Published in final edited form as:

Tetrahedron. 2007 May 21; 63(21): 4422–4428. doi:10.1016/j.tet.2007.03.080.

1,1'-Binaphthyl Ligands with Bulky 3,3'-Tertiaryalkyl Substituents for the Asymmetric Alkyne Addition to Aromatic Aldehydes

Qin Wang[†], Shan-Yong Chen[†], Xiao-Qi Yu^{†,‡,*}, and Lin Pu^{§*}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Key Laboratory of Green Chemistry and Technology (Ministry of Education), Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610064, P. R. China

[‡]State Key Laboratory of Biotherapy, West China Hospital, West China Medical School, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610041, P. R. China

[§]Department of Chemistry, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4319, USA

Abstract

The BINOL ligand (*R*)-**2** that contains bulky 3,3'-tertiaryalkyl groups shows improved catalytic properties than the previously reported 3,3'-substituted BINOL ligands in the asymmetric alkyne addition to aromatic aldehydes. It can catalyze the phenylacetylene addition to aromatic aldehydes with high enantioselectivity (86–94% ee) and good yields without using Ti(O^{*i*}Pr)₄ and a Lewis base additive. The catalytic properties of several analogs of (*R*)-**2** in the asymmetric alkyne addition to aldehydes have also been studied. .

Introduction

Chiral propargylic alcohols are versatile precursors to many organic compounds.^{1,2} One efficient way to synthesize this class of compound is by the catalytic asymmetric alkyne addition to aldehydes. Recent research activity in this area has led to the development of a number of highly enantioselective catalysts.^{3–12} Among these, using 1,1'-bi-2-naphthol (BINOL) and its derivatives has attracted our particular attention.^{5–7} We found that BINOL in combination with Et₂Zn and Ti(O^{*i*}Pr)₄ can catalyze the highly enantioselective reaction of alkynes with aromatic, aliphatic and α,β -unsaturated aldehydes.⁵ We also synthesized the BINOL derivative (*S*)-**1** that contained two bulky 3,3'-anisyl substituents.⁶ This compound was found to catalyze the asymmetric alkynylzinc addition to aromatic aldehydes without Ti(O^{*i*}Pr)₄. Although using (*S*)-**1** simplified the catalytic process, its enantioselectivity and productivity were still limited. For example, the reaction of phenylacetylene with 1-naphthylaldehyde catalyzed by (*S*)-**1** in combination with Et₂Zn showed 45% yield and 80% ee. Therefore, we propose to further improve the catalytic properties of (*S*)-**1** by studying the BINOL derivative (*R*)-**2** that contains the bulky 3,3'-tertiaryalkyl substituents very close to the BINOL center. Herein, our use of (*R*)-**2** and its analogs in the asymmetric alkyne addition to aromatic aldehydes are reported. This chiral ligand has shown improved catalytic properties over (*S*)-**1**.

E-mail: lp6n@virginia.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Results and Discussion

Compound (*R*)-**2** was prepared from (*R*)-BINOL following the procedure recently reported.¹³ We first tested the use of (*R*)-**2** in combination with Et_2Zn to catalyze the reaction of phenylacetylene with benzaldehyde to make 1,3-diphenyl-2-propyn-1-ol without using $\text{Ti}(\text{O}^i\text{Pr})_4$ (Scheme 1). The results are summarized in Table 1. Similar to (*S*)-**1**, (*R*)-**2** showed much greater enantioselectivity in THF than in other solvents. The optimized conditions were identified by using (*R*)-**2** (30 mol%) to catalyze the reaction of phenylacetylene with benzaldehyde in THF at 0 °C which gave the propargylic alcohol product with 91% ee (entry 11). The configuration of the product was *R* as determined by comparing the HPLC (ChiralDiacel OD column) data with the literature.^{5e}

We used (*R*)-**2** to catalyze the reaction of phenylacetylene with various aromatic aldehydes by applying the conditions of entry 11 in Table 1. As shown in Table 2, high enantioselectivity was observed for the reactions of phenylacetylene with benzaldehydes containing *ortho*-, *meta*-, *para*-, electron-withdrawing and electron-donating substituents. For the reaction of 1-naphthylaldehyde, good enantioselectivity (90% ee) and yield (70%) were also obtained which is significantly improved over the use of (*S*)-**1**. In general, using (*R*)-**2** gave more consistently good yields and significantly reduced the ZnEt_2 addition side products often observed when using (*S*)-**1**.

2. Asymmetric Alkyne Addition to Aromatic Aldehydes Using the Analogs of (*R*)-**2**

In order to better assess the various factors that influence the enantioselectivity of (*R*)-**2**, we prepared several analogs of (*R*)-**2**, including (*R*)-**3**,^{13,14} (*R*)-**4**¹³ and (*R*)-**5**,¹⁵ and studied their use for the reaction of phenylacetylene with benzaldehyde in the presence of Et_2Zn by applying the conditions of entry 11 in Table 1. In Table 3, the results using (*R*)-**3**, (*R*)-**4**, and (*R*)-**5** as the catalysts are summarized and are compared with that of (*R*)-**2**.

Compound (*R*)-**3** not only showed greatly reduced enantioselectivity than (*R*)-**2** but also gave the product with the opposite configuration. This indicates that the structures of the catalytic sites are very different for these two compounds. When (*R*)-**2** is treated with Et_2Zn ,

deprotonation of the two hydroxyl groups of (*R*)-**2** may require 2 equiv of Et₂Zn to generate the zinc complex **6**. When (*R*)-**3** is treated with Et₂Zn, its four hydroxyl groups will require 4 equiv of Et₂Zn for deprotonation and the resulting zinc complex could have at least three isomeric structures **7** – **9** without including the isomers containing a zinc atom bridging the central two oxygens. An aldehyde molecule could be activated by coordinating to one or two of the Lewis acidic zinc centers in **6** – **9** for the subsequent alkyne addition reaction. Because many of the zinc centers in **7** – **9** have very different steric and electronic environments from those in **6**, it could explain the very different catalytic properties between (*R*)-**2** and (*R*)-**3**.

Compound (*R*)-**5** showed greatly reduced enantioselectivity in comparison with (*R*)-**2** (entry 4, Table 3). This demonstrates that the bulky diphenyl substituents on each of the 3,3'-bis(methoxymethyl) groups are important for the high stereo selectivity. The same product configuration for (*R*)-**2** and (*R*)-**5** suggests a similar catalyst structure. The loss of catalytic activity found for (*R*)-**4** indicates that this ligand cannot form a catalytically active site.

On the basis of the study of ligands (*R*)-**2**, (*R*)-**3**, (*R*)-**4**, and (*R*)-**5**, a reaction mechanism for the catalytic asymmetric alkyne addition to aldehydes in the presence of (*R*)-**2** could be proposed (Scheme 4). Reaction of (*R*)-**2** with excess Et₂Zn will generate **10** via **6**. The Lewis base activated Et₂Zn unit in **10** can react with phenylacetylene to generate the zinc acetylide in **11**. Coordination of an aldehyde with the two tricoordinated zinc centers in **11** will give **12**. Migration of the phenylacetylide to the activated aldehyde carbonyl followed by displacement by Et₂Zn will regenerate **10** and form the zinc propargyloxide product.

When (*R*)-**4** is treated with two equivalents of ZnEt₂, complex **13** could be generated. Because of the two central methyl groups in **13**, it makes the two central oxygen atoms both sterically and electronically unfavorable to coordinate to ZnEt₂ for the formation of an intermediate like **10**. In **10**, the two central basic oxygen atoms coordinate with Et₂Zn and activate the subsequent deprotonation of phenylacetylene. Without such activation, (*R*)-**4** cannot produce the nucleophilic alkynylzinc reagent. This could explain the inactivity of (*R*)-**4** for the catalytic asymmetric alkyne addition.

3. Asymmetric Alkyne Addition to Aromatic Aldehydes Using (*R*)-**3** in the Presence of Lewis Base Additives

As described in the previous section, the tetrahydroxyl ligand (*R*)-**3** shows very poor enantioselectivity for the phenylacetylene addition to benzaldehyde. Since the tetrahydroxyl functions of (*R*)-**3** are similar to those of TADDOLs that have shown high enantioselectivity in many asymmetric reactions including the asymmetric organozinc additions,¹⁶ we attempted to improve the reaction catalyzed by (*R*)-**3** with the addition of various Lewis bases. Table 4 summarizes the results for the reaction of phenylacetylene with benzaldehyde catalyzed by (*R*)-**3** in combination with ZnEt₂ (2.0 equiv) and a Lewis base at room temperature. The Lewis bases were added while (*R*)-**3** and Et₂Zn were mixed. We found that addition of 2 equiv Et₃N boosted the ee up to 80% (entry 9). With or without the Lewis bases, the configuration of the propargylic alcohol product remained as *S* as determined by comparing the HPLC data with those reported.^{10e}

The conditions in entry 9 of Table 4 were used for the reaction of phenylacetylene with other aromatic aldehydes. As the results summarized in Table 5 show, up to 86% ee was observed for the reaction with *ortho*-substituted benzaldehyde (entry 2, Table 5). Generally, the ee's were above 50% for the reaction of a variety of aromatic aldehydes and cinnamaldehyde.

The Lewis base Et₃N probably coordinates to the zinc centers in the zinc complexes of (*R*)-**3**, such as **7** – **9**. This could modify the structure of the catalyst and lead to the higher enantioselectivity than without the additive. However, the enantioselectivity of (*R*)-**3** even with the additive is still significantly lower than that of (*R*)-**2** in almost all the cases.

Summary

We have synthesized the BINOL ligand (*R*)-**2** that contains bulky 3,3'-tertiaryalkyl groups. This compound shows improved catalytic properties than the previously reported 3,3'-substituted BINOL ligands in the asymmetric alkyne addition to aromatic aldehydes. It can catalyze the phenylacetylene addition to aromatic aldehydes with high enantioselectivity without using $\text{Ti}(\text{O}^i\text{Pr})_4$ and a Lewis base additive. Several analogs of (*R*)-**2** have also been synthesized and their catalytic properties in the asymmetric alkyne addition to aldehydes have been studied.

Experimental Section

General Data

All the solvents were dried according to the standard methods prior to use. Aldehydes were purchased from Lancaster and used directly. Diethylzinc (1.1 M in toluene) and deuterated chloroform was purchased from Aldrich Chemical Co. $n\text{BuLi}$ (2.5 M in hexane) was purchased from ACROS Chemical Co.

A Typical Experimental Procedure for the Asymmetric Alkyne Addition to Aromatic Aldehydes by Using (*R*)-**2**

Under argon, diethylzinc (2.0 equiv) was added to a solution of (*R*)-**2** (0.3 equiv) in THF (3 mL, distilled over sodium) in a 10 mL flask. After the mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h, phenylacetylene (1.5 equiv) was added and the stirring continued for an additional hour. Then, an aldehyde (0.25 mmol) was added at 0 °C, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 36 – 40 h. The reaction was quenched with saturated NH_4Cl . The resulting mixture was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 and the extract was dried over MgSO_4 . After removal of the volatile solvent under reduced pressure, the residue was passed through a short silica gel column eluted with 2–10% ethyl acetate in petrol ether to afford the propargylic alcohol product. The enantiomeric purity of the product was determined by using HPLC Chiralcel OD column.

A Typical Experimental Procedure for the Asymmetric Alkyne Addition to Aromatic Aldehydes by Using (*R*)-**3** and Et_3N

Under argon atmosphere, diethylzinc (2.0 equiv) was added to a solution of (*R*)-**3** (0.2 equiv) in THF (3 mL, distilled over sodium) in a 10 mL flask, and then Et_3N (2 equiv) was added. After the mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h, phenylacetylene (1.5 equiv) was added and the stirring continued for an additional hour. Then, an aldehyde (0.25 mmol) was added at 0 °C, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 36 – 40 h. The reaction was quenched with saturated NH_4Cl . The resulting mixture was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 and the extract was dried over MgSO_4 . After removal of the volatile solvent under reduced pressure, the residue was passed through a short silica gel column eluted with 2–10% ethyl acetate in petrol ether to afford the propargylic alcohol product. The enantiomeric purity of the product was determined by using HPLC Chiralcel OD column.

General Procedure for the Preparation of Racemic Propargylic Alcohol

All the racemic propargylic alcohols were prepared for the HPLC analysis according to the following procedure. Under argon, $n\text{BuLi}$ (0.12 mL, 2.5 M in hexane) was added into a solution of phenylacetylene (0.35 mmol) in 3 mL tetrahydrofuran in a 10 mL round bottom flask. After stirred for 3 h, an aldehyde (0.25 mmol) was added and the reaction was continuously stirred for 8 h. The reaction mixture was quenched with ice, extracted with methylene chloride, and the extract was dried over MgSO_4 . After the volatile solvent was removed by roto-evaporation, the residue was passed through a short silica gel eluted with 2–10% ethyl acetate in petrol ether to afford the desired racemic product.

Determination of the ee's of the Chiral Propargylic Alcohol Products Formed by Using (*R*)-2 as the Catalyst

All the ee's were determined by Chiral HPLC: Chiralcel OD column and 254nm UV detector. The solvents used were hexane/2-propanol = 9/1 at 1.0 mL/min unless indicated otherwise.

1, 3-Diphenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 9.5$ min (*R*), and $t_{\text{minor}} = 16.9$ min (*S*).

1-(2-Methoxyphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 10.9$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 13.5$ min.

1-(3-Methoxyphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 12.7$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 21.6$ min.

1-(4-Methoxyphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 10.8$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 22.7$ min.

1-(2-Methylphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.2$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 14.3$ min.

1-(3-Methylphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 8.0$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 17.5$ min.

1-(4-Methylphenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.3$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 14.0$ min.

1-(3-Chlorophenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.6$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 22.9$ min.

1-(4-Chlorophenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.5$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 21.1$ min.

1-(4-Bromophenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.9$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 23.0$ min.

1-(4-Fluorophenyl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 7.1$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 18.3$ min.

1-(Naphthalen-1-yl)-3-phenyl-prop-2-yn-1-ol

Retention time: $t_{\text{major}} = 9.8$ min, and $t_{\text{minor}} = 19.1$ min (10% *i*-PrOH in hexane at 1.2 mL/min).

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 20328203, 20272039), Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University and Scientific Fund of Sichuan Province for Outstanding Young scientist. LP thanks the partial support of this work from the US National Institute of Health (R01GM58454/R01EB002037-05) and Changjiang Scholarship of the Educational Ministry of China.

References

1. (a) Marshall JA, Wang XJ. *J. Org. Chem* 1992;57:1242–1252. (b) Henderson MA, Heathcock CH. *J. Org. Chem* 1988;53:4736–4745. (c) Fox ME, Li C, Marino JP Jr, Overman LE. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:5467–5480. (d) Myers AG, Zheng B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1996;118:4492–4493.
2. (a) Vourloumis D, Kim KD, Petersen JL, Magriotis PA. *J. Org. Chem* 1996;61:4848–4852. [PubMed: 11667429] (b) Trost BM, Krische MJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1999;121:6131–6141. (c) Roush WR, Sciotti RJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1994;116:6457–6458. (d) Burgess K, Jennings LD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1991;113:6129–6139.
3. For reviews, see: (a) Pu L. *Tetrahedron* 2003;59:9873–9886. (b) Pu L, Yu HB. *Chem. Rev* 2001;101:757–824. [PubMed: 11712502] (c) Frantz DE, Fassler R, Tomooka CS, Carreira EM. *Acc. Chem. Res* 2000;33:373–381. [PubMed: 10891055] (d) Lu G, Li Y-M, Li, Chan ASC. *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2005;249:1736–1744.
4. (a) Anand NE, Carreira EM. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:9687–9688. [PubMed: 11572696] (b) Frantz DE, Fassler R, Carreira EM. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:1806–1807. (c) Sasaki H, Boyall D, Carreira EM. *Helv. Chem. Acta* 2001;81:964–971. (d) Boyall D, Lopez F, Sasaki H, Frantz D, Carreira EM. *Org. Lett* 2000;2:4233–4236. [PubMed: 11150207] (e) Boyall D, Frantz DE, Carreira EM. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:2605–2606. [PubMed: 12123387]
5. (a) Moore D, Pu L. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:1855–1857. [PubMed: 12027631] (b) Gao G, Moore D, Xie R-G, Pu L. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:4143–4146. [PubMed: 12423107] (c) Moore D, Huang W-S, Xu M-H, Pu L. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2002;43:8831–8834. (d) Lan L, Pu L. *Tetrahedron* 2004;60:7427–7430. (e) Gao G, Xie R-G, Pu L. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA)* 2004;101:5417–5420. [PubMed: 15026570] (f) Gao G, Wang Q, Yu X-Q, Xie R-G, Pu L. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl* 2006;45:122–125. [PubMed: 16299819]
6. Xu M-H, Pu L. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:4555–4557. [PubMed: 12465936]
7. (a) Lu G, Li X-S, Chan W-L, Chan ASC. *Chem. Commun* 2002:172–173. (b) Li X-S, Lu G, Kwok WH, Chan ASC. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2002;124:12636–12637. [PubMed: 12392391] (c) Lu G, Li X-S, Chen G, Chan WL, Chan ASC. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 2003;14:449–452. (d) Liu Q-Z, Xie N-S, Luo Z-B, Cui X, Cun L-F, Gong LZ, Mi A-Q, Jiang YZ. *J. Org. Chem* 2003;68:7921–7924. [PubMed: 14510582] (e) Takita R, Yakura K, Ohshima T, Shibasaki M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:13760–13761. [PubMed: 16201775]
8. (a) Dahmen S. *Org. Lett* 2004;6:2113–2116. [PubMed: 15200298] (b) Fang T, Du D-M, Lu S-F, Xu J-X. *Org. Lett* 2005;7:2081–2084. [PubMed: 15901139] (c) Wolf C, Liu S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:10996–10997. [PubMed: 16925396]
9. (a) Xu Z-Q, Wang R, Xu J-K, Da C-S, Yan W-J, Chen C. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl* 2003;42:5754–5749. (b) Xu Z-Q, Chen C, Xu J-K, Miao M-B, Yan W-J, Wang R. *Org. Lett* 2004;6:1193–1195. [PubMed: 15070295] (c) Jiang B, Chen Z-L, Xiong W-N. *Chem. Commun* 2002:1524–1525. (d) Jiang B, Si Y-G. *Adv. Synth. Catal* 2004;346:669–674. (e) Zhou Y-F, Wang R, Xu Z-Q, Yan W-J, Liu L, Gao Y-F, Da C-S. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 2004;15:589–591.
10. (a) Niwa S, Soai K. *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. I* 1990:937–943. (b) Ishizaki M, Hoshino O. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 1994;5:1901–1904. (c) Kamble RM, Singh VK. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2003;44:5347–5349. (d) Li M, Zhu X-Z, Yuan K, Cao B-X, Hou X-L. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 2004;15:219–222. (e) Pizzuti MG, Superchi S. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 2005;16:2263–2269.
11. Corey EJ, Cimprich KA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1994;116:3151–3152.
12. Trost BM, Weiss AH, Wangelin AJ, von . *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:8–9. [PubMed: 16390095]
13. Wang Q, Chen X, Tao L, Wang L, Xiao D, Yu X-Q, Pu L. *J. Org. Chem* 2007;72:97–101. [PubMed: 17194086]
14. Dixon DI, Tillman AL. *Synlett* 2005;17:2635–2638.
15. Orito Y, Hashimoto S, Ishizuka T, Nakajima M. *Tetrahedron* 2006;62:390–400.
16. Seebach D, Beck AK, Heckel A. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* 2001;40:92–138.

Scheme 1.

Reaction of Phenylacetylene with Benzaldehyde in the Presence of *(R)*-**2** and Et_2Zn .

Scheme 4.

A Proposed Mechanism for the Catalytic Asymmetric Reaction of Phenylacetylene with Aldehydes in the Presence of *(R)*-**2** and Et_2Zn .

Table 1Results for the Reaction of Phenylacetylene with Benzaldehyde Catalyzed by (*R*)-**2**.^a

Entry	(<i>R</i>)- 2 (mol%)	Solvent	T (°C)	ee (%)
1 ^b	20	CH ₂ Cl ₂	0	3
2 ^b	20	toluene	0	10
3 ^b	20	ether	0	47
4 ^b	20	THF	0	74
5 ^c	20	THF	0	53
6	20	THF	0	85
7	20	THF	30	55
8	20	THF	−21	89
9	15	THF	0	80
10	25	THF	0	89
11	30	THF	0	91
12	35	THF	0	91

^a Unless indicated otherwise the following procedure was used. (*R*)-**2** and Et₂Zn (2 equiv) in THF (3 mL) were stirred at rt for 1 h, and then phenylacetylene (1.5 equiv) was added. After an additional hour, benzaldehyde was added at 0 °C.

^b (*R*)-**2**, phenylacetylene and Et₂Zn in solvent were stirred at rt for 2 h. Then benzaldehyde was added at 0 °C.

^c Phenylacetylene and Et₂Zn in THF (1 mL) were stirred at rt for 1 h, and then (*R*)-**2** in THF (2 mL) was added. After an additional hour, benzaldehyde was added at 0 °C.

Table 2Results for Phenylacetylene Addition to Aldehydes Catalyzed by (*R*)-**2**.

Entry	Aldehyde	Product	Isolated Yield (%)	ee (%)
1			81	91
2			76	87
3			75	94
4			70	86
5			67	90
6			71	90
7			77	88
8			80	86
9			75	92
10			80	90
11			75	92
12			70	90

Table 3Results for the Reaction of Phenylacetylene with Benzaldehyde in the Presence of the Chiral Ligands and Et₂Zn.

Entry	Catalyst	ee (%)	Configuration
1	(<i>R</i>)- 2	91	R
2	(<i>R</i>)- 3	28	S
3	(<i>R</i>)- 4	No reaction	
4	(<i>R</i>)- 5	32	R

Table 4Reaction of Phenylacetylene with Benzaldehyde Catalyzed by Using (*R*)-**3**, ZnEt₂ and a Lewis Base.

Entry	(<i>R</i>)- 3	Additive ^a	ee (%)
1	0.2 eq	HMPA (2 eq)	15(S)
2	0.2 eq	DMSO (2 eq)	7(S)
3	0.2 eq	Pyridine (2 eq)	9(S)
4	0.2 eq	Ph ₃ PO (2 eq)	7(S)
5	0.2 eq	IM (2 eq)	22(S)
6	0.2 eq	DMBA (2 eq)	66(S)
7	0.2 eq	DMA (2 eq)	76(S)
8	0.2 eq	NMM (2 eq)	77(S)
9	0.2 eq	Et₃N (2 eq)	80(S)
10	0.2 eq	Et ₃ N (1 eq)	77(S)
11	0.2 eq	Et ₃ N (4 eq)	77(S)

^aIM: Imidazole. DMBA: N,N-dimethylbenzylamine. DMA: N,N-dimethylaniline. NMM: N-methylmorpholine.

Table 5Results for Phenylacetylene Addition to Aldehydes Catalyzed by Using (*R*)-**3**, ZnEt₂ and Et₃N.

Entry	Aldehyde	Product	Yield (%)	ee (%)
1			83	80 (S)
2			76	86
3			74	76
4			65	66
5			76	70
6			84	69
7			83	50
8			75	57
9			78	51
10			83	54
11			75	65