2003; 5:1249. [PubMed: 12688731] (c) Bahmanyar S, Houk KN, Martin HJ, List B. J Am Chem Soc. 2003; 125:2475. [PubMed: 12603135] (c) Cheong PHY, Houk KN, Warrier JS, Hanessian S. Adv Synth Cat. 2004; 346:1111.(d) Cheong PHY, Houk KN. J

Am Chem Soc. 2004; 126:13912. [PubMed: 15506738] (e) Cheong PHY, Houk KN. Synthesis. 2005; 9:1533.

9. An organocatalyst derived from chiral aminosulfonamide has been shown to be anti-selective. Kano T, Yamaguchi Y, Tokuda O, Maruoka K. J Am Chem Soc. 2005; 127:16408. [PubMed: 16305223]

10. Mitsumori S, Zhang H, Cheong PH-Y, Houk KN, Tanaka F, Barbas CF III. J Am Chem Soc. 2005 ASAP.

Figure 1.
Transition structures for the C-C bond formation of the (*S*)-proline and (*S*)-pipecolic acid-catalyzed Mannich reaction between propionaldehyde and N-PMP-protected α-imino methyl gloxylate. S-*trans-si* transition structures **TS-(S,S)-4** and **TS-(S,S)-8** give rise to product **1a**, while **TS-(R,S)-6** and **TS-(R,S)-10** gives rise to **2a**.

Scheme 1.
Mechanism of the (*S*)-proline-catalyzed Mannich reaction of aldehydes with α-imino ethyl glyoxylate.

Table 1

(*S*)-Pipecolic acid-catalyzed Mannich reaction of aldehydes and α-imino ethyl glyoxylate to afford products *syn*-**1a**-**1e** and *anti*-**2a**-**2e**.[a]

Entry	R	Product	Yield (%)	dr syn(1):anti(2)	ee (%) syn(1)	ee (%) anti(2)
1	Me	**1a+2a**	80	2.0:1	>99	>99
2	*i*-Pr	**1b+2b**	82	1.4:1	>99	98
3	*n*-Bu	**1c+2c**	83	1.5:1	>99	>99
4	*n*-Pent	**1d+2d**	86	1.4:1	>99	>99
5		**1e+2e**	77	1.6:1	>99	>99

[a]Typical conditions: To a solution of *N*-PMP-protected α-imino ethyl glyoxylate (0.5 mmol) and aldehyde (1.0 mmol) in anhydrous DMSO (5 mL), (*S*)-pipecolic acid (0.15 mmol) was added, and the mixture was stirred for 6–14 h at room temperature. The diastereomeric ratio was determined without purification by ^{1}H NMR. The enantiomeric excess was determined by chiral-phase HPLC analysis.

Cheong et al. Page 8

Table 2

Comparison of the experimentally observed product ratios involving reaction of propionaldehyde with *N*-PMP-protected α-imino ethyl glyoxylate with computed stereoselectivities based on transition state theory predictions involving *N*-PMP-protected α-imino methyl glyoxylate.

Entry	Catalyst	Type	dr *syn*(**1**):*anti*(**2**)	ee (%) *syn (anti)*
1	Proline	Exp.	3:1	>99
2	Proline	Computed	3.5:1	97
3	Pipecolic acid	Exp.	2:1	>99 (>99)
4	Pipecolic acid	Computed	1.4:1	93 (96)