

D_2 -Symmetric Dirhodium Catalyst Derived from a 1,2,2-Triarylcyclopropanecarboxylate Ligand: Design, Synthesis and Application


Changming Qin,[†] Vyacheslav Boyarskikh,[†] Jørn H. Hansen,[†] Kenneth I. Hardcastle,[†] Djamaladdin G. Musaev,^{*,†} and Huw M. L. Davies^{*,†}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Emory University, 1515 Dickey Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, United States

^{*}Cherry L. Emerson Center for Scientific Computation, Emory University, 1521 Dickey Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, United States

 Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Dirhodium tetrakis-(*R*)-(1-(4-bromophenyl)-2,2-diphenylcyclopropanecarboxylate) ($\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$) was found to be an effective chiral catalyst for enantioselective reactions of aryl- and styryldiazoacetates. Highly enantioselective cyclopropanations, tandem cyclopropanation/Cope rearrangements and a combined C–H functionalization/Cope rearrangement were achieved using $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ as catalyst. The advantages of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ include its ease of synthesis, its tolerance to the size of the ester group in the styryldiazoacetates, and its compatibility with dichloromethane as solvent. Computational studies suggest that the catalyst adopts a D_2 -symmetric arrangement, but when the carbenoid binds to the catalyst, two of the *p*-bromophenyl groups on the ligands rotate outward to make room for the carbenoid and the approach of the substrate to the carbenoid.



INTRODUCTION

Dirhodium catalysts have played a prominent role in the metal-catalyzed reactions of diazo compounds.¹ Over the past few decades, great effort has been made to prepare various chiral dirhodium tetracarboxylate and dirhodium tetracarboxamidate catalysts.^{2,3} Our group has studied a series of proline-based dirhodium catalysts, such as $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-DOSP})_4$ (**1**, Figure 1),^{3f} and examined their capacity to induce high asymmetric induction in the reactions of donor/acceptor carbenoids.^{1a} The asymmetric induction in these catalyzed reactions is sensitive to solvent and substrate structure.^{3f} High asymmetric induction with $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-DOSP})_4$ as catalyst requires the use of a methyl ester as the acceptor group in the carbenoid and nonpolar solvents such as hydrocarbons.^{3f} Although our effort to solve these limitations has led to the development of other promising catalysts, such as the phthalimidocarboxylate $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTAD})_4$ (**2**)⁴ and the bridged dicarboxylate catalyst, $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-biTISP})_2$ (**3**),⁵ the relatively tedious synthetic routes to these catalysts erode their overall appeal. Therefore, the development of both synthetically accessible and highly selective chiral dirhodium catalysts remains highly desirable. Herein, we report the concise synthesis of a novel catalyst, $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ (**4**), and its application in highly enantioselective transformations of donor/acceptor carbenoids.

Over the past few years, we have developed several novel enantioselective reactions of donor/acceptor carbenoids, such as cyclopropanation,^{3f,4–6} formal [4 + 3] cycloaddition,⁷ C–H functionalization,^{1a} and ylide transformations.⁸ These reactions have been used in total synthesis⁹ and as enabling technologies in medicinal chemistry programs.^{7,10} We have become intrigued

with the possibility of using the new asymmetric transformations to enable the design of new chiral catalysts. Indeed, the inspiration for the development of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTAD})_4$, a related catalyst to Hashimoto's catalyst $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTTL})_4$ (**5**),^{3e} came from the discovery that donor/acceptor carbenoids undergo enantioselective C–H functionalization of adamantane.⁴ Donor/acceptor carbenoids are also capable of generating highly substituted cyclopropanes with high enantioselectivity.^{3f,4–8,11} We decided to explore whether the resulting cyclopropanecarboxylic acids would be useful ligands for dirhodium catalysts. The cyclopropane ring would be expected to limit the possible conformations of the ligands and in this way we would hope to address the limitations observed with the $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-DOSP})_4$ catalyst.^{3f}

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To evaluate the utility of cyclopropanecarboxylate catalysts, the 1,2-diphenylcyclopropanecarboxylate complex **8**, $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-DPCP})_4$, was prepared (Scheme 1). $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-DOSP})_4$ -catalyzed enantioselective cyclopropanation of styrene **6** with methyl phenyldiazoacetate **7**, afforded the diarylcyclopropanecarboxylate in 81% yield, >20: 1 dr and 91% *ee*,⁶ which was further enriched to >99% *ee* by recrystallization. A sequential hydrolysis and recrystallization provided the diphenylcyclopropanecarboxylic acid in 60% yield and >99% *ee*. Finally, ligand exchange with sodium rhodium carbonate in refluxing water gave **8** in 65% yield.

Received: August 27, 2011

Published: November 02, 2011







Figure 1. Chiral dirhodium catalysts.

Scheme 1. Synthesis of Rh₂(R-DPCP)₄Scheme 2. Evaluation of Rh₂(R-DPCP)₄

The selectivity of Rh₂(R-DPCP)₄ was evaluated in the standard cyclopropanation reaction between styrene **6** and styryldiazoacetate **9** using dichloromethane as solvent (Scheme 2). The styrylcyclopropane **10** was formed in 81% yield and with high diastereoselectivity (>20: 1 dr), which is typical for the cyclopropanation chemistry of donor/acceptor carbenoids. However, the asymmetric induction exhibited by Rh₂(R-DPCP)₄ was only 11% ee.

At this stage, we re-examined what might be required for an effective cyclopropanecarboxylate ligand. Even though the cyclopropanecarboxylate in **8** has two stereogenic centers, the two phenyl rings are on the opposite side of the ring to the carboxylate. Therefore, the phenyl rings are not likely to display a major chiral influence on the catalyst nor are they likely to limit conformational mobility of the ligands. To overcome this issue, we decided to make a ligand with an additional phenyl ring *syn*- to the carboxylate. The triarylcyclopropanecarboxylate, was prepared from Rh₂(R-DOSP)₄ catalyzed cyclopropanation reactions between 1,1-diphenylethylene (**11**) and *para*-bromophenyl diazoacetate **12** (Scheme 3). As previously established, this type of cyclopropanation proceeds with very high enantioselectivity.^{6,11} The cyclopropane ester was converted to the corresponding carboxylic acid by ^tBuOK in dimethyl sulfoxide without erosion of enantioselectivity and was enriched to 99% ee after recrystallization.

Scheme 3. Synthesis of Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄Table 1. Initial Evaluation of Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄- and Rh₂(R-DOSP)₄-Catalyzed Cyclopropanation^a

entry	solvent	temp. (°C)	time (h)	Rh ₂ (R-BTPCP) ₄		Rh ₂ (R-DOSP) ₄	
				yield (%)	ee (%)	yield (%)	ee (%)
1	pentane	23	1.5	82	84 ^b	85	92
2	CH ₂ Cl ₂	23	1.5	86	91	80	81
3	CH ₂ Cl ₂	0	2.0	72	92 ^c	81	84
4	CH ₂ Cl ₂	-78	12	71	91	78	87
5 ^d	CH ₂ Cl ₂	23	24	77	92	69	81
6 ^e	CH ₂ Cl ₂	23	60	46	92	38	81

^a Standard conditions: **9** (0.4 mmol) was added to a solution of Rh(II) catalyst and styrene (2.0 mmol) under argon over 1 h. Reported yields were obtained after chromatographic purification. dr was determined by ¹H NMR prior to chromatography, and ee was determined by chiral HPLC. Absolute configuration of **10** was assigned according to previous studies.^{3f} ^b -89% ee was obtained when Rh₂(S-BTPCP)₄ was used. ^c Rh₂(S-BTPCP)₄ was used. ^d 0.1 mol % catalyst. ^e 0.01 mol % catalyst.

Standard ligand exchange conditions generated Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ (**4**) in 63% yield as a green solid.


With Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ in hand, its efficiency was examined in the standard reaction between the styryldiazoacetate **9** and styrene **6**. The influence of the *syn*-phenyl group in the ligand was dramatic as the reaction in dichloromethane at 23 °C generated the cyclopropane **10** in 91% ee, which is better than the same reaction catalyzed by Rh₂(R-DOSP)₄ (81% ee), (Table 1, entry 2). Further experiments comparing Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ and Rh₂(R-DOSP)₄ are summarized in Table 1. Temperature did not influence the enantioselectivity of the Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄-catalyzed reaction between **9** and styrene **6** as **10** was produced in 91% ee over a reaction temperature range from 23 to -78 °C (Table 1, entries 2, 4). Furthermore, decreasing the catalyst loading from 1 to 0.01 mol % did not alter the enantioselectivity (Table 1, entries 5, 6),¹² but the reaction did not go to completion at the 0.01 mol % catalyst loading.

High asymmetric induction with Rh₂(S-DOSP)₄ can only be obtained when the electron-withdrawing group is a methyl ester.^{3f} Even changing the methyl ester to a *tert*-butyl ester caused a dramatic drop in the enantioselectivity. Therefore, a study was undertaken to determine how Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄-catalyzed reactions responded to the size of the ester (Table 2). Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ exhibited good tolerance to ester size, and the

enantioselectivity actually improved on increasing the ester size from methyl to *tert*-butyl (Table 2, entries 1–4, from 91% *ee* to 95% *ee*). In contrast, hindered esters were confirmed to have a detrimental effect on asymmetric induction with Rh₂(R-DOSP)₄, leading to a steady drop in enantioselectivity from 81% *ee* to 16% *ee* (Table 2, entries, 5–8).

To probe the generality of this catalyst in enantioselective cyclopropanation with donor/acceptor carbenoid intermediates, various combinations of aryl- or vinyl diazoacetates with terminal alkenes were evaluated. The results for representative vinyl diazoacetates and terminal alkenes are summarized in Table 3.

Table 2. Effect of Ester Size on Asymmetric Cyclopropanation^a




entry	starting material	R	catalyst	product	yield (%)	<i>ee</i> (%)
1	9	Me	Rh ₂ (R-BTPCP) ₄	10	86	91
2	13a	Et	Rh ₂ (R-BTPCP) ₄	14a	88	93
3	13b	<i>i</i> -Pr	Rh ₂ (R-BTPCP) ₄	14b	89	96
4	13c	<i>t</i> -Bu	Rh ₂ (R-BTPCP) ₄	14c	87	95
5	9	Me	Rh ₂ (R-DOSP) ₄	10	80	81
6	13a	Et	Rh ₂ (R-DOSP) ₄	14a	84	75
7	13b	<i>i</i> -Pr	Rh ₂ (R-DOSP) ₄	14b	82	55
8	13c	<i>t</i> -Bu	Rh ₂ (R-DOSP) ₄	14c	80	16

^a Standard conditions: Diazo compound (0.4 mmol) was added to a solution of Rh(II) catalyst and styrene (2.0 mmol) in dichloromethane under argon over 1 h. Reported yields were obtained after chromatographic purification. *dr* was determined by ¹H NMR prior to chromatography, and *ee* was determined by chiral HPLC.

All the reactions proceeded smoothly in dichloromethane, affording the corresponding cyclopropanes **16a-k** with high diastereo- and enantioselectivity with yields ranging from 59% to 94%. Carbenoid precursors with electron-donating substituents on the donor group (Table 3, entry 11) resulted in higher asymmetric induction than those having electron-withdrawing substituents on the donor group (Table 3, entries 9, 10). Electron-deficient alkenes gave better enantioselectivity than electron-rich alkenes. An optimum system is *para*-trifluoromethylstyrene and its reaction with styryldiazoacetate **9**, produced the cyclopropane **16a** in 97% *ee* (Table 3, entry 1). In contrast, the reaction with *para*-methoxystyrene produced the corresponding cyclopropane **16e** in 83% *ee* at room temperature, but this could be improved to 93% *ee* when the reaction was conducted at –40 °C (Table 3, entry 5). Inclusion of an *ortho* substituent on the styrene had little influence on the enantioselectivity, as reaction of *ortho*-methylstyrene and methyl


Table 4. Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄-Catalyzed Asymmetric Cyclopropanation with Aryldiazoacetates^a



entry	starting material	R	product	yield (%)	<i>ee</i> (%)
1	7	Ph	18a	82	83
2	12	<i>p</i> -BrC ₆ H ₄	18b	80	85
3	17a	<i>p</i> -MeOC ₆ H ₄	18c	74	91
4	17b	<i>p</i> -CF ₃ C ₆ H ₄	18d	86	89


^a Standard conditions: Diazo compound (0.4 mmol) was added to a solution of Rh(II) catalyst and styrene (2.0 mmol) in dichloromethane under argon over 1 h. Reported yields were obtained after chromatographic purification. *dr* was determined by ¹H NMR prior to chromatography, and *ee* was determined by chiral HPLC. Absolute configuration of the products was assigned according to previous studies.⁶

Table 3. Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄-Catalyzed Asymmetric Cyclopropanation with Styryldiazoacetates^a




entry	R ¹	diazo compound	R ²	product	yield (%)	<i>ee</i> (%)
1	<i>p</i> -CF ₃ C ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16a	87	97
2	<i>p</i> -NO ₂ C ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16b	92	95
3	<i>p</i> -ClC ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16c	86	95
4	3,4-diClC ₆ H ₃	9	Ph	16d	88	93
5	<i>p</i> -MeOC ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16e	94	84(93) ^b
6	<i>o</i> -CH ₃ C ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16f	88	93
7	<i>o</i> -MeO ₂ CC ₆ H ₄	9	Ph	16g	59	89
8	H ₃ C(CH ₂) ₃	9	Ph	16h	60	90 ^c
9	Ph	15a	<i>p</i> -ClC ₆ H ₄	16i	82	90
10	Ph	15c	3,4-diClC ₆ H ₃	16j	79	86
11	Ph	15d	3,4-diMeOC ₆ H ₃	16k	70	–93 ^d

^a Standard conditions: Diazo compound (0.4 mmol) was added to a solution of Rh(II) catalyst and styrene (2.0 mmol) in dichloromethane under argon over 1 h. Reported yields were obtained after chromatographic purification. *dr* was determined by ¹H NMR prior to chromatography, and *ee* was determined by chiral HPLC. ^b Reaction was conducted at –40 °C. ^c *dr* >10:1. ^d Rh₂(S-BTPCP)₄ was used as catalyst.

Table 5. Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ Catalyzed Tandem Cyclopropanation/Cope Rearrangement^a

entry	starting diene	R	product	yield (%)	ee (%)
1	19a	Ph	20a	56	87
2	19b	<i>p</i> -CF ₃ C ₆ H ₄	20b	71	91
3	19c	<i>p</i> -MeOC ₆ H ₄	20c	60	89

^a Standard conditions: Diazo compound (0.4 mmol) was added to a solution of Rh(II) catalyst and styrene (2.0 mmol) in dichloromethane at -40 °C under argon over 1 h. Reported yields were obtained after chromatographic purification. dr was determined by ¹H NMR prior to chromatography, and ee was determined by chiral HPLC. Absolute configuration of the products was assigned according to previous studies.^{7a}



Scheme 4. Combined C–H Cope/Retro-Cope Reaction^a

2-vinylbenzoate with the styryldiazoacetate **9** provided the cyclopropanes **16f** and **16g** in 93% ee and 89% ee, respectively (Table 3, entries 6, 7). Unactivated alkenes are also suitable substrates as 1-hexene (Table 3, entry 8) gave the cyclopropane **16h** in 60% yield and 90% ee.

The cyclopropanation reactions of representative aryldiazoacetates are summarized in Table 4. The reactions generated the cyclopropanes **18a–d** in high yield and stereoselectivity (>20:1 dr, 83–91% ee), with *p*-methoxyphenyl derivative **17a** giving the highest enantioselectivity (91% ee). These results are similar to the reported results for the Rh₂(S-DOSP)₄-catalyzed cyclopropanations of aryldiazoacetates in hexane as solvent.⁶

Encouraged by the cyclopropanation results, we decided to investigate the scope of the catalyst further by looking at more elaborate reactions of vinyldiazoacetates. When vinyldiazoacetates react with dienes, a formal [4 + 3] cycloaddition occurs by a tandem cyclopropanation/Cope rearrangement.⁷ The Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄-catalyzed reactions of styryldiazoacetate **9** with dienes **19** gave rise to the cycloheptadienes **20** in 56–71% yield and the enantioselectivity was 87–91% ee. As is typical of this transformation,⁷ **20** were formed as single diastereomers.

In recent years, vinyldiazoacetates have been shown to be broadly useful in a range of C–H functionalization reactions.^{1a} An example is the formal C–H functionalization of dihydro-naphthalene **21** to form **22**.¹³ This reaction proceeds by a sequence involving a combined C–H functionalization/Cope rearrangement followed by a reverse Cope rearrangement. When this reaction was catalyzed by Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄, the product **22** was formed in 92% yield as a single diastereomer and in 98% ee (Scheme 4).¹³ This result compares favorably to the Rh₂(S-DOSP)₄-catalyzed formation of **22** with hexane as solvent.

**Figure 2.** Three distinct ligand orientations used to rationalize enantioselectivity in dirhodium carboxylate-catalyzed reactions.**Figure 3.** X-ray crystal structure of Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ (axial ligands omitted for clarity).

Even though dirhodium tetracarboxylates contain two potentially reactive rhodium sites and four identical ligands of C₁ symmetry, they are capable of very high asymmetric induction.^{2a} Previously, this feature was explained by envisioning the dirhodium tetracarboxylates in conformations of higher symmetry than the ligands themselves. For Rh₂(S-DOSP)₄-catalyzed reactions, we proposed the catalyst to preferentially exist in a D₂ symmetric “up-down-up-down” conformation, providing identical C₂ symmetric binding sites at both rhodium faces of the catalyst (Figure 2).^{3f} Hashimoto rationalized the selectivity of his phthalimido amino acid derived catalysts by proposing a C₂ symmetric “up-up-down-down” arrangement for the catalyst.^{3e} More recently, Fox reported that the *tert*-butyl catalyst Rh₂(S-PTTL)₄, the most broadly used of Hashimoto’s catalysts, exists in an “all-up” distorted C₄ conformation.^{3h,i} According to this model, the bulky *tert*-butyl groups are necessary to limit reactivity to only one of the Rh faces of the catalyst, whereas a distorted C₄ symmetric chiral crown-like ligand arrangement guides the facial selectivity at the open Rh-face. Recently, other groups have reported X-ray structures of related catalysts to Rh₂(S-PTTL)₄, and all these catalysts adopt an “all-up” C₄ conformation.^{3j,k,m,n} Because Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ is structurally quite different from the other above-mentioned chiral dirhodium tetracarboxylate catalysts, a study to determine what made it such an effective chiral catalyst was undertaken.

A single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis of Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ provided valuable insights into the catalyst geometry. In the X-ray structure, the large chiral ligands of Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ are organized in an overall D₂ symmetric arrangement, forming identical rectangular orthogonal (approximately 8.5 × 10.5 Å) binding cavities of C₂ symmetry at the two catalytically active axial termini of the rhodium dimer (Figure 3).

Rh₂(R-BTPCP)₄ and Rh₂(S-PTTL)₄ have different overall symmetry, D₂ and distorted C₄, respectively, but they possess a related rectangular binding cavity at the reactive axial positions




Figure 4. Catalytically active sites of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ (X-ray) and $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTTL})_4$ (calculated structure).




Figure 5. DFT model of *s-cis* and *s-trans* carbene conformers.

(Figure 4). The rectangular binding cavity for $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ ($8.5 \times 10.5 \text{ \AA}$) is significantly smaller than the cavity for $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTTL})_4$ ($12.8 \times 14.1 \text{ \AA}$). Furthermore, both Rh faces of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ have identical binding cavities of C_2 symmetry. However, for $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTTL})_4$ only one Rh face has the rectangular binding cavity, whereas the other face is considered to be blocked by the *tert*-butyl groups. According to the $\text{Rh}_2(\text{S-PTTL})_4$ model proposed by Fox,^{3h,i} a carbene would align with the wide dimension of the catalyst leaving the *Si* face open for the attack because of the wider gap between two of the ligands. To test if the same model could be utilized to explain the stereochemical outcome of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ -catalyzed transformations, a computational analysis of the catalyst-carbene complex was conducted.

Traditional computational approaches to analyze dirhodium carbene complexes have tended to rely on the X-ray structure of the catalyst in combination with DFT optimized geometries of the carbenoid with a simplified, achiral, catalyst model.^{3j,m,14} Although such analysis may provide preliminary insights into the catalyst selectivity, more precise studies accounting for interactions between the carbene and ligands, as well as ligand mobility in these systems would give a much better understanding of the role of the chiral catalyst. In fact, our preliminary DFT calculations^{15–17} on the simplified model of the dirhodium-(tetracarboxylate)-carbene complex (Figure 5) demonstrates the importance of such studies. A comparison of the DFT optimized geometries, given in Figure 5, with the reported size of the catalyst binding cavity (Figure 4) reveals that even the shortest




Figure 6. ONIOM partitioning of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ -carbene complex.




Figure 7. Lowest-energy conformation of *s-trans* carbene, top view (left) and side view (right). Hydrogen atoms were omitted for clarity.

s-trans carbenoid conformation would not fit into the tight environment (the dimensions shown on Figures 4 and 5 were measured from atomic centers and do not account for atomic radii) of the $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ catalyst.

Performing DFT calculations on the complete rhodium carbene complex (approximately 200 atoms) would be impractical unless very small basis sets were used,³¹ and these may not give a realistic representation of the complex. Therefore, we employ an alternative ONIOM approach¹⁸ to study the carbenoid reaction. A two-layer ONIOM (QM:MM) method used in these studies divides the whole system into two subsystems (denoted “model” and “real” layers) and treat them at the best possible level of theory. The ONIOM partitioning of the catalyst-carbene system that was used is shown in Figure 6. In these studies the B3LYP^{15–17} and UFF¹⁹ methods were used for the calculations of the “model” (in red) and “real” (in blue) layers, respectively. Such partition provided an accurate description for the central rhodium carboxylate-carbene complex and accounted for the steric influence of the surrounding ligands.

Our computational results support the importance of the steric environment within the catalyst. Thus even the best matching combination of the shortest *s-trans* carbene aligned with the widest dimension of the orthogonal binding cavity caused steric repulsions significant enough to rotate two *para*-bromophenyl groups in either conrotary or disrotary directions. A similar result was obtained when the *s-trans* carbene was aligned with the shortest catalyst dimension; this time the phenyl groups rotated in a similar way. Overall, we were able to locate sixteen distinct minima on the potential energy surface corresponding to different conformations of the *s-trans* carbene with $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$. The lowest energy conformation, separated from the closest one by $\Delta E = 1.8 \text{ kcal/mol}$ is depicted in Figure 7. In this conformer two ligands rotated in a conrotary fashion to minimize steric interactions with the carbene, whereas the other two ligands remained in the upward position to reduce steric




Figure 8. Predictive stereochemical model for $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ -catalyzed transformation.

repulsions with the neighboring ligands. This arrangement resulted in a C_2 symmetric environment at the carbene site cavity containing two phenyl rings and two *para*-bromophenyl groups. One of the rings is blocking the donor group (aryl, styryl) while the other one is positioned next to the acceptor group (ester). The same ligand conformation having the *s-cis* carbene geometry was found to be 2.5 kcal/mol higher.

On the basis of the computational data summarized above, we propose a stereochemical model that explains the selectivity observed in $\text{Rh}_2(\text{R-BTPCP})_4$ catalyzed transformations (Figure 8). It is well established that the substrate approaches donor/acceptor-substituted rhodium-carbenoids over the donor group.^{17a} The ester group aligns perpendicular to the carbene plane, and blocks attack on its side. When the substrate approaches over the donor group, the *Re*-face is blocked by the aryl ring of the ligand leaving the *Si*-face open for the attack. This model predicts correctly the observed absolute configuration of the products.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have developed dirhodium tetrakis-triaryl-cyclopropanecarboxylates as a new class of chiral catalysts with a relatively rigid and easily tunable backbone. The efficiency and selectivity of this catalyst has been demonstrated in a variety of highly diastereo- and enantioselective reactions of donor/acceptor carbenoids. The computational analysis allowed us to propose a stereochemical model to explain selectivity of the new catalyst. This analysis illustrates the importance of considering the conformational mobility of the ligands once the carbene is bound to the catalyst.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

S Supporting Information. Synthetic details, computational details, X-ray crystallographic data, and spectral data. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

hmdavie@emory.edu; dmusaev@emory.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Dr. Janelle Thompson for preliminary studies on the diphenylcyclopropanecarboxylate catalyst. This research was supported by the National Science Foundation for HMLD (CHE-07502730) and for HMLD and DGM under the Center for Chemical Innovation in Stereoselective C–H Functionalization (CHE-0943980). We acknowledge the NSF-MRI grant

CHE-0553581 and the use of computational resources at the Cherry Emerson Center for Scientific Computation

REFERENCES

- (1) For recent general reviews on rhodium carbenoid chemistry, see: (a) Davies, H. M.; Morton, D. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2011**, *40* (4), 1857–69. (b) Doyle, M. P.; Duffy, R.; Ratnikov, M.; Zhou, L. *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 704–724.
- (2) For general reviews on chiral dirhodium catalysts, see: (a) Hansen, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2008**, *252*, 545–555. (b) Doyle, M. P.; Forbes, D. C. *Chem. Rev.* **1998**, *98*, 911–935.
- (3) For leading references, see: (a) Doyle, M. P. *Aldrichimica Acta* **1996**, *29*, 3–11. (b) Doyle, M. P.; Brandes, B. D.; Kazala, A. P.; Pieters, R. J.; Jarstfer, M. B.; Watkins, L. M.; Eagle, C. T. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1990**, *31*, 6613–6616. (c) Hashimoto, T.; Kimura, H.; Maruoka, K. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 6844–6847. (d) Hashimoto, T.; Maruoka, K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 10054–10055. (e) Hashimoto, S.; Watanabe, N.; Sato, T.; Shiro, M.; Ikegami, S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1993**, *34*, 5109–5112. (f) Davies, H. M. L.; Bruzinski, P. R.; Lake, D. H.; Kong, N.; Fall, M. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, *118*, 6897–6907. (g) Ishitani, H.; Achiwa, K. *Synlett* **1997**, 781–782. (h) DeAngelis, A.; Boruta, D. T.; Lubin, J. B.; Plampin, J. N., 3rd; Yap, G. P.; Fox, J. M. *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, *46*, 4541–4543. (i) DeAngelis, A.; Dmitrenko, O.; Yap, G. P.; Fox, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 7230–7231. (j) Lindsay, V. N. G.; Nicolas, C.; Charette, A. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 8972–8981. (k) Lindsay, V. N.; Lin, W.; Charette, A. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 16383–16385. (l) Sambasivan, R.; Ball, Z. T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 9289–9291. (m) Goto, T.; Takeda, K.; Shimada, N.; Nambu, H.; Anada, M.; Shiro, M.; Ando, K.; Hashimoto, S. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 6803–6808. (n) Ghanem, A.; Gardiner, M. G.; Williamson, R. M.; Müller, P. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 3291–3295.
- (4) Reddy, R. P.; Davies, H. M. L. *Org. Lett.* **2006**, *8*, 5013–5016.
- (5) Davies, H. M. L.; Panaro, S. A. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1999**, *40*, 5287–5290.
- (6) Davies, H. M. L.; Bruzinski, P. R.; Fall, M. J. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1996**, *37*, 4133–4136.
- (7) (a) Davies, H. M. L.; Stafford, D. G.; Doan, B. D.; Houser, J. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1998**, *120*, 3326–3331. (b) Reddy, R. P.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 10312–10313.
- (8) Lian, Y.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 440–441.
- (9) Lian, Y.; Miller, L. C.; Born, S.; Sarpong, R.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 12422–12425.
- (10) Manning, J. R.; Sexton, T.; Childers, S. R.; Davies, H. M. L. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **2009**, *19*, 58–61.
- (11) (a) Doyle, M. P.; Zhou, Q. L.; Charnsangavej, C.; Longoria, M. A.; McKervey, M. A.; Garcia, C. F. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1996**, *37*, 4129–4132. (b) Moye-Sherman, D.; Welch, M. B.; Reibenspies, J.; Burgess, K. *Chem. Commun.* **1998**, 2377–2378.
- (12) Pelphrey, P.; Hansen, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *Chem. Sci.* **2010**, *1*, 254–257.
- (13) Davies, H. M. L.; Jin, Q. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 10862–10863.
- (14) For more examples of computational analysis of dirhodium carboxylates see: (a) Snyder, J. P.; Padwa, A.; Stengel, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 11318–11319. (b) Nakamura, E.; Yoshikai, N.; Yamana, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 7181–7192. (c) Nowlan, D. T., III; Gregg, T. M.; Davies, H. M. L.; Singleton, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 15902–15911. (d) Nowlan, D. T., III; Singleton, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 6190–6191. (e) Liu, Z.; Liu, J. *Cent. Eur. J. Chem.* **2009**, *8*, 223–228. (f) Hansen, J.; Li, B.; Dikarev, E.; Autschbach, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 6564–6571. (g) Hansen, J. H.; Parr, B. T.; Pelphrey, P.; Jin, Q.; Autschbach, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 2544–2548. (h) Hansen, J.; Gregg, T. M.; Ovalles, S. R.; Lian, Y.; Autschbach, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 5076–5085. (i) Liang, Y.; Zhou, H.; Yu, Z. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 17783.

(15) Calculations were performed using Gaussian '09 software package: Frisch, M. J. et al. *Gaussian 09*, revision A 0.2; Gaussian Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2009. See Supporting Information for complete reference.

(16) Hybrid Density Functional method B3LYP was used throughout the paper: (a) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, *37*, 785–789. (b) Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648–5652.

(17) Stuttgart relativistic small-core effective core potential and associated basis sets [Stuttgart RSC 1997 ECP] were used for rhodium with an added polarization 4f-function (ζ_r (Rh) = 1.350), the split valence 6-31G(d) basis sets were used on all other atoms. See: (a) Hansen, J.; Autschbach, J.; Davies, H. M. L. *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 6555–6563. (b) Kaupp, M.; Schleyer, P. v. R.; Stoll, H.; Preuss, H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, *94*, 1360. (c) Bergner, A.; M. D.; Kuechle, W.; Stoll, H.; Preuss, H. *Mol. Phys.* **1993**, *80*, 1431. (d) Dolg, M.; Stoll, H.; Preuss, H.; Pitzer, R. M. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 5852.

(18) A combination of B3LYP and UFF methods were used in the two-layer ONIOM (QM:MM) calculations. See Supporting Information for the optimized geometries. For more information on the ONIOM methodology see: (a) Dapprich, S.; Komáromi, I.; Byun, K. S.; Morokuma, K.; Frisch, M. J. *THEOCHEM* **1999**, *461–462*, 1–21. Vreven, T.; Byun, K. S.; Komaromi, I.; Dapprich, S.; Montgomery, J. A.; Morokuma, K.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Chem. Theory. Comput.* **2006**, *2* (3), 815–826.

(19) Rappe, A. K.; Casewit, C. J.; Colwell, K. S.; Goddard, W. A., III; Skiff, W. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 10024–35.