Highly Enantioselective Asymmetric Michael Addition Reactions with New Chiral Multisite Phase-Transfer Catalysts

Sivamani Jayaraman, Duraimurugan Kumaraguru, Jesin Beneto Arockiam, Subha Paulpandian, Balasaravanan Rajendiran, Ayyanar Siva*

Department of Inorganic Chemistry, School of Chemistry, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai 625 021, Tamilnadu, India Fax +91(452)2459181; E-mail: drasiva@gmail.com

Received: 13.03.2014; Accepted after revision: 22.04.2014

Abstract: Highly enantioselective Michael addition reactions of diethyl malonate to various chalcones have been achieved under mild chiral multisite phase-transfer reaction conditions by the successful utilization of 2,4,6-(triscinchoniummethyl)phenyl-1,3,5-triazines as new chiral quaternary ammonium catalysts. This simple asymmetric Michael addition process was found to be quite effective and to obtain Michael adducts with very good yields and enantiomeric excesses.

Key words: phase-transfer catalysts, Michael reaction, enantioselective reaction, quaternary ammonium salt, cinchona alkaloid

Phase-transfer catalysis is a versatile, well-established synthetic technique applicable to a number of organic biphase reactions.¹ This technique has become one of the most interesting and fascinating topics of research during the last few years being successful for a multitude of organic transformations.² One of the most general, efficient, and environmental benign methodologies that can successfully be employed to solve the predicament of insolubility of aqueous phase with organic phase is phasetransfer catalysis.³ As the chemical reactants reside in immiscible phases, phase-transfer catalysts have the ability to carry one of the reactants as a highly active species for penetrating the interface, into the other phase where the reaction takes place, and to give a high conversion and selectivity for the desired product under mild reaction conditions. Since the mid 1880's the Michael addition reaction has been extensively investigated and applied in organic chemistry.⁴ During the past two decades, a large progress has been made in the development of asymmetric catalyzed Michael addition reactions in the presence of cinchona-based chiral catalysts with very good vield and high enantiomeric excesses.

In recent years most of the researchers concentrated on the catalysis of asymmetric Michael reaction using chiral metal complexes and cinchona alkaloid based chiral catalysts, they have been developed as an efficient method for the enantioselective construction of carbon–carbon bonds.⁵ Recently, Corey et al.^{6a} and Kim et. al.^{6b} have reported the enantioselective Michael addition of nitromethane and nitroalkane to α,β -enone using a chiral quaternary ammonium salt as chiral catalyst, respectively.

SYNLETT 2014, 25, 1685–1691 Advanced online publication: 12.06.2014 DOI: 10.1055/s-0033-1339124; Art ID: st-2014-b0220-l © Georg Thieme Verlag Stuttgart · New York Shishido et al. has reported on the synthesis of (+)-triptoquinone using the chiral cinchonidine-based quaternary ammonium bromide as catalyst.7 All the previously reported Michael addition reactions are using single-site quaternary ammonium chiral catalysts also they have achieved moderate yield and enantiomeric excesses. In our study for the first time we reported the multisite-containing chiral quaternary ammonium catalysts for the Michael addition reaction under mild basic conditions with very good yield and enantiomeric excesses (Figure 1, 1-3). As part of our research program related to the development of effective cinchona alkaloid derived chiral multisite phase-transfer catalysts (CMPTC),⁸ we reported the catalytic enantioselective Michael reaction promoted by quaternary ammonium salts from cinchonine as phasetransfer catalysts **11a** and **11b**.⁹



Figure 1 Cinchona-derived chiral phase-transfer catalysts

In this paper, we wish to report the catalytic enantioselective Michael reaction of diethyl malonate **5** to chalcone derivative **4** using the cinchona alkaloid derived quaternary ammonium salts **11a** and **11b** (Scheme 1). In order to determine suitable reaction conditions, we initially investigated the reaction system using 5 mol% of catalyst with diethyl malonate **5** as the Michael donor and chalcone **4** as the Michael acceptor with various solvents as well as bases. Catalysts **11a** and **11b** (Scheme 2) having an *O*-ben-



Scheme 1 Enantioselective Michael addition of diethylmalonate 5 to chalcone derivative 4 using CMPTC 11 in aqueous media



Scheme 2 Synthesis of enantioselective chiral catalysts 11

zyl/allyl group showed higher catalytic efficiencies than other catalysts such as single-site CPTC **1a** and **1b** in terms of yields and enantioselectivity due to the multiactive center (tri-site) present in the catalysts **11a** and **11b** which can influence the formation of an ion-pair interaction between the α -carbon of the diethylmalonate with trisite catalysts (Table 1, entries 1–4). Compound **6** was formed using cinchonine-derived catalysts (**1** and **11**) as the excessive enantiomer, which should be the case because all of these catalysts posses the same chirality.

We chose *N*-alkyl cinchonium salts **11a** and **11b**, which are well-known as chiral MPTCs to give valuable Michael adducts under mild biphasic conditions. The results are shown in Table 1. Enantioselective Michael addition reaction was carried out in different nonaqueous solvents using test CMPTC **11** under biphasic conditions keeping the other variables as constant. From the obtained results (Table 2), it is seen that the change of solvent is found to be an important influential factor in the Michael addition reaction owing to solvent polarity. The chemical yield and enantiomeric excesses have been found to increase gradually, when we are using polar solvents (Table 2, entries 1–

16). The results obtained with various solvents have been related to their dielectric constants. The decreased product yield/enantiomeric excesses in high polar solvents like DMF (Table 2, entries 11 and 12) is due to the higher degree of solvation of CMPTC, which in turn decreases the efficiency of the catalyst. That is, most probably, the high polar solvents should reduce the ionic interaction between the catalyst and the anionic agents (diethylmalonate) reducing the yield and enantiomeric excess. In the case of toluene and cyclohexane, which is a low polar solvent, the degree of solvation of CMPTC is considerably less. Hence, the degree of decay due to solvation of CMPTC of the catalyst is almost minimized/ignored. Otherwise, the interaction between R_4N^+ of the catalyst and anion of the diethylmalonate is more. This in turn improves the potential of the catalyst as well as effective attraction of the substrate and catalyst, and hence the reaction yield and enantiomeric excesses were found to be higher in toluene and cyclohexane medium (Table 2, entries 7–10).

Catalyst **11b** having an O-allyl group showed higher catalytic efficiencies than the *O*-benzyl-protected catalyst **11a** in terms of yields and enantioselectivity (Table 3, en-

 Table 1
 Catalytic Asymmetric Michael Addition of Diethyl Malonate 5 to Chalcone 4 with Different CPTC 1 and CMPTC 11 under Ultrasonic Conditions

	+ $\begin{pmatrix} CO_2Et \\ CO_2Et \\ 5 \end{pmatrix}$	C 1 and CMPTC 11 (5 mol %) KOt-Bu (10%) CH ₂ Cl ₂ , ultrasonication		~	
Entry	Catalyst	Time (h) ^a	Yield (%) ^b	ee (%) ^c	Abs. config.d
1	1a	7	46	51	R
2	1b	7	60	65	R
3	11a	7	96	98	R
4	11b	7	97	99	R

^a The Michael reaction of chalcone 4 (0.1 mmol), diethyl malonate 5 (0.12 mmol), and CPTC 1 and CMPTC 11 (5 mol%) with solvent (1 mL) and base (10%, 0.5 mL) base under ultrasonic conditions.

^b Isolated yield of purified material.

^c Enantiopurity was determined by HPLC analysis of the Michael adduct **6** using a chiral column (Phenomenex Chiralpack) with hexane–2-PrOH as solvent.

^d Absolute configuration was determined by comparison of the HPLC retention time.

tries 1–12,). It has been also found that KO*t*-Bu, K_2CO_3 , and Cs_2CO_3 were the more effective bases in this reaction than others such as NaOH, KOH, and Et₃N (Table 3, entries 1–12). Under the optimized reaction conditions described above (5 mol% of catalyst **11a** and **11b**, 10% base, CH₂Cl₂, ultrasonic conditions), we investigated the catalytic asymmetric Michael addition of diethyl malonate to chalcone **4**. The reaction smoothly proceeded to afford the corresponding adduct **6** with good enantioselectivities. Reaction of 1.2 equivalents of diethyl malonate **5** with 1.0 equivalent of chalcone **4**, cinchonium salts **11a** and **11b** (5 mol%) and KOt-Bu in CH_2Cl_2 at room temperature with stirring for 1–8 hours afforded the Michael adducts **6** in good yields with very good enantioselectivities (67–99% ee, Table 3). In all cases the enantiomeric excesses were determined by HPLC analysis.

 Table 2
 Catalytic Asymmetric Michael Addition of Diethyl Malonate 5 to Chalcone 4 with Different Solvents and CMPTC 11a and 11b under Ultrasonic Conditions

+ CO_2Et CO_2Et 5	CMPTC (11a/11b , 5 mo KO <i>t</i> -Bu (10%) solvent ultrasonication		6 CO ₂ Et		
Solvent	Catalyst	Time (h) ^a	Yield (%) ^b	ee (%) ^c	Abs. config.d
CH ₂ Cl ₂	11a	4	90	93	R
CH_2Cl_2	11b	4	90	99	R
THF	11 a	4	90	93	R
THF	11b	4	90	95	R
МеОН	11a	8	35	75	R
МеОН	11b	8	55	72	R
toluene	11a	8	82	88	R
toluene	11b	8	89	96	R
cyclohexane	11a	8	90	92	R
cyclohexane	11b	8	88	98	R
DMF	11a	8	90	68	R
DMF	11b	8	51	73	R
	$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \\ & \end{array} \\ \\ & \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\$		EtO2CMPTC (11a/11b, 5 mol%)FtO2($f \in CO_2Et$ CMPTC (11a/11b, 5 mol%) $f \in CO_2Et$ $KOtBu (10\%)$ solvent ultrasonication $f \in f \in CI$ SolventCatalystTime (h) ^a CH2Cl211a4CH2Cl211b4THF11a4THF11b4MeOH11a8toluene11a8toluene11b8cyclohexane11a8DMF11a8DMF11b8	$ \begin{array}{c c} \leftarrow \leftarrow$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

 Table 2
 Catalytic Asymmetric Michael Addition of Diethyl Malonate 5 to Chalcone 4 with Different Solvents and CMPTC 11a and 11b under Ultrasonic Conditions (continued)

\bigcirc	$4 + \begin{pmatrix} CO_2Et \\ CO_2Et \\ CO_2Et \\ 5 \end{pmatrix}$	CMPTC (11a/11b, 5 mol KOt-Bu (10%) solvent ultrasonication		C CO ₂ Et		
Entry	Solvent	Catalyst	Time (h) ^a	Yield (%) ^b	ee (%) ^c	Abs. config. ^d
13	CHCl ₃	11a	5	93	71	R
14	CHCl ₃	8b	6	70	76	R
15	acetone	8a	8	79	83	R
16	acetone	8b	6	80	89	R

^a The Michael reaction of chalcone **4** (0.1 mmol), diethyl malonate **5** (0.12 mmol), and CMPTC **11** (**11a**/**11b**, 5 mol%) with solvent (1 mL) and KOt-Bu (10%, 0.5 mL) under ultrasonic conditions.

^b Isolated yield of purified material.

^c Enantiopurity was determined by HPLC analysis of the Michael adduct **6** using a chiral column (Phenomenex Chiralpack) with hexane–2-PrOH as solvent.

^d Absolute configuration was determined by comparison of the HPLC retention time.

Table 3 Catalytic Asymmetric Michael Addition of Diethyl Malonate 5 to Chalcones 4 with Different Bases and CMPTC 11a and 11b

Ŷ	1	EtO ₂ C CO ₂ Et						
	CO ₂ Et	CMPTC (11a/11b, 5	mol%)					
	4 5	base (10%), CH ₂ ultrasonication		6				
Entry	Base	Catalyst	Time (h) ^a	Yield (%) ^b	ee (%) ^c	Abs. config.d		
1	K ₂ CO ₃	11a	6	86	91	R		
2	K ₂ CO ₃	11b	7	86	97	R		
3	Cs ₂ CO ₃	11a	7	80	85	R		
4	Cs ₂ CO ₃	11b	8	80	96	R		
5	NaOH	11a	1	68	74	R		
6	NaOH	11b	1	68	89	R		
7	КОН	11a	1	65	69	R		
8	КОН	11b	1	63	84	R		
9	KOt-Bu	11a	4	90	93	R		
10	KOt-Bu	11b	4	90	99	R		
11	Et ₃ N	11a	8	_	-	-		
12	Et ₃ N	11b	8	30	67	R		

^a The Michael reaction of chalcone **4** (0.1 mmol), diethyl malonate **5** (0.12 mmol), and CMPTC **11** (**11a/11b**, 5 mol%) with solvent (1 mL) and base (10%, 0.5 mL) under ultrasonic conditions.

^b Isolated yield of purified material.

^c Enantiopurity was determined by HPLC analysis of the Michael adduct **6** using a chiral column (Phenomenex Chiralpack) with hexane–2-PrOH as solvent.

^d Absolute configuration was determined by comparison of the HPLC retention time.

The enantioselective Michael addition of chalcone at higher concentration of base irrespective of CMPTC gave disparate results, which can be explained by invoking a catalyst-degradation mechanism (Figure 2). Initially, the deprotonation of the catalysts **11** occurred at high concentrations of base leading to Hofmann elimination and giv-



Figure 2 Catalysts decomposition mechanism at higher concentrations of base

ing compound of **12**, viz. olefinic compound (inactive catalysts). Based on these observations, the base concentration was fixed at 10% and the structural stability of CMPTC was maintained without decomposition. Similar studies have been reported by Paramzitsinghet al.,¹⁰ Siva et al.,¹¹ Maruoka et al.,¹² and O'Donnell et al.¹³ for cinchona alkaloid derived CPTC in the alkylation of glycine imine at higher concentration of base.

Furthermore, the formation of lower yield and lower enantiomeric excess (Table 3, entries 5–8) may be explained as follows: The CMPTC, containing lone-pairs of electrons on the nitrogen atoms (present in triazine), shift the electron density to the electron-deficient terminal R_4N^+ site of the CMPTC via an aromatic ring spacer chain, and, as a result, no bond resonance is formed (Figure 3). This leads to detachment/deactivation of the catalytic sites, thus losing their attracting power (i.e., electrophileattracting power) towards the anions of the α -carbon of the diethylmalonate. As a result, the degree of ion pair formation between R₄N⁺ of CMPTC (**11b** and **12b**) with anions of the α -carbon of the diethylmalonate is relatively lower, hence it has produced a lower yield and enantiomeric excesses (Table 3, entries 5–8).

Further, we investigate the Michael addition reaction of 1,4-diarylenone 4 under the optimized reaction conditions described above (5 mol% of catalyst 11, KOt-Bu, CH_2Cl_2 , ultrasonic conditions), as listed in Table 4. From the observed results both electron-withdrawing and electron-do-



Figure 3 Detachment/deactivation of CMPTC due to ion-pair formation between the quaternary ammonium of triazine with anions of α -carbon of the diethylmalonate

© Georg Thieme Verlag Stuttgart · New York

	A	Ar ² +	CO ₂ Et	11 (5 mc KO <i>t</i> -Bu (1 CH ₂ Cl ₂ , ultras 4 h	0%) Ar1	CO_2Et CO_2Et CO_2Et Ar^2 6		
Entry	Enone 4 Ar ¹	Enone 4 Ar ²		Catalyst	Product ^a	Yield (%) ^b	ee (%) ^c	Abs. config.d
1	Ph	$4-MeC_6H_4$		11a	6a	90	93	R
2	Ph	$4-MeC_6H_4$		11b	6a	90	99	R
3	Ph	$4-ClC_6H_4$		11 a	6b	92	92	R
4	Ph	$4-ClC_6H_4$		11b	6b	92	99	R
5	4-BrC ₆ H ₄	$4-ClC_6H_4$		11 a	6c	90	91	R
6	$4-BrC_6H_4$	$4-ClC_6H_4$		11b	6c	90	97	R
7	$4-BrC_6H_4$	4-MeOC ₆ H ₄		11a	6d	91	95	R
8	$4-BrC_6H_4$	4-MeOC ₆ H ₄		11b	6d	91	97	R

Table 4 Catalytic Asymmetric Michael Addition of Diethyl Malonate 5 to Chalcone Derivatives 4 under CPTC Conditions^a

^a The Michael reaction of chalcone 4 (0.1 mmol), diethyl malonate 5 (0.12 mmol), and CMPTC 11 (11a/11b, 5 mol%) with CH_2Cl_2 (1 mL) and KOt-Bu (10%, 0.5 mL) under ultrasonic conditions.

^b Isolated yield of purified material.

^c Enantiopurity was determined by HPLC analysis of the Michael adducts **6** using a chiral column (Phenomenex Chiralpack) with hexane-2-PrOH as solvent.

^d Absolute configuration was determined by comparison of the HPLC retention time.

nating groups on the aryl groups and hence the corresponding Michael adducts **6** were obtained in excellent product yield and higher enantiomeric excess (Table 4, entries 1-8).

The obtained results indicated that the stereochemical course of the Michael addition reaction mainly depends on the stereochemistry/molecular assembly between the substrates such as electrophile **5** and different chalcones **4** with CMPTC. The formation of higher Michael adduct yield (Table 4, entries 1–8,) and its enantiomeric excesses of each reaction catalyzed by $C_9(O)$ -protected CMPTC would be mainly attributed to an effective contact of ion pair formed between the positive quaternary ammonium ions (R_4N^+) of the respective CMPTC with an electrophile (Figure 4, a), at the same time the interaction between the



Figure 4 Formation of higher enantioselectivity and chemical yield of various intermediates/molecular assemblies during the enantioselective

Synlett 2014, 25, 1685-1691

electrophile with a carbocation of the chalcone due to electrostatic attraction¹⁴ and also the same attraction between the R_4N^+ of the respective CMPTC with enolate of the chalcone (Figure 4, b). The results also suggested that apart from the ionic interaction between the catalyst and substrates, there is also a π - π -stacking interaction¹⁵ between the benzyl group of the respective C₉(O)-protected CMPTC with the aryl group of the chalcone which would further facilitate the binding of the two species. This in turn shows to facilitate an effective ion-pair interaction and thus effect for parallel increasing of chemical yield and enantiomeric excesses.

In conclusion, we have developed a new class of asymmetric phase-transfer catalyst, which shows good enantioselectivity in the Michael addition of diethyl malonate to chalcones. We are currently involved in the further development of these catalyst systems and investigating their applicability to other asymmetric phase-transfer processes.

Acknowledgment

We acknowledge the financial support of the University Grants Commission, New Delhi, India (Grant No. UGC No.41-215/2012 (SR) and Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi, India [Grant No. 01(2540)/11/EMR-II].

Supporting Information for this article is available online at http://www.thieme-connect.com/products/ejournals/journal/10.1055/s-00000083.

References and Notes

- (a) Jarrouse, J. C. R. *Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci. Ser. C* 1951, 232, 1424. (b) Freedman, H. H. *Pure Appl. Chem.* 1986, 58, 857. (c) Starks, C. M.; Liotta, C. L. *Phase Transfer Catalysis*; Academic Press: New York, 1978, Chap. 2.
- (2) (a) Dehmlow, E. V.; Dehmlow, S. S. *Phase Transfer Catalysis*; VCH: Weinheim, **1993**. (b) Starks, C. M.; Liotta, C. L.; Halpern, M. *Phase Transfer Catalysis: Fundamentals, Applications and Industrial Perspectives*; Chapman: New York, **1994**. (c) Halpern, M. *Phase Trans. Catal. Commun.* **1997**, *3*, 33.
- (3) (a) Makosza, M. ARKIVOC 2006, (iv), 7. (b) Yadav, G. D. Top. Catal. 2004, 29, 145.
- (4) (a) Berlmutter, P. Conjugate Addition Reactions in Organic Synthesis, In Tetrahedron Organic Chemistry Series; Pergamon Press: Oxford, 1992. (b) Oare, D. A.; Heathcock, C. H. Top. Stereochem. 1989, 19, 227. (c) Rossiter, B. E.; Swingle, N. M. Chem. Rev. 1992, 92, 771. (d) Krause, N.; Gerold, A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1997, 36, 186.
- (5) (a) Shibasaki, M.; Sasai, H.; Arai, T. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1997, 36, 1236. (b) Yamaguchi, M.; Shiraishi, T.; Hirama, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1993, 52, 1176.
- (6) (a) Corey, E. J.; Zhang, F. Y. Org. Lett. 2000, 2, 4257.
 (b) Kim, D. Y.; Huh, S. C.; Kim, S. M. Tetrahedron Lett. 2001, 42, 6299.
- (7) Shishido, K.; Goto, K.; Miyoshi, S.; Takaishi, Y.; Shibuya, M. J. Org. Chem. 1994, 59, 406.
- (8) (a) Nerinckx, W.; Vandewalle, M. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 1990, *1*, 265. (b) Diéz-Barra, E.; de la Hoz, A.; Merino, S.;

Rodríguez, A.; Sánchez-Verdú, P. *Tetrahedron* 1998, *54*, 1835. (c) Loupy, A.; Sansoulet, J.; Zaparucha, A.; Merienne, C. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1989, *30*, 333. (d) Loupy, A.; Zaparucha, A. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1993, *34*, 473. (e) Perrard, T.; Plaquevent, J.-C.; Desmurs, J.-R.; Hebrault, D. Org. Lett. 2000, *2*, 2959. (f) Kim, D. Y.; Huh, S. C.; Kim, S. M. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2001, *42*, 6299. (g) Ooi, T.; Ohara, D.; Fukumoto, K.; Maruoka, K. Org. Lett. 2005, *7*, 3195. (h) Siva, A.; Murugan, E. J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem. 2006, *248*, 1.

(9) A mixture of 2,4,6-tris-(4-bromomethylphenyl)-[1,3,5]triazine (9, 0.1 g, 10 mmol), cinchona derivatives 10a or 10b (30 mmol) was dissolved in THF (5 mL) and heated to reflux overnight, the white solid was filtered, washed with Et₂O, and dried to get pure three-site chiral phase-transfer catalyst (86% yield).

Triazine-Based Benzylcinchonine (11a)

¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO- d_6): $\delta = 9.08$ (s, 1 H), 8.97 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 2 H), 8.48–8.37 (m, 1 H), 8.20 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1 H), 8.14 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 1 H), 8.04–7.98 (m, 1 H), 7.97–7.91 (m, 1 H), 7.86 (d, J = 9.6 Hz, 2 H), 7.62 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 2 H), 7.51 (dd, J = 20.1, 12.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.42 (dd, J = 12.7, 5.5 Hz, 1 H),6.67–6.51 (m, 1 H), 6.07–5.83 (m, 1 H), 5.80 (dd, *J* = 22.9, 13.5 Hz, 1 H), 5.29 (d, J = 11.4 Hz, 1 H), 5.20-5.13 (m, 1 H), 5.10-4.91 (m, 2 H), 4.85-4.69 (m, 1 H), 4.66-4.53 (m, 1 H), 4.51-4.29 (m, 1 H), 4.10 (s, 2 H), 2.68 (s, 2 H), 2.11-1.90 (m, 2 H), 1.82 (d, J = 12.0 Hz, 2 H), 1.27 (s, 1 H). ¹³C NMR $(125 \text{ MHz}, \text{DMSO-}d_6): \delta = 171.49, 150.8, 148.58, 141.57,$ 140.86, 138.26, 137.58, 137.36, 137.23, 135.08, 130.35, 130.21, 130.08, 129.6, 129.23, 128.97, 128.93, 128.85, 128.72, 128.58, 128.42, 128.33, 128.07, 117.16, 116.85, 116.12, 71.22, 70.97, 70.86, 68.48, 59.46, 37.32, 27.04, 26.38, 24.69. ESI-MS: $m/z = 1765.00 [M]^{3+}$.

Triazine-Based Allylcinchonine (11b)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6): $\delta = 9.06$ (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1 H), 8.96 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 2 H), 8.44 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1 H), 8.17 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1 H), 8.15–8.08 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 2 H), 7.91 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 1 H), 7.85–7.81 (m, 1 H), 7.74 (s, 1 H), 6.46 (s, 1 H), 6.29–6.19 (m, 1 H), 6.04 (dd, J = 17.2, 6.7 Hz, 1 H), 5.50 (d, J = 17.4 Hz, 1 H), 5.37 (d, J = 10.0 Hz, 1 H), 5.27 (t, J = 13.5 Hz, 2 H), 4.82 (s, 1 H), 4.35 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 1 H), 4.17 (d, J = 22.3 Hz, 2 H), 4.05 (s, 2 H), 3.66 (d, J = 9.9 Hz, 1 H), 3.06 (s, 2 H), 2.70 (s, 1 H), 1.95 (s, 1 H), 1.81 (s, 3 H), 1.25 (s, 1 H). ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6): $\delta = 171.53$, 150.65, 148.45, 141.16, 137.43, 137.26, 135.17, 134.66, 133.24, 130.21, 129.64, 128.0, 125.66, 124.58, 120.27, 118.49, 117.58, 73.55, 69.95, 67.55, 62.94, 56.71, 54.98, 37.0, 26.77, 23.28, 21.61. ESI-MS: m/z = 1599.9200 [M]³⁺.

- (10) Singh, P.; Arora, G. Indian J. Chem., Sect. B: Org. Chem. Incl. Med. Chem. **1986**, 25, 1034.
- (11) Siva, A.; Murugan, E. *Synthesis* **2005**, 2927.
- (12) (a) Ooi, T.; Kameda, M.; Maruoka, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 5139. (b) Ooi, T.; Kameda, M.; Tannai, H.; Maruoka, K. Tetrahedron Lett. 2000, 41, 8339.
- (13) O'Donnell, M. J.; Wu, S.; Huffman, J. C. Tetrahedron 1994, 50, 4507.
- (14) (a) Lipkowitz, K. B.; Cavanaugh, M. W.; Baker, B.;
 O'Donnell, M. J. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 5181. (b) Dolling,
 U. H.; Davis, P.; Grabowski, E. J. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984,
 106, 446. (c) Masui, M.; Ando, A.; Shioiri, T. Tetrahedron Lett. 1988, 29, 2835.
- (15) (a) Whitesell, J.; Bhattacharya, A.; Buchanan, C. H.; Chen, H.-H.; Milton, M. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **1986**, *51*, 551. (b) For a review, see: Jones, G. B.; Chapman, B. J. *Synthesis* **1995**, 475.

Copyright of Synlett is the property of Georg Thieme Verlag Stuttgart and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.