Published in final edited form as:

Angew Chem Int Ed Engl. 2013 July 8; 52(28): . doi:10.1002/anie.201300102.

“Supersilyl” Group as Novel Carboxylic Acid Protecting Group: Application to Highly Stereoselective Aldol and Mannich Reactions

Jiajing Tan,

Department of Chemistry, The University of Chicago 5735 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60637 (USA)

Matsujiro Akakura, and

Department of Chemistry, Aichi University of Education Igaya-cho, Kariya, 448-8542 (Japan)

Hisashi Yamamoto

Department of Chemistry, The University of Chicago 5735 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60637 (USA)

Molecular Catalyst Research Center, Chubu University, 1200 Matsumoto, Kasugai 487-8501 Japan

Hisashi Yamamoto: yamamoto@uchicago.edu

Abstract

“Super Power”: The application of the “supersilyl” group as carboxylic acid protecting group has been investigated. The unique properties of the “supersilyl” group enabled it to outperform typical carboxyl protecting groups, conferring extraordinary protection upon the carboxyl functionality. “Supersilyl” esters were also utilized for the first time as stable carboxylic acid synthetic equivalents in highly stereoselective aldol and Mannich reactions. The value of this methodology has been further described by the easy photo-deprotection protocol and its applications in rapid synthesis of polyketide subunits.

Keywords

carboxyl protecting group; aldol reaction; Mannich reaction; photo removable; polyketide

Historically, silyl groups have rarely been utilized as a protecting group for carboxylic acids in organic synthesis, as the Si-O bonds are too labile even under mild reaction conditions.^[1,2] Similarly, the employment of silyl esters in synthetically useful organic transformations has also been underrepresented.^[1,2] As part of our continuing studies on *tris*(trialkylsilyl)silyl (“supersilyl”) group, we have developed the “supersilyl” directed aldol reactions of β -siloxy methyl ketones and cascade Mukaiyama aldol reactions, which enabled the rapid assembly of polyol motifs and expedient synthesis of polyketide natural products.^[3] The “supersilyl” group, with unique electronic properties and large steric bulk, has been discovered to play a crucial role in obtaining high yields and selectivities.^[3] Encouraged especially by the stability and steric encumbrance of “supersilyl” ether motifs, we reasoned that the “supersilyl” group might be able to offer the necessary robustness for

Correspondence to: Hisashi Yamamoto, yamamoto@uchicago.edu.

Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under <http://www.angewandte.org>

silyl esters as it is well-known that the stability of silyl esters, like that of silyl ethers, parallels the steric bulk of the silyl group.^[1] Herein, we are glad to report our initial efforts toward the low stability problems of silyl esters described above: 1) the use of “supersilyl” group as a highly effective carboxyl protection group and 2) the exemplificative application of “supersilyl” esters as stable synthetic equivalents of carboxylic acids in highly stereoselective aldol and Mannich reactions.

The installation of the “supersilyl” group could be simply achieved by treatment of carboxylic acids with *tris*(triethylsilyl)silyl triflate (generated *in situ* by mixing the silane with triflic acid) in the presence of imidazole (Scheme 1, eq. 1).^[4] It is worth mentioning that the obtained silyl esters are UV-active due to the “supersilyl” group (allowing for straightforward TLC analysis even when the R group is aliphatic)^[5] and stable for purification by chromatography. Our preliminary efforts made to evaluate the stabilities of “supersilyl” esters toward various reagents implied that the model substrate **1f** is stable to excess MeMgBr, *n*-BuLi, DIBAL-H and LiHMDS (Table 1).^[6,7] Like most known carboxyl protecting groups, this silyl group failed to offer protection against MeLi due to the rapid formation of methylated silane. Remarkably, treating **1a** with *n*-BuLi at -78°C only led to the conjugate addition product **1g** while the carboxyl group remained intact (eq. 2).^[8] These results clearly showed that the “supersilyl” group confers extraordinary protection upon the carboxyl functionality. Such unprecedented stability of silyl esters may offer a high degree of synthetic flexibility and even an exciting possibility for new synthetic strategies, which thus prompted us to explore their applications in organic transformations.

Even though the carboxyl moiety is well-protected by the “supersilyl” group, deprotonation at the α -position is still effective. Reaction of **1b** with *n*-BuLi at -78°C followed by quenching with D₂O gave the deuterium-substituted product in quantitative yield with >95% deuterium incorporation.^[7] This promising result led us to first investigate the reactivity of stable “supersilyl” ester enolates. Undoubtedly, one of the most straightforward strategies for synthesizing β -amino/hydroxyl carboxylic acid derivatives is the stereoselective aldol^[9,10] or Mannich^[11,12] reaction of metal enolates with aldehydes or imines, respectively. Since these compounds are privileged structural motifs for biologically active molecules and natural products such as peptides^[13] (dolastatin D) and polyketides^[14] (erythromycin A), the development of alternative synthetic methods is still highly desirable (Figure 1). Notably, the employment of silyl groups as carboxylic acid donor groups in stereoselective metal enolate C-C bond formation reactions has never been explored to date.

To our delight, the model reaction of the lithium enolate of **1b** and benzaldehyde in THF gave **A1** with good yield and *syn*-selectivity (Table 2, entry 1). Other bases including LDA, LiHMDS, *t*-BuLi, KHMDS and *n*-BuMgCl were also screened, only the *t*-BuLi offered comparable results (entries 2–6).^[15] Switching the solvent to toluene or ether proved to be detrimental to the yield and selectivity, implying the importance of THF coordination to lithium (entries 7–8). A decreased or even reversed selectivity was observed when TMEDA or HMPA was employed as the additive (entries 9–10). The control experiment with the TIPS group gave only trace amounts of the aldol product while the rest of starting materials decomposed at -78°C (entry 11). Further optimization revealed that raising the temperature to -40°C failed to improve the results (entry 12). Despite careful screening, increasing lithiation time was finally found to be critical for obtaining high *syn*-selectivity (entry 13).^[7]

A variety of substrates were then investigated under the optimized reaction conditions (Table 3). The aromatic aldehydes with both electron donating and withdrawing groups, possessing various substitution patterns on the phenyl ring, gave the aldol products with good yields and selectivities (entries 1–11). Subjection of the aliphatic aldehydes to standard conditions also provided the desired products in excellent selectivities (entries 12–16). In

addition, conjugated aldehydes were suitable substrates to solely give 1,2 addition products (entries 17–18). When the α -oxygenated aldehyde was examined, the aldol reaction proceeded effectively to give the polyol product in 90% yield and 95:5 *syn*-selectivity (entry 19). Aldehydes bearing either heterocycles or naphthyl rings were also well-tolerated, delivering aldol products with slightly lower yields (entries 20–24). Essentially, the acetophenone was used as the electrophile, which led to the product with contiguous tertiary and quaternary carbon centers (entry 25). Further exploration of Silyl esters **1b–1e** with diverse **R¹** groups also provided the aldol products with good *syn*-selectivities (entry 26–28). Even **1g**, with a bulky benzyl substituent, could be deprotonated to form the stable enolate, giving the desired product with moderate stereoselectivity (entry 29).

Next, the Mannich reactions with various *N*-diphenylphosphinyl (*N*-DPP) imines were evaluated (Table 4).^[7] In all reactions of the aromatic imines, excellent stereoselectivities were achieved, while both electron-donating and -withdrawing groups had little impact (entries 1–10). The reactions of conjugated imines exclusively gave the 1,2 addition products (entries 11–12). Aliphatic imines with and without enolizable α -hydrogens all reacted with silyl ester enolates effectively (entries 13–15). For imines bearing naphthyl rings, the Mannich reactions all occurred with high selectivities (entries 16–17). Notably, heteroaryl-substituted amino acids, widely present in molecules with promising biological activities, could be constructed by this protocol in excellent stereoselectivities from heteroaromatic imines such as furyl imines and thienyl imines (entries 18–19).^[13] Reaction of **1c** also gave the desired β -amino silyl ester product with high *syn*-selectivity (entry 20).

To address the synthetic utility of this protocol, the desilylation methods were studied. In addition to commonly-used fluoride methods (TBAF, HF/Py) for the removal of silyl groups, an environmentally friendly photo-desilylation condition was established.^[16] Simple exposure of the “supersilyl” esters to 254 nm light from UV lamps for laboratory use could remove this unique silyl group in high efficiency (Scheme 2). Given the significance of polyketides in medicinal chemistry,^[14] we recognized another attractive prospect might be the rapid synthesis of polyketide subunits with carboxyl functionalities. β -siloxy aldehydes obtained *via* cascade Mukaiyama aldol reactions^[3a] were thus used to react with these silyl ester enolates, providing the desired polyketide analogues in good yields and selectivities (Scheme 3).

Finally, the bulky aryl ester reported by Heathcock *et al*^[10c,e] were examined for the Mannich reaction. The *anti*-product was obtained instead. Hence, we concluded that our method represents a complementary approach, favouring *syn*-selective products for aldol and Mannich reactions. With a more advantageous deprotection protocol, this methodology is also expected to be as broadly utilized in natural product synthesis as Heathcock’s method (Scheme 4).

In order to shed light on the mechanism, DFT calculations were carried out to unveil the configuration of “supersilyl” ester enolates (Figure 2).^[7] Computation results suggested that the solvated *Z*-enolate of **1b** is more stable than its solvated *E*-enolate. Three THF molecules were coordinated to the lithium center. Based on the observed stereochemical information of aldol products, the sense of induction could not be rationalized by invoking the six-membered Zimmerman-Traxler-type transition state as suggested for the similar addition of ester enolates to aldehydes.^[10c,17] Instead, the observed *syn*-selectivity might originate from an *anti*-clinal open transition state where the smallest aldehydic hydrogen is oriented over the bulky silyl group to minimize serious steric interactions.^[18,19] Low diastereoselectivity obtained by the addition of HMPA might be the result of the destabilization of solvated enolates through the replacement of coordinated THF molecules.

To summarize, we have introduced the application of the “supersilyl” group as an effective carboxyl protection group. The exceptional properties of the “supersilyl” group enabled it to outperform typical carboxyl protecting groups, especially for protection against the organometallic reagents. Moreover, “supersilyl” esters with outstanding stabilities were used as the innovative synthetic equivalents of carboxylic acids for the first time in highly stereoselective aldol and Mannich reactions, which allowed for the rapid synthesis of α -branched β -amino/hydroxyl carboxylic acid derivatives in uniformly good yields and diastereoselectivities. The value of this methodology has been highlighted *via* the efficient photo-deprotection protocol and its applications in rapid synthesis of polyketide subunits. This new “supersilyl” carboxyl protection group is expected to be of broad utilities in organic synthesis. Future work will focus on discovering new chemistry of “supersilyl” esters.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Support of this work was provided by NIH (P50 GM086 145-01). JJT is grateful for fruitful discussions with Dr. B. J. Albert, Dr. Y. Yosuke, Dr. S. Hirashima, P. B. Brady and Prof. S. A. Kozmin.

References

1. (a) Kocienski, P. *Protecting Groups*. 3rd ed.. Thieme: Stuttgart; 2005. (b) Wuts, PGM.; Greene, TW. *Greene's Protective Groups in Organic Synthesis*. 4th ed.. New York: Wiley-Interscience; 2007.
2. (a) Corey EJ, Kim CU. *J. Org. Chem.* 1973; 38:1233. [PubMed: 4691165] (b) Iwasaki A, Kondo Y, Maruoka K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2000; 122:10238.(c) Liang H, Hu L, Corey EJ. *Org. Lett.* 2011; 13:4120. [PubMed: 21744824]
3. (a) Boxer M, Yamamoto H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2006; 128:48. [PubMed: 16390115] (b) Boxer M, Yamamoto H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2007; 129:2762. [PubMed: 17309266] (c) Boxer M, Yamamoto H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2008; 130:1580. [PubMed: 18193878] (d) Albert BJ, Yamamoto H. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2010; 49:2747.(e) Yamaoka Y, Yamamoto H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2010; 132:5354. [PubMed: 20349994] (f) Albert BJ, Yamaoka Y, Yamamoto H. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2011; 50:2610.(g) Saadi J, Akakura M, Yamamoto H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2011; 133:14248. [PubMed: 21815682] (h) Brady PB, Yamamoto H. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2012; 51:1942.
4. (a) Corey EJ, Venkateswarlu A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1972; 94:6190.(b) Tacke R, Lange H. *Chem. Ber.* 1983; 116:3685.
5. Ramsey BG. *J. Organomet. Chem.* 1974; 67:C67.
6. (a) Hashimoto T, Takagaki T, Kimura H, Maruoka K. *Chem. Asian J.* 2011; 6:1936. [PubMed: 21567972] (b) Bellassoued M, Grugler J, Lensen N, Catheline A. *J. Org. Chem.* 2002; 67:5611. [PubMed: 12153258] (c) Corriu RJP, Lanneau GF, Perrot M. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1987; 28:3841.(d) Larson GL, Ortiz M, Rodriguez de Roca M. *Synth. Commun.* 1981; 11:583.
7. For details, see Supporting Information.
8. Cooke MP Jr. *J. Org. Chem.* 1986; 51:1637.
9. (a) Evans, DA.; Nelson, JV.; Taber, TR. *Topics in Stereochemistry*. Vol. Vol. 13. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1982. p. 1(b) Heathcock, CH. Ch. 2. In: Morrison, JD., editor. *Asymmetric Synthesis*. Vol. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press; 1984. (c) Heathcock, CH. *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis*. Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. Vol. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon Press; 1991. p. 181(d) Mahrwald, R. *Modern Aldol Reactions*. Vol. Vol. 1–2. KGaA., Weinheim: Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co; 2004. (e) Trost BM, Brindle CS. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2010; 39:1600. [PubMed: 20419212]
10. (a) Buse CT, Heathcock CH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1977; 99:8109.(b) Heathcock CH, Buse CT, Kleschick WA, Pirrung MC, Sohn JE, Lampe J. *J. Org. Chem.* 1980; 45:1066.(c) Pirrung MC,

- Heathcock CH. J. Org. Chem. 1980; 45:1727.(d) Heathcock CH, Hagen JP, Jarvi ET, Pirrung MC, Young SD. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981; 103:4972.(e) Heathcock CH, Pirrung MC, Montgomery S, Lampe HJ. Tetrahedron. 1981; 37:4087.(f) Heathcock CH, Pirrung MC, Young SD, Hagen JP, Jarvi ET, Badertscher U, Marki H-P, Montgomery SH. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984; 106:8161.(g) Ruano JLG, Barros D, Maestro MC, Araya-Maturana R, Fischer J. J. Org. Chem. 1996; 61:9462.(h) Dixon DJ, Ley SV, Polara A, Sheppard TD. Org. Lett. 2001; 3:3749. [PubMed: 11700129] (i) Evans, DA.; Helmchen, G.; Rueping, M. Asymmetric Synthesis-The Essentials. Christmann, M.; Brase, S., editors. Vol. Vol. 3. Weinheim: Wiley-VCH & Co; 2007. (j) Khatik GL, Kumar V, Nair VA. Org. Lett. 2012; 14:2442.
11. (a) Kleinmann, EF. Ch. 4.1. In: Trost, BM.; Flemming, I., editors. Comprehensive Organic Synthesis. Vol. Vol. 2. New York: Pergamon Press; 1991. (b) Arend M, Westerman B, Risch N. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 1998; 37:1044.(c) Kobayashi S, Ishitani H. Chem. Rev. 1999; 99:1069. [PubMed: 11749440] (d) Denmark, S.; Nicaise, OJ-C. Comprehensive Asymmetric Catalysis. Jacobsen, EN.; Pfaltz, A.; Yamamoto, H., editors. Vol. Vol. 2. Berlin: Springer; 1999. p. 93(e) Ting A, Schaus SE. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2007:5797.(f) Verkade JMM, VanHemert LJC, Quaedflieg PJLM, Rutjes FPJT. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2008; 37:29. [PubMed: 18197331]
 12. (a) Fujieda H, Kanai M, Kambara T, Iida A, Tomioka K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1997; 119:2060.(b) Saito S, Hatanaka K, Yamamoto H. Org. Lett. 2000; 2:1891. [PubMed: 10891184] (c) Palomo C, Oiarbide M, Landa A, Gonzalez-Rego MC, Garcia JM, Gonzalez A, Odriozola JM, Martin-Pastor M, Linden A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002; 124:8637. [PubMed: 12121105] (d) Davis FA, Deng J. Org. Lett. 2004; 6:2789. [PubMed: 15281770] (e) Hata S, Iguchi M, Iwasawa T, Yamada K, Tomioka K. Org. Lett. 2004; 6:1721. [PubMed: 15151398] (g) Morimoto H, Wiedemann SH, Yamaguchi A, Harada S, Chen Z, Matsunaga S, Shibasaki M. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2006; 45:3146.(h) Tiong EA, Gleason JL. Org. Lett. 2009; 11:1725. [PubMed: 19354318] (h) Colpaert F, Mangelinckx S, De Kimpe N. Org. Lett. 2010; 12:1904. [PubMed: 20361742]
 13. (a) Nussbaum, FV.; Spiteller, P. Highlights in Bioorganic Chemistry: Methods and Application. Schmuck, C.; Wennemers, H., editors. Weinheim, Germany: Wiley-VCH; 2003. p. 63(b) Lelais G, Seebach D. Biopolymers. 2004; 76:206. [PubMed: 15148683] (c) Kuhl A, Hahn MG, Dumic M, Mittendorf J. Amino Acids. 2005; 29:89. [PubMed: 15986181]
 14. (a) Rychnovsky SD. Chem. Rev. 1995; 95:2021.(b) Rohr J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2000; 39:2847. (c) Koskinen AMP, Karisalmi K. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2005; 34:677. [PubMed: 16186897] (d) Hertweck C. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2009; 48:4688.(e) Pal S. Tetrahedron. 2006; 62:3171.
 15. (a) Snieckus V. Chem. Rev. 1990; 90:879.(b) Clayden, J. Organolithiums: Selectivity for Synthesis. Amsterdam: Pergamon; 2002. (c) Bakker, WII.; Wong, PL.; Snieckus, V.; Warrington, JM.; Barriault, L. e-EROS. Paquette, LA., editor. New York: Wiley; 2004.
 16. (a) Pillai VNR. Synthesis. 1980:1.(b) Pirrung MC, Lee YR. J. Org. Chem. 1993; 58:6961.(c) Brook MA, Balduzzi S, Mohamed M, Gottardo C. Tetrahedron. 1999; 55:10027.(d) Klan P, Zabadal M, Heger D. Org. Lett. 2000; 2:1569. [PubMed: 10841481] (e) Pirrung MC, Fallon L, Zhu J, Lee YR. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2001; 123:3638. [PubMed: 11457095] (f) Givens, RS.; Conrad, PG., II; Yousef, AL.; Lee, J-I. Photoremovable Protecting Groups in CRC Handbook of Organic Photochemistry and Photobiology. 2nd Ed.. Horspool, WM., editor. Vol. Ch. 69. 2003. p. 1
 17. (a) Zimmerman HE, Traxler MD. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1957; 79:1920.(b) Dubois JE, Fort JF. Tetrahedron. 1972; 28:1653.(c) Dubois JE, Fort JF. Tetrahedron. 1972; 28:1665.(d) Dubois JE, Fellman PCR. Acad. Sci. 1972; 274:1307.(e) Dubois JE, Fellman P. Tetrahedron Lett. 1975:1225.
 18. This model could be used to rationalize the unique *syn*-selectivity for Mannich reaction. However, the observed *syn*-selectivity could possibly originate from cyclic- or twist-boat TS. For references, see: Denmark SE, Henke BR. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1991; 113:2177. Hoffmann RW, Ditrich K, Froech S. Tetrahedron. 1985; 41:5517.
 19. Williams DR, Donnell AF, Kammler DC. Heterocycles. 2004; 62:167.

Figure 1.
Dolastatin D and erythromycin A.

Figure 2.
Calculated enolates configuration and proposed TS.

Scheme 1.

"Supersilyl" esters synthesis and 1,4 addition reaction.

Scheme 2.
Deprotection methods.

Scheme 3.

Rapid synthesis of polyketide subunits. [a] Determined by ^1H NMR of the crude product. [b] Yields for the major diastereomer. *dr* cannot be determined by the ^1H NMR analysis.

Scheme 4.
anti-Selective aldol and Mannich reaction of Esters.

Table 1

Stability examination of “supersilyl” esters.

Reagents	1f (0.1 M)
MeMgBr (2 eq)	No nucleophilic attack and silane methylation observed (−78°C to r.t.)
MeLi (2 eq)	Rapid formation of methylated silane observed at −78°C
DIBAL-H (2 eq)	No reduction of carboxyl functionality observed (−78°C to r.t.)
LiHMDS (2 eq)	No decomposition and deprotonation observed (−78°C to r.t.)
<i>n</i> -BuLi (2 eq)	No nucleophilic attack and silane alkylation observed Enolate formation observed (−78°C to −20°C)

Table 2

Reaction condition optimization.

Entry	RM	Solvent	Yield(%) ^[a]	Syn:anti ^[b]
1	<i>n</i> -BuLi	THF	90	95:5
2	LDA	THF	60	80:20
3	LiHMDS	THF	N.R.	N.D.
4	KHMDS	THF	N.R.	N.D.
5	<i>t</i> -BuLi	THF	90	95:5
6	<i>n</i> -BuMgCl	THF	N.R.	N.D.
7	<i>n</i> -BuLi	Ether	20	75:25
8	<i>n</i> -BuLi	PhMe	trace	N.D.
9	<i>n</i> -BuLi/TMEDA	THF	85	84:16
10	<i>n</i> -BuLi/HMPA	THF	82	33:67
11 ^[c]	<i>n</i> -BuLi	THF	trace	N. D.
12 ^[d]	<i>n</i> -BuLi	THF	91	75:25
13 ^[e]	<i>n</i> -BuLi	THF	86	99:1

^[a] Isolated yield.^[b] Determined by ¹H NMR of crude products.^[c] TIPS group was used.^[d] Temperature: -40°C.^[e] lithiation time: 24 h.

Table 3

Substrates scope for aldol reaction.

1b-1e $\xrightarrow[\text{THF, -78}^\circ\text{C}]{n\text{-BuLi (1.05 eq)}}$ $\xrightarrow[\text{THF, -78}^\circ\text{C}]{\text{R}^2\text{CHO (1.1 eq)}}$ **A1-A29**

Si: tris(triethylsilyl)silyl

Entry	R ¹	R ²	Yield(%) ^[a]	Syn:anti ^[b]
1	Me	Ph	86	99:1
2	Me	2-Me-C ₆ H ₄	75	99:1
3	Me	2-F-C ₆ H ₄	74	99:1
4	Me	3-Me-C ₆ H ₄	86	99:1
5	Me	3-MeO-C ₆ H ₄	83	99:1
6	Me	3-Br-C ₆ H ₄	90	99:1
7	Me	4-Me-C ₆ H ₄	95	99:1
8	Me	4-F-C ₆ H ₄	89	99:1
9	Me	4-Br-C ₆ H ₄	87	99:1
10	Me	4-CF ₃ -C ₆ H ₄	77	99:1
11	Me	4-MeO-C ₆ H ₄	89	99:1
12	Me	<i>t</i> -butyl	90	97:3
13	Me	ethyl	88	95:5
14	Me	cyclopropyl	87	97:3
15	Me	<i>c</i> -hex	90	99:1
16	Me	<i>n</i> -C ₇ H ₁₅	86	98:2
17	Me	cinnamyl	93	99:1
18	Me	phenylacetylenyl	85	95:5
19	Me	BnOCH ₂	90	92:8
20	Me	1-naphthyl	70	98:2
21	Me	2-naphthyl	83	99:1
22	Me	2-furyl	70	99:1
23	Me	2-thienyl	79	99:1
24	Me		65	99:1
25	Me	acetophenone	66	95:5
26	Et	Ph	85	97:3
27	BnO	Ph	80	90:10
28	Allyl	Ph	72	90:10
29	Bn	Ph	86	86:14

^[a] Isolated yield.^[b] Determined by ¹H NMR of the crude products.

Table 4

Substrate scope for Mannich reaction.

$$\text{R}^1\text{CH}_2\text{COOSi} \xrightarrow[\text{THF, -78}^\circ\text{C}]{n\text{-BuLi (1.05 eq)}} \xrightarrow[\text{THF, -78}^\circ\text{C}]{\text{R}^2\text{CHO (1.1 eq)}} \text{R}^1\text{CH}(\text{NHDPP})\text{CH}(\text{R}^2)\text{COOSi}$$

$\text{Si: tris(triethylsilyl)silyl}$

Entry	R ¹	R ²	Yield(%) ^[a]	Syn:anti ^[b]
1	Me	Ph	88	99:1
2	Me	2-Me-C ₆ H ₄	83	99:1
3	Me	2-F-C ₆ H ₄	70	97:3
4	Me	3-Me-C ₆ H ₄	79	99:1
5	Me	3-MeO-C ₆ H ₄	78	99:1
6	Me	3-Br-C ₆ H ₄	91	99:1
7	Me	4-Me-C ₆ H ₄	77	98:2
8	Me	4-CF ₃ -C ₆ H ₄	85	99:1
9	Me	4-Br-C ₆ H ₄	89	99:1
10	Me	4-MeO-C ₆ H ₄	81	98:2
11	Me	cinnamyl	89	97:3
12	Me	phenylacetylenyl	75	91:9
13	Me	isopropyl	79	93:7
14	Me	cyclopropyl	80	97:3
15	Me	<i>t</i> -butyl	92	95:5
16	Me	1-naphthyl	68	99:1
17	Me	2-naphthyl	87	99:1
18	Me	2-furyl	80	97:3
19	Me	2-thienyl	72	99:1
20	Et	Ph	80	97:3

^[a] Isolated yield.^[b] Determined by ¹H NMR of the crude products.