Published in final edited form as:

J Org Chem. 2009 November 6; 74(21): 8314–8320. doi:10.1021/jo901459t.

Rh(I)-Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation of Allenol Esters to Prepare Acetoxy 4-Alkylidene Cyclopent-3-en-2-ones

Kay M. Brummond, Matthew M. Davis, and Chaofeng Huang

Department of Chemistry, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Kay M. Brummond: kbrummon@pitt.edu

Abstract

A Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction of allenol esters has been examined and its synthetic viability established for the conversion of trisubstituted allenes to bicyclo-[4.3.0], and -[5.3.0] skeletons possessing an α -acetoxy cyclopentadienone. Tetrasubstituted allenol acetates gave elimination products, providing examples of a cyclocarbonylation reaction between an alkyne and a latent cumulene or cumulene equivalent. Cleavage of the acetate affords a free hydroxyl group illustrating the utility of this method for accessing α -hydroxy carbonyls from allenol esters.

Introduction

α -Hydroxy carbonyls are important building blocks in organic synthesis and are present in a number of biologically active molecules.¹ A variety of methods exist for forming α -hydroxyl carbonyls, the most commonly used protocol being the oxidation of enol ethers.^{1c} In view of incompatibilities of some functional groups to these oxidation conditions,^{1b} the regioselectivity requirements for the enolization step,² and redox economy considerations,³ synthetic alternatives to this late stage enolization/oxidation strategy would be useful.

The Pauson-Khand reaction provides a powerful method for the preparation of highly functionalized cyclopentenone-containing compounds.⁴ However, missing from the cyclocarbonylation reaction arsenal is efficient ways of accessing an α -hydroxycarbonyl moiety via an enol ether or vinyl ester precursor. Shore demonstrated that alkoxy cyclopentenones could be prepared from enol ether precursors⁵ using a Pauson-Khand reaction and subsequently a number of groups have rendered this reaction asymmetric.⁶ However, relatively harsh conditions are required for the conversion of the alkoxy cyclopentenone to a hydroxycyclopentenone, thus the alkoxy group serves as a control element in the reaction and then is typically removed.⁶ The $\text{Co}_2(\text{CO})_8$ -mediated Pauson-Khand reaction of vinyl esters to form an α -acetoxy- or α -benzyloxy-cyclopentenones, results in concurrent loss of the ester moiety through a proposed single electron reduction.⁷

Correspondence to: Kay M. Brummond, kbrummon@pitt.edu.

Supporting Information **Available:** Full experimental protocols and characterization of new compounds. This information is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

The Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction⁸ of allene-ynes is an efficient method for synthesizing a variety of alkylidene cyclopentenones including bicyclo[5.3.0]undecadienones, a long sought after ring system previously inaccessible to cyclocarbonylation methodologies.⁹ It was hypothesized that a Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction of allenol acetates affording α -acetoxy cyclopentadienones may be possible due to the mildness of the reaction conditions and the unlikely prospect of the rhodium(I) catalyst participating in a single electron transfer process under these reaction conditions.¹⁰ Moreover, allenol acetates are well-known and are prepared via a formal [3,3]-sigmatropic rearrangement of a propargyl acetates using a variety of transition metal catalysts such as Ag, Au, Cu, Pt, and Rh.¹¹ Thus, readily available allenol acetates afford an opportunity to directly access α -acetoxy cyclopentadienones, which in turn can be used as precursors to α -hydroxycarbonyl-containing compounds. Herein, a Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction to form α -acetoxy cyclopentadienones is reported.

Results and Discussion

Substrate Design

Once the feasibility of the cyclocarbonylation reaction of allenol acetates to produce α -acetoxy carbonyls has been established, our research objective is to examine several cycloaddition substrates. Guided by a plethora of natural product substructures that would benefit from this reaction: 1) the chain length of the tether between the allene and alkyne will be varied ($n = 1-4$); 2) substitution on the allene, alkyne and tether altered; and 3) stereochemical consequences of the [3,3]-sigmatropic rearrangement of **1** to give **2** and the cyclocarbonylation reaction to give **3** will be examined (Scheme 1). Furthermore, imbedding the allene into a conformationally anchored cyclohexane ring will serve as an effective method for examining diastereoselective issues.

Preparation of Propargyl Acetates

Propargyl acetates were prepared using two general procedures. Preparation of cyclohexane-based substrates began by alkylating the lithium enolate of dimethyl hydrazone **4**, with the corresponding halides or triflates **5a-c** (Scheme 2).¹² Acidic hydrolysis with oxalic acid gave ketones **6a** and **6c** ($n = 1, 3$) in 44% and 83% yield.¹³ Ketone **6b** was obtained in only 5% yield, possibly due to a competing E2 elimination of the triflate to form an enyne. The diastereomers of **6a-c** were separated via column chromatography and the major diastereomer was carried forward. Addition of ethynyl or 1-propynylmagnesium bromide to **6a-c** gave the corresponding propargyl alcohols in 63-90% yields with diastereoselectivities ranging from 1:1 to 3:1. The major diastereomers were assigned based upon the predisposition of small nucleophiles to add axially to substituted cyclohexanones.¹⁴ Separation of the two diastereomers was readily accomplished via column chromatography. The major diastereomers were acetylated using triethylamine, DMAP, and acetic anhydride yielding a single diastereomer of propargyl acetates **7a-d** in 39-47% yield from ketones **6a-c**. Two substrates were prepared to examine electronic and steric effects of the carboxy group. A bulky pivaloyl group was appended to the corresponding propargyl alcohol from **6c** using trimethylacetic anhydride and catalytic Sc(OTf)₃ to give **7e** in 81% yield.¹⁵ An electron withdrawing *p*-nitrobenzoate was attached to the same propargyl alcohol using 4-nitrobenzoyl chloride and DMAP to give **7f** in 74% yield.¹⁶

Linear propargyl acetates were prepared using two different methods (Scheme 3). Propargyl acetates **9a-d** ($n = 1, 2$) were prepared by addition of ethynylmagnesium bromide or 1-propynylmagnesium bromide to aldehyde **8a** or ketones **8b-c** followed by in situ acetylation with acetyl chloride furnishing the desired products in 55-83% yields.¹⁷ For propargyl acetate **9e** ($R^2 = n\text{-Pr}$) addition of the lithium acetylide of 1-pentyne to ketone **8c** gave the

propargyl alcohol, which was then acetylated using triethylamine, DMAP, and acetic anhydride to obtain propargyl acetate **9e** in 49% yield over two steps. Propargyl acetates **9f-g** were prepared by reacting a slight excess of the sodium salt of methyl acetoacetate with iodides **5c** and **5d**.¹⁸ After an aqueous work up, the crude material was subjected to Krapcho decarboxylation by heating the ketoester to 130 °C with lithium chloride in wet DMSO to obtain 8-(trimethylsilyl)oct-7-yn-2-one or 9-(trimethylsilyl)non-8-yn-2-one.¹⁹ Purification of the ketones proved impractical and as a result the crude material was subjected to alkynylation with ethynylmagnesium bromide. After chromatographic purification, the alcohols were acetylated using triethylamine, DMAP, and acetic anhydride to obtain propargyl acetates **9f** and **9g** in 38 and 22% yields over 4 steps.

Formation of Allenol Acetates From Propargyl Acetates

Previously reported conditions to form allenol acetates were screened for efficiency and diastereoselectivity. Reacting a single diastereomer of **7c** with AuCl₃ at 60 °C (entry 1, Table 1) gave complete conversion to the allene-yne to **10c** in 30 min in a 1:1 diastereomeric ratio (dr).^{11k} Performing this same reaction at room temperature with AuCl₃ gave **10c** as a 1:1 mixture of diastereomers in 30 min (entry 2). Upon lowering the temperature to -30 °C, the reaction took 5 h to go to 55% completion and afforded **10c** a 1:1 dr (entry 3). Increasing the temperature to 90 °C decreased the reaction time to give full conversion to allenol acetate **10c** in 12 min in a 1:1 dr (entry 4). Two Ag(I) catalysts, AgBF₄ and AgSbF₆, were examined (entries 5-8) with no significant changes in diastereoselectivity, but significant loss of the TMS group was observed.^{11f,i} Using [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ gave only a trace amount of product after 14 h (entry 9).^{11j} Using the PtCl₂ conditions reported by Malacria,^{11h} clean conversion to **10c** was observed with a 1:1 dr (entry 10). Among the conditions examined, AuCl₃ afforded the allenol acetates in the highest yield, and shortest reaction times. The reaction temperature of the AuCl₃-catalyzed process had no effect on the diastereoselectivity.

Interestingly, reacting both diastereomers of **7c** independently with AuCl₃ at room temperature showed little difference in reaction time, yield, or dr (entries 1 and 2, Table 2). However, when using [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ significant differences in reactivity for the two diastereomers were observed (compare entries 3 and 4). With the alkyne *cis* to the *t*-butyl group only trace amounts of product were observed after 72 h (entry 3). Conversely, the *trans* diastereomer showed complete conversion to **10c** in 4 h in 94% yield (entry 4).

Similar results were seen when **11** (7:1 dr) was reacted with [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ (Scheme 4). After 5 h at 60 °C, the minor diastereomer possessing a *trans* relationship between the alkyne and the *t*-butyl group was completely converted to allene **12**, and no change was observed for the major diastereomer of **11**, based upon ¹H NMR. Thus the stereochemistry of the propargyl acetate significantly impacts the reaction time and efficiency of the rearrangement when using [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂, with the axially oriented alkyne being the slowest and least efficient. It is postulated that developing 1,3-diaxial interactions of the alkyne coordinated to [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ slow this reaction.

With optimized rearrangement conditions in hand, propargyl acetates **7a-c** were transformed to the trisubstituted allenol acetates **10a-c** using AuCl₃ in 74–84% yield as 1:1 mixtures of diastereomers (entries 1-3, Table 3). Tetrasubstituted allenol acetate **10d** was isolated in 54% yield due to the incomplete consumption of starting material and the relative instability of **10d** evidenced by decomposition within 4 h of standing in CDCl₃ at rt (entry 4). Reacting pivaloate ester **7e** to AuCl₃ readily formed allene-yne **10e** in 1 h (91%, 2:1 dr, entry 5). Subjecting *p*-nitrobenzoate ester **7f** to AuCl₃-catalyzed conditions gave allene-yne **10f** in 87% yield in a 1:1 dr (entry 6). Reacting the acyclic secondary propargyl acetate **9a** to the

AuCl₃-catalyzed reaction conditions yielded only trace amounts of 1,3-disubstituted allene even if the reaction temperature was increased to 60 °C; [Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ and PtCl₂ conditions were also tried, but to no avail (entry 7). Tertiary acyclic propargyl acetates **9b** and **9c** (entries 8 and 9) rearranged to give the desired allenol acetates **13b** and **13c** in 46% and 67% yields. Longer reaction times were required when compared to the analogous cyclohexane based propargyl acetates (compare entries 1 and 2 to entries 8 and 9). Substituting an alkyl group for the proton on the terminus of the alkyne had little effect on the yield for the rearrangement of the linear system compared to the analogous cyclohexane based system (compare entries 9 and 10 to 14 and 15). Propargyl acetates **9f** and **9g** (n = 3, 4) reacted in significantly shorter reaction times and gave **13f** and **13g** in 78 and 76% yields, respectively (entries 12 and 13). The reaction time was dependent upon the tether length; for example, the more removed the appended alkyne from the propargyl acetate, the faster the reaction. It is postulated that increasing the distance of the appended alkyne from the ring minimizes coordination of the gold catalyst allowing for more rapid catalyst turnover. Reacting propargyl acetate **14a** (R = H)^{9a} to AuCl₃ gave allene-yne **15a** in near quantitative yield as a 1.3:1 dr (entry 14). However, treating propargyl acetate **14b** (R = Me)^{9a} to AuCl₃ gave allene-yne **15b** in a 43% yield (entry 15). The low yield is attributed to slow reaction times, because after 19 h propargyl acetate **14b** was still observed in the crude ¹H NMR along with the appearance of a byproduct containing alkene resonances by ¹H NMR.

Rh(I)-Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation Reaction of Allenol Acetates to Form α-Acetoxy Cyclopentadienones

Next, the feasibility, scope and limitation studies of the Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction of allenol acetates for the formation of bi- and tricyclic ring systems were explored (Table 4). Previously developed and optimized conditions were used to effect the cyclocarbonylation reaction of allenol acetates.⁹ Reaction of allenol acetate **10a** to the standard Rh(I) cyclocarbonylation conditions gave only a 19% yield of **16a** after 8 h (entry 1). Allene-ynes **10b** and **10c** underwent cyclocarbonylation to produce **16b** and **16c** in 67% and 76% yields, respectively (entries 2 and 3). Formation of the [6-7-5] ring system took significantly longer than the analogous [6-6-5] ring system (17 h vs 1 h). Subjecting **10e** to cyclocarbonylation conditions gave a 2.3:1 dr of α-acetoxy 4-alkylidene cyclopentadienone **16e** in 51% yield (entry 4). Cyclocarbonylation of **10f** gave the cyclized product **16f** as a 1.8:1 mixture of diastereomers in 34% yield (entry 5). Thus, it appears that neither steric nor electronic changes in the carboxy group significantly impact the diastereomeric ratio of the products. Reaction of linear allene-yne **13b** (entry 6) gave **17b** in 28% yield along with significant decomposition products, indicating that either the starting material or the bicyclic [5-5] ring systems are unstable to the reaction conditions. Cyclocarbonylation of allene-yne **13c** and **13f** are readily accomplished giving **17c** and **17f** in 53% and 61% yields, respectively (entries 7 and 8). The reaction of **13g** to produce an [8-5] ring system resulted in only trace amounts of the product with the majority of allenol ester rearranging to the conjugated dienol acetate (entry 9).²⁰ Cyclocarbonylation of allenol-acetate **15a** gave the α-acetoxy 4-alkylidene cyclopentenone **19a** in 19 h and 74% yield.

Cyclocarbonylation reactions of tetrasubstituted allenes of **10d** and **15b** afforded a 26% yield of **20** in 69 h and a 45% yield of **21** in 47 h, respectively (Scheme 5). Linear allenol acetate **13d** gave a 49% yield of trienone **22d**, along with a trace amount of the desilylated product observed in the crude ¹H NMR. Similarly, allenol acetate **13e** afforded triene **22e** in 42% yield along with desilylated **22e'** in 13% yield. Compounds **20**, **21**, and **22d,e** proved relatively unstable with observable decomposition by ¹H NMR after 24 h in a freezer. *These are examples of a cyclocarbonylation reaction between an alkyne and a latent cumulene or cumulene equivalent.* Two possible mechanisms for the formation of these compounds have been considered. One involves elimination of the acetoxy group prior to cyclocarbonylation

and the other mechanism involves elimination of the acetoxy group after the cyclocarbonylation process. Studies are underway to elucidate the reaction pathway and synthetic utility of this transformation.

The cyclocarbonylation of allene-ynes **24a** and **24c** gave cycloadducts **25a** and **25c** in 32% and 70% yields (Scheme 6), paralleling the yields obtained for analogous [6-5-5] and [6-7-5] ring systems **16a** and **16c** (Table 4, entries 1 and 3) suggesting that the acetoxy group has little influence on the yields of the cyclocarbonylation. Conversely, the reaction times for the cyclocarbonylation of **24a** and **24c** were 30 and 40 min, compared to 8 and 17 h for **16a** and **16c** showing that the acetoxy group slowed the cyclocarbonylation reaction considerably.

Diastereoselective Considerations

To probe the origin of the slight increase in diastereomeric ratios (1:1 to 2:1) in the transformation of **10c** to **16c**, the cyclocarbonylation of diastereomerically enriched allene-yne **10c** was performed in *d*₈-toluene and monitored via ¹H NMR (Table 5). Starting with 3:1 dr (or 1:3) of **10c**, rapid isomerization of the allenol acetate was observed giving a 1:1 mixtures of allenol acetates in 40 min with no evidence of **16c** (entries 1 and 2). Performing the reaction at room temperature slowed the rate of isomerization but still resulted in a 1:1 dr of **10c** after 7 h with no evidence of **16c** (entries 3 and 4). Heating allene **10c** in the absence of rhodium catalyst for 24 h at 90 °C resulted in no change in dr. Thus, under the Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction conditions, rapid isomerization of the allene of **10c** is occurring. Moreover, subjecting a 5 : 1 dr of **16c** to the cyclocarbonylation reaction conditions afforded **16c** with no change in the dr after 24 h. Therefore, the diastereoselectivity occurs by a selective transformation of one allenol acetate to the cyclocarbonylation product over the other.

Finally, reacting acetate **16c** with K₂CO₃ in MeOH/H₂O gave alcohol **26** in 60% yield (Scheme 7), thus demonstrating the synthetic utility of the Rh(I)-catalyzed allenic cyclocarbonylation reaction for accessing α-hydroxy containing cyclopentadienones.

Conclusions

We have demonstrated the first Rh(I)-catalyzed cyclocarbonylation reaction for the formation of α-acetoxy 4-alkylidene cyclopentenones from both cyclohexane derived and linear allene-ynes. Cyclohexane and linear allene-ynes [6-5] and [7-5] ring systems were prepared in good yields, however [5-5] ring systems proved less successful. Control experiments confirmed that yields for the cyclocarbonylation reactions for acetoxy-containing allenes parallel that of hydrocarbon-only allenes, but that the former reactions are significantly decelerated. Liberation of the acetate to the free alcohol was also readily accomplished yielding an α-hydroxy ketone. Studies are underway to expand the scope of this reaction and to render the cyclocarbonylation reaction stereoselective.

Experimental Section

General Procedure for the AuCl₃ Catalyzed Allenol Ester Formation—A flame-dried, 5 mL round-bottomed flask equipped with a Teflon-coated stir-bar was charged with AuCl₃ (0.1 equiv) in a nitrogen filled glove box. The flask was removed from the glove box, wrapped in aluminum foil, and placed under N₂. A solution of propargyl acetate in toluene (0.2 M, toluene degassed by bubbling with nitrogen for ~5 min) was added rapidly via cannula. The reaction was stirred at rt in a darkened hood. When the reaction was complete as observed by TLC, the mixture was passed through a plug of silica gel using hexanes/EtOAc and concentrated in vacuo.

3-Methyl-9-(trimethylsilyl)nona-1,2-dien-8-ynyl acetate (13f)—Following the General Procedure for the AuCl₃ Catalyzed Allenol Ester Formation, AuCl₃ (4 mg, 0.01 mmol) and propargyl acetate **9f** (32 mg, 0.12 mmol) were reacted in toluene (0.61 mL) for 30 min. Purification via flash chromatography (hexanes/EtOAc, 9:1, v/v) afforded the title compound (25 mg, 79%) as a colorless oil. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.30 (sext, *J* = 2.1 Hz, 1H), 2.26–2.20 (m, 2H), 2.16–2.02 (m, 2H), 2.13 (s, 3H), 1.83 (d, *J* = 2.1 Hz, 3H), 1.61–1.49 (m, 4H), 0.14 (s, 9H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 189.4, 168.8, 115.7, 109.7, 107.2, 84.6, 34.6, 28.0, 26.3, 20.9, 20.4, 19.6, 0.1; IR: 3065, 2943, 2862, 2174, 1976, 1750, 1456, 1369, 1249, 1215, 1066, 1039, 843 cm⁻¹; MS *m/z* (relative intensity): 249 (36%, M-CH₃), 222 (26%), 117 (100%), 84 (88%), 75 (79%), 73 (95%); HRMS-EI (*m/z*): [M - CH₃]⁺ calcd for C₁₄H₂₁O₂Si, 249.1311; found, 249.1308.

General Procedure for the [Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation

Reaction—A flame-dried test tube (10 × 100 mm) equipped with a Teflon-coated stir-bar was charged with allene-yne and toluene (0.1 M). The tube was evacuated for 3–5 s and refilled with CO(g) (3×). To the allene-yne solution was added [Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ (0.10 equiv) in one portion and the test tube was evacuated and refilled with CO(g) (3×). The test tube was placed in a preheated 90 °C oil bath and stirred under CO(g). After the reaction was complete by TLC, the mixture was cooled to rt, passed through a short plug of silica gel using hexanes/EtOAc and concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was purified by flash chromatography.

(8E)-1,2,4,5,6,7-Hexahydro-8-methyl-3-(trimethylsilyl)-2-oxoazulen-1-yl acetate (17f)

—Following the General Procedure for the [Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation Reaction, allene-yne **13f** (27 mg, 0.10 mmol) and [Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ (3 mg, 0.008 mmol) were reacted in toluene (1.0 mL) for 46 h. Purification via flash chromatography (hexanes/EtOAc, 95:5, v/v) afforded the title compound (18 mg, 62%) as a slightly yellow oil. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ: 5.73 (s, 1H), 2.87 (dt, *J* = 14.7, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.81–2.70 (m, 1H), 2.51–2.32 (m, 2H), 2.15 (s, 3H), 1.94–1.72 (m, 4H), 1.85 (s, 3H), 0.25 (s, 9H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ: 204.4, 181.8, 170.0, 143.5, 136.8, 134.5, 73.5, 34.1, 30.6, 25.9, 24.1, 23.7, 20.7, -0.2; IR: 2937, 2865, 1746, 1697, 1528, 1369, 1246, 1224, 1049, 842.1 cm⁻¹; MS *m/z* (relative intensity): 292 (14%, M⁺), 266 (24%), 249 (21%), 232 (71%), 217 (28%), 117 (51%), 75 (88%), 73 (100%); HRMS-EI (*m/z*): [M]⁺ calcd for C₁₆H₂₄O₃Si, 292.1495; found, 292.1485.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the National Institutes of Health (GM54161) for financial support of this project.

References

1. For selected examples, see: Ball M, Andrews SP, Wierschem F, Cleator E, Smith MD, Ley SV. *Org Lett*. 2007; 9:663–666. [PubMed: 17256950] Ley SV, Antonello A, Balskus EP, Booth DT, Christensen SB, Cleator E, Gold H, Högenaur K, Hüniger U, Myers RM, Oliver SF, Simic O, Smith MS, Søhoel H, Woolford JA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2004; 101:12073–12078. [PubMed: 15226504] Chen BC, Zhou P, Davies FA, Ciganek E. *Org React*. 2003; 62:1. and references therein. Tang YQ, Sattler I, Thiericke R, Grabley S, Feng XZ. *Eur J Org Chem*. 2000:2401–2406.
2. Krafft ME, Holton RA. *Tetrahedron Lett*. 1983; 24:1345–1348.
3. Burns NZ, Baran PS, Hoffmann RW. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2009; 48:2854–2867.

4. For Reviews, see: Shibata T. *Adv Synth Catal.* 2006; 348:2328–2336. Chung YK, Park KH. *Synlett.* 2005; 4:545–559. Gibson SE, Mainolfi N. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2005; 44:3022–3037. Laschat S, Becheanu A, Bell T, Baro A. *Synlett.* 2005; 17:2547–2570. Alcaide B, Almendros P. *Eur J Org Chem.* 2004:3377–3383. Perez-Castells J, Blanco-Urgoiti J, Anorbe L, Perez-Serrano L, Dominguez G. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2004; 33:32–42. [PubMed: 14737507] Gibson SE, Stevenazzi A. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2003; 42:1800–1810. Carretero JC, Rivero MR, Adrio J. *Eur J Org Chem.* 2002:2881–2889. Brummond KM, Kent JL. *Tetrahedron.* 2000; 56:3263–3283. Schore NE. *Organic Reactions.* 1991; 40:1–90.
5. Schore NE, Croudace MC. *J Org Chem.* 1981; 46:5357–5363.
6. (a) Castro J, Moyano A, Pericàs MA, Riera A, Greene AE, Alvarez-Larena A, Piniella JF. *J Org Chem.* 1996; 61:9016–9020. [PubMed: 11667888] (b) Castro J, Moyano A, Pericàs MA, Riera A, Greene AE. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry.* 1994; 5:307–310. (c) Verdager X, Moyano A, Pericàs MA, Riera A, Greene AE, Piniella JF, Alvarez-Larena A. *J Organomet Chem.* 1992; 433:305–310. (d) Castro J, Sorensen H, Riera A, Morin C, Moyano A, Pericàs MA, Greene AE. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1990; 112:9388–9389.
7. Kerr WJ, McLaughlin M, Pauson PL, Robertson SM. *J Organomet Chem.* 2001; 630:104–117.
8. (a) Koga Y, Kobayashi T, Narasaka K. *Chem Lett.* 1998:249. (b) Jeong N, Lee S, Sung BK. *Organometallics.* 1998; 17:3642–3644. (c) Kobayashi T, Koga Y, Narasaka K. *J Organomet Chem.* 2001; 624:73–87.
9. (a) Brummond KM, Chen D, Davis MM. *J Org Chem.* 2008; 73:5064–5068. [PubMed: 18522429] (b) Hirose T, Miyakoshi N, Mukai C. *J Org Chem.* 2008; 73:1061–1066. [PubMed: 18161987]
10. Barriere F, Geiger WE. *Organometallics.* 2001; 20:2133–2135.
11. For selected examples, see: Lemeire G, Gandon V, Cariou K, Fukuyama T, Dhiman AL, Fensterbank L, Malacria M. *Org Lett.* 2007; 9:2207–2209. [PubMed: 17455944] Caruana PA, Frontier AJ. *Tetrahedron.* 2007; 63:10646–10656. Yeom H, Yoon S, Shin S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2007; 48:4817–4820. Buzas A, Gagosz F. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:12614–12615. [PubMed: 17002332] Marion N, Diez-Gonzalez S, de Fremont P, Noble AR, Nolan SP. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2006; 45:3647–3650. Zhao J, Hughes CO, Toste FD. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:7436–7437. [PubMed: 16756286] Zhang L. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2005; 127:16804–16805. [PubMed: 16316224] Cariou K, Mainetti E, Fensterbank L, Malacria M. *Tetrahedron.* 2004; 60:9745–9755. Sromek AW, Kel'in AV, Gevorgyan V. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2004; 43:2280–2282. Bowden B, Cookson RC, Davis HA. *J Chem Soc, Perkin Trans 1.* 1973:2634–2637. Miki K, Ohe K, Uemura S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2003; 44:2019–2022. Cookson RC, Cramp MC, Parsons PJ. *Chem Comm.* 1980:197–198. Oelberg DG, Schiavelli MD. *J Org Chem.* 1977; 42:1804–1806. von Schlossarczyk H, Sieber W, Hesse M, Hansen HJ, Schmid H. *Helv Chim Acta.* 1973; 56:875–944.
12. Nakamura E, Kubota K, Sakata G. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1997; 119:5457–5458.
13. Enders D, Nührling A, Runsink J. *Chirality.* 2000; 12:374–377. [PubMed: 10824155]
14. Eliel, EL.; Wilen, SH. *Stereochemistry of Organic Compounds.* John Wiley and Sons; 1994. p. 735–736.
15. Ishihara K, Kubota M, Kurihara H, Yamamoto H. *J Org Chem.* 1996; 61:4560–4567. [PubMed: 11667380]
16. Anjun S, Marco-Contelles J. *Tetrahedron.* 2005; 61:4793–4803.
17. Cruciani P, Stammer R, Aubert C, Malacria M. *J Org Chem.* 1996; 61:2699–2708. [PubMed: 11667101]
18. (a) Bräse S, Wertal H, Frank D, Vidovič D, de Meijere A. *Eur J Org Chem.* 2005:4167–4178. (b) Hodgson DM, Labande AH, Pierard FYTM, Castro MAE. *J Org Chem.* 2003; 68:6153–6159. [PubMed: 12895044] (c) Lomberget T, Bouyssi D, Balme G. *Synthesis.* 2005:311–329.
19. Trost BM, Jungheim LN. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1980; 102:7910–7925.
20. Conjugated dienol acetate **18** was observed in ~1:1 E/Z ratio

Scheme 1.
Substrate Design

Scheme 2.
Preparation of Propargyl Acetates **7a-f**

Scheme 3.
Preparation of Propargyl Acetates **9a-g**

Scheme 4.
[Rh(OCOCF₃)₂]₂ Catalyzed Rearrangement of **11**

Scheme 5.

The $[\text{Rh}(\text{CO})_2\text{Cl}]_2$ Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation Reaction of Tetrasubstituted Allenol Esters

Scheme 6.
Preparation and Cyclocarbonylation of Allene-ynes **24a** and **24c**

Scheme 7.
Deprotection of **16c**

Table 1

Catalyst Screening for Rearrangement

entry	catalyst	mol %	T (°C)	time (h)	conversion % (isolated %) ^a	d ^b
1	AuCl ₃	10	60	0.5	100 (71)	1:1
2	AuCl ₃	10	rt	0.5	100 (74)	1:1
3	AuCl ₃	20	-30	5	55	1:1
4	AuCl ₃	10	90	0.2	100 (62)	1:1
5	AgBF ₄	50	rt	4	84 ^c	1:1
6	AgSbF ₆	10	60	3	83	2:1
7	AgSbF ₆	10	rt	19	90 ^c	1:1
8	AgSbF ₆ /PPh ₃	20	rt	17	73	1:1
9	[Rh(OCOCF ₃) ₂] ₂	2	60	14	2	1:1
10	PtCl ₂	10	40	96	100	1:1

^aConversion determined by ¹H NMR^bDiastereomeric ratio determined comparing allenyl protons by ¹H NMR^cSignificant loss of TMS observed by ¹H NMR

Au(III)- and Rh(II)-Catalyzed Rearrangement

^a Approximate conversion by ¹H NMR

Table 3

Preparation of Allenol Acetates^a

entry	propargyl acetate	time (h)	isolated yield (%)	dr ^c
1 ^b	7a n = 1 R ¹ = H, R ² = Me	3	84	1:1
2 ^b	7b n = 2 R ¹ = H, R ² = Me	0.5	80	1.1:1
3 ^b	7c n = 3 R ¹ = H, R ² = Me	0.5	74	1:1
4 ^b	7d n = 3 R ¹ = Me, R ² = Me	5	53	1.2:1
5	7e n = 3 R ¹ = H, R ² = <i>t</i> -Bu	1	91	1.4:1
6	7f n = 3 R ¹ = H, R ² = <i>p</i> -NO ₂ -C ₆ H ₄	16	87	1.4:1
7	9a n = 1, R ¹ = H, R ² = H	20	trace ^c	NA
8	9b n = 1, R ¹ = Me, R ² = H	19	46	NA
9	9c n = 2, R ¹ = Me, R ² = H	4	67 ^d	NA
10	9d n = 2, R ¹ = R ² = Me	1.5	64	NA
11	9e n = 2, R ¹ = Me, R ² = <i>n</i> -Pr	1.5	58	NA
12	9f n = 3, R ¹ = Me, R ² = H	0.5	79	NA
13	9g n = 4, R ¹ = Me, R ² = H	0.5	77	NA

entry	propargyl acetate	time (h)	isolated yield (%)	dr ^c

14 ^e	14a R = H	4	quant	1.3:1
15 ^f	14b R = Me	19	43	1.5:1

^a Conditions: AuCl₃ (10 mol %), toluene, rt

^b Reacted as a single diastereomer

^c Observed by ¹H NMR

^d Contaminated with unknown impurity

^e Reacted as a 4:1 dr

^f Reacted as a 5:1 dr

Table 4

[Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ Catalyzed Cyclocarbonylation Reactions^a

entry	allene-yne	time (h)	yield (%)	dr ^b
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>10</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>16</p> </div> </div>				
1	10a n = 1, R ¹ = Me 1:1 dr	8	19	1.3:1
2	10b n = 2, R ¹ = Me 1.1:1 dr	1	67	1:1.2
3	10c n = 3, R ¹ = Me 1:1 dr	17	76	1.9:1
4	10e n = 3, R ¹ = <i>t</i> -Bu 2:1 dr	18	51	2.3:1
5	10f n = 3, R ¹ = <i>p</i> -NO ₂ -C ₆ H ₄ 1.4:1 dr	18	35	1.8:1
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>13</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>17</p> </div> </div>				
6	13b n = 1	22	28	NA
7	13c n = 2	2	53	NA
8	13f n = 3	46	62	NA
9	13g n = 4	120	trace ^c	NA

entry	allene-yne	time (h)	yield (%)	d ^b
10	15	19	74	2.3:1
	19			

^a Conditions: [Rh(CO)₂Cl]₂ (10 mol %), CO(g) (1 atm), toluene, 90 °C.

^b Diastereomeric ratio determined comparing proton resonances by ¹H NMR.

^c Observed by ¹H NMR.

Table 5
Isomerization of Allenol Acetate 10c

entry	starting dr (major/minor)	catalyst (mol %)	T (°C)	time ^a
1	3:1	10	90	40 min ^b
2	1:3	10	90	40 min ^b
3	3:1	10	rt	7 h ^b
4	1:3	10	rt	7 h ^b
5	3:1	0	90	— ^c
6	1:3	0	90	— ^c

^aTime indicating a 1:1 dr

^bPerformed under 1 atm CO atm

^cNo epimerization observed after 24 h under Ar.