

Catalytic Carbonyl Addition through Transfer Hydrogenation: A Departure from Preformed Organometallic Reagents**

John F. Bower, In Su Kim, Ryan L. Patman, and Michael J. Krische*

allylation · C–C coupling · propargylation ·
transfer hydrogenation · vinylation

Classical protocols for carbonyl allylation, propargylation and vinylation typically rely upon the use of preformed allyl metal, allenyl metal and vinyl metal reagents, respectively, mandating stoichiometric generation of metallic byproducts. Through transfer hydrogenative C–C coupling, however, carbonyl addition may be achieved from the aldehyde or alcohol oxidation level in the absence of stoichiometric organometallic reagents or metallic reductants. Here, we review transfer hydrogenative methods for carbonyl addition, which encompass the first catalytic protocols enabling direct C–H functionalization of alcohols.

Introduction to Carbonyl Allylation

Enantioselective carbonyl allylation ranks among the most broadly utilized methods in organic synthesis.^[1] In seminal reports, Mikhailov and Bubnov (1964) and Hosomi and Sakurai (1976) described the first carbonyl allylations employing isolable allyl boron reagents and isolable allyl silanes, respectively.^[2] Subsequently, Hoffmann (1978) devised the first chirally modified allyl metal reagent, an allylborane derived from camphor.^[3a,b] These studies inspired the development of numerous protocols for asymmetric carbonyl allylation based on chirally modified allyl metal reagents, including those developed by Kumada (1982),^[3c] Brown (1983),^[3d] Roush (1985),^[3e] Reetz (1988),^[3f] Masamune (1989),^[3g] Corey (1989),^[3h] Seebach (1987),^[3i] Duthaler (1989),^[3j] Panek (1991),^[3k] Leighton (2002),^[3l,m] and Soder-

quist (2005)^[3n] (Scheme 1). By virtue of these efforts, highly enantioselective carbonyl and imine allylation is now possible for nearly every imaginable substrate class. Nevertheless, the effort required to prepare chirally modified


allyl metal reagents poses a significant barrier to their use. Further, stoichiometric quantities of chiral inducing element and stoichiometric byproduct generation detracts from the utility of such reagents.

The aforementioned limitations have not gone unaddressed. Following groundbreaking work by Yamamoto (1991),^[4a] highly enantioselective chiral Lewis acid catalyzed carbonyl allylations were described by Umani-Ronchi and Keck (1993).^[4b,c] Elegant studies by Denmark (1994) demonstrate that catalytic quantities of chiral Lewis base also promote enantioselective carbonyl allylation.^[4d,e] These methods are highly effective, but do not circumvent the use of preformed allyl metal reagents. For example, allyl stannanes employed in the Umani-Ronchi–Keck allylation mandate stoichiometric generation of tin byproducts. Further, such allyl metal reagents typically are prepared from the organomagnesium or organolithium compounds, which, in turn, are prepared from the allyl halides, meaning that the carbon atom of the allyl donor is activated “stoichiometrically” three times in advance of C–C coupling. Naturally, such preactivation increases cost and contributes to excessive waste generation (Scheme 2).

Another major approach to carbonyl allylation involves the reduction of metallo- π -allyls derived from allylic alcohols, allylic carboxylates, or allylic halides. Here, stoichiometric quantities of metallic reductants, such as SmI_2 , SnCl_2 , and Et_2Zn are required for catalytic turnover.^[5–8] Finally, byproduct-free carbonyl allylation can be achieved through carbonyl–ene processes, however, enantioselective variants of

[*] Dr. J. F. Bower, Dr. I. S. Kim, R. L. Patman, Prof. M. J. Krische
University of Texas at Austin, Department of Chemistry and
Biochemistry, 1 University Station, A5300, Austin, TX 78712-1167
(USA)
Fax: (+1) 512-471-8696
E-mail: mkrische@mail.utexas.edu


[**] Acknowledgement is made to Merck, Umicore, the Robert A. Welch Foundation, the ACS-GCI Pharmaceutical Roundtable, the Korea Research Foundation (KRF-2007-356-E00037), and the NIH-NIGMS (RO1-GM069445) for support of this research. We thank Dr. Oliver Briel (Umicore) for donation of iridium and ruthenium salts, Prof. Xumu Zhang for donation of (R)-C3-TunePhos, and Drs. Ian Davies, Kevin Campos and Scott Shultz (Merck) for donation of (–)-trmbtp.



Scheme 1. Chirally modified allyl metal reagents for use in asymmetric carbonyl allylation.



Ryan L. Patman was born in 1982 in Elk City, Oklahoma. He received a B.S. degree in chemistry from Oklahoma State University in 2006, where he conducted undergraduate research under the supervision of Professor Richard A. Bunce. He is currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Texas in Austin in the research group of Professor Michael J. Krische.




In Su Kim was born in 1975 in Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. He received B.S. (2001), M.S. (2003), and Ph.D. (2006) degrees from the College of Pharmacy, Sungkyunkwan University, where he conducted research under the supervision of Professor Young Hoon Jung. After working as a postdoctoral fellow of the BK21 program funded by the Korean Ministry of Science and Technology, he joined the research group of Professor Michael J. Krische at the University of Texas at Austin as a post-doctoral research associate funded by the Korea Research Foundation.



John F. Bower was born in 1980 in Chester, England. He received both M.Sc. (2003) and Ph.D. (2007) degrees in chemistry from the University of Bristol, where he conducted research under the supervision of Professors Guy C. Lloyd-Jones and Timothy Gallagher, respectively. In May 2007, he joined the research group of Professor Michael J. Krische at the University of Texas in Austin as a post-doctoral research associate.




Michael J. Krische was born in 1966 in Burlingame, California. He received a B.S. degree in chemistry from the University of California at Berkeley in 1989 under the supervision of Professor Henry Rapoport. Following receipt of his Ph.D. degree in 1996 under the mentorship of Professor Barry Trost, he studied with Jean-Marie Lehn at the Université Louis Pasteur as a post-doctoral fellow. In 1999, he was appointed Assistant Professor at the University of Texas at Austin. He was promoted to Full Professor 2004, and 2007 he was awarded the Robert A. Welch Chair. Selected awards include the Tetrahedron Young Investigator Award (2009), Novartis Lectureship Award (2008), Elias J. Corey Award (2007), and Dreyfus Teacher Scholar Award (2003).



Scheme 2. Chirally modified Lewis acid and Lewis base catalyzed enantioselective carbonyl allylation. binol = 1,1-binaphthol, DCM = dichloromethane.

these processes are limited to highly activated electrophiles.^[9,10]


We have found that diverse π -unsaturated reactants engage in reductive C–C coupling under the conditions of catalytic hydrogenation.^[11] Specifically, by exploiting unsaturated reactants as latent carbanions, highly regio- and stereoselective carbonyl and imine vinylation, aldol and Mannich coupling, and acyl substitution are achieved.^[12] One can easily envision hydrogenative carbonyl allylations, wherein allenes, dienes, and allylic acetates serve as allyl donors. This concept is extended further through C–C bond forming transfer hydrogenation, wherein hydrogen embedded within an alcoholic reactant, typically isopropyl alcohol, mediates reductive C–C coupling. Of greater significance, an alcohol may serve dually as hydrogen donor and precursor to the carbonyl electrophile. In this way, carbonyl addition may be achieved directly from the alcohol oxidation level in the absence of preformed organometallic reagents or metallic reductants (Scheme 3).^[13,14]



Scheme 3. Conceptual framework for hydrogenative and transfer hydrogenative carbonyl allylation.

Hydrogenative Carbonyl Allylation Employing Allenes as Allyl Donors

The feasibility of hydrogenative carbonyl allylation was established in studies on the reductive coupling of allenes to aldehydes and activated ketones employing hydrogen as terminal reductant. Specifically, iridium catalyzed hydrogenation of commercially available 1,1-dimethylallene in the presence of carbonyl electrophiles delivers products of reverse prenylation as single regioisomers in good to excellent yield (Scheme 4).^[15] Functional groups often considered




Scheme 4. Iridium catalyzed hydrogenative coupling of 1,1-dimethylallene to carbonyl compounds. cod = cyclooctadiene; BARF = $\text{B}(\text{3,5-(CF}_3)_2\text{C}_6\text{H}_3)_4^-$; biphep = 2,2'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-1,1'-biphenyl; DCE = dichloroethane.

“hydrogen-labile”, for example, aryl halides, benzylic ethers and nitroarenes, remain intact under the conditions of hydrogenative coupling. The combination of a cationic iridium complex in conjunction with Li_2CO_3 as a basic additive prevents over-reduction of the olefinic product. Notably, all atoms of each reactant, including hydrogen, are

incorporated into the product, preventing stoichiometric generation of byproducts.

Hydrogenative coupling of 1,1-dimethylallene to 5-nitro-2-furancarboxaldehyde under an atmosphere of elemental deuterium provides a product of reverse prenylation incorporating deuterium solely at the interior vinylic position (80 % ^2H), as revealed by ^2H NMR spectroscopy. This result is consistent with a catalytic mechanism involving base-mediated heterolytic hydrogen activation to furnish an iridium monohydride followed by allene hydrometallation to deliver the primary σ -allyl species **A** (Scheme 5). Allyl addition to the carbonyl electrophile through a closed six-centered transition




Scheme 5. Iridium catalyzed hydrogenative coupling of 1,1-dimethylallene to an aldehyde under an atmosphere of deuterium.

structure **B** provides iridium alkoxide **C**, which upon hydrolysis releases the alcohol product and an iridium monohydride to close the cycle. Incomplete deuterium incorporation is likely due to β -hydride elimination of the tertiary σ -allyl haptomer of **A** to form isoprene. The results of isotopic labelling cannot exclude alternative pathways involving allene–aldehyde oxidative coupling.

Unlike reverse prenylation, the parent allylation employing gaseous allene was accompanied by over-reduction of the coupling product. It was postulated that the transfer of hydrogen from an alcoholic reductant, as opposed to direct use of elemental hydrogen, would enable more precisely controlled introduction of hydrogen. Indeed, by simply substituting elemental hydrogen for isopropyl alcohol under conditions nearly identical to those previously employed, allene–aldehyde reductive coupling occurs to provide products of reverse prenylation in good to excellent yield, as well as products of allylation and crotylation, which are generated without any detectable over-reduction (Scheme 6, top).^[16]


Direct C-allylation of alcohols is potentially achieved in transfer hydrogenative C–C couplings in which an alcoholic reactant serves as both hydrogen donor and aldehyde precursor. Indeed, under conditions employing a cationic iridium precatalyst and basic additive, alcohols couple directly to 1,1-dimethylallene to provide an identical set of carbonyl reverse prenylation products in good to excellent yield.^[16] The reaction is broadly tolerant of the electronics of the alcohol, allowing direct carbinol C–H functionalization of benzylic and even aliphatic alcohols. Carbonyl allylation and



Scheme 6. Iridium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of allenes to aldehydes and alcohols.

crotylation employing gaseous allene and methyl allene, respectively, occurs without over-reduction of the olefinic product. In the case of allylation, lower efficiency is attributed to contamination of commercial allene gas with propyne (Scheme 6, bottom).

Exposure of 1,1-dimethylallene to benzaldehyde under standard conditions employing $[\text{D}_8]$ isopropyl alcohol as reductant results in deuterium transfer to the vinylic position (85 % ^2H) of the resulting adduct. Similarly, exposure of $[\text{D}_2]$ benzyl alcohol to the reaction conditions results in transfer of the benzylic deuteride to the internal vinylic position of the product (85 % ^2H). (Scheme 7, top). These data are consistent with a hydrometallative mechanism, but cannot exclude catalytic mechanisms involving allene–aldehyde oxidative coupling. Crossover experiments involving exposure of 1,1-dimethylallene to equimolar quantities of *p*-nitrobenzyl alcohol and benzaldehyde under standard coupling conditions result in formation of the indicated *p*-nitrophenyl- and phenyl-containing adducts in a 4:1 ratio, respectively. In a related experiment involving exposure of 1,1-dimethylallene to equimolar quantities of *p*-nitrobenz-




Scheme 7. Top: Isotopic labeling experiments in iridium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative couplings of 1,1-dimethylallene. Bottom: Cross-coupling experiments establish rapid redox equilibration in advance of C–C coupling.

aldehyde and benzyl alcohol under standard coupling conditions, an identical product distribution is observed. These data establish fast and reversible alcohol dehydrogenation to form a non-metal-bound aldehyde in advance of C–C coupling (Scheme 7, bottom). In preliminary studies, a chiral iridium complex modified by (*R*)-C3-TunePhos was found to promote the coupling of 1,1-dimethylallene to *p*-nitrobenzyl alcohol in 55 % yield and 76 % *ee*.^[17] Erosion of enantiomeric excess is not observed under the coupling conditions, indicating that the product of carbonyl allylation, a secondary alcohol, is not subject to redox equilibration.

Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenation is one of the most powerful methods for the reduction of carbonyl compounds.^[18] Surprisingly, reductive C–C bond formations catalyzed by ruthenium are highly uncommon.^[19–21] Under the conditions of ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenation employing isopropyl alcohol as the terminal reductant, 1,1-disubstituted allenes engage in reductive coupling to paraformaldehyde and higher aldehydes.^[22] Coupling occurs with branched regioselectivity to deliver homoallylic alcohols bearing all-carbon quaternary centers (Scheme 8). Ruthenium catalyzed allene–alcohol transfer hydrogenative coupling is currently under investigation.

Hydrogenative Carbonyl Allylation Employing 1,3-Dienes as Allyl Donors


The hydrometallation of conjugated dienes represents an alternate method for the generation of allyl metal species. Under the conditions of iridium catalyzed hydrogenative coupling employing isopropyl alcohol as the terminal reductant, 1,3-cyclohexadiene couples to diverse aryl aldehydes to provide products of carbonyl cyclohexenylation in good to excellent yield and with high levels of diastereocontrol.^[23]




Scheme 8. Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of allenes to paraformaldehyde and higher aldehydes. Pthl = phthaloyl; TBS = *tert*-butyl dimethylsilyl.

Under nearly identical conditions but in the absence of isopropyl alcohol, 1,3-cyclohexadiene couples directly to benzylic alcohols to furnish the very same products of carbonyl cyclohexenylation. Thus, carbonyl addition is achieved with equal facility from the aldehyde or alcohol oxidation level. Regioisomeric 1,5-olefinic adducts are formed as minor byproducts in all cases. Deuterium labelling studies corroborate a catalytic mechanism wherein alcohol dehydrogenation provides an iridium hydride, which upon diene hydrometallation produces an allyl metal nucleophile. These data do not exclude alternate pathways involving diene–aldehyde oxidative coupling (Scheme 9).


Under the conditions of transfer hydrogenation employing [RuHCl(CO)(PPh₃)₃] as precatalyst, the acyclic conjugated dienes butadiene, isoprene and 2,3-dimethylbutadiene couple to benzylic alcohols to furnish products of carbonyl crotylation, carbonyl isoprenylation, and carbonyl reverse 2-methyl-prenylation, respectively.^[24a] In these reactions, the presence of an acid co-catalyst (*m*-NO₂BzOH) is essential as only trace quantities of product are observed otherwise. Additionally, exogenous acetone and phosphine ligand are found to have beneficial effects upon the efficiency of the reaction. In all cases, efficient coupling is observed using only 250 mol % of the diene (Scheme 10, left). This first-generation catalytic system also promotes coupling to simple unactivated aliphatic alcohols, as demonstrated by the coupling of isoprene to 1-nonanol in 65 % yield (Scheme 11). Related diene–aldehyde couplings proceed efficiently using either isopropyl alcohol or formic acid as terminal reductants (Scheme 10, left). The branched regioselectivity observed in these processes complements the linear regioselectivity observed in related Ni-catalyzed diene–aldehyde reductive



Scheme 9. Iridium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of 1,3-cyclohexadiene to aldehydes and alcohols.



Scheme 10. Left: Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of acyclic dienes to alcohols and aldehydes to furnish homoallylic alcohols. [a] Conditions A: no added ligand; conditions B: (*p*-MeOPh)₃P (15 mol%) as ligand; conditions C: *rac*-binap (5 mol%) as ligand. Right: Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of acyclic dienes to alcohols and aldehydes to furnish β,γ -unsaturated ketones. [b] Butadiene (800 mol%), isoprene (250 mol%), 2,3-dimethylbutadiene (300 mol%). [c] The reaction product was contaminated with approximately 10% of the α,β -unsaturated ketone.




Scheme 11. Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of isoprene to an unactivated aliphatic alcohol.

couplings.^[26,27] Transfer hydrogenative diene–alcohol or diene–aldehyde couplings employing the more highly coordi-

natively unsaturated ruthenium catalyst, $[\text{Ru}(\text{O}_2\text{CCF}_3)_2(\text{CO})(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$,^[28] induce further oxidation of the initially formed homoallylic alcohol to furnish β,γ -unsaturated ketones (Scheme 10, right).^[24b,25] Thus, all oxidation levels of substrate (alcohol or aldehyde) and product (homoallyl alcohol or β,γ -unsaturated ketone) are accessible (Scheme 10).

The coupling of isoprene to $[\text{D}_2]$ benzyl alcohol results in transfer of a benzylic deuteride to the allylic methyl (19% ²H) and allylic methine (32% ²H). These data suggest reversible hydrometallation of the less substituted olefin to form the

secondary σ -allyl species. Isomerization to the more stable primary σ -allyl haptomer precedes carbonyl addition, which occurs with allylic inversion through a six-centered transition state to deliver, upon protonolysis, the product of carbonyl allylation. Similarly, in aldehyde couplings employing $[D_8]$ isopropyl alcohol as the terminal reductant, deuterium incorporation is observed at the allylic methyl (19% 2H) and allylic methine (10% 2H) (Scheme 12).



Scheme 12. Isotopic labeling experiments in ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative couplings of isoprene.


Hydrogenative Carbonyl Allylation Employing Allyl Acetate as an Allyl Donor

Prevailing protocols for carbonyl allylation employing allylic alcohols, allylic carboxylates, or allylic halides as allyl donors typically require stoichiometric quantities of metallic reductants, such as SmI_2 , $SnCl_2$, and Et_2Zn for catalytic turnover.^[5–8] The facility of alcohol dehydrogenation under the aforementioned transfer hydrogenative coupling conditions suggests the feasibility of catalytic allyl acetate mediated carbonyl allylations employing sacrificial alcohols as terminal reductant. Again, one may envision related processes in which an alcohol serves both as reductant and aldehyde precursor, thus enabling catalytic carbonyl allylation from the alcohol oxidation level. The outcome of such transformations was rendered uncertain by reports of alcohol–allyl acetate coupling to form enones under the conditions of ruthenium catalysis,^[29] and the fact that allyl acetates react with alcohols to deliver products of *O*-allylation upon exposure to iridium catalysts (Scheme 13).^[30]


In the presence of an iridium complex derived from $[IrCl(cod)]_2$ and (–)-tmbtp or (*R*)-Cl₂MeO-biphep, allyl acetate reductively couples to aryl aldehydes, enals, and aliphatic aldehydes to furnish products of *C*-allylation with exceptional levels of asymmetric induction (Scheme 14, top).^[31] In these processes, isopropyl alcohol functions as the terminal reductant. At most, only trace quantities ($\leq 5\%$) of *O*-allylation product are observed. Remarkably, an identical set of carbonyl allylation products are accessible from the corresponding alcohols. High levels of asymmetric induction are achieved using chiral iridium catalysts modified by (*R*)-binap or (*R*)-Cl₂MeO-biphep (Scheme 14, bottom). Thus, highly enantioselective catalytic carbonyl allylation is achieved from the aldehyde or alcohol oxidation level in the absence of allyl metal reagents.

Experiments aimed at illuminating key features of the catalytic mechanism establish the *ortho*-cyclometallated C,O-

O-Allylation through conventional allylic substitution:



C-Allylation through transfer hydrogenative coupling:




Scheme 13. Reversal of reactivity in the metal catalyzed coupling of allyl acetates to alcohols.


benzoate **1** as a catalytically relevant species. The binap derivative of complex **1** has been characterized by single crystal X-ray diffraction. The results of isotopic labeling are consistent with intervention of symmetric iridium π -allyl intermediates or rapid interconversion of σ -allyl haptomers through the agency of a symmetric π -allyl (Scheme 15). Competition experiments demonstrate rapid and reversible dehydrogenation of the carbonyl partner in advance of C–C coupling. Notably, the coupling products, which are homo-allylic alcohols, experience very little erosion of optical purity by way of redox equilibration under the coupling conditions, yet isopropyl alcohol, a secondary alcohol, may serve as terminal reductant.

Hydrogenative Carbonyl Propargylation Employing 1,3-Enynes as Propargyl Donors

Like carbonyl allylation, much effort has been devoted to the development of efficient methods for diastereo- and enantioselective carbonyl propargylation.^[32] As early as 1950, Prévost et al. showed that allenic Grignard reagents participate in carbonyl additions to generate mixtures of β -acetylenic and α -allenic carbinols, which evoked the term “propargylic transposition.”^[33a,b] Relative stereocontrol in such additions was later demonstrated by Chodkiewicz (1969).^[33c] Lequang and Guillerme (1973)^[33d] reported that preformed allenic stannanes enable carbonyl propargylation when exposed to chloral. Subsequently, Mukaiyama (1981) showed that stannanes generated in situ from propargyl iodides and stannous chloride provide mixtures of β -acetylenic and α -allenic carbinols upon reaction with aldehydes.^[33e] Related propargylations employing allenylboron reagents were first reported by Favre and Gaudemar (1966).^[33f]




Scheme 14. Iridium catalyzed carbonyl allylation from the aldehyde or alcohol oxidation level employing allyl acetate. (–)-tmbtp = (–)-4,4'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-2,2',5,5'-tetramethyl-3,3'-bithiophene; binap = 2,2'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-1,1'-binaphthyl.



Scheme 15. Top: Iridium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of allyl acetate to an alcohol employing isotopically labelled allyl acetate. Bottom: Catalytically competent cyclometallated complex I.

Propargylations employing allenylsilicon reagents were first reported by Danheiser (1980).^[33g]

Initially developed asymmetric propargylation protocols relied upon chirally modified allenyl metal reagents. For example, Yamamoto (1982)^[33h] and Corey (1990)^[33i] have shown that allenylboron reagents with chiral modifiers at boron engage in asymmetric carbonyl propargylation with useful levels of enantioselectivity. Similarly, allenylstannanes chirally modified at the tin center engage in asymmetric carbonyl propargylation, as first reported by Mukaiyama (1987).^[33j] Axially chiral allenylstannanes, allenylsilanes, and allenylboron reagents propargylate aldehydes enantiospecifically, as first described by Marshall (1991, 2001),^[33k,l] and Hayashi (1993),^[33m] respectively (Scheme 16). More recently, chiral Lewis acid and chiral Lewis base catalyzed asymmetric aldehyde propargylations employing allenylmetal reagents have been reported by Keck (1994)^[33n] and Denmark (2001),^[33o] respectively.



Scheme 16. Chirally modified allenyl metal reagents for use in asymmetric carbonyl propargylation.


We envision an alternative approach to carbonyl propargylation based on C–C bond forming transfer hydrogenation, wherein conjugated enynes serve as surrogates to preformed allenyl metal reagents. However, the feasibility of such processes was uncertain as related 1,3-enyne–carbonyl reductive couplings catalyzed by rhodium^[34] and nickel^[35–37] promote C–C coupling at the acetylenic terminus of the enyne. Despite this unfavorable precedent, enyne–alcohol transfer hydrogenative coupling delivers the desired products of carbonyl propargylation as single regioisomers using a catalyst prepared in situ from $[\text{RuHCl}(\text{CO})(\text{PPh}_3)_3]$ and dppe (1,1'-bis(diphenylphosphino)ferrocene).^[38] Iridium com-

plexes also catalyze this process, but ruthenium catalysts were found to be superior.

This first-generation catalytic system for enyne-mediated propargylation is applicable to benzylic alcohols, allylic alcohols and unactivated aliphatic alcohols. Additionally, 1,3-enynes possessing aryl, heteroaryl, alkyl, and heteroalkyl groups at the alkyne terminus are tolerated. In all cases, products are isolated in good to excellent yields with complete levels of regioselection (Scheme 17, top). Under related transfer hydrogenation conditions employing isopropyl alcohol as the terminal reductant, carbonyl propargylation may be conducted from the aldehyde oxidation level in good to excellent yield (Scheme 17, bottom). Thus, carbonyl propargylation is achieved in the absence of preformed allenyl metal reagents from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation level.


Ruthenium catalyzed enyne coupling to $[D_2]$ benzyl alcohol results in transfer of a benzylic deuteride to the allylic methyl (56% 2H) and allylic methine (24% 2H). Deuterium is completely retained at the benzylic methine of the coupling

product (Scheme 18). These results are consistent with a mechanism involving alcohol dehydrogenation to generate a ruthenium hydride followed by reversible enyne hydrometallation to furnish an allenylruthenium intermediate. The



Scheme 18. Isotopic labeling in the ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of a 1,3-enyne.

aldehyde–allenylmetal nucleophile–electrophile pair thus formed engages in carbonyl addition with propargylic transposition to deliver the product of carbonyl propargylation. The ability to bypass barriers imposed by oxidation level, coupled with the accessibility of diverse enynes, makes the development of stereocontrolled enyne-mediated propargylations an important goal of ongoing research.




Scheme 17. Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of 1,3-enynes to alcohols and aldehydes. [a] *m*-NO₂BzOH (5 mol%) employed as additive.

Hydrogenative Carbonyl Vinylation Employing Alkynes as Vinyl Donors

The synthetic utility of allylic alcohols has led to the development of diverse methods for their preparation. Among existing protocols, carbonyl vinylation represents an effective and convergent means of preparing allylic alcohols. Following seminal studies of Oguni (1984) and Noyori (1986),^[39] enantioselective catalytic addition of vinylzinc reagents to aldehydes were developed by Oppolzer (1992) and Wipf (1994).^[40–42] Generation of the vinylzinc reagent relies upon alkyne hydroboration or hydrozirconation with subsequent transmetalation to zinc employing ZnMe₂. This approach requires the successive use of four stoichiometric organometallic reagents to preactivate the alkyne as a vinyl carbanion equivalent. Consequently, molar equivalents of multiple metallic byproducts are generated (Scheme 19).

Direct alkyne–carbonyl reductive coupling bypasses the use of multiple stoichiometric organometallic reagents. As reported by Ojima (1994), Crowe (1995), and Montgomery (1997), this pattern of reactivity was first observed in the cyclization of acetylenic aldehydes catalyzed by rhodium, titanium, and nickel, respectively.^[43–45] Intermolecular var-



Successive Use of Four Preformed Organometallic Reagents


Scheme 19. Carbonyl vinylation through stoichiometric alkyne hydro-metallation.

variants of the nickel catalyzed alkyne–carbonyl reductive couplings soon followed.^[37,46] However, while reductive couplings of this type signal a departure from stoichiometric organometallic reagents, they exploit terminal reductants such as hydrosilanes, hydrostannanes, organozinc reagents, organoboron reagents, or chromium(II) chloride, which generate molar equivalents of chemical byproducts. Under the conditions of rhodium and iridium catalyzed hydrogenation, byproduct-free alkyne–carbonyl and imine–carbonyl reductive coupling may be achieved in a highly regio- and stereoselective fashion (Scheme 20).^[11,12a–c,34]

By exploiting alcohols as both aldehyde precursors and sources of hydrogen, it should be possible to promote direct byproduct-free carbonyl vinylation in the absence of any stoichiometric reductant. Accordingly, transfer hydrogenative alkyne–alcohol coupling was explored under the conditions of ruthenium catalysis. In an initial set of experiments, it was found that $[\text{Ru}(\text{O}_2\text{CCF}_3)_2(\text{CO})(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ catalyzes alkyne–alcohol coupling to provide the desired allylic alcohols, representing a direct C–H vinylation of the alcohol (Scheme 21).^[47] Thus, simple nonconjugated alkynes are activated as vinyl anion equivalents in carbonyl addition from the alcohol oxidation level under mild conditions. Ruthenium catalyzed alkyne–aldehyde transfer hydrogenative coupling is currently under investigation.


Conclusions and Outlook

Through hydrogenative and transfer hydrogenative C–C coupling, nonstabilized carbanion equivalents may be generated from unsaturated compounds, enabling carbonyl allylation, propargylation, and vinylation from the aldehyde or alcohol oxidation level in the absence of preformed



Scheme 21. Ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenative coupling of alkynes to alcohols. Yields of isolated enone side-product indicated in parentheses.

organometallic reagents or metallic reductants. Further, the alcohol–unsaturate couplings described in this Minireview represent a byproduct-free method for direct C–H functionalization of alcohols, evoking numerous avenues of exploration. For example, ethylene–alcohol transfer hydrogenative coupling would dispense with the requirement of utilizing diethylzinc, a pyrophoric liquid, in carbonyl ethylation. The coupling of ethylene to (bio)ethanol would provide an



Scheme 20. Examples of rhodium and iridium catalyzed hydrogenative coupling of alkynes to carbonyl compounds and imines.

efficient means of preparing (bio)butanol. Amine–unsaturated coupling would enable imine addition from the amine oxidation level, providing efficient access to pharmaceutical building blocks. These and many other challenges remain—just as classical carbanion chemistry is broad, so is the potential to generate carbanion equivalents through hydrogenation and transfer hydrogenation.

Received: June 19, 2008

Published online: November 28, 2008

- [1] For reviews on enantioselective carbonyl allylation, see: a) P. V. Ramachandran, *Aldrichimica Acta* **2002**, 35, 23–35; b) J. W. J. Kennedy, D. G. Hall, *Angew. Chem.* **2003**, 115, 4880–4887; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, 42, 4732–4739; c) S. E. Denmark, J. Fu, *Chem. Rev.* **2003**, 103, 2763–2793; d) C.-M. Yu, J. Youn, H.-K. Jung, *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 27, 463–472; e) I. Marek, G. Sklute, *Chem. Commun.* **2007**, 1683–1691; f) D. G. Hall, *Synlett* **2007**, 1644–1655.
- [2] a) B. M. Mikhailov, Y. N. Bubnov, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Khim.* **1964**, 1874–1876; b) A. Hosomi, H. Sakurai, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1976**, 17, 1295–1298; c) H. Sakurai, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1982**, 54, 1–22.
- [3] Chirally modified allyl metal reagents: a) T. Herold, R. W. Hoffmann, *Angew. Chem.* **1978**, 90, 822–823; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1978**, 17, 768–769; b) R. W. Hoffmann, T. Herold, *Chem. Ber.* **1981**, 114, 375–383; c) T. Hayashi, M. Konishi, M. Kumada, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1982**, 104, 4963–4965; d) H. C. Brown, P. K. Jadhav, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1983**, 105, 2092–2093; e) W. R. Roush, A. E. Walts, L. K. Hoong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1985**, 107, 8186–8190; f) M. Reetz, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1988**, 60, 1607–1614; g) R. P. Short, S. Masamune, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, 111, 1892–1894; h) E. J. Corey, C.-M. Yu, S. S. Kim, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, 111, 5495–5496; i) D. Seebach, A. K. Beck, R. Imwinkelried, S. Roggo, A. Wonnacott, *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1987**, 70, 954–974; j) M. Riediker, R. O. Duthaler, *Angew. Chem.* **1989**, 101, 488–490; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1989**, 28, 494–495; k) J. S. Panek, M. Yang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, 113, 6594–6600; l) J. W. A. Kinnaird, P. Y. Ng, K. Kubota, X. Wang, J. L. Leighton, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, 124, 7920–7921; m) B. M. Hackman, P. J. Lombardi, J. L. Leighton, *Org. Lett.* **2004**, 6, 4375–4377; n) C. H. Burgos, E. Canales, K. Matos, J. A. Soderquist, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 127, 8044–8049.
- [4] Catalytic asymmetric carbonyl allylation employing allyl metal reagents: a) K. Furuta, M. Mouri, H. Yamamoto, *Synlett* **1991**, 561–562; b) A. L. Costa, M. G. Piazza, E. Tagliavini, C. Trombini, A. Umani-Ronchi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, 115, 7001–7002; c) G. E. Keck, K. H. Tarbet, L. S. Geraci, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, 115, 8467–8468; d) S. E. Denmark, D. M. Coe, N. E. Pratt, B. D. Griedel, *J. Org. Chem.* **1994**, 59, 6161–6163; e) S. E. Denmark, J. Fu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, 123, 9488–9489.
- [5] For selected reviews covering carbonyl allylation through umpolung of π -allyls, see: a) Y. Tamaru in *Handbook of Organopalladium Chemistry for Organic Synthesis*, Vol. 2 (Eds.: E.-i. Negishi, A. de Meijere), Wiley, New York, **2002**, pp. 1917–1943; b) Y. Tamaru in *Perspectives in Organopalladium Chemistry for the XXI Century* (Ed.: J. Tsuji), Elsevier, Amsterdam, **1999**, pp. 215–231; c) T. Kondo, T.-a. Mitsudo, *Curr. Org. Chem.* **2002**, 6, 1163–1179.
- [6] For selected examples of reactions involving nucleophilic π -allyls, see: Palladium: a) T. Tabuchi, J. Inanaga, M. Yamaguchi, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1986**, 27, 1195–1196; b) J. P. Takahara, Y. Masuyama, Y. Kuru, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, 114, 2577–2586; c) M. Kimura, Y. Ogawa, M. Shimizu, M. Sueishi, S. Tanaka, Y. Tamaru, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1998**, 39, 6903–6906; d) M. Kimura, M. Shimizu, K. Shibata, M. Tazoe, Y. Tamaru, *Angew. Chem.* **2003**, 115, 3514–3517; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, 42, 3392–3395; e) G. Zanon, S. Gladiali, A. Marchetti, P. Piccinini, I. Tredici, G. Vidari, *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, 116, 864–867; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, 43, 846–849; Rhodium: f) Y. Masuyama, Y. Kaneko, Y. Kuru, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2004**, 45, 8969–8971; Ruthenium: g) Y. Tsuji, T. Mukai, T. Kondo, Y. Watanabe, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1989**, 369, C51–C53; h) T. Kondo, H. Ono, N. Satake, T.-a. Mitsudo, Y. Watanabe, *Organometallics* **1995**, 14, 1945–1953.
- [7] For selected examples of carbonyl allylation through catalytic Nozaki–Hiyama–Kishi coupling, see: a) A. Fürstner, N. Shi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, 118, 2533–2534; b) M. Bandini, P. G. Cozzi, A. Umani-Ronchi, *Polyhedron* **2000**, 19, 537–539; c) H. A. McManus, P. G. Cozzi, P. J. Guiry, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2006**, 348, 551–558; d) G. C. Hargaden, H. Müller-Bunz, P. J. Guiry, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 4235–4243; e) G. C. Hargaden, T. P. O’Sullivan, P. J. Guiry, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2008**, 6, 562–566.
- [8] For a recent review of catalytic Nozaki–Hiyama–Kishi coupling, see: G. C. Hargaden, P. J. Guiry, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2007**, 349, 2407–2424.
- [9] For reviews on carbonyl–ene reactions, see: a) K. Mikami, M. Shimizu, *Chem. Rev.* **1992**, 92, 1021–1050; b) D. J. Berrisford, C. Bolm, *Angew. Chem.* **1995**, 107, 1862–1864; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1995**, 34, 1717–1719; c) J. S. Johnson, D. A. Evans, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2000**, 33, 325–335.
- [10] For nickel catalyzed carbonyl–ene reactions, see: a) C.-Y. Ho, S.-S. Ng, T. F. Jamison, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 5362–5363; b) S.-S. Ng, C.-Y. Ho, T. F. Jamison, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 11513–11528.
- [11] Reviews on hydrogen-mediated C–C coupling: a) H.-Y. Jang, M. J. Krische, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2004**, 37, 653–661; b) M.-Y. Ngai, J.-R. Kong, M. J. Krische, *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 72, 1063–1072; c) H. Iida, M. J. Krische, *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2007**, 279, 77–104; d) E. Skucas, M.-Y. Ngai, V. Komanduri, M. J. Krische, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2007**, 40, 1394–1401; e) F. Shibahara, M. J. Krische, *Chem. Lett.* **2008**, 37, 1102–1107.
- [12] For recent examples, see: C=X Vinylation: a) E. Skucas, J. R. Kong, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 7242–7243; b) A. Barchuk, M.-Y. Ngai, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 8432–8433; c) M.-Y. Ngai, A. Barchuk, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 12644–12645. Aldol and Mannich addition: d) C.-K. Jung, S. A. Garner, M. J. Krische, *Org. Lett.* **2006**, 8, 519–522; e) C.-K. Jung, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 17051–17056; f) S. A. Garner, M. J. Krische, *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 72, 5843–5846; g) C. Bee, H. Iida, S. B. Han, A. Hassan, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, 130, 2746–2747. Acyl substitution: h) Y.-T. Hong, A. Barchuk, M. J. Krische, *Angew. Chem.* **2006**, 118, 7039–7042; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2006**, 45, 6885–6888.
- [13] For reviews of related hydrogen autotransfer processes, which result in formal substitution of the hydroxy moiety rather than carbonyl addition, see: a) G. Guillena, D. J. Ramón, M. Yus, *Angew. Chem.* **2007**, 119, 2410–2416; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2007**, 46, 2358–2364; b) M. H. S. A. Hamid, P. A. Slatford, J. M. J. Williams, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2007**, 349, 1555–1575.
- [14] Processes that enable the direct catalytic functionalization of carbinol C–H bonds are highly uncommon. For an isolated report, see: L. Shi, Y.-Q. Tu, M. Wang, F.-M. Zhang, C.-A. Fan, Y.-M. Zhao, W. J. Xia, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 127, 10836–10837.
- [15] E. Skucas, J. F. Bower, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 12678–12679.
- [16] J. F. Bower, E. Skucas, R. L. Patman, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 15134–15135.

- [17] J. F. Bower, F. Shibahara, M. J. Krische, unpublished results.
- [18] For selected reviews of ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenation, see: a) G. Zassinovich, G. Mestroni, S. Gladiali, *Chem. Rev.* **1992**, 92, 1051–1069; b) R. Noyori, S. Hashiguchi, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1997**, 30, 97–102; c) R. Noyori, M. Yamakawa, S. Hashiguchi, *J. Org. Chem.* **2001**, 66, 7931–7944; d) R. Noyori, T. Ohkuma, *Angew. Chem.* **2001**, 113, 40–75; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2001**, 40, 40–73; e) R. Noyori, *Angew. Chem.* **2002**, 114, 2108–2123; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, 41, 2008–2022; f) R. Noyori, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2003**, 345, 15–32; g) K. Muñiz, *Angew. Chem.* **2005**, 117, 6780–6785; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, 44, 6622–6627; h) R. Noyori, *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 1807–1811; i) S. Gladiali, E. Alberico, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2006**, 35, 226–236; j) T. Ikariya, A. J. Blacker, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2007**, 40, 1300–1308.
- [19] For a review of ruthenium catalyzed alkene hydroformylation, see: P. Kalck, Y. Peres, J. Jenck, *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **1991**, 32, 121–146.
- [20] For ruthenium catalyzed reductive C–C bond formations beyond alkene hydroformylation, see: C.-M. Yu, S. Lee, Y.-T. Hong, S.-K. Yoon, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2004**, 45, 6557–6561. Also see references [6g,h].
- [21] For selected reviews of ruthenium catalyzed C–C coupling, see: a) B. M. Trost, F. D. Toste, A. B. Pinkerton, *Chem. Rev.* **2001**, 101, 2067–2096; b) T. Kondo, T.-a. Mitsudo, *Curr. Org. Chem.* **2002**, 6, 1163–1179; c) S. Derien, F. Monnier, P. H. Dixneuf, *Top. Organomet. Chem.* **2004**, 11, 1–44.
- [22] M.-Y. Ngai, E. Skucas, M. J. Krische, *Org. Lett.* **2008**, 10, 2705–2708.
- [23] J. F. Bower, R. L. Patman, M. J. Krische, *Org. Lett.* **2008**, 10, 1033–1035. For a related rhodium-catalyzed cyclohexadiene–aldehyde reductive coupling employing elemental hydrogen as the terminal reductant, see: H.-Y. Jang, R. R. Huddleston, M. J. Krische, *Angew. Chem.* **2003**, 115, 4208–4211; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, 42, 4074–4077.
- [24] a) F. Shibahara, J. F. Bower, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, 130, 6338–6339; b) F. Shibahara, J. F. Bower, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, 130, 14120–14122.
- [25] For a related ruthenium catalyzed hydroacylation of 1,3-dienes employing aldehydes as acyl donors, see: T. Kondo, N. Hiraishi, Y. Morisaki, K. Wada, Y. Watanabe, T.-a. Mitsudo, *Organometallics* **1998**, 17, 2131–2134.
- [26] For intermolecular nickel-catalyzed diene–aldehyde reductive coupling, see: a) M. Kimura, A. Ezoe, K. Shibata, Y. Tamaru, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1998**, 120, 4033–4034; b) M. Takimoto, Y. Hiraga, Y. Sato, M. Mori, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1998**, 39, 4543–4546; c) M. Kimura, H. Fujimatsu, A. Ezoe, K. Shibata, M. Shimizu, S. Matsumoto, Y. Tamaru, *Angew. Chem.* **1999**, 111, 410–413; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1999**, 38, 397–400; d) M. Kimura, K. Shibata, Y. Koudahashi, Y. Tamaru, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2000**, 41, 6789–6793; e) M. Kimura, A. Ezoe, S. Tanaka, Y. Tamaru, *Angew. Chem.* **2001**, 113, 3712–3714; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2001**, 40, 3600–3602; f) T.-P. Loh, H.-Y. Song, Y. Zhou, *Org. Lett.* **2002**, 4, 2715–2717; g) Y. Sato, R. Sawaki, N. Saito, M. Mori, *J. Org. Chem.* **2002**, 67, 656–662; h) L. Bareille, P. Le Gendre, C. Moïse, *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 775–777; i) M. Kimura, A. Ezoe, M. Mori, K. Iwata, Y. Tamaru, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 8559–8568; j) Y. Yang, S.-F. Zhu, H.-F. Duan, C.-Y. Zhou, L.-X. Wang, Q.-L. Zhou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 2248–2249; k) Y. Sato, Y. Hinata, R. Seki, Y. Oonishi, N. Saito, *Org. Lett.* **2007**, 9, 5597–5599.
- [27] For reviews encompassing nickel-catalyzed diene–aldehyde reductive coupling, see: a) Y. Tamaru, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1999**, 576, 215–231; b) S.-i. Ikeda, *Angew. Chem.* **2003**, 115, 5276–5278; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, 42, 5120–5122; c) J. Montgomery, *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, 116, 3980–3998; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, 43, 3890–3908; d) *Modern Organo Nickel Chemistry* (Ed.: Y. Tamaru), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2005**; e) M. Kimura, Y. Tamaru, *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2007**, 279, 173–207.
- [28] A. Dobson, S. D. Robinson, M. F. Uttley, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* **1975**, 370–377.
- [29] T. Kondo, T. Mukai, Y. Watanabe, *J. Org. Chem.* **1991**, 56, 487–489.
- [30] a) F. Lopez, T. Ohmura, J. F. Hartwig, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, 125, 3426–3427; b) H. Nakagawa, T. Hirabayashi, S. Sakaguchi, Y. Ishii, *J. Org. Chem.* **2004**, 69, 3474–3477; c) C. Shu, J. F. Hartwig, *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, 116, 4898–4901; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, 43, 4794–4797; d) J. P. Roberts, C. Lee, *Org. Lett.* **2005**, 7, 2679–2682; e) S. Ueno, J. F. Hartwig, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, 120, 1954–1957; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, 47, 1928–1931.
- [31] a) I. S. Kim, M.-Y. Ngai, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, 130, 6340–6341; b) I. S. Kim, M.-Y. Ngai, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, 130, 14891–14899.
- [32] For reviews encompassing carbonyl propargylation employing allenyl metal reagents, see: a) J.-L. Moreau in *The Chemistry of Ketenes, Allenes and Related Compounds* (Ed.: S. Patai), Wiley, New York, **1980**, pp. 363–413; b) J. A. Marshall, *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, 96, 31–48; c) B. W. Gung, *Org. React.* **2004**, 64, 1–113; d) J. A. Marshall, B. W. Gung, M. L. Grachan in *Modern Allene Chemistry* (Eds.: N. Krause, A. S. K. Hashmi), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2004**, pp. 493–592; e) J. A. Marshall, *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 72, 8153–8166.
- [33] For selected milestones in carbonyl propargylation, see: a) C. Prévost, M. Gaudemar, J. Honigberg, *C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci.* **1950**, 230, 1186–1188; b) J. H. Wotiz, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1950**, 72, 1639–1642; c) M. Karila, M. L. Capmau, W. Chodkiewicz, *C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci.* **1969**, 269, 342–345; d) M. Lequan, G. Guillerme, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1973**, 54, 153–164; e) T. Mukaiyama, T. Harada, *Chem. Lett.* **1981**, 621–624; f) E. Favre, M. Gaudemar, *C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci.* **1966**, 263, 1543–1545; g) R. L. Danheiser, D. J. Carini, *J. Org. Chem.* **1980**, 45, 3925–3927; h) R. Haruta, M. Ishiguro, N. Ikeda, H. Yamamoto, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1982**, 104, 7667–7669; i) E. J. Corey, C.-M. Yu, D.-H. Lee, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, 112, 878–879; j) N. Minowa, T. Mukaiyama, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1987**, 60, 3697–3704; k) J. A. Marshall, X.-J. Wang, *J. Org. Chem.* **1991**, 56, 3211–3213; l) J. A. Marshall, K. Maxson, *J. Org. Chem.* **2000**, 65, 630–633; m) Y. Matsumoto, M. Naito, Y. Uozumi, T. Hayashi, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1993**, 1468–1469; n) G. E. Keck, D. Krishnamurthy, X. Chen, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1994**, 35, 8323–8324; o) S. E. Denmark, T. Wynn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, 123, 6199–6200.
- [34] For rhodium catalyzed reductive coupling of 1,3-enynes to carbonyl compounds and imines, see: a) H.-Y. Jang, R. R. Huddleston, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, 126, 4664–4668; b) J.-R. Kong, C.-W. Cho, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 127, 11269–11276; c) J.-R. Kong, M.-Y. Ngai, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 718–719; d) V. Komanduri, M. J. Krische, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, 128, 16448–16449; e) Y.-T. Hong, C.-W. Cho, E. Skucas, M. J. Krische, *Org. Lett.* **2007**, 9, 3745–3748.
- [35] For nickel catalyzed reductive coupling of 1,3-enynes to carbonyl compounds, see: a) K. M. Miller, T. Luanphaisarnnont, C. Molinaro, T. F. Jamison, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, 126, 4130–4131; b) K. M. Miller, T. F. Jamison, *Org. Lett.* **2005**, 7, 3077–3080; c) K. M. Miller, E. A. Colby, K. S. Woodin, T. F. Jamison, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2005**, 347, 1533–1536.
- [36] For seminal contributions to nickel catalyzed alkyne–carbonyl reductive coupling, see reference [45a].
- [37] For reviews encompassing nickel catalyzed alkyne–carbonyl reductive coupling, see: a) J. Montgomery, *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, 116, 3980–3998; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, 43, 3890–3908; b) J. Montgomery, G. J. Sormunen, *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2007**, 279,

- 1–23; c) R. M. Moslin, K. Miller-Moslin, T. F. Jamison, *Chem. Commun.* **2007**, 4441–4449.
- [38] R. L. Patman, V. M. Williams, J. F. Bower, M. J. Krische, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 5298–5301; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 5220–5223.
- [39] a) N. Oguni, T. Omi, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1984**, *25*, 2823–2824; b) M. Kitamura, S. Suga, K. Kawai, R. Noyori, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, 6071–6072.
- [40] For enantioselective catalytic addition of vinylzinc reagents to aldehydes, see: a) W. Oppolzer, R. N. Radinov, *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1992**, *75*, 170–173; b) W. Oppolzer, R. N. Radinov, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 1593–1594; c) K. Soai, K. Takahashi, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 1* **1994**, 1257–1258; d) P. Wipf, W. Xu, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1994**, *35*, 5197–5200; e) W. Oppolzer, R. N. Radinov, J. De Brabander, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1995**, *36*, 2607–2610; f) P. Wipf, S. Ribe, *J. Org. Chem.* **1998**, *63*, 6454–6455; g) W. Oppolzer, R. N. Radinov, E. El-Sayed, *J. Org. Chem.* **2001**, *66*, 4766–4770; h) S. Dahmen, S. Bräse, *Org. Lett.* **2001**, *3*, 4119–4122; i) Y. K. Chen, A. E. Lurain, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 12225–12231; j) J.-X. Ji, L.-Q. Qiu, C. W. Yip, A. S. C. Chan, *J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, *68*, 1589–1590; k) A. E. Lurain, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 10677–10683; l) D.-H. Ko, S.-W. Kang, K. H. Kim, Y. Chung, D.-C. Ha, *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *25*, 35–36; m) C. M. Sprout, M. L. Richmond, C. T. Seto, *J. Org. Chem.* **2004**, *69*, 6666–6673; n) S.-J. Jeon, Y. K. Chen, P. J. Walsh, *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 1729–1732; o) F. Lauterwasser, J. Gall, S. Höfener, S. Bräse, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2006**, *348*, 2068–2074; p) S.-J. Jeon, E. L. Fisher, P. J. Carroll, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 9618–9619; q) L. Salvi, S.-J. Jeon, E. L. Fisher, P. J. Carroll, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 16119–16125.
- [41] For reviews encompassing catalytic enantioselective aldehyde vinylation using organozinc reagents, see: a) P. Wipf, C. Kendall, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2002**, *8*, 1778–1784; b) P. Wipf, R. L. Nunes, *Tetrahedron* **2004**, *60*, 1269–1279.
- [42] For catalytic enantioselective ketone vinylation using organozinc reagents, see: a) H. Li, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 6538–6539; b) H. Li, P. J. Walsh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 8355–8361; c) S.-J. Jeon, H. Li, C. García, L. K. LaRochelle, P. J. Walsh, *J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *70*, 448–455.
- [43] I. Ojima, M. Tzamarioudaki, C.-Y. Tsai, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 3643–3644.
- [44] a) W. E. Crowe, M. J. Rachita, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *117*, 6787–6788; b) For an aligned study, see: N. M. Kablaoui, S. L. Buchwald, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *117*, 6785–6786.
- [45] For intramolecular nickel catalyzed alkyne–carbonyl reductive coupling, see: a) E. Oblinger, J. Montgomery, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 9065–9066; b) X.-Q. Tang, J. Montgomery, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 6098–6099; c) X.-Q. Tang, J. Montgomery, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 6950–6954; d) B. Knapp-Reed, G. M. Mahandru, J. Montgomery, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 13156–13157.
- [46] For intermolecular nickel catalyzed alkyne–carbonyl reductive coupling, see: a) W.-S. Huang, J. Chan, T. F. Jamison, *Org. Lett.* **2000**, *2*, 4221–4223; b) K. M. Miller, W.-S. Huang, T. F. Jamison, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 3442–3443; c) K. Takai, S. Sakamoto, T. Isshiki, *Org. Lett.* **2003**, *5*, 653–655; d) G. M. Mahandru, G. Liu, J. Montgomery, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 3698–3699.
- [47] R. L. Patman, M. R. Chaulagain, V. M. Williams, M. J. Krische, manuscript in preparation.