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#### Abstract

Optically active trans-(1S,2S)-1-substituted-2-(N,N-dialkylamino)-1-indanol derivatives have been prepared and used in the asymmetric addition of diethylzinc to aldehydes to give sec-alcohol in good yield with up to $93.1 \%$ enantiomeric excess.
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The catalytic enantioselective addition of dialkylzinc to aldehydes has attracted much attention in recent years because of its potential in the preparation of optically active secondary alcohol ${ }^{1}$. Among the chiral ligands used, a myriad of $\beta$-amino alcohols have been especially investigated as catalysts because they are readily accessible in an enantiomeric purity in a few steps from natural precursors, i.e. $\alpha$-amino acids ${ }^{1,2}$. However amino indanol, although has been widely applied in the asymmetric reduction of prochiral ketones to secondary alcohols ${ }^{3}$, has rarely been used as catalysts in the enantioselective addition of dialkylzinc to aldehydes ${ }^{4}$. In this paper, we report the syntheses of trans-(1S,2S)-1-substituted-2-(N,N-dialkylamino)-1-indanol derivatives ${ }^{5}$ 1-6 (Scheme 1) and initial results on the catalytic activity of these chiral catalysts in the enantioselective addition of diethylzinc to aldehydes (Table 1).
$L$-Phenylalanine was first protected as $L$-N-ethoxycarbonyl-phenylalanine with ethyl chloroformate in quantitative yield. The ethoxycarbonyl derivative was transformed to acid chloride by $\mathrm{PCl}_{5}$, followed by Friedel-Crafts cyclization to give (S)-2-[(ethoxycarbonyl)amino]-1-indanone $7^{6}$. The key intermediate 7 was converted by Grignard reagents to trans-(1S,2S)-1-substituted-2-[(N-ethoxycarbonyl)amino]-1indanol 8-10. The configurations of $\mathbf{8 - 1 0}$ were determined by NMR techniques; specifically, NOE was not observed between $\mathrm{H}-2$ and $\mathrm{R}^{1}\left(\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ (Figure 1). Accordingly, the (1S,2S)-configuration was deduced. $\mathbf{8 - 1 0}$ were then deprotected with $\mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ solution to produce $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 3}$, alkylated by iodoethane or 1 -iodobutane to

[^0]give trans-(1S,2S)-1-substituted-2- (N,N-dialkylamino)-1-indanol 1-6 ${ }^{5}$.

## Scheme 1



7
8-10


$$
\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Et} \\
2 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Et} & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Et} \\
3 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Ar} & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Et} \\
4 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me} & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu} \\
5 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Et} & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu} \\
6 & \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Ar} & \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{Bu}
\end{array}
$$

Reagents and conditions: a) $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCOCl} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 100 \%$ yield; b) $\mathrm{PCl}_{5}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}$, $100 \%$ yield; c) $\mathrm{AlCl}_{3}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, 61 \%$ yield; d) $\mathrm{R}^{1} \mathrm{MgX} /$ ether, $\mathrm{rt}, 10 \mathrm{~h}, 53-57 \%$ yield; e) $\mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$, reflux, $4 \mathrm{~h}, 94-98 \%$ yield; f) $\mathrm{R}^{2} \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, reflux, $12 \mathrm{~h}, 37-85 \%$ yield.

Figure 1


The results indicated that the chiral trans-(1S,2S)-1-substituted-2-(N,N-dialkyl-amino)-1-indanol derivatives $\mathbf{1 - 6}$ catalyze efficiently the addition of diethylzinc to benzaldehyde and afforded 1-phenyl-1-propanol in high yields with good enantiomeric excesses (entries 1-6). The enantioselectivity of the reaction is very sensitive to the structure of chiral catalyst. The enhancement of the bulkiness of substituents on the nitrogen-atom induced an increasing of the enantioselectivity (entries $1 v s 4$, or $2 v s 5$, or 3 vs 6). Anymore, the enantioselectivity also increased with the increasing bulkiness of substituents on hydroxy-bearing carbon (entries $1-3$ vs 4-6) and with the chiral ligand $\mathbf{6}$, which has bulkiness substituents both on nitrogen atom and hydroxy-bearing carbon, gave the best reactivity and enantioselectivity. When chiral ligand 6 was used as catalyst in the enantioselective addition of diethylzinc to various aldehydes, high enantioselectivities were generally obtained for aromatic aldehydes (entries 6-15) except for 4-pyridinecarboxaldehyde, which gave much low enantiomeric excess (entries 16). For this substrate, the nitrogen atom on heterocyclic ring and its corresponding addition product, sec-alcohol, might promote the non-enantioselective ethylation reaction of 4-pyridinecarboxaldehyde with diethylzinc. It then reduced the overall enantioselectivity ${ }^{7}$. A reasonably enantioselective ( $45.4 \sim 58.2 \%$ e.e.) addition products were obtained for aliphatic aldehydes (entries 17-20).

Table 1 The enantioselective addition of diethylzinc to aldehydes ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Entry | Substrate | Catalyst | Yield (\%) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | E.e. (\%) (Config.) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Benzaldehyde | 1 | 91 | 81.9 (R) |
| 2 | Benzaldehyde | 2 | 94 | 78.9 (R) |
| 3 | Benzaldehyde | 3 | 89 | 90.7 (R) |
| 4 | Benzaldehyde | 4 | 87 | 88.5 (R) |
| 5 | Benzaldehyde | 5 | 90 | 88.2 (R) |
| 6 | Benzaldehyde | 6 | 90 | 93.1 (R) |
| 7 | $p$-Anisaldehyde | 6 | 91 | 89.7 (R) |
| 8 | $o$-Chlorobenzaldehyde | 6 | 90 | 90.6 (R) |
| 9 | p-Chlorobenzaldehyde | 6 | 90 | 86.2 (R) |
| 10 | $p$-Tolualdehyde | 6 | 83 | 92.3 (R) |
| 11 | 3,4-Dimethoxybenzaldehyde | 6 | 96 | 83.0 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 12 | 1-Naphthaldehyde | 6 | 91 | 86.7 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 13 | 2- Naphthaldehyde | 6 | 95 | 84.1 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 14 | p-Morphlinobenzaldehyde | 6 | 90 | 87.6 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 15 | 4-(Dimethylamino) benzaldehyde | 6 | 94 | 76.4 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 16 | 4-Pyridinecarboxaldehyde | 6 | 79 | 8.2 (R) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 17 | trans-Cinnamaldehyde | 6 | 93 | $45.4(\mathrm{R})^{\text {d }}$ |
| 18 | Dodecylaldehyde | 6 | 80 | $55.8(\mathrm{R})^{\text {e }}$ |
| 19 | Nonylaldehyde | 6 | 77 | $50.2(\mathrm{R})^{\text {e }}$ |
| 20 | Cyclohexanecarboxaldehyde | 6 | 86 | $58.2(\mathrm{R})^{\text {e }}$ |

a) The reactions were carried out in toluene/hexane (v/v, $1 / 4$ ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $20 \%$ mol chiral ligand, $\mathrm{ZnEt}_{2} /$ aldehyde $=10.0 / 5.0(\mathrm{mmol})$. b) Based on isolated product. c) Except as noted, the e.e. values were determined by GLC with Chrompack CP-Chirasil-DEX CB capillary column and the configurations were determined by comparison the specific rotation with known compounds. d) The e.e. values were determined by HPLC with a Chiralcel-OD column. e) The e.e. values were determined by GLC after acetylation.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that ligands 1-6 were efficient chiral catalysts in the enantioselective addition of diethylzinc to benzaldehyde and chiral ligand 6, which has bulkiness substituents both on hydroxy-bearing carbon and nitrogen atom, gives the best enantiomeric excess. This chiral ligand promoted the ethylation with good enantioselectivities for a number of aromatic aldehydes and with reasonable enantioselectivities for aliphatic aldehydes.
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