


Bifunctional Thioureas with α -Trifluoromethyl or Methyl Groups: Comparison of Catalytic Performance in Michael Additions

Eddy I. Jiménez, Wilmer E. Vallejo Narváez, Carlos A. Román-Chavarría, Josue Vazquez-Chavez, Tomás Rocha-Rinza, and Marcos Hernández-Rodríguez*

Institute of Chemistry, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Circuito Exterior, Ciudad Universitaria, Del. Coyoacán, 04510 Cd. Mx., Mexico

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Thioureas are an important scaffold in organocatalysis because of their ability to form hydrogen bonds that activate substrates and fix them in a defined position, which allows a given reaction to occur. Structures that enhance the acidity of the thiourea are usually used to increase the hydrogen-bonding properties, such as 3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl and boronate ureas. Herein, we report the synthesis of bifunctional thioureas with a chiral moiety that include either a trifluoromethyl or methyl group. Their catalytic performance in representative Michael addition reactions was used in an effort to compare the electronic effects of the fluorination at the methyl group. The observed differences concerning yields and ee values cannot be attributed solely to the different steric environments; theoretical results indicate distinct interactions within the corresponding transition states. The calculated transition states show that the fluorinated catalysts have stronger N–H \cdots O and C–H \cdots F hydrogen bonds, while the nonfluorinated systems have C–H \cdots π contacts. These results have shown that a variety of hydrogen-bonding interactions are important in determining the yield and selectivity of thiourea organocatalysis. These details can be further exploited in catalyst design.



INTRODUCTION

Hydrogen-bonding catalysis and a chiral counterion strategy have risen recently as a reliable synthetic methodology.¹ Takemoto² introduced chiral bifunctional catalysts³ to activate an electrophile through hydrogen bonds (HB). These systems also contain a tertiary amine that deprotonates a nucleophile which is subsequently added. The Takemoto catalyst (Figure 1a) features a




Figure 1. Moieties used to enhance hydrogen bond donor properties or to modulate steric effects in H-bond catalysis and counterion strategies.

3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl group⁴ that enhances the acidity of the thiourea and thereby increases its hydrogen-bonding properties. Boronate ureas have a similarly enhanced HB donor capacity of the HNC(O) moiety, in this case by means of an

internal Lewis acid.^{5,6} Stereocontrol of the addition products⁷ can be achieved by addition of chiral substituents to the thiourea moiety (Figure 1b); however, this is done at the expense of the HB activation ability. Nonetheless, if a chiral group with electron-withdrawing properties is bound to the thiourea (Figure 1c), a good compromise between the modulation of the steric demands and activation by the catalyst can be accomplished. On this subject, Ellman,⁸ Jacobsen, and others⁹ have used *N*-sulfinyl ureas that are able to catalyze a variety of reactions. Herein we report the synthesis and application of bifunctional thioureas with a chiral group that incorporates a trifluoromethyl group in its structure.¹⁰ Thioureas featuring trifluoromethyl groups have shown exceptional properties in the recognition of chiral carboxylates with binding constants that are 10 times higher than those for the analogous nonfluorinated compounds.¹¹ The chiral moiety with –CF₃ confers to the thioureas reported in this work (1) good HB properties¹² without the deactivation of the catalyst by intramolecular interactions¹³ and (2) the possibility of modulating the steric environment. In addition, the catalysts put forward in this are easily synthesized and allow the incorporation of a variety of functional groups in their structure. This study also considers the corresponding nonfluorinated catalysts¹⁴ to provide insights into the effect of the NH acidity on the yield and enantiomeric excess of the reactions considered in this investigation.

Received: May 6, 2016

Published: July 11, 2016

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis of the chiral scaffold with trifluoromethyl groups was performed by the nucleophilic addition of the Ruppert–Prakash reagent to (*S*)-*N*-*tert*-butylsulfinylimines **1a–d**, affording compounds **2a–d** with excellent diastereoselectivity.¹⁵ After removal of the chiral auxiliary, amines **3a–d** were transformed to isothiocyanates **4a–d** and added to both enantiomers of *trans*-*N,N*-dimethyl-1,2-diaminocyclohexane¹⁶ to produce the diastereomeric catalysts (*R,S,S*)-**5a–d** and (*R,R,R*)-**6a–d** (Scheme 1). This same protocol led to catalysts with a methyl instead of a trifluoromethyl group (thioureas **7a–d** and **8a–d**).^{17,18}


The Michael addition of 1,3-dicarbonyl compounds to β -nitrostyrene has become an archetypical reaction to assess the performance of bifunctional catalysts.¹⁹ We employed 2,4-pentanedione as the source of the nucleophile for this reaction. In particular, we focused on the performance of the fluorinated

and nonfluorinated systems to compare thioureas with different HB donor properties.


We found that systems with an α -trifluoromethyl group have a strong match–mismatch relationship (Table 1, entries 1–8) as opposed to their nonfluorinated analogs (Table 1, entries 9–16). Additionally, we further studied the effect of the trifluoromethyl group on the yield and enantioselectivity by comparison of the diastereomeric catalysts **5b** and **6b** along with **7b** and **8b**.²⁰

Similar trends concerning match–mismatch relationships were found with different nitroalkenes, as reported in Table 2: i.e., fluorinated catalysts **5b** and **6b** have a strong match–mismatch relationship, in contrast with catalysts **7b** and **8b**. Interestingly, **6b** gives yields comparable with those of Takemoto but its performance is less susceptible to structural differences in the Michael acceptor. Because catalysts **6b** and **8b** only differ by three fluorine atoms, we expected that both systems with the

Scheme 1. Synthesis of the Bifunctional Organocatalysts Considered in This Work




(a) (*S*)-*tert*-butanesulfinamide, Ti(OEt)₄, rt, 17h. (b) 1.2 equiv. TMSCF₃, 0.2 equiv. TBAT, -50 °C 4h then -20 °C 20h. (c) HCl, MeOH rt, 2h. (d) Cl₂CS, Et₃N, overnight.

Table 1. Michael Addition of 2,4-Pentanedione to β -Nitrostyrene with the Catalysts Developed in This Work


entry	R, X	cat.	yield (%)	ee ^a	entry	R, X	cat.	yield (%)	ee ^a
1	Ph, F	5a	82	68	9	Ph, H	7a	87	86
2	Ph, F	6a	96	-89	10	Ph, H	8a	68	-81
3	1-Naphth, F	5b	87	67	11	1-Naphth, H	7b	94	87
4	1-Naphth, F	6b	94	-92	12	1-Naphth, H	8b	84	-76
5	9-Anthr, F	5c	76	46	13	9-Anthr, H	7c	86	74
6	9-Anthr, F	6c	87	-82	14	9-Anthr, H	8c	75	-60
7	<i>t</i> -Bu, F	5d	88	69	15	<i>t</i> -Bu, H	7d	87	84
8	<i>t</i> -Bu, F	6d	90	-94	16	<i>t</i> -Bu, H	8d	95	-62





^aAnalyzed by CSP-HPLC. Catalysts **5** and **7** afford compound (*R*)-**9**, while the *S* enantiomer is produced with catalysts **6** and **8**.

Table 2. Yield and ee Values^a of the Michael Additions of 2,4-Pentanedione to Different Nitroalkenes Using Catalysts T and 5b–8b


entry	Ar	Prod.	T	5b	6b	7b	8b
			3,5-(CF ₃) ₂ C ₆ H ₃	CH(1-Naphth)CF ₃	CH(1-Naphth)CH ₃		
1	4-Me-C ₆ H ₄	10	90 (74)	74 (56)	87 (-87)	93 (76)	90 (-69)
2	4-OMe-C ₆ H ₄	11	92 (75)	86 (51)	90 (-89)	85 (79)	63 (-62)
3	4-Cl-C ₆ H ₄	12	90 (69)	75 (56)	94 (-84)	94 (76)	80 (-68)
4	4-NO ₂ -C ₆ H ₄	13	86 (80)	58 (64)	86 (-81)	83 (83)	81 (-70)
5	2-Br-C ₆ H ₄	14	86 (86)	88 (49)	92 (-84)	93 (76)	92 (-68)
6	1-Naphth	15	82 (83)	81 (50)	82 (-87)	79 (81)	72 (-72)
7	2-thiophene	16	80 (64)	87 (71)	69 (-89)	80 (78)	72 (-60)

^aee values are given in parentheses. Catalysts T, 5, and 7 afford compounds (*R*)-10–15, while the *S* enantiomer is produced with catalysts 6 and 8. Compound 16 presents the opposite configuration by CIP rules.

Table 3. Yields and ee Values^a of the Michael Addition Product of a Variety of Nucleophiles with *trans*- β -Nitrostyrene using Catalysts T and 5b–8b


entry	NuH	Prod.	T	5b	6b	7b	8b
			3,5-(CF ₃) ₂ C ₆ H ₃	CH(1-Naphth)CF ₃	CH(1-Naphth)CH ₃		
1		17	83 (88)	66 (68)	69 (-87)	78 (88)	34 (-76)
2		18 ^b	88 (92)	61 (72)	57 (-91)	64 (90)	18 (-83)
3		19 ^c	73 (64)	77 (25)	96 (-76)	79 (50)	59 (-80)
4		20	96 (88)	98 (87)	84 (-96)	94 (90)	86 (-85)

^aee values are given in parentheses. Each diastereomeric catalyst generated a different enantiomer. ^b72 h reaction time. ^cdr. = 7:1 in all experiments.


S,S configuration in the diamine to be the match combination. This, however, was not the case; catalyst 7b with the diamine having the *R,R* configuration gave better results in this regard.

We found similar yields, selectivities, and match–mismatch relationships for other pronucleophiles addressed in this work: i.e., those leading to products 17–20 (Table 3). We noted that the enantioselectivity of 6b was comparable to that obtained from 7b with malonate nucleophiles.

Finally, we studied the performance of catalysts 6b and 7b in different solvents. We observed with catalyst 6b much lower yields in ether solvents, but in all cases the reaction was stereoselective (around 90% of the major enantiomer). On the other hand, the nonfluorinated catalyst 7b presented the opposite trend; the yield was little affected and the stereoselectivity highly depended on the solvent used (Table 4).

The different behavior shown by the presented catalysts could also be attributed to the steric difference between the

Table 4. Solvent Effects in the Michael Addition with Catalysts 6b and 7b




entry	solvent	6b		7b	
		yield (%)	ee ^a	yield (%)	ee ^a
1	Toluene	94	-92	94	87
2	CCl ₄	87	-89	93	62
3	DCM	87	-76	93	53
4	MTBE	55	-83	82	57
5	THF	36	-82	87	5

^aAnalyzed by CSP-HPLC. Catalysts 7b afford compound (*R*)-9, while the *S* enantiomer is produced with catalyst 6b.

methyl and trifluoromethyl groups. The van der Waals radii of $-\text{CH}_3$ and $-\text{CF}_3$ are 2.0 and 2.7 Å, respectively.²¹ In addition, the A value of trifluoromethyl is higher than that of isopropyl²² and hence it has been proposed that the $-\text{CF}_3$ group is of similar size to^{23a} or somewhat smaller than^{23b} $-\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)_2$. We studied diastereomeric catalysts **21** and **22** with isopropyl substituents to find out if the steric demand is the factor responsible for the difference in the obtained results. We found that the catalysts featuring isopropyl groups have similar selectivity, but their corresponding enantiomeric excesses (60 and 56% as shown in Scheme 2) are considerably lower than those obtained with

Scheme 2. Yields and ee Values of the Michael Addition with Diastereomeric Catalysts **20** and **21**



systems **6a** and **7a** (89 and 87%, respectively). We conclude that there should be other explanations for the observed enantioselectivity. The search for a suitable interpretation of the results

considered up to this point motivated the theoretical studies presented below.

Computational Analysis. We now consider the reaction mechanism of the Michael addition. Takemoto proposed the first mechanism for this reaction, which involves the sequential activation of the electrophile and the nucleophile.^{2a} Afterward, Pápai²⁴ suggested a different mechanism with a lower activation energy than that of Takemoto. Our results with catalyst **6a**, shown in Figure S2 of the Supporting Information, are also consistent with Pápai's mechanism. In this reaction pathway (Figure 2), the nucleophile is first deprotonated by the tertiary amine **A**, and then migrates to the cavity of the thiourea **B**. Subsequently, the electrophile is attacked by the nucleophile–thiourea adduct, forming the trimolecular complex **C**, which is responsible for the orientation of the new carbon–carbon bond TS_P and the stereochemistry of the product **D**.

A model catalyst with a phenyl rather than a naphthyl group was used to reduce the number of atoms in the system and hence the computation time of the calculations. This is particularly reasonable inasmuch as the results obtained with catalysts including either $-\text{C}_6\text{H}_5$ or $-\text{C}_{10}\text{H}_7$ within their structure are similar (Table 1). In this way, we explored the energy profile with diastereomeric catalysts **5a** and **6a** along with their nonfluorinated counterparts **7a** and **8a**.

The energy profiles in Figure 3 show that the activation barrier for the trifluoromethyl systems **6a** is less than the corresponding value for **5a** (4.6 and 6.7 kcal/mol, respectively) in accordance with the observed rate ($k_{\text{obs}} = 0.0092$ and 0.0066, respectively; see Figure S1 and Table S1 in the Supporting Information). In the nonfluorinated catalyst, the opposite configuration of the diamine has a smaller activation barrier (4.7 kcal/mol for **7a** and




Figure 2. Bifunctional catalyst mechanism proposed by Pápai.




Figure 3. Gibbs energy profile of the rate-limiting step in Pápai's mechanism for the Michael addition of 2,4-pentanedione and β -nitrostyrene with trifluoromethyl catalysts **5a** and **6a** and their nonfluorinated analogues **7a** and **8a**. The calculations were performed with the COSMO-(toluene)-RIJCOSX-MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ//M06-2x/6-31+g(d) level of theory. The structures of C, TS_p , and D are shown in Figure 2. (a) Catalysts with the R,R configuration in the diamine **5a** and **7a** generate the (R)-**9** product (b) Catalysts with the S,S configuration **6a** and **8a** yield the (S)-**9** compound.

5.2 kcal/mol for **8a**) also in agreement with the observed rates ($k_{obs} = 0.0331$ and 0.0042 , respectively). Although the theoretical calculations predict correctly the relative reaction rate for the diastereomeric pairs **5a** vs **6a** and **7a** vs **8a**, the computations are not fully consistent when the relative rates of all four systems are compared. This discrepancy may be attributable to factors such as product inhibition and the reversibility of the reaction,^{25,26} which are not taken into account in the computational analysis.

Figure 3 also shows that the fluorinated catalysts lead to different activation energies for the formation of each enantiomer, thereby favoring the observed enantioselectivity of the reaction. The calculated differences in activation energies are 2.0 and 3.5 kcal/mol for **5a** and **6a**, respectively, predicting correctly that **6a** is more enantioselective. With the nonfluorinated systems, these differences are 2.3 and 2.4 kcal/mol for **7a** and **8a**, respectively, which explains the lack of a strong match–mismatch relationship in these catalysts (Tables 1–3).

Further structural analysis of the transition states revealed the following.

(1) Thioureas attached with a trifluoromethyl group generate a shorter HB with the nucleophile,²⁶ as expected (Table S2 in the Supporting Information). These shorter and stronger hydrogen bonds in the fluorinated systems can be responsible for the lack of significant solvent effects on the enantioselectivity obtained with catalyst **6b**. This is buttressed by the fact that solvent effects are more pronounced in the ee achieved using **7b**, as reported in Table 4.

(2) There are other interactions that involve the arylethyl groups which are particular to each catalyst. The structures of the systems with an R,R configuration of the diamine (**5a** and **7a**) present the phenyl ring on the same side of the approaching β -nitrostyrene in a way that a T-shaped π – π contact is formed between the phenylethyl group of the thiourea and the $-C_6H_5$ part of $PhCH=CHNO_2$ (Figure 4). The observed distances between the centroids of the phenyl rings are 4.72 and 4.62 Å for **5a** and **7a**, respectively. These values are close to the optimal distance for this interaction (5.0 Å) computed with high-level ab initio calculations.²⁷

On the other hand, fluorinated and nonfluorinated catalysts with the S,S configuration in the diamine (**8a** and **6a**) lead to

transition states with the $-CH_3$ and $-CF_3$ groups on the same side as the approaching nitrostyrene. Therefore, the phenylethyl group in catalyst **8a** is rotated to form the aforementioned π – π interaction, whereas the structure produced with catalyst **6a** presents interactions between two fluorine atoms and an ortho C–H of the nitrostyrene molecule,²⁸ as shown in Figure 5 and confirmed with the topological analysis of the electron density (vide infra).

After having considered the energetic and structural aspects of the transition states of the Michael addition, we analyzed the interactions between the catalysts, the enolate, and the nitrostyrene by means of quantum chemical topology.²⁹ Figure 4 shows the molecular graph of the transition states for Pápai's mechanism formed with catalysts **5a** and **7a**. Both systems present bond paths between sulfur and the hydrogen atoms of the stereogenic carbon bonded to the thiourea. These trajectories of $\nabla\rho(\mathbf{r})$ suggest a moderate rigidity of the bifunctional catalysts, which facilitates the formation of the supramolecular complex. The interactions between both the fluorinated and nonfluorinated thioureas with the two reactants include five hydrogen bonds. Tables S3 and S5 in the Supporting Information report some selected topological properties of the charge distribution at the corresponding bond critical points. As expected, these hydrogen bonds are described as closed shell interactions, reflected in the sign of the Laplacian of the charge density, $\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{r}) > 0$, in the intermolecular region. The $-CF_3$ catalyst **5a** has stronger $NH\cdots O$ hydrogen bonds (E_H in Table S3) and two $CH\cdots\pi$ interactions, while the nonfluorinated compound **7a** presents three $CH\cdots\pi$ interactions. We also noted that the phenyl group in the catalyst responsible for these $CH\cdots\pi$ interactions has a less negative charge in compound **5a** due to the inductive effect of the trifluoromethyl group (Table S5). These weak interactions might explain the better performance of **7a** in comparison with that of **5a**. Considering the size of the aromatic ring in the catalyst, we can assume that the 9-anthracenyl group is too bulky for an optimal performance of the catalyst and the phenyl does not have a large enough molecular area for effective π – π interactions. The naphthyl group provides a better compromise between the establishment of efficient $\pi\cdots\pi$ interactions and the avoidance of steric hindrance.




Figure 4. Noncovalent interactions within the transition states for the Pápai's mechanism with catalysts **5a** and **7a**. The complete molecular graphs of these systems can be observed in Tables S4 and S6 of the Supporting Information.




Figure 5. Noncovalent interactions within the transition states for Pápai's mechanism with catalysts **6a** and **8a**. The complete molecular graphs of these systems can be found in Tables S5 and S7 in the Supporting Information.

Figure 5 shows a similar topological analysis of the electron density for the transition states with systems **6a** and **8a**. Once more, the fluorinated catalyst has stronger NH \cdots O hydrogen bonds than the nonfluorinated analogue. In particular, compound **6a** forms the strongest NH \cdots O $_4$ interaction (see Table S4 in the Supporting Information). Apart from these interactions, there are other hydrogen bonds between catalyst **6a** or **8a** and the reactants that depend on the conformation of the

–CHPhCX $_3$ group (X = F, H). The fluorinated catalyst presents HBs between two F atoms and an ortho hydrogen of the phenyl group of nitrostyrene, whereas the nonfluorinated system exhibits –CH \cdots π bonds linking the two –C $_6$ H $_5$ rings in the corresponding transition state. Again, the interactions between the reactants and catalyst **6a** are stronger than those found for **8a**. Overall, the topological analysis of the charge distribution indicates that the –CF $_3$ group leads to a stronger association of a

bifunctional thiourea with the reactants and thereby promotes the catalytic process more efficiently, in good agreement with the larger yield and enantiomeric excess of **6a** in comparison with **8a**. In addition, these CF \cdots HC interactions could explain the inefficiency of systems with isopropyl (**21** and **22**). The *i*-Pr group produces no significant attractive forces and only provides steric hindrance. In the mismatch combination **21**, the isopropyl is on the same side of the approaching nitrostyrene, interfering in this way with the docking of this electrophile.

The computational analysis indicates that the fluorinated and nonfluorinated catalysts behave differently on account of their distinct secondary noncovalent interactions. The trifluoromethyl group in the catalyst **6a** is on the same side of the approaching β -nitrostyrene, and hence, the fluorine atoms form CF \cdots H–C interactions. However, the nonfluorinated catalyst **7a** has the aromatic fragment on the same side of the approaching electrophile, which allows π – π interactions to be maximized. Therefore, although fluorinated catalyst **6a** presents the strongest NH \cdots O HBs, nonfluorinated system **7a** exhibits a greater number of secondary noncovalent interactions (CH \cdots π and CH \cdots O), which results in the similar performances of both catalysts.

CONCLUSION

We found that the incorporation of chiral groups with an α -trifluoromethyl moiety in bifunctional thioureas has a modest positive effect on the yield and selectivity of the Michael additions considered in this work. Nevertheless, the new catalysts **6** present stronger NH \cdots O hydrogen bonds and CF \cdots HC interactions with the reactants in comparison to their methylated counterparts. The methylated systems **7**, on the other hand, exhibit more CH \cdots π and CH \cdots O secondary interactions, which explains the comparable yield and selectivity. However, the chiral group presented in this work shows a good compromise between enhanced HB donor properties and controlled steric demands, which could be of interest to hydrogen-bonding organocatalysis.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Computational Studies. The geometries of all intermediates and transition states were completely optimized with the M06-2x/6-31+G(d)³⁰ approximation as implemented in the Gaussian 09 package.³¹ Each stationary structure was characterized as a local minimum or a saddle point of first order by means of the computation of the corresponding harmonic frequencies. Intrinsic reaction coordinate calculations were carried out in all cases to verify that the localized transition state structures connect the two minima on the potential energy hypersurface associated with reactants and products. Solvent (toluene) effects were considered through the COSMO model and single-point energy calculations of all the stationary points with COSMO-(Toluene)-RJCOSX-MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ.³²

The topological analysis of the electron density was done in accordance with the quantum theory of atoms in molecules (QTAIM)²⁹ and using the AIMAll program.³³ In particular, we considered the critical points of the charge distribution related to different elements of molecular structure defined in QTAIM, especially those associated with bonding between two atoms. The characterization of the different interactions between the bifunctional catalysts addressed in this study and the reactants of the Michael addition was done in terms of the properties of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, including $\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{r})$ and the density of the potential energy, $V(\mathbf{r})$, from which hydrogen bond formation energies can be estimated as in ref 34.

General Considerations. All starting materials were used directly as obtained commercially. THF was distilled from sodium benzophenone ketyl. Flash column chromatography was carried out with silica gel 60 (0.4/0.63 mm, 230–400 mesh); TLC was performed with silica gel F254 plates. Melting points are uncorrected. ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra

were recorded at 300 and 75 MHz, respectively. Chemical shifts (δ) are reported in ppm downfield from TMS, and coupling constants are in hertz. Mass spectra were obtained by EI HRMS (FAB and DART) were measured with quadrupole and TOF mass spectrometers; CSP-HPLC analysis was performed using the indicated chiral column and UV detector.

2,2,2-Trifluoro-1-arylamines and precursors have been reported previously (see ref 15).

General Procedure for the Synthesis of Sulfinylamines 1a–d.

One equivalent (15 mmol) of the corresponding aldehyde was dissolved in 40 mL of anhydrous THF under a nitrogen atmosphere. Then, we added 6.2 mL (30 mmol, 2 equiv) of titanium tetraethoxide and 1.8 g (15 mmol, 1 equiv) of (*S*)-*tert*-butylsulfonamide and stirred the mixture at room temperature for 17 h. The reaction mixture was poured into 40 mL of brine with vigorous stirring, and the resulting suspension was filtered over Celite. The cake was washed with EtOAc (20 mL \times 3). The organic layer was separated, and the aqueous phase was extracted with EtOAc (15 mL \times 3). The combined organic phases were dried with Na₂SO₄ and concentrated afterward. The final product was purified by FC with hexane/EtOAc 10/0 to 8/2. The acquired NMR spectra of target compounds matched those previously reported.

(*S*)-*N*-Benzylidene-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**1a**).^{35a} Colorless liquid, 91% yield (2.86 g). R_f = 0.23 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 9/1). $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +97.5 (c 1.15, CHCl₃) (lit.^{35a} $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +99.7 (c 1.15, CHCl₃)). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 8.44 (s, 1H), 7.68 (m, 2H), 7.42–7.19 (m, 3H), 1.10 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 162.4, 133.8, 132.1, 129.0, 128.6, 57.3, 22.3. IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3355, 3065, 2961, 2926, 2870, 1606, 1573, 1479, 1451, 1363, 1314, 1216, 1173, 1118, 1085, 877, 855, 758, 735, 693. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 209 (2) [M]⁺, 153 (100), 136 (34), 126 (11), 105 (92), 77 (66), 71 (19), 57 (100), 51 (35), 4 (68), 29 (36), 18 (6).

(*S*)-*N*-[(1-Naphthyl)methylidene]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**1b**).^{35b,c} White solid, 84% yield (3.27 g). R_f = 0.51 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 8/2). Mp: 48–50 °C (lit.^{35b} *R* enantiomer mp 52–54 °C). $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +4.4 (c 1.13, CHCl₃) (lit.^{35c} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = –4.5 (c 1, CHCl₃)). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 9.16 (s, 1H), 9.02 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 8.08–7.96 (m, 2H), 7.95–7.86 (m, 1H), 7.71–7.60 (m, 1H), 7.60–7.48 (m, 2H), 1.32 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 162.6, 134.0, 133.4, 132.0, 131.4, 129.6, 129.0, 128.1, 126.6, 125.3, 124.5, 57.8, 22.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3061, 2995, 2966, 2917, 2862, 1596, 1562, 1510, 1473, 1458, 1440, 1386, 1359, 1333, 1234, 1208, 1174, 1158, 1076, 1033, 1012, 977, 798, 772, 698, 581, 549.519, 465, 440, 409. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 260 (5) [M + H]⁺, 203 (100), 186 (12), 155 (50), 127 (23), 101 (3), 77 (4), 57 (13), 41 (2).

(*S*)-*N*-[(9-Anthracenyl)methylidene]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**1c**).^{15b} Yellow solid, 90% yield (4.18 g). R_f = 0.33 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 8/2). Mp: 134–136 °C (lit.^{15b} *R* enantiomer mp 137–138 °C). $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +76.0 (c 1, CHCl₃) (lit.^{15b} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = –80.8 (c 1, CHCl₃)). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 9.92 (s, 1H), 8.88 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.04 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.47–7.67 (m, 4H), 1.38 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 162.0, 139.1, 132.7, 131.4, 131.3, 129.3, 128.1, 125.7, 124.6, 57.7, 22.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3048, 2960, 2922, 2862, 1621, 1579, 1553, 1517, 1443, 1360, 1250, 1173, 1076, 1022, 982, 958, 914, 788, 732, 690, 603, 575, 539, 505, 450, 405. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 309 (2) [M]⁺, 253 (33), 203 (100), 178 (16), 176 (15), 151 (5).

(*S*)-*N*-[2,2-Dimethylpropylidene]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**1d**).^{35d} Yellow oil, 94% yield (2.67 g). R_f = 0.42 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 9/1). $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +117.8 (c 1.16, CHCl₃) (lit.^{35d} $[\alpha]_D^{25}$ = +99.7 (c 1.15, CHCl₃)). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.74 (s, 1H), 1.01 (s, 9H), 0.98 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 175.4, 56.2, 37.7, 26.5, 22.1. IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ cm⁻¹ = 3349, 3069, 2964, 2930, 2904, 2870, 1738, 1620, 1474, 1459, 1429, 1364, 1262, 1186, 1162, 1118, 1086, 879, 845, 741, 709. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 190 (100) [M + H]⁺.

General Procedure for Trifluoromethyl Addition (2a–d). A 20 mmol amount (1 equiv) of sulfinylimine **1** and 2.15 g (4 mmol, 0.2 equiv) of TBAT (tetrabutylammonium difluorotriphenylsilicate) were suspended in 60 mL of anhydrous THF under a nitrogen atmosphere. The reaction mixture was cooled to –50 °C, and then 3.6 mL (24 mmol, 1.2 equiv) of TMSCF₃ was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 4 h at –50 °C and 20 h at –20 °C. The reaction was

quenched with 60 mL of aqueous ammonium chloride solution and extracted with EtOAc (50 mL \times 3). The combined organic phases were dried with Na₂SO₄ and then concentrated. The product was purified by FC with hexane/EtOAc as eluent (proportions indicated in each compound). The acquired NMR spectra of the compounds matched with previously reported data.^{15a}

(*S*)-*N*-[(*R*)-1-Phenyl-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**2a**).^{15a} Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 7/3. White solid, 59% yield (3.30 g). *R*_f = 0.52 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 1/1), Mp: 95–97 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = +75.2 (c 1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.42 (m, 5H), 5.00–4.70 (m, 1H), 3.68 (br, 1H), 1.25 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 133.8, 129.7, 129.3, 128.1, 124.7 (q, *J* = 281.6 Hz), 61.5 (q, *J* = 30.6 Hz), 57.1, 22.5. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3117, 2994, 2964, 2928, 2904, 2867, 1712, 1667, 1498, 1455, 1425, 1365, 1259, 1149, 1118, 1097, 1051, 1011, 930, 909, 849, 760, 699, 590, 555, 512, 452. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 279 (1) [M]⁺, 223 (69), 216 (5), 176 (12), 159 (91), 145 (22), 140 (46), 126 (5), 109 (55), 104 (28), 91 (9), 77 (24), 57 (100), 51 (12), 41 (68), 29 (34).

(*S*)-*N*-[(*R*)-1-(1-Naphthyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**2b**).^{15a} Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 6/4. White solid, 84% yield (5.53 g). *R*_f = 0.48 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 6/4). Mp: 127–131 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = +203.0 (c 1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 8.15 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 7.98–7.85 (m, 2H), 7.71–7.58 (m, 2H), 7.58–7.45 (m, 2H), 5.83–5.61 (m, 1H), 3.78 (d, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 1.25 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 134.1, 131.0, 130.6, 129.9, 129.3, 127.5, 126.5, 125.6, 125.3, 125.2 (q, *J* = 282.0 Hz), 122.7, 57.2, 56.2 (q, *J* = 31.1 Hz), 22.5. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3216, 3051, 2965, 2904, 1596, 1510, 1458, 1395, 1366, 1328, 1301, 1244, 1176, 1112, 1053, 888, 858, 797, 775, 737, 698, 623, 562, 525, 442. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 330 (23) [M + H]⁺, 273 (11), 256 (41), 225 (4), 209 (100), 189 (18), 176 (15), 159 (29), 154 (26), 128 (27), 87 (11), 77 (3), 57 (39), 41 (4).

(*S*)-*N*-[(*R*)-1-(9-Anthracenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**2c**).^{15a,35e} Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 9/1 to 7/3. Yellowish solid, 69% yield (5.24 g). *R*_f = 0.32 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 7/3). Mp: 153–156 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = +182.7 (c 1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 8.54 (s, 1H), 8.46 (d, *J* = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 8.30 (d, *J* = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 8.04 (t, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.68–7.44 (m, 4H), 6.47 (qd, *J* = 8.5, 3.7 Hz, 1H), 4.23 (d, *J* = 3.4 Hz, 1H), 1.29 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 132.0, 131.5, 131.4, 131.2, 130.4, 129.8, 129.7, 128.1, 127.8, 127.1, 125.9 (q, *J* = 283.8 Hz), 125.4, 125.0, 124.9, 124.4, 123.0, 57.2, 56.5 (q, *J* = 32.4 Hz). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3374, 2961, 2930, 2870, 1624, 1466, 1331, 1253, 1157, 1109, 1072, 930, 888, 864, 786, 729, 701, 597, 534, 458. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 379 (5) [M]⁺, 323 (15), 259 (100), 238 (5), 204 (14), 189 (4), 178 (43), 151 (3), 88 (2), 57 (13), 42 (2).

(*S*)-*N*-[(*R*)-1-(*tert*-Butyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-*tert*-butanesulfonamide (**2d**).^{15a} Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 7/3. White solid, 46% yield (2.39 g). *R*_f = 0.34 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 7/3). TLC stain PMA. Mp: 97–100 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = +79.0 (c 1.1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 3.44 (m, 2H), 1.25 (s, 9H), 1.12 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 125.9 (q, *J* = 283.7 Hz), 66.3 (q, *J* = 26.9 Hz), 57.1, 33.6, 27.5, 22.6. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3223, 2989, 2965, 2915, 2876, 1733, 1477, 1370, 1346, 1263, 1222, 1202, 1150, 1104, 1050, 941, 921, 878, 839, 704, 606, 576, 510, 465, 431. EM (IE, 70 eV): *m/z* (%) 259 (3) [M]⁺, 203 (65), 196 (4), 188 (6), 170 (4), 156 (4), 119 (3), 105 (5), 98 (3), 87 (7), 77 (3), 61 (10), 57 (100), 41 (94), 29 (51), 18 (5).

General Procedure for Amine Synthesis (3a–d). Sulfonamide **2** (15 mmol) was suspended in 10 mL of methanol. Then, 7.5 mL (30 mmol, 2 equiv) of 4 M HCl in dioxane was added. After 2 min the suspension became a clear solution and was stirred at room temperature for 1 h. It was concentrated and the residue dissolved in 60 mL of dichloromethane. The organic layer was washed with 60 mL of NaOH (10% aqueous), and the aqueous phase was re-extracted with DCM (40 mL \times 2). The combined organic layers were dried with Na₂SO₄ (anhydrous) and concentrated. The recorded NMR spectra are similar to those of the amine hydrochlorides.^{15a}

(*R*)-1-Phenyl-2,2,2-trifluoroethylamine (**3a**). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 6/4. Colorless liquid, 97% yield (2.55 g). *R*_f = 0.56 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 6/4). [α]_D²⁵ = -12.2 (c 1, CHCl₃) (lit.^{35f} [α]_D²⁵ = -17.4 (c 3.4, EtOH)). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.51–7.22 (m, 5H), 4.37 (q, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 1.80 (br, 2H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 135.6,

129.0, 128.7, 127.9, 125.8 (q, *J* = 281.2 Hz), 58.0 (q, *J* = 29.6 Hz). IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3394, 3324, 3066, 3036, 2982, 2940, 2871, 1734, 1622, 1495, 1476, 1456, 1391, 1365, 1259, 1155, 1118, 987, 890, 758, 702, 625, 585. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 176 (100) [M + H]⁺, 137 (39). HRMS (DART/TOF): *m/z* [M + H]⁺ calcd for C₈H₉F₃N 176.0687; found 176.0690.

(*R*)-1-(1-Naphthyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethylamine (**3b**). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 6/4. White solid, 97% yield (3.28 g). *R*_f = 0.41 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 7/3). Mp: 50–51 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = -4.8 (c 1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 8.09 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 7.95–7.81 (m, 2H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 7.63–7.42 (m, 3H), 5.32 (q, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 1.85 (br, 2H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 134.0, 131.9, 131.7, 129.7, 129.2, 126.9, 126.3 (q, *J* = 282.3 Hz), 126.0, 125.4, 125.2, 122.9, 52.9 (q, *J* = 30.0 Hz). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3374, 3281, 3191, 3057, 2910, 1599, 1513, 1399, 1369, 1339, 1258, 1184, 1152, 1115, 1030, 1003, 953, 913, 863, 799, 775, 759, 736, 689, 533, 456. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 225 (22) [M]⁺, 209 (6), 189 (4), 186 (3), 156 (100), 129 (45), 101 (4), 78 (12), 63 (4), 51 (3). HRMS (DART/TOF): *m/z* [M + H]⁺ calcd for C₁₂H₁₁F₃N 226.0844; found 226.0852.

(*R*)-1-(9-Anthracenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethylamine (**3c**). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 9/1 to 7/3. Yellow solid, 80% yield (3.30 g). *R*_f = 0.32 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 7/3). Mp: 110–113 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = -45.1 (c 1, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 9.02 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 8.48 (s, 1H), 8.21 (d, *J* = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 8.00 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.68–7.32 (m, 4H), 6.09 (q, *J* = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 2.05 (br, 2H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 132.6, 132.2, 131.4, 131.3, 130.6, 130.3, 129.8, 129.5, 128.9, 127.3, 126.5, 126.0, 125.1, 124.9, 123.1, 121.34, 53.7 (q, *J* = 31.4 Hz). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3392, 3302, 3051, 1624, 1523, 1362, 1255, 1146, 1119, 1099, 1008, 930, 911, 888, 860, 838, 810, 727, 625, 530, 452, 375. MS-EI (70 eV): *m/z* (%) 275 (30) [M]⁺, 259 (4), 139 (4), 206 (100), 178 (24), 103 (20). HRMS (DART/TOF): *m/z* [M + H]⁺ calcd for C₁₆H₁₃F₃N 276.1000; found 276.1012.

(*R*)-1-(*tert*-Butyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethylamine Hydrochloride (**3d**). The amine has a low boiling point; therefore, at the end of the reaction, ether was added and then the hydrochloride of **3d** precipitated. It was filtered to give a white solid in 93% yield (2.67 g). [α]_D²⁵ = -1.4 (c 0.94, CH₃OH). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆): δ 9.17 (s, 3H), 4.00 (q, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 1.10 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆): δ 124.65 (q, *J* = 284.0 Hz), 58.42 (q, *J* = 27.7 Hz), 32.43, 26.43. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 2938, 2853, 2029, 1593, 1527, 1275, 1220, 1187, 1122, 1077, 1046, 900, 694, 583, 553, 519, 470. MS-DART (positive): *m/z* (%) 156 (100) [M + H]⁺

General Procedure for the Isothiocyanate Synthesis (4a–d). Amine **3** (5 mmol, 1 equiv) was dissolved in 20 mL of DCM and cooled to 0 °C. We added 0.42 mL of thiophosgene (5.5 mmol, 1.1 equiv) followed by 0.83 mL of triethylamine (6 mmol, 1.2 equiv). The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min at 0 °C and 17 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was washed with 10 mL of NaHCO₃ (saturated aqueous) and then was dried and concentrated. The product was purified by flash chromatography with a 9S/5 hexane/EtOAc mixture, giving the different isothiocyanates as slightly yellow liquids. Note that (1) a better yield of **3a** was obtained when the order of addition was reversed (DCM, thiophosgene, amine, and triethylamine) and (2) the isothiocyanate **4d** has a low boiling point and, therefore, a one-pot procedure was performed to obtain catalysts **5d** and **6d**.

(*R*)-1-Phenyl-2,2,2-trifluoroethylisothiocyanate (**4a**). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 9S/5. Yellow liquid, 88% yield (956 mg). *R*_f = 0.60 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 9/1). [α]_D²⁵ = -7.2 (c 2.11, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.46 (s, 5H), 5.19 (q, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 1H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 141.2, 130.5, 130.3, 129.2, 127.9, 122.7 (q, *J* = 282.5 Hz), 62.4 (q, *J* = 33.4 Hz). IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm⁻¹) 3070, 3039, 2925, 2044, 1496, 1456, 1339, 1259, 1188, 1136, 871, 832, 757, 698, 632. MS-DART (positive): *m/z* (%) 218 (5) [M + H]⁺, 150 (100). HRMS (DART/TOF): *m/z* [M + H]⁺ calcd for C₉H₇F₃NS 218.0251; found 218.0246.

(*R*)-1-(1-Naphthyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethylisothiocyanate (**4b**). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 9S/5. Slightly yellow solid, 87% yield (1.16 g). *R*_f = 0.56 (hexane/ethyl acetate, 9/1). Mp: 50–52 °C. [α]_D²⁵ = +15.4 (c 1.43, CHCl₃). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 7.96–7.85 (m, 3H), 7.78 (d, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 7.69–7.44 (m, 3H), 6.07 (q, *J* =

6.1 Hz, 1H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 141.1, 133.9, 131.0, 130.6, 129.3, 127.5, 127.0, 126.4, 126.3, 125.3, 123.2 (q, $J = 283.4$ Hz), 122.1, 58.5 (q, $J = 33.8$ Hz). IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3055, 2932, 2253, 2041, 1864, 1719, 1599, 1514, 1379, 1338, 1301, 1256, 1188, 1133, 1032, 951, 916, 895, 863, 837, 797, 775, 753, 732, 694, 633. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 268 (41) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 209 (100), 136 (15), 117 (30). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{13}\text{H}_9\text{F}_3\text{NS}$ 268.0408; found 268.0409.

(R)-1-(9-Anthracenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethylisothiocyanate (4c). Purified by FC hexane/EtOAc, 95/5. Yellow solid, 89% yield (1.41 g). $R_f = 0.48$ (hexane/ethyl acetate, 9/1). Mp: 113–115 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = -151.6$ (c 1, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.66 (d, $J = 9.0$ Hz, 1H), 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 8.04 (d, $J = 8.9$ Hz, 2H), 7.72–7.56 (m, 2H), 7.56–7.41 (m, 2H), 6.97 (q, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 1H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 141.5, 131.9, 131.2, 130.9, 130.3, 130.0, 129.6, 128.2, 127.4, 125.8, 125.5, 125.2, 122.0, 120.0, 57.7 (q, $J = 35.2$ Hz). IR (film): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3057, 2963, 2923, 2238, 2111, 2024, 1721, 1675, 1623, 1523, 1449, 1344, 1268, 1176, 1154, 1115, 1039, 1018, 961, 896, 878, 847, 827, 788, 726, 689, 599, 531, 492, 404. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 317 (67) $[\text{M}]^+$, 259 (100), 239 (30), 209 (15), 204 (13), 189 (25), 176 (8), 163 (5), 150 (4), 124 (10), 119 (5), 105 (5), 88 (11), 69 (4), 62 (3). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{11}\text{F}_3\text{NS}$ 318.0564; found 318.0556.

General Procedure for the Preparation of Bifunctional Catalysts 5–8 and T. The corresponding isothiocyanate (2 mmol, 1 equiv) was dissolved in 7 mL of DCM. *N,N*-Dimethyl-2-aminocyclohexanamine (2.4 mmol, 1.2 equiv) was added, and the mixture was stirred overnight at room temperature. The reaction mixture was concentrated and the catalyst purified by flash chromatography with EtOAc as eluent followed by a 90/10/1 $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$ mixture.

For catalysts **5d–8d** the isothiocyanate needed for the thiourea has a low boiling point. We applied a one-pot protocol to circumvent this issue. After the reaction with thiophosgene occurred, it was washed with a solution of aqueous sodium bicarbonate and dried with anhydrous Na_2SO_4 prior to the addition of the diamine. Thus, the yield was calculated from the starting amine **3d** or the nonfluorinated analogue.

1-[3,5-Bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]-3-[(1R,2R)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (T). 24 White solid, 82% yield (678 mg). $R_f = 0.38$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 57–60 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = -34.6$ (c 1, CHCl_3) (lit. 24 $[\alpha]_D^{16} = -32.7$ (c 0.99, CHCl_3)). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.02 (s, 2H), 7.45 (s, 1H), 4.04 (br s, 1H), 2.59–2.36 (m, 2H), 2.28 (s, 6H), 1.96–1.71 (m, 2H), 1.71–1.57 (m, 1H), 1.37–1.00 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 180.4 (br), 141.3, 131.6 (q, $J = 33.3$ Hz), 123.2 (q, $J = 272.5$ Hz), 122.3 (br), 116.8 (hept, $J = 4.1$ Hz), 66.8, 55.3, 40.0 (br), 32.5, 24.8, 24.5, 21.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3239, 3043, 2936, 2862, 2792, 1620, 1540, 1466, 1379, 1273, 1170, 1125, 1062, 1037, 969, 939, 881, 849, 756, 701, 678, 652, 594, 561, 481. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 414 (3) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 394 (4), 368 (8), 340 (3), 335 (5), 296 (3), 271 (100), 252 (28), 221 (6), 213 (35), 202 (14), 194 (6), 163 (14), 142 (11), 125 (32), 84 (38), 71 (16), 58 (14), 46 (3). HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{22}\text{F}_6\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 414.1439; found 414.1444.

1-[1-(R)-Phenyl]-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1R,2R)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (5a). White solid, 90% yield (647 mg). $R_f = 0.33$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 55–57 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = +45.6$ (c 1, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.74–7.09 (m, 6H), 6.56–6.29 (m, 1H), 4.57 (br, 0.5H), 3.64 (br, 1H), 2.37 (s, 7H), 2.18–2.01 (m, 1H), 1.96–1.63 (m, 3H), 1.31–1.11 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 184.5, 133.9, 128.9, 128.7, 128.4, 125.0 (q, $J = 281.8$ Hz), 67.7 (br), 60.3 (q, $J = 32.1$ Hz), 56.9 (br), 40.6, 33.2, 24.6, 24.5, 23.3 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3259, 3036, 2932, 2861, 2788, 1739, 1542, 1452, 1372, 1322, 1254, 1233, 1169, 1116, 1030, 951, 873, 758, 703, 639, 558, 515, 424. MS-EI (IE, 70 eV): m/z (%) 359 (2) $[\text{M}]^+$, 314 (18), 217 (21), 211 (18), 159 (100), 148 (24), 125 (76), 109 (49), 97 (15), 84 (68), 71 (28), 58 (22). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{25}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 360.1721; found 360.1715.

1-[1-(R)-(1-Naphthyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1R,2R)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (5b). White solid, 87% yield (712 mg). $R_f = 0.38$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 85–89 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = +210.8$ (c 1.03, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz,

CDCl_3): δ 8.43 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 1H), 7.91–7.71 (m, 2H), 7.66–7.28 (m, 5H), 7.14 (br, 2H), 3.34 (br, 1H), 2.49–2.34 (m, 1H), 2.27 (s, 6H), 1.90–1.42 (m, 4H), 1.26–0.91 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 184.3, 133.9, 131.8, 130.6, 129.6, 128.8, 127.2, 126.2, 125.4 (q, $J = 282.7$ Hz), 125.4, 125.0, 123.8, 67.7 (br), 57.1, 55.2 (m), 40.8, 33.1, 24.6, 24.3, 23.1 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3247, 3044, 2933, 2860, 2791, 1538, 1446, 1374, 1347, 1253, 1232, 1166, 1117, 1030, 949, 874, 849, 796, 775, 750, 700, 633, 593, 534, 481, 432. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 409 (3) $[\text{M}]^+$, 364 (22), 267 (46), 209 (75), 189 (21), 159 (27), 125 (100), 97 (18), 84(53), 58 (24). HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{27}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 410.1878; found 410.1873.

1-[1-(R)-(9-Anthracenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1R,2R)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (5c). Yellow solid, 71% yield (652 mg). $R_f = 0.32$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 119–122 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = +191.1$ (c 1, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 12.06–9.64 (br, 0.6H), 8.67 (s, 1H), 8.49 (s, 1H), 8.33 (s, 1H), 8.17 (q, $J = 9.9$ Hz, 1H), 8.00 (d, $J = 9.1$ Hz, 2H), 7.74–7.21 (m, 4H), 6.56 (br, 1H), 3.39 (br, 1H), 2.42 (s, 7H), 1.99–1.46 (m, 4H), 1.31–0.95 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 185.1, 132.3 (br), 131.8 (br), 130.5, 130.0 (br), 129.4 (br), 127.8, 127.5 (br), 126.0 (br), 125.1 (br), 124.8, 124.3 (br), 124.0 (br), 68.4 (br), 58.9 (br), 56.8 (q, $J = 30.6$ Hz), 42.1 (br), 33.0, 24.9, 24.5. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3200, 3034, 2937, 2861, 2835, 2791, 1624, 1582, 1537, 1449, 1397, 1376, 1354, 1298, 1252, 1234, 1164, 1117, 1092, 1043, 1018, 951, 877, 847, 787, 732, 702, 634, 618, 602. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 459 (6) $[\text{M}]^+$, 317 (56), 259 (100), 248 (27), 239 (18), 209 (15), 189 (11), 142 (20), 125 (38), 84 (50), 71 (14), 58 (16), 49 (11). HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{25}\text{H}_{29}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 460.2034; found 460.2029.

1-[1-(R)-(tert-Butyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1R,2R)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (5d). Yellow solid, 45% yield (305 mg). $R_f = 0.55$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 160–162 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = +61.2$ (c 0.57, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 6.59 (br, 1H), 5.16 (m, 1H), 3.85 (s, 1H), 3.65 (s, 1H), 2.54–2.42 (m, 1H), 2.35 (s, 6H), 2.29–2.18 (m, 1H), 1.98–1.69 (m, 3H), 1.34–1.20 (m, 4H), 1.09 (s, 9H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 185.8, 126.2 (q, $J = 283.3$ Hz), 68.2, 63.5 (q, $J = 27.4$ Hz), 57.7, 41.1, 34.6, 33.4, 27.4, 24.8, 24.6, 23.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3257, 3219, 3061, 2935, 2859, 2775, 1544, 1372, 1317, 1261, 1203, 1161, 1107, 1035, 947, 874, 751, 705, 565, 435. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 340 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{15}\text{H}_{29}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 340.2034; found 340.2028.

1-[1-(R)-Phenyl]-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1S,2S)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (6a). White solid, 97% yield (697 mg). $R_f = 0.35$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 136–137 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = -52.5$ (c 0.55, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.62–7.17 (m, 6H), 6.60–6.31 (m, 1H), 6.13 (br, 0.3H), 3.69 (br, 1H), 2.44 (br, 1H), 2.21 (s, 7H), 1.90–1.64 (m, 3H), 1.29–1.14 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 184.7, 133.7, 128.9, 128.8, 128.1, 124.9 (q, $J = 281.8$ Hz), 67.9 (br), 59.9 (q, $J = 32.5$ Hz), 56.8 (br), 40.6, 33.2, 29.7, 24.6, 24.5, 23.0 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3274, 3068, 2936, 2860, 2827, 2787, 1537, 1452, 1380, 1318, 1234, 1211, 1170, 1114, 1068, 1034, 946, 876, 847, 754, 705, 670, 619, 558, 508, 422. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 360 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{25}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 360.1721; found 360.1717.

1-[1-(R)-(1-Naphthyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1S,2S)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (6b). White solid, 90% yield (737 mg). $R_f = 0.36$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 103–104 °C. $[\alpha]_D^{25} = -8.3$ (c 1.03, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.71–8.29 (m, 1H), 7.87 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.73–7.44 (m, 4H), 7.10 (s, 1H), 6.90–5.53 (br, 1H), 3.75 (br, 2H), 2.32–1.62 (m, 10H), 1.31–1.11 (m, 5H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 184.5, 133.8, 131.8, 130.0, 129.7, 128.7, 127.1, 126.1, 125.5 (q, $J = 282.8$ Hz), 125.1, 124.9, 123.9, 67.7 (br), 56.6, 55.5 (m), 40.1, 33.1, 24.5, 24.4, 22.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3274, 3068, 2936, 2860, 2827, 2786, 1536, 1452, 1380, 1318, 1303, 1233, 1170, 1114, 1068, 1034, 946, 875, 847, 754, 705, 670, 619, 558, 508, 422. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 410 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 372 (6). HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{27}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 410.1878; found 410.1879.

1-[1-(R)-(9-Anthracenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1S,2S)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (6c). Yellow solid, 80% yield

(735 mg). $R_f = 0.40$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 118–121 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 72.9$ (c 1.02, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.85–8.33 (m, 3H), 8.04 (d, $J = 8.3$ Hz, 2H), 8.00–7.83 (m, 1H), 7.76–7.36 (m, 4H), 6.97 (s, 1H), 3.64 (m, 1.26H), 2.55–2.30 (m, 2H), 2.32–2.09 (m, 7H), 1.36–0.92 (m, 6H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 184.4, 131.8 (br), 130.7, 129.8 (br), 127.6 (br), 127.5 (br), 125.1, 123.9 (br), 67.0, 57.2 (br), 56.0 (q, $J = 32.3$ Hz), 40.3, 32.7, 25.0, 24.6, 22.8 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3250, 3050, 2932, 2859, 2788, 1624, 1528, 1448, 1319, 1232, 1160, 1110, 1029, 951, 874, 785, 728, 699, 631, 588, 534, 474, 425. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 460 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{23}\text{H}_{29}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 460.2034; found 460.2028.

1-[(1-*R*)-(tert-Butyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethyl]-3-[(1*S*,2*S*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (6d). Yellow solid, 36% yield (244 mg). $R_f = 0.48$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 121–125 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} - 16.7$ (c 0.54, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 6.29 (s, 1H), 5.21 (m, 1H), 4.12 (q, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 1H), 2.78 (m, 1H), 2.50 (s, 6H), 2.32–2.17 (m, 1H), 2.04–1.66 (m, 3H), 1.37–1.22 (m, 4H), 1.11 (s, 9H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 185.5, 126.2 (q, $J = 284.9$ Hz), 67.3, 62.8 (q, $J = 24.9$ Hz), 55.8, 40.3, 34.5, 33.2, 27.3, 24.6, 24.5, 22.7. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3259, 2930, 2860, 1546, 1367, 1319, 1258, 1239, 1204, 1156, 1029, 949, 919, 854, 731, 707, 570, 433. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 340 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{15}\text{H}_{29}\text{F}_3\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 340.20343; found 340.20347.

1-[(*S*)-1-Phenylethyl]-3-[(1*R*,2*R*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (7a). White solid, 85% yield (519 mg). $R_f = 0.32$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 14.7$ (c 1, CHCl_3) (lit.^{17b} $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 16.0$ (c 1.18, CHCl_3)). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.24–7.36 (br, 0.5H), 7.39–7.06 (m, 5H), 6.24 (s, 1H), 5.04 (s, 1H), 3.55 (m, 1H), 3.12 (s, 1H), 2.37–2.24 (m, 1H), 2.16 (s, 6H), 1.83–1.48 (m, 3H), 1.43 (d, $J = 6.8$ Hz, 3H), 1.29–0.69 (m, 4H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.4, 143.0, 128.7, 127.4, 126.1, 67.3, 56.2, 53.7, 40.2, 32.9, 24.9, 24.5, 22.7, 22.2. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3259, 3058, 3030, 2967, 2932, 2859, 2828, 2786, 1649, 1538, 1495, 1450, 1400, 1356, 1267, 1237, 1209, 1187, 1152, 1088, 1062, 1039, 953, 873, 758, 734, 699. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 306 (11) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 306 (9), 260 (7), 155 (7), 125 (100), 105 (40), 84 (25), 71 (9), 58 (9). HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{28}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 306.2004; found 306.2000.

1-[(*S*)-1-(1-Naphthyl)ethyl]-3-[(1*R*,2*R*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (7b). White solid, 64% yield (455 mg). $R_f = 0.40$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 49–52 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 71.7$ (c 1, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.16 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.85 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 7.76 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 1H), 7.58–7.45 (m, 3H), 7.39 (t, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 6.28 (s, 1H), 5.96 (s, 1H), 4.98–4.43 (br, 0.2H), 3.45 (s, 1H), 2.41–2.09 (m, 2H), 2.02 (s, 6H), 1.68 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 5H), 1.59–1.48 (m, 1H), 1.18–0.89 (m, 4H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.3, 138.4 (br), 133.8, 130.9 (br), 128.7, 128.1, 126.4, 125.7, 125.3, 123.4 (br), 122.6, 67.2, 56.0, 50.0, 39.8, 32.9, 24.6, 24.3, 22.0 (br), 21.0 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3249, 3044, 2928, 2856, 2827, 2781, 1529, 1448, 1397, 1352, 1324, 1261, 1234, 1261, 1234, 1206, 1186, 1095, 1036, 951, 870, 799, 777, 725, 647, 593, 555, 479, 430. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 356 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{30}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 356.2160; found 356.2160.

1-[(*S*)-1-(9-Anthracenyl)ethyl]-3-[(1*R*,2*R*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (7c). Chiral amine and isothiocyanate was obtained according to the literature procedure.^{15b} White solid, 87% yield (705 mg). $R_f = 0.48$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 135–136 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 52.6$ (c 1.02, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.53 (d, $J = 8.9$ Hz, 2H), 8.37 (s, 1H), 7.97 (d, $J = 9.7$ Hz, 2H), 7.88–7.58 (br, 0.47H), 7.59–7.36 (m, 4H), 6.56 (s, 2H), 3.69 (m, 1H), 2.13 (s, 7H), 1.89 (d, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 3H), 1.65 (br, 2H), 1.49–1.35 (m, 1H), 1.26–1.17 (m, 2H), 1.15–0.96 (m, 3H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.0, 131.7, 129.6, 129.0, 128.2, 126.2, 124.9, 124.2, 66.9, 55.5, 49.9, 40.0, 32.4, 24.7, 22.3, 21.8. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 406 (62) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 372 (14), 205 (100), 143 (50). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{25}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 406.2317; found 406.2314.

1-[(*S*)-1,2,2-Trimethylpropyl]-3-[(1*R*,2*R*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (7d). White solid, 57% yield (325 mg). $R_f = 0.32$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 149–152 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 20.2$ (c 1, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.73–7.33 (br, 0.5H),

6.91 (s, 1H), 5.70–5.22 (br, 0.5H), 4.15 (br, 1H), 3.95 (s, 1H), 2.82–2.61 (m, 1H), 2.42 (s, 7H), 2.00–1.65 (m, 3H), 1.43–1.16 (m, 4H), 1.11 (d, $J = 6.7$ Hz, 3H), 0.95 (s, 9H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 182.1, 67.3, 58.3, 56.0, 40.3, 34.8, 33.2, 26.5, 24.9, 24.5, 23.0, 15.6. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3233, 3064, 2934, 2857, 2824, 2776, 1740, 1539, 1471, 1450, 1359, 1330, 1273, 1246, 1205, 1118, 1088, 1064, 1041, 956, 874, 725, 670, 602, 569, 517, 473, 433. MS-EI (70 eV): m/z (%) 286 (4) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 240 (8), 194 (2), 185 (9), 166 (2), 143 (3), 125 (100), 97 (14), 84 (33), 71 (10), 58 (10), 44 (5). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{15}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 286.2317; found 286.2312.

1-[(*S*)-1-Phenylethyl]-3-[(1*S*,2*S*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (8a). Hygroscopic white solid, 83% yield (507 mg). $R_f = 0.25$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 7.6$ (c 1.15, CHCl_3) (lit.^{17b} $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} - 6$ (c 0.2, CHCl_3) for the enantiomer). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.02–7.01 (m, 6H), 6.57 (br, 1H), 4.93 (br, 1H), 3.59 (m, 1H), 2.68 (br, 1H), 2.29 (br, 1H), 2.07–1.58 (m, 9H), 1.49 (d, $J = 6.8$ Hz, 3H), 1.29–0.98 (m, 4H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.4, 142.9, 128.6, 127.3, 125.8, 66.6, 55.8, 53.5, 39.3, 32.6, 24.9, 24.3, 23.4 (br), 21.5 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3349, 3282, 3064, 3035, 2971, 2932, 2849, 2825, 2782, 1532, 1491, 1441, 1399, 1356, 1335, 1285, 1250, 1228, 1201, 1146, 1087, 1041, 1008, 952, 905, 879, 836, 759, 697, 609, 557, 445, 418. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 306 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (FAB) m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{17}\text{H}_{28}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 306.2004; found 306.1998.

1-[(*S*)-1-(1-Naphthyl)ethyl]-3-[(1*S*,2*S*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (8b). White solid, 56% yield (398 mg). $R_f = 0.25$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 70–73 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 36.1$ (c 1, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.29–8.04 (m, 1H), 8.04–7.71 (m, 2H), 7.71–7.29 (m, 4H), 6.36 (s, 1H), 5.74 (br, 1H), 4.12 (q, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 0.3H), 3.40 (s, 1H), 2.68 (br, 0.4H), 2.04 (m, 1H), 1.79–1.54 (m, 5H), 1.53–1.13 (m, 7H), 1.12–0.82 (m, 4H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.8, 138.3, 134.0, 130.8 (br), 128.3, 126.6, 125.8, 125.7 (br), 122.7, 67.0 (br), 55.9, 50.0, 38.9, 32.8 (br), 25.0 (br), 24.4, 23.2 (br), 22.3 (br), 21.8 (br). IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3349, 3276, 3037, 2970, 2929, 2857, 2826, 2781, 1526, 1449, 1354, 1334, 1232, 1203, 1041, 951, 873, 798, 776, 724, 697, 558, 490, 447. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 356 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 155 (8), 143 (11). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{30}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 356.2146; found 356.2150.

1-[(*S*)-1-(9-Anthracenyl)ethyl]-3-[(1*S*,2*S*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (8c). Chiral amine and isothiocyanate were obtained according to the literature procedure.^{15b} Yellow solid, 78% yield (632 mg). $R_f = 0.47$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 120–124 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 124.0$ (c 0.24, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.57 (br, 2H), 8.44 (s, 1H), 8.02 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 2H), 7.77–7.33 (m, 5H), 6.25 (br, 1H), 6.02 (s, 1H), 3.29 (m, 1H), 2.72 (br, 1H), 1.91 (d, $J = 6.4$ Hz, 3H), 1.68–1.47 (m, 3H), 1.45–1.09 (m, 3H), 1.00 (s, 8H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.8, 131.9, 129.7, 129.1, 128.8, 126.6, 125.0, 123.7, 66.0, 56.5, 50.0, 38.6, 32.5, 25.1, 24.4, 22.0, 21.1. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3209, 2927, 2856, 2779, 1662, 1526, 1448, 1319, 1233, 1203, 1157, 1041, 883, 837, 788, 730, 633, 491. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 406 (32) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$, 247 (54), 205 (48), 201 (100), 157 (17), 143 (44). HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{25}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 406.2317; found 406.2297.

1-[(*S*)-1,2,2-Trimethylpropyl]-3-[(1*S*,2*S*)-2-(dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]thiourea (8d). White solid, 55% yield (314 mg). $R_f = 0.29$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp: 106–109 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} + 37.6$ (c 1.09, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.28 (s, 1H), 6.97 (br, 1H), 3.89 (s, 2H), 2.75–2.54 (m, 1H), 2.34 (s, 7H), 1.93–1.53 (m, 3H), 1.33–1.06 (m, 4H), 1.00 (d, $J = 6.5$ Hz, 3H), 0.83 (s, 9H). $^{13}\text{C NMR}$ (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.8, 66.9, 58.1, 55.2, 39.8, 34.6, 33.0, 26.3, 24.7, 24.3, 22.3, 15.8. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3277, 3066, 2932, 2860, 2777, 1536, 1473, 1446, 1344, 1270, 1242, 1201, 1119, 1090, 993, 953, 873, 852, 729, 672, 569, 429. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 286 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{15}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 286.2317; found 286.2329.

1-[(1*R*,2*R*)-2-(Dimethylamino)cyclohexyl]-3-[(*R*)-2-methyl-1-phenylpropyl]thiourea (21). (*R*)-2-Methyl-1-phenylpropylamine was obtained according to the literature procedure.³⁷ Yellow solid, 79% yield (526 mg). $R_f = 0.56$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1), mp 186–189 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} - 7.2$ (c 2.04, CHCl_3). $^1\text{H NMR}$ (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.61 (m, 2H), 7.26 (m, 5H), 5.30 (s, 1H), 4.56

(s, 1H), 3.29 (m, 1H), 2.76 (s, 6H), 2.37–2.21 (m, 1H), 2.18–2.02 (m, 2H), 2.00–1.89 (m, 1H), 1.79–1.69 (m, 1H), 1.43–1.22 (m, 4H), 1.02 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H), 0.88 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 182.1, 141.3, 128.3, 127.4, 127.1, 67.2, 63.9, 54.5 (br), 39.4, 34.1, 32.8, 24.6, 24.2, 22.9 (br), 19.6, 18.9. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ (cm^{-1}) 3255, 3058, 2922, 2854, 1552, 1449, 1366, 1314, 1214, 1169, 1031, 990, 874, 755, 702, 617, 568, 526. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 334 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{19}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 334.2317; found 334.2306.

1-((1*S*,2*S*)-2-(Dimethylamino)cyclohexyl)-3-((*R*)-2-methyl-1-phenylpropyl)thiourea (**22**). (*R*)-2-Methyl-1-phenylpropylamine-amine was obtained according to the literature procedure.³⁷ Yellow solid, 90% yield (600 mg). $R_f = 0.51$ ($\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$, 90/10/1). Mp 92–96 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -12.8$ (c 0.94, CHCl_3). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.44–7.17 (m, 5H), 6.81 (br, 1H), 5.40 (br, 1H), 4.92 (br, 1H), 4.01 (br, 1H), 2.75–2.57 (m, 1H), 2.44 (s, 6H), 2.33–2.18 (m, 1H), 2.08–1.78 (m, 3H), 1.66 (m, 1H), 1.38–1.15 (m, 4H), 1.00 (d, $J = 6.5$ Hz, 3H), 0.84 (d, $J = 6.6$ Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 181.5 (br), 141.0 (br), 128.3, 127.4, 127.2, 67.1, 64.2, 55.3, 40.0, 34.0, 32.7, 24.6, 24.3, 22.4, 19.4, 19.0. IR (KBr): $\tilde{\nu}$ $\text{cm}^{-1} = 3272$, 3056, 2926, 2854, 1533, 1449, 1364, 1308, 1269, 1210, 1095, 1029, 952, 873, 744, 698, 665, 569, 532, 486. MS-DART (positive): m/z (%) 334 (100) $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$. HRMS (DART/TOF): m/z $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$ calcd for $\text{C}_{19}\text{H}_{32}\text{N}_3\text{S}$ 334.2317; found 334.2324.

General Procedure for Michael Addition to Nitrostyrenes. We dissolved 29.8 mg (1 equiv, 0.2 mmol) of β -nitrostyrene and 0.05 equiv (0.01 mmol) of the bifunctional thiourea in 0.66 mL of dry toluene in a 4 mL screw cap dram vial with a magnetic stirrer. The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min, and then the nucleophile was added (1.5 equiv, 0.30 mmol). The mixture was agitated for 24 h at 20 °C. The solvent was removed and purified in FC with a 7/3 hexane/EtOAc mixture. The reported yields and weights were obtained with catalyst **6b**.

(*S*)-3-(2-Nitro-1-phenylethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**9**).^{2b} White solid, 94% yield (46.8 mg). Mp: 101–104 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +179.3$ (c 1, CHCl_3) (91% ee) (lit.^{2b} *R* enantiomer mp 112–114, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -175.4$ (c 1.08, CHCl_3), 89% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.50–6.95 (m, 5H), 4.68–4.54 (m, 2H), 4.40–4.29 (m, 1H), 4.27–4.12 (m, 1H), 2.23 (s, 3H), 1.90 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 201.8, 201.1, 136.1, 129.3, 128.5, 128.0, 78.2, 70.6, 42.9, 30.5, 29.8. HPLC: Chiralpak IA, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.8 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 14.5 min (S), 22.9 min (R).

(*S*)-3-(2-Nitro-1-(4-methylphenyl)ethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**10**).^{36a} White solid, 87% yield (45.8 mg). Mp: 93–95 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +170.2$ (c 1, CHCl_3) (87% ee) (lit.^{36a} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -194.1$ (c 1, CHCl_3), 97% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.12 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 7.06 (d, $J = 8.8$ Hz, 2H), 4.61 (d, $J = 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 4.60–4.58 (m, 1H), 4.35 (d, $J = 10.9$ Hz, 1H), 4.28–4.12 (m, 1H), 2.30 (s, 3H), 2.28 (s, 3H), 1.94 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 202.0, 201.2, 138.5, 133.0, 130.2, 128.0, 78.5, 71.0, 42.6, 30.5, 29.6, 21.2. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 15.6 min (S), 20.1 (R).

(*S*)-3-(1-(4-Methoxyphenyl)-2-nitroethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**11**).^{36a} White solid, 90% yield (50.2 mg). Mp: 100–103 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +153.4$ (c 1.0, CHCl_3) (89% ee) (lit.^{36a} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -191.6$ (c 1, CHCl_3), 98% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.10 (d, $J = 8.7$ Hz, 2H), 6.84 (d, $J = 8.8$ Hz, 2H), 4.60 (d, $J = 1.4$ Hz, 1H), 4.58 (s, 1H), 4.33 (d, $J = 10.9$ Hz, 1H), 4.25–4.14 (m, 1H), 3.77 (s, 3H), 2.28 (s, 3H), 1.94 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 201.8, 201.1, 159.6, 129.1, 127.66, 114.7, 78.4, 71.0, 55.2, 42.1, 30.3, 29.4. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 254 nm, retention times 12.0 min (S), 16.5 min (R).

(*S*)-3-(1-(4-Chlorophenyl)-2-nitroethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**12**).^{36b} White solid, 94% yield (53.3 mg). Mp: 112–115 °C, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +131.7$ (c 1.0, CHCl_3) (84% ee) (lit.^{36b} (*R*) enantiomer mp 119–121 °C $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -132.5$ (c 1.04, CHCl_3), 88% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.35 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 2H), 7.17 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 2H), 4.74–4.57 (m, 2H), 4.36 (d, $J = 10.7$ Hz, 1H), 4.32–4.17 (m, 1H), 2.33 (s, 3H), 2.01 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 201.5, 200.7, 134.8 (2C), 129.7, 129.5, 78.1, 70.8, 42.3, 30.6, 29.8. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 7.0 min (S), 9.8 min (R).

(*S*)-3-(2-Nitro-1-(4-nitrophenyl)ethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**13**).^{36c} Beige solid, 86% yield (50.6 mg). Mp: 110–113 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +99.9$ (c 1.03, CHCl_3) (84% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.21 (d, $J = 8.8$ Hz, 2H), 7.41 (d, $J = 8.8$ Hz, 2H), 4.77–4.55 (m, 2H), 4.38 (s, 2H), 2.33 (s, 3H), 2.03 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 200.9, 143.8, 129.3, 124.6, 77.5, 70.3, 42.5, 30.7, 30.1. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 250 nm, retention times 11.6 min (S), 16.1 (R).

(*S*)-3-(1-(2-Bromophenyl)-2-nitroethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**14**).^{36a} White solid, 92% yield (60.3 mg). Mp: 77–79 °C, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +185.0$ (c 1, CHCl_3) (84% ee) (lit.^{36a} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -218.5$ (c 1, CHCl_3), 98% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.63 (m, 1H), 7.30 (m, 1H), 7.22–7.09 (m, 2H), 4.93–4.80 (m, 1H), 4.80–4.52 (m, 3H), 2.29 (s, 3H), 2.05 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 202.1, 201.0, 135.3, 134.2, 130.1, 129.1, 128.4, 124.7, 76.4, 69.3, 41.3, 31.1, 28.5. HPLC: Chiralpak IA, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.8 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 11.1 min (S), 13.8 (R).

(*S*)-3-(1-(Naphthalen-1-yl)-2-nitroethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**15**).^{36b} Yellow liquid, 82% yield (49.1 mg). $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +171.4$ (c 1.50, CHCl_3) (87% ee) (lit.^{36b} *R* enantiomer $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -182.0$ (c 1.0, CHCl_3), 95% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.18 (d, $J = 8.3$ Hz, 1H), 7.85 (dd, $J = 24.8$, 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.74–7.48 (m, 2H), 7.48–7.12 (m, 2H), 5.46–5.11 (m, 1H), 5.07–4.48 (m, 3H), 2.32 (s, 3H), 1.87 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 202.4, 200.9, 134.4, 132.1, 130.9, 129.6, 129.3, 127.5, 126.5, 125.4, 124.99 (br), 122.0, 77.9, 70.6, 36.6, 31.1, 28.8. HPLC: Chiralpak IA, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.8 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 11.7 min (S), 14.5 min (R).

(*R*)-3-(2-Nitro-1-(thiophen-2-yl)ethyl)pentane-2,4-dione (**16**).^{17c} Beige solid, 69% yield (35.2 mg). $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +126.5$ (c 1.10, CHCl_3) (89% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.31–7.19 (m, 1H), 7.01–6.83 (m, 2H), 4.66 (d, $J = 5.3$ Hz, 2H), 4.61–4.49 (m, 1H), 4.41 (d, $J = 10.1$ Hz, 1H), 2.30 (s, 3H), 2.08 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 201.6, 200.8, 138.6, 127.5, 127.1, 125.9, 78.6, 71.2, 38.3, 30.7, 29.8. HPLC: Chiralcel OJ, hexane/ethanol 70/30, 1.0 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 33.4 min (S), 41.9 min (R).

Dimethyl (*S*)-2-(1-Phenyl-2-nitroethyl)malonate (**17**).^{2b} White solid, 69% yield (38.8 mg). Mp: 50–55 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +6.0$ (c 1.10, CHCl_3) (87% ee) (lit.^{2b} *R* enantiomer mp 63–64 °C, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -6.15$ (c 1.10, CHCl_3), 89% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.45–7.13 (m, 5H), 5.03–4.77 (m, 2H), 4.25 (td, $J = 8.8$, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 3.87 (d, $J = 9.1$ Hz, 1H), 3.76 (s, 3H), 3.56 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 168.0, 167.4, 136.2, 129.2, 128.6, 128.0, 54.9, 53.2, 53.0, 43.1. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times: 9.1 min (R), 10.6 (S).

Dimethyl (*R*)-2-Methyl-2-(1-phenyl-2-nitroethyl)malonate (**18**).^{2b} White solid, 57% yield (33.6 mg). Mp: 124–127 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -28.5$ (c 1.00, CHCl_3) (93% ee) (lit.^{2b} *S* enantiomer mp 130–132 °C, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +32.3$ (c 1.06, CHCl_3), 93% ee). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.37–7.27 (m, 3H), 7.19–7.12 (m, 2H), 5.11–4.99 (m, 2H), 4.21–4.14 (m, 1H), 3.78 (s, 3H), 3.74 (s, 3H), 1.35 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 171.5, 170.9, 135.1, 129.1, 129.0, 128.7, 56.9, 53.2, 53.0, 48.5, 20.5. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 7.1 min (R), 9.2 (S).

Ethyl ξ -1-((*R*)-2-Nitro-1-phenylethyl)-2-oxocyclopentane-1-carboxylate (**19**).^{36d} Colorless liquid, 96% yield (58.6 mg). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 7.46–7.12 (m, 5H), 5.18 (dd, $J = 13.6$, 3.9 Hz, 1H), 5.02 (dd, $J = 13.5$, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 4.21 (q, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 2H), 4.08 (dd, $J = 10.9$, 3.9 Hz, 1H), 2.58–2.22 (m, 3H), 2.05–1.79 (m, 3H), 1.27 (t, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 212.5, 169.4, 135.4, 129.4, 128.9, 128.4, 76.6, 62.5, 62.3, 46.3, 38.0, 31.3, 19.5, 14.1. HPLC: Chiralpak IC3, hexane/ethanol 85/15, 0.6 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 9.1 min (R), 11.3 (S).

(*R*)-2-Hydroxy-3-(2-nitro-1-phenylethyl)naphthoquinone (**20**).^{36e} Yellow solid, 84% yield (54.3 mg). Mp: 148–150 °C. $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} -15.6$ (c 0.33, CHCl_3) (96% ee) (lit.^{31e} *S* enantiomer mp 147–149 °C, $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25} +37$ (c 1.0, acetone)). ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 8.20–7.99 (m, 2H), 7.89–7.62 (m, 3H), 7.55–7.41 (m, 2H), 7.38–7.19 (m, 3H), 5.56–5.41 (m, 1H), 5.38–5.25 (m, 1H), 5.22–5.08 (m, 1H). ^{13}C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl_3): δ 183.6, 181.1, 153.2, 137.5, 135.4, 133.2, 132.6, 129.0, 128.3, 127.8, 127.2, 126.3, 120.8, 76.4, 39.7.

HPLC: Chiralcel OJ, hexane/ethanol 70/30, 0.8 mL/min, λ 220 nm, retention times 22.2 min (S), 41.4 (R).

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.joc.6b01063.

Kinetics of the addition of 2,4-pentanedione to β -nitrostyrene and QTAIM analysis of the transition states with catalysts 5a–8a, Takemoto's and Pápai's calculated mechanisms with catalyst 6a, ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra of compounds obtained in this work, HPLC traces, and Cartesian coordinates and energies of computed structures (PDF)

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail for M.H.-R.: marcosh@unam.mx.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the DGAPA-UNAM (project IN209915) and CONACyT (grant 254014) for financial support, and the DGCTIC, UNAM, for supercomputer resources (SC16-1-IR-109 and SC16-1-IG-99). E.I.J., W.E.V.N., and J.V.-C. gratefully acknowledge the CONACyT/México for Ph.D. scholarships. We also thank L. C. Márquez, E. García, and L. M. Ríos for HPLC analysis and J. Pérez, L. Velasco, M. C. García for mass analysis. T. R.-R. and M.H.-R. express their gratitude to M. A. Peña, M. I. Chávez, E. Huerta, B. Quiroz, I. M. Aguilar, G. Cortés, and D. Vázquez for technical support.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) (a) Connon, S. J. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2006**, *12*, 5418–5427. (b) Doyle, A. G.; Jacobsen, E. N. *Chem. Rev.* **2007**, *107*, 5713–5743. (c) Zhang, Z.; Schreiner, P. R. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2009**, *38*, 1187–1198. (d) Peterson, E. A.; Jacobsen, E. N. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 6328–6331. (e) Auvil, T. J.; Schafer, A. G.; Mattson, A. E. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *2014*, 2633–2646. (f) Busschaert, N.; Caltagirone, C.; Rossom, W. V.; Gale, P. A. *Chem. Rev.* **2015**, *115*, 8038–8155.
- (2) (a) Okino, T.; Hoashi, Y.; Takemoto, Y. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 12672–12673. (b) Okino, T.; Hoashi, Y.; Furukawa, T.; Xu, X.; Takemoto, Y. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 119–125. (c) Takemoto, Y. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2005**, *3*, 4299–4306. (d) Connon, S. J. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2006**, *12*, 5418–5427.
- (3) For some reviews on bifunctional organocatalysts, see: (a) Siau, W.-Y.; Wang, J. *Catal. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *1*, 1298–1310. (b) Serdyuk, O. V.; Heckel, C. M.; Tsogoeva, S. B. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2013**, *11*, 7051–7071. (c) Somanathan, R.; Chávez, D.; Servin, F. A.; Romero, J. A.; Navarrete, A.; Parra-Hake, M.; Aguirre, G.; Anaya de Parodi, C.; González, J. *Curr. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *16*, 2440–2461. (d) Fang, X.; Wang, C. J. *Chem. Commun.* **2015**, *51*, 1185–1197. (e) Wang, Y.; Lu, H.; Xu, P.-F. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2015**, *48*, 1832–1844.
- (4) Zhang, Z.; Bao, Z.; Xing, H. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2014**, *12*, 3151–3162.
- (5) (a) Hughes, M. P.; Shang, M. Y.; Smith, B. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **1996**, *61*, 4510–4511. (b) Hughes, M. P.; Smith, B. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **1997**, *62*, 4492–4499.
- (6) (a) So, S. S.; Burkett, J. A.; Mattson, A. E. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 716–719. (b) So, S. S.; Mattson, A. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 8798–8801. (c) Nickerson, D. M.; Mattson, A. E. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 8310–8314. (d) Hardman, A. M.; So, S. S.; Mattson, A. E. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2013**, *11*, 5793–5797. (e) Thioureas with pyridinium ions were recently reported: Fan, Y.; Kass, S. R. *Org. Lett.* **2016**, *18*, 188–191.

(7) A nice example is the extensive optimization of bifunctional catalysts by Berkessel in the DKR of α -lactones: Berkessel, A.; Mukherjee, S.; Muller, T. N.; Cleemann, F.; Roland, K.; Brandenburg, M.; Neudörfl, J.-M.; Lex, J. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2006**, *4*, 4319–4330.

(8) (a) Robak, M. T.; Trincado, M.; Ellman, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 15110–15111. (b) Kimmel, K. L.; Robak, M. T.; Ellman, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 8754–8755. (c) Kimmel, K. L.; Robak, M. T.; Thomas, S.; Lee, M.; Ellman, J. A. *Tetrahedron* **2012**, *68*, 2704–2712. (d) Kimmel, K. L.; Weaver, J. D.; Ellman, J. A. *Chem. Sci.* **2012**, *3*, 121–125. (e) Kimmel, K. L.; Weaver, J. D.; Lee, M.; Ellman, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 9058–9061.

(9) (a) Xu, H.; Zuend, S. J.; Woll, M. G.; Tao, Y.; Jacobsen, E. N. *Science* **2010**, *327*, 986–990. (b) Robak, M. T.; Herbage, M. A.; Ellman, J. A. *Tetrahedron* **2011**, *67*, 4412–4416. (c) Pei, D.; Wang, Z.; Wei, S.; Zhang, Y.; Sun, J. *Org. Lett.* **2006**, *8*, 5913–5915.

(10) Organocatalysts with one fluorine atom have been reported: (a) Sparr, C.; Schweizer, W. B.; Senn, H. M.; Gilmour, R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 3065–3068. (b) Zimmer, L.; Sparr, C.; Gilmour, R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 11860–11871. (c) Molnár, G.; Tanzer, E.-M.; Daniluc, C.; Gilmour, R. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2014**, *20*, 794–800. (d) Cahard, D.; Bizet, V. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, *43*, 135–147.

(11) Trejo-Huizar, K. E.; Ortiz-Rico, R.; Peña-González, M. A.; Hernández-Rodríguez, M. *New J. Chem.* **2013**, *37*, 2610–2613.

(12) The acidity of the bifunctional thiourea correlates with the yield in the reaction and other HB catalysis: (a) Li, X.; Deng, H.; Zhang, B.; Li, J.; Zhang, L.; Luo, S.; Chen, J.-P. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 450–455. (b) Walvoord, R. R.; Huynh, P. N. H.; Kozłowski, M. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 16055–16065.

(13) Electron-withdrawing groups with good hydrogen bond acceptors could deactivate the catalyst by intramolecular hydrogen bonds. For example *N*-acyl ureas have a strong intramolecular hydrogen bond. (a) Lessene, G.; Smith, B. J.; Gable, R. W.; Baell, J. B. *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 6511–6525. (b) Abraham, M. H.; Abraham, R. J.; Acree, W. E., Jr.; Aliev, A. E.; Leo, A. J.; Whaley, W. L. *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 11075–11083.

(14) The enhanced acidity of fluorine-containing alcohols is already known: (a) Vuluga, D.; Legros, J.; Crousse, B.; Slawin, A. M. Z.; Laurence, C.; Nicolet, P.; Bonnet-Delpon, D. *J. Org. Chem.* **2011**, *76*, 1126–1133. Nevertheless, fluorine incorporation in molecules does not always increase their acidity. It has been reported that in conformationally restricted cyclohexanols an internal OH...F interaction diminishes the acidity of alcohol; see: Graton, J.; Wang, Z.; Brossard, A.-M.; Monteiro, D. G.; Le Questel, J.-Y.; Linclau, B. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 6176–6180.

(15) (a) Prakash, G. K. S.; Mandal, M.; Olah, G. A. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 589–590. (b) Hernández-Rodríguez, M.; Castillo-Hernández, T.; Trejo-Huizar, K. E. *Synthesis* **2011**, *2011*, 2817–2821. (c) Xu, J.; Liu, Z.-J.; Yang, X.-J.; Wang, L.-M.; Chen, G.-L.; Liu, J.-T. *Tetrahedron* **2010**, *66*, 8933–8937.

(16) (a) Suez, G.; Bloch, V.; Nisnevich, G.; Gandelman, M. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *2012*, 2118–2122.

(17) (a) Fuerst, D. E.; Jacobsen, E. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 8964–8965. (b) Zhang, Z.-H.; Dong, X.-Q.; Chen, D.; Wang, C.-J. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2008**, *14*, 8780–8783. (c) Jiang, X.; Zhang, Y.; Liu, X.; Zhang, G.; Lai, L.; Wu, L.; Zhang, J.; Wang, R. *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 5562–5567. (d) Jiang, X.; Zhang, Y.; Wu, L.; Zhang, G.; Liu, X.; Zhang, H.; Fu, D.; Wang, R. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2009**, *351*, 2096–2100. (e) Ma, S.; Wu, L.; Liu, M.; Huang, Y.; Wang, Y. *Tetrahedron* **2013**, *69*, 2613–2618. (f) Geng, Z.-C.; Zhang, J.-X.; Li, N.; Chen, J.; Huang, X.-F.; Zhang, S.-Y.; Li, H.-Y.; Tao, J.-C.; Wang, X.-W. *Tetrahedron* **2014**, *70*, 417–426.

(18) Bifunctional catalysts with primary amine and phenylethylamine have also been reported: (a) Tsogoeva, S. B.; Yalalov, D. A.; Hateley, M. J.; Weckbecker, C.; Huthmacher, K. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *2005*, 4995–5000. (b) Tsogoeva, S. B.; Wei, S. *Chem. Commun.* **2006**, *13*, 1451–1453. (c) Yalalov, D. A.; Tsogoeva, S. B.; Schmatz, S. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2006**, *348*, 826–832. (d) Li, B.-L.; Wang, Y.-F.; Luo, S.-P.; Zhong, A.-G.; Li, Z.-B.; Du, X.-H.; Xu, D.-Q. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *2010*, 656–662. (e) Shubina, T. E.; Freund, M.; Schenker, S.; Clark, T.; Tsogoeva, S. B. *Beilstein J. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *8*, 1485–1498. (f) Bastida,

D.; Yankai, L.; Xu, T.; Escudero-Adán, E.; Melchiorre, P. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*, 220–223. (g) Pou, A.; Moyano, A. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, *2013*, 3103–3111.

(19) For some recent examples of Michael addition with 2,4-pentanedione, see: (a) Ren, X.; He, C.; Feng, Y.; Chai, Y.; Yao, W. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2015**, *13*, 5054–5060. (b) Rao, K. S.; Trivedi, R.; Kantam, M. L. *Synlett* **2015**, *26*, 221–227. (c) Işik, M.; Unver, M. Y.; Tanyeli, C. *J. Org. Chem.* **2015**, *80*, 828–835. (d) Sun, Q.-S.; Chen, X.-Y.; Zhu, H.; Lin, H.; Sun, X.-W.; Lin, G.-Q. *Org. Chem. Front.* **2015**, *2*, 110–113. (e) Bae, H. Y.; Song, C. E. *ACS Catal.* **2015**, *5*, 3613–3619.

(20) Although **6d** was the most selective catalyst, we chose to study catalysts with naphthyl because most of the compounds considered in this work have aromatic rings.

(21) Seebach, D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1990**, *29*, 1320–1367.

(22) Carcenac, Y.; Diter, P.; Wakselman, C.; Tordeux, M. *New J. Chem.* **2006**, *30*, 442–446.

(23) (a) Smart, B. E. In *Organofluorine Chemistry: Principles and Commercial Applications*; Banks, R. E., Smart, B. E., Tatlow, J. C., Eds.; Plenum Press: New York, 1994; pp 81–82. (b) Ruzziconi, R.; Spizzichino, S.; Mazzanti, A.; Lunazzi, L.; Schlosser, M. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2010**, *8*, 4463–4471.

(24) (a) Hamza, A.; Schubert, G.; Soós, T.; Pápai, I. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 13151–13160. (b) Zhu, J.-L.; Zhang, Y.; Liu, C.; Zheng, A.-M.; Wang, W. *J. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *77*, 9813–9825. (c) Azuma, T.; Kobayashi, Y.; Sakata, K.; Sasamori, T.; Tokitoh, N.; Takemoto, Y. *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 1805–1817. (d) Kótai, B.; Kardos, G.; Hamza, A.; Farkas, V.; Pápai, I.; Soós, T. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2014**, *20*, 5631–5639.

(25) Varga, E.; Míka, L. T.; Csámpai, A.; Holczbauer, T.; Kardos, G.; Soós, T. *RSC Adv.* **2015**, *5*, 95079–95086.

(26) Tárkányi, G.; Király, P.; Soós, T.; Varga, S. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 1918–1922.

(27) (a) Tsuzuki, S.; Honda, K.; Uchamaru, T.; Mikami, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 144323. (b) Nishio, M. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *13*, 13873–13900.

(28) (a) O'Hagan, D. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2008**, *37*, 308–319. (b) Schneider, H.-J. *Chem. Sci.* **2012**, *3*, 1381–1394. (c) Champagne, P. A.; Desroches, J.; Paquin, J.-F. *Synthesis* **2015**, *47*, 306–322.

(29) (a) Bader, R. F. W. *Atoms in Molecules: A Quantum Theory*; Clarendon Press: Wotton-under-Edge, U.K., 1994. International Series of Monographs on Chemistry 22. (b) Vallejo-Narváez, W. E.; Rocha-Rinza, T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2015**, *119*, 2098–2110.

(30) This DFT functional has been used previously in organocatalysis with good results: Schenker, S.; Schneider, C.; Tsogoeva, S. B.; Clark, T. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 3586–3595.

(31) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A., et al. *Gaussian 09*; Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford, CT, 2013.

(32) Kossmann, S.; Neese, F. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2010**, *6*, 2325–2338. The RIJCOSX-MP2 single points were computed in the ORCA program, version 3.03. Neese, F. *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2*, 73–78.

(33) Keith, T. A. *AIMAll (Version 14.06.21)*; TK Gristmill Software, Overland Park, KS, USA, 2014; aim.tkgristmill.com.

(34) Espinosa, E.; Molins, E.; Lecomte, C. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *285*, 170–173.

(35) (a) Vyas, D. J.; Fröhlich, R.; Oestreich, M. *Org. Lett.* **2011**, *13*, 2094–2097. (b) Plobeck, N.; Powell, D. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **2002**, *13*, 303–310. (c) Collados, J. F.; Toledano, E.; Guijarro, D.; Yus, M. *J. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *77*, 5744–5750. (d) Kells, K. W.; Chong, J. M. *Org. Lett.* **2003**, *5*, 4215–4218. (e) Estivill, C.; Mendizabal, J.; Virgili, A.; Monteagudo, E.; Flor, T.; Sánchez-Ferrando, F.; Alvarez-Larena, A.; Piniella, J. F. *Tetrahedron* **2009**, *65*, 171–176. (f) Fernández, I.; Valdivia, V.; Alcuida, A.; Chelouan, A.; Khiar, N. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *2010*, 1502–1509. (g) Zuend, S. J.; Jacobsen, E. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 15872–15883.

(36) (a) Malerich, J. P.; Hagihara, K.; Rawal, V. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 14416–14417. (b) Gao, P.; Wang, C.; Wu, Y.; Zhou, Z.; Tang, C. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *2008*, 4563–4566. (c) Kardos, G.;

Soos, T. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2013**, *2013*, 4490–4494. (d) Da Silva, R. C.; Da Silva, G. P.; Sangi, D. P.; Pontes, J. G. d. M.; Ferreira, A. G.; Correa, A. G.; Paixao, M. W. *Tetrahedron* **2013**, *69*, 9007–9012. (e) Wu, R.; Chang, X.; Lu, A.; Wang, Y.; Wu, G.; Song, H.; Zhou, Z.; Tang, C. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 5034–5036.

(37) (a) Almansa, R.; Guijarro, D.; Yus, M. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **2008**, *19*, 2484–2491. (b) Petrone, D. A.; Yoon, H.; Weinstabl, H. M.; Lautens, M. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 7908–7912.