

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41453176>

# Scope and Mechanistic Investigations on the Solvent-Controlled Regio- and Stereoselective Formation of Enol Esters from the Ruthenium-Catalyzed Coupling Reaction of Terminal Alkyne...

ARTICLE *in* ORGANOMETALLICS · OCTOBER 2009

Impact Factor: 4.13 · DOI: 10.1021/om9007357 · Source: PubMed

---

CITATIONS

27

---

READS

24

2 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:



Chae S Yi

Marquette University

62 PUBLICATIONS 1,897 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Published in final edited form as:

*Organometallics*. 2009 October 30; 28(22): 6585–6592. doi:10.1021/om9007357.

# Scope and Mechanistic Investigations on the Solvent-Controlled Regio- and Stereoselective Formation of Enol Esters from the Ruthenium-Catalyzed Coupling Reaction of Terminal Alkynes and Carboxylic Acids

Chae S. Yi\* and Ruili Gao

Department of Chemistry, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201-1881

## Abstract

The ruthenium-hydride complex  $(PCy_3)_2(CO)RuHCl$  was found to be a highly effective catalyst for the alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction to give synthetically useful enol ester products. Strong solvent effect was observed for the ruthenium catalyst in modulating the activity and selectivity; the coupling reaction in  $CH_2Cl_2$  led to the regioselective formation of *gem*-enol ester products, while the stereoselective formation of (*Z*)-enol esters was obtained in THF. The coupling reaction was found to be strongly inhibited by  $PCy_3$ . The coupling reaction of both  $PhCO_2H/PhC\equiv CD$  and  $PhCO_2D/PhC\equiv CH$  led to the extensive deuterium incorporation on the vinyl positions of the enol ester products. An opposite Hammett value was observed when the correlation of a series of *para*-substituted  $p$ -X- $C_6H_4CO_2H$  (X = OMe, CH<sub>3</sub>, H, CF<sub>3</sub>, CN) with phenylacetylene was examined in  $CDCl_3$  ( $\rho = +0.30$ ) and THF ( $\rho = -0.68$ ). Catalytically relevant Ru-carboxylate and  $\eta^2$ -vinylidene-carboxylate complexes,  $(PCy_3)_2(CO)(Cl)Ru(\kappa^2-O_2CC_6H_4-p-OMe)$  and  $(PCy_3)_2(CO)(Cl)RuC(=CHPh)O_2CC_6H_4-p-OMe$ , were isolated, and the structure of both complexes was completely established by X-ray crystallography. A detailed mechanism of the coupling reaction involving a rate-limiting C-O bond formation step was proposed on the basis of these kinetic and structural studies. The regioselective formation of the *gem*-enol ester products in  $CH_2Cl_2$  was rationalized by a direct migratory insertion of the terminal alkyne via a Ru-carboxylate species, whereas the stereoselective formation of (*Z*)-enol ester products in THF was explained by invoking a Ru-vinylidene species.

## Introduction

Enol esters are a versatile class of precursors for a variety of synthetically important organic transformations such as cycloaddition,<sup>1</sup> asymmetric hydrogenation,<sup>2</sup> C-C bond coupling,<sup>3</sup> and Aldol- and Mannich-type of condensation reactions.<sup>4</sup> Since enol esters can also serve as a synthon for aldehydes and ketones, much research efforts has been devoted to develop efficient catalytic methods to control both regio- and stereoselectivity in forming substituted enol esters. Notable recent examples on the catalytic synthesis of enol esters include: Zr-catalyzed methylalumination of alkynes,<sup>5</sup> Au-catalyzed intramolecular rearrangements of propargylic esters and alcohols,<sup>6</sup> Cu-catalyzed oxidative esterification of aldehydes with  $\beta$ -dicarbonyl compounds,<sup>7</sup> and asymmetric coupling reaction of ketenes with aldehydes by chiral Fe catalysts.<sup>8</sup> From an industrial perspective of increasing synthetic efficiency as well as for


chae.yi@marquette.edu.

Supporting Information Available: Spectroscopic data of organic products and X-ray crystallographic data of **6** and **7** (77 pages, print/PDF). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

reducing waste byproducts, catalytic methods for producing enol esters are highly desired compared to the classical methods that utilize stoichiometric amounts of strong base or toxic Hg salts.<sup>9</sup>

Transition metal-catalyzed alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction offers an attractive route to enol esters, but its synthetic potential has not been fully exploited in part because the catalytic method typically produces a mixture of *gem*- and (*E*)/(*Z*)-enol ester products.<sup>10</sup> Considerable research has been devoted to control both regio- and stereoselectivity of the enol ester products by modulating steric and electronic nature of the metal catalysts. Generally, late transition metal catalysts have been found to be effective for producing a mixture of (*E*)- and (*Z*)-enol esters from *anti*-Markovnikov addition of carboxylic acids to terminal alkynes over *gem*-enol ester products,<sup>10,11</sup> though the regioselective formation of *gem*-enol esters has been achieved by using Ru and Rh catalysts.<sup>12</sup> Dixneuf and co-workers elegantly showed the relationship between steric environment of the ruthenium-phosphine catalysts and the stereoselective formation of the (*Z*)-enol esters.<sup>13</sup> In a subsequent study, the same authors reported a regioselective 2:1 alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction to form the dieny l esters by using Cp\*Ru(COD)Cl catalyst, in which a ruthenacyclopentadiene complex was proposed as the key intermediate species for the coupling reaction.<sup>14</sup> Both intra- and intermolecular versions of the catalytic alkyne-to-carboxylic coupling methods have been successfully applied to the synthesis of complex organic molecules.<sup>15</sup> Despite considerable synthetic and mechanistic progress, however, neither the nature of reactive intermediate species nor controlling factors for the formation of *gem*- vs (*E*)/(*Z*)-enol esters has been clearly established.

We previously reported that the coordinatively unsaturated ruthenium-hydride complex (PCy<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(CO)RuHCl (**1**) is a highly effective catalyst for the coupling reactions of alkenes and alkynes.<sup>16</sup> Both ruthenium-acetylide and -vinylidene complexes have been found to be the key species for these coupling reactions.<sup>17</sup> As part of on-going efforts to extend synthetic utility of the ruthenium-catalyzed alkyne coupling reactions, we have been exploring the catalytic activity of the ruthenium-hydride complexes toward the coupling reactions of alkynes with heteroatom substrates. In this article, we report a detailed scope and mechanistic study of the ruthenium-catalyzed alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction, which provides new insights in mediating solvent-controlled regio- and stereoselective formation of the enol ester products.



## Results and Discussion

### Catalyst Survey and Reaction Scope

The catalytic activity of selected ruthenium complexes was initially screened for the coupling reaction of benzoic acid and 4-ethynylanisole (eq 1). Among the selected ruthenium catalysts, complex **1** was found to exhibit uniquely high catalytic activity and selectivity in giving the *gem*-enol ester product **2a** within 5 h at 95 °C in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (Table 1). Both Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub> and Cp\*Ru(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Cl showed significant activity, but suffered from low selectivity in forming the coupling products. The catalyst Cp\*Ru(COD)Cl, on the other hand, produced a mixture of 1:1 and 1:2 coupling products, which is in line with the previously reported results on the formation of dienyne ester products.<sup>14</sup>

Next, the solvent effect on the activity and selectivity patterns of the catalyst was examined for the coupling reaction of benzoic acid and 4-ethynylanisole (Table 2). A remarkably strong solvent influence on the ruthenium catalyst **1** was observed in modulating the formation of the enol ester products. Thus, the coupling reaction in relatively non-polar and non-coordinating solvents tended to favor the formation of geminal coupling product **2a** over (*E*)- and (*Z*)-**3a**, of which CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> was found to be the best in producing the geminal product **2a** among these solvents (entry 4). In contrast, among polar coordinating solvents, which tended to favor the formation of (*Z*)-enol ester product (*Z*)-**3a**, THF was found to be the most selective in giving (*Z*)-**3a** (entry 10). It should be emphasized that the formation of 1:2 coupling products was not observed from the coupling reaction catalyzed by **1**. Other ruthenium catalysts such as Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub>, Cp\*Ru(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Cl and Cp\*Ru(COD)Cl surveyed in Table 1 did not exhibit similar degree of solvent control in forming the coupling products.

It is imperative to briefly mention about the recent advances in using solvents with different polarity and coordinating ability to control the product selectivity. Coordinatively unsaturated transition metal complexes have been found to be particularly sensitive to the nature of solvents in mediating unreactive bond activation reactions.<sup>18–20</sup> For example, Milstein discovered a remarkable solvent effect of the pincer-ligated (PCP)Rh complexes in directing C-H vs C-C bond and C-I vs C-CN bond activation reactions.<sup>18</sup> Jones investigated the similar solvent control effects in C-C vs C-H bond cleavage reactions of alkenyl nitriles by using well-defined Ni-diphosphine complexes.<sup>19</sup> The regioselectivity of a number of synthetically useful catalytic coupling reactions of alkenes and alkynes, such as Heck-type and allylic substitution reactions, has also been successfully controlled by using different solvents.<sup>20</sup>

The scope of the coupling reaction was surveyed in both CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and THF by using the catalyst **1** (Table 3). Excellent degree of solvent-control was observed for the coupling reaction of terminal alkynes with carboxylic acids in facilitating regio- and stereoselective formation of the enol ester products. Thus, the coupling reaction in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> led to the exclusive formation of the *gem*-enol ester product **2** for both aliphatic and aryl-substituted terminal alkynes. In contrast, the coupling reaction for aryl-substituted alkynes in THF predominantly gave the (*Z*)-enol ester products (*Z*)-**3**. The electronic nature of the alkynes was found to be an important factor in dictating regioselective product formation, since *gem*-enol ester product **2** was formed predominantly with the aliphatic terminal alkynes, even when the reaction was performed in THF (entries 17–19, 32, 34). In all cases, a relatively low catalyst loading (1–2 mol %) was used for the coupling reaction, and the enol ester products were readily isolated in high yields after a simple column chromatography on silica gel.

To further demonstrate the synthetic efficacy of the ruthenium catalyst **1**, we next examined the coupling reaction of carboxylic acids with both propargylic alcohols and diynes (Table 4). The catalyst **1** was found to catalyze the coupling reaction of carboxylic acids with propargylic alcohols to give the acetomethyl ester products **4** in high yields. In these cases, exclusive

formation of the ketone product was formed from the Markovnikov-selective hydration of the alkynes. Such Markovnikov-selectivity has been generally preferred for the hydration of terminal alkynes,<sup>21</sup> although *anti*-Markovnikov selective hydration of alkynes has been achieved more recently by using late transition metal catalysts.<sup>22</sup> The analogous coupling reaction with an aryl-substituted diyne 1,4-diethynylbenzene in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> predictably yielded the corresponding *gem*-dienol diester product **5a** (entry 8), while a mixture of *gem*-, (*E*)- and (*Z*)-dienol diester products was formed in THF (*gem*:(*E*):(*Z*) = 18:32:50, 91% combined yield). In contrast, an aliphatic diyne produced *gem*-dienol diester **5b** exclusively in both CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and THF (entry 9).

### Mechanistic Study: Phosphine Inhibition Study

The following experiments were performed to probe the factors influencing the formation of the enol ester products. First, the phosphine inhibition kinetics was measured from the coupling reaction of benzoic acid and phenylacetylene in the presence of the catalyst **1** (2 mol %). The plot of the initial rate ( $v_i$ ), which was estimated from a first-order plot of  $\ln[\text{product}]$  vs reaction time, as a function of [PCy<sub>3</sub>] showed that the rate is inversely dependent on added [PCy<sub>3</sub>] (Figure 1). The addition of PCy<sub>3</sub> (10–30 mM, 2.5–7.5 mol %) to the reaction mixture under otherwise similar conditions led to a steady decrease from  $k_{\text{obs}} = 1.8 \times 10^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$  (without added PCy<sub>3</sub>) to  $4.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$  (30 mM of PCy<sub>3</sub>). These results indicate that the active Ru catalyst is formed by a reversible dissociation of the phosphine ligand.

### Deuterium Labeling Study

The treatment of PhCO<sub>2</sub>D with PhC≡CH (2.0 equiv) and **1** (2 mol %) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at 95 °C yielded the *gem*-enol ester product **2c** with ca. 30% D on both vinyl positions as determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>2</sup>H NMR (Scheme 1). The analogous reaction in THF also formed the product (*Z*)-**3c** with a similar amount of deuterium on the vinyl positions. Conversely, the reaction of PhCO<sub>2</sub>H with PhC≡CD (2 equiv) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and in THF formed the products, **2c** and (*Z*)-**3c** respectively, with nearly equal amounts of the deuterium (62–67%) on the vinyl positions. In a control experiment, the treatment of PhCO<sub>2</sub>D with PhC≡CH (2.0 equiv) in the presence of **1** (2 mol %) led to almost complete H/D exchange within 10 min at 95 °C prior to the product formation. The ruthenium catalyst was found to be essential for the H/D exchange reaction, since no significant H/D exchange between PhCO<sub>2</sub>D and PhC≡CH occurred in the absence of **1** under otherwise similar conditions. These results indicate that the H/D exchange between the acid and alkynyl hydrogens is rapid and reversible, and that neither the alkynyl C–H bond nor the carboxylic acid O–H bond activation step is a rate-limiting step of the coupling reaction.

### Hammett Study

To discern the electronic effects on the product formation, the Hammett  $\rho$  values were measured for the coupling reaction in both CDCl<sub>3</sub> and THF. Thus, the correlation of relative rates with  $\sigma_p$  for a series of *para*-substituted benzoic acids *p*-X-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CO<sub>2</sub>H (X = OMe, CH<sub>3</sub>, H, CF<sub>3</sub>, CN) with phenylacetylene in the presence **1** (2 mol %) at 95 °C led to the opposing trend between the reaction in CDCl<sub>3</sub> ( $\rho = +0.30$ ) and in THF ( $\rho = -0.68$ ) (Figure 2).<sup>9b</sup> An analogous correlation of the reaction rates of benzoic acid with a series of *para*-substituted alkynes *p*-Y-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>C≡CH (Y = OMe, CH<sub>3</sub>, H, F, CF<sub>3</sub>) also resulted in the opposite slope between two solvents ( $\rho = -0.57$  in CDCl<sub>3</sub> vs  $\rho = +0.33$  in THF) (Figure 3).

The opposite Hammett  $\rho$  value indicates a different mechanistic pathway between the coupling reaction in CDCl<sub>3</sub> and in THF. The positive  $\rho$  value observed from the correlation of *para*-substituted benzoic acids *p*-X-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CO<sub>2</sub>H in CDCl<sub>3</sub> matches well with a direct migratory insertion of the carboxylate group to a coordinated terminal alkyne, which is dictated by the nucleophilicity of a developing negative charge on the carboxylic oxygen. On the other hand, a negative  $\rho$  value obtained from the reaction in THF indicates considerable cationic character

build-up on the transition state, and this can be explained via the formation of the Ru-vinylidene species, wherein electrophilic character of the  $\alpha$ -vinylidene carbon has been well established.<sup>10a,21a</sup> The analogous opposite trend from the correlation of the alkynes  $p$ -Y-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>C $\equiv$ CH can similarly be rationalized in terms of developing a positive charge on the alkynyl carbon. Thus, a negative  $\rho$  value in CDCl<sub>3</sub> is consistent with the positive charge build-up on the *internal* alkynyl carbon, while a positive  $\rho$  value in THF suggests of an electrophilic character on the *terminal* alkynyl carbon. Once again, the latter case is consistent with the formation of a Ru-vinylidene species and the addition of the carboxylate group to the electrophilic  $\alpha$ -vinylidene carbon in the transition state.

### Catalytically Relevant Ruthenium-Carboxylate and -Vinylidene-Carboxylate Complexes

A catalytically relevant ruthenium-carboxylate complex was successfully isolated from the reaction of **1** with a carboxylic acid. For example, the treatment of **1** (72 mg, 0.10 mmol) with  $p$ -OMe-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CO<sub>2</sub>H (16 mg, 0.11 mmol) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (2 mL) at room temperature for 10 h led to the clean formation of the ruthenium-carboxylate complex **6**, which was isolated in 87% yield after recrystallization in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>/hexanes. The complex **6** exhibited two sets of aryl protons at  $\delta$  7.88 (d,  $J$  = 8.7 Hz) and 6.89 (d,  $J$  = 8.7 Hz) in the <sup>1</sup>H NMR, as well as two carbonyl peaks at  $\delta$  208.8 (t,  $J_{CP}$  = 13.3 Hz, CO) and 179.0 (s, CO<sub>2</sub>) in the <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR. A single phosphine peak at  $\delta$  28.7 was also observed by the <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR. The structure of **6** was further established by X-ray crystallography (Figure 4). The molecular structure showed a pseudooctahedral geometry around the ruthenium center with trans phosphine and cis CO and Cl<sup>−</sup> ligand arrangements. A slightly larger than 90° bond angle between CO to Cl<sup>−</sup> ligands (96.4°) may be due to a  $\kappa^2$ -bonding mode of the carboxylate ligand.

In an effort to form a catalytically relevant ruthenium-vinylidene complex, the reaction of the ruthenium-carboxylate complex **6** with terminal alkynes was performed in THF. Thus, the treatment of complex **6** (44 mg, 0.050 mmol) with phenylacetylene (1.2 equiv) in THF at 95 °C for 10 h led to the coupling product **7**, which was isolated in 85% yield as a pale yellow-colored solid. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR of complex **7** showed a diagnostic vinyl peak at  $\delta$  6.24 (br s), and two distinct  $\alpha$ -carbonyl peaks at  $\delta$  208.8 (t,  $J_{CP}$  = 14.4 Hz, Ru-CO) and 190.2 (t,  $J_{CP}$  = 12.1 Hz, Ru-C(O)CHPh) were also observed by the <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR.

The molecular structure of **7** as determined by X-ray crystallography showed a syn orientation between the carboxylate oxygen atom and the phenyl group that was apparently resulted from the coupling between the carboxylate and the vinylidene ligands (Figure 5). The structure clearly implicates the formation of the (*Z*)-enol ester product (*Z*)-**3k** from the protonation by another carboxylic acid. To show the enol ester product formation, the complex **7** was treated with an equivalent of benzoic acid in THF, which produced the carboxylate complex **6** and (*Z*)-**3k** along with another unidentified ruthenium complex upon heating at 90 °C for 2 h. Furthermore, the activity of both complexes **6** and **7** was found to be virtually identical to **1** for the coupling reaction of benzoic acid and phenylacetylene in THF (>90% yield with 2 mol % of **7**).

The successful isolation of the catalytically relevant complexes **6** and **7** enabled us to further examine the kinetics for the formation of these complexes. The treatment of **1** (14 mg, 0.020 mmol) with excess amounts of  $p$ -OMe-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CO<sub>2</sub>H (10 equiv) and HC $\equiv$ CPh (15 equiv) in THF was followed by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P NMR (Scheme 2). As expected, the formation of the previously synthesized ruthenium-vinyl complex **8** was observed after 15 min at room temperature.<sup>23</sup> Upon warming to 40 °C, the vinyl complex **8** was slowly converted to the carboxylate complex **6** within 10 min along with the formation of styrene. At 60 °C, the signals due to the vinylidene-carboxylate complex **7** gradually appeared at the expense of the carboxylate complex **6**. Eventually, the formation of the coupling product (*Z*)-**3k** along with Cy<sub>3</sub>PH<sup>+</sup>PhCO<sub>2</sub><sup>−</sup> was observed after heating at 90 °C for 2 h.



The kinetics of the conversion of the vinyl complex **8** to the vinylidene-carboxylate complex **7** was followed by  $^{31}\text{P}$  NMR (Figure 6). In a J-Young NMR tube, **1** (14 mg, 0.020 mmol), 4-methoxybenzoic acid (30 mg, 0.20 mmol) and phenylacetylene (31 mg, 0.30 mmol) were dissolved in THF (0.5 mL). The formation of the vinyl complex **8** was completed within 10 min at room temperature. The appearance of **6** and **7** was monitored by  $^{31}\text{P}$  NMR at 60 °C in 5 min intervals. The experimental data was successfully fitted to the kinetic equation for two consecutive reaction kinetics by using non-linear regression techniques for the conversion of **8** to **7** (Sigmaplot Version 10).<sup>24</sup> The rate constants  $k_1 = 0.039 \text{ min}^{-1}$  and  $k_2 = 0.013 \text{ min}^{-1}$  were obtained from this analysis. A relatively smaller value of  $k_2$  compared to  $k_1$  is consistent with the rate-limiting C-O bond formation step.

### Proposed Mechanism

We propose a mechanism of the coupling reaction involving a coordinatively unsaturated ruthenium-carboxylate complex **9** as one of the key intermediate species (Scheme 3). The phosphine inhibition study suggests that the catalytically active 16 e<sup>-</sup> complex **9** is formed from the Ru-carboxylate complex **6** by a reversible phosphine dissociation. For the coupling reaction in a non-coordinating solvent such as  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ , the direct migratory insertion of the carboxylate oxygen to the internal carbon of the alkyne substrate would be preferred over to the terminal one to give the *gem*-enol ester product **2**. The dative coordination of carboxylic oxygen atom would also promote the insertion by stabilizing intermediate species. On the other hand, the formation of (*Z*)-enol ester product (*Z*)-**3** is rationalized by invoking the formation of Ru-vinylidene species **10**. It has been well-established that the acetylene-to-vinylidene rearrangement is relatively facile for aryl-substituted alkynes.<sup>10,21</sup> The ability to promote the acetylene-to-vinylidene rearrangement for the ruthenium-catalyst should be an important factor for the stereoselective formation of (*Z*)-enol ester products, and the coordinating solvent THF would facilitate such rearrangement by stabilizing a coordinatively unsaturated Ru-vinylidene species.

The Hammett study suggested that the C-O bond formation of the catalytic coupling reaction is strongly influenced by the electronic nature of the substrates. For the coupling reaction in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ , this implies a direct migratory insertion of the coordinated terminal alkyne to the Ru-carboxylic oxygen bond, where both steric and electronic factors dictate the Markovnikov-selective formation of the *gem*-enol ester product **2**. The dative coordination of the carbonyl oxygen to the Ru center would also facilitate this transformation by avoiding the formation of a high-energy 14-electron species.

The successful isolation of **6** and **7** and their kinetic reaction profile provided new mechanistic insights for the formation of (*Z*)-enol ester product (*Z*)-**3**. The reversible dissociation of  $\text{PCy}_3$  from both complexes **6** and **7** should form the catalytically active species for the coupling reaction, and in this regard, the formation of  $\text{Cy}_3\text{PH}^+$  from the protonation of free  $\text{PCy}_3$  by the carboxylic acid substrate would prohibit the re-coordination of the phosphine ligand to the Ru center. The syn geometry of the vinylidene-carboxylate ligand of **7** clearly indicates that the formation of (*Z*)-enol ester product (*Z*)-**3** is electronically controlled during the addition of carboxylate group to the  $\alpha$ -vinylidene ligand of the ruthenium-vinylidene species **10**. Such cis addition of the carboxylate group could also be facilitated by the dative coordination of the carboxylate oxygen atom. A complementary computational study on the catalytic coupling reaction would be prudent in identifying these catalytically active intermediate species.

### Concluding Remarks

The ruthenium-hydride complex **1** was found to be a highly effective catalyst for the alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction to give synthetically valuable enol esters. Regio- and stereoselectivity of the catalyst **1** was successfully controlled by using  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  and THF. From

a synthetic point of view, the ruthenium catalyst **1** exhibited a number of salient features including: its ability to control the activity and selectivity on the enol ester product formation with a relatively low catalyst loading, and a broad substrate scope under relatively moderate reaction conditions. The kinetic and mechanistic investigations as well as the successful isolation of Ru-carboxylate and -vinylidene-carboxylate complexes **6** and **7** provided a detailed mechanistic picture for the coupling reaction. The mechanistic knowledge gained from this study should give invaluable insights in designing the next generation of metal catalysts for the alkyne-to-carboxylic acid coupling reaction.

## Experimental Section

### General Information

All operations were carried out in a nitrogen-filled glove box or by using standard high vacuum and Schlenk techniques unless otherwise noted. Tetrahydrofuran, benzene, hexanes and Et<sub>2</sub>O were distilled from purple solutions of sodium and benzophenone immediately prior to use. The NMR solvents were dried from activated molecular sieves (4 Å). All carboxylic acids and alkyne substrates were received from commercial sources and used without further purification. RuCl<sub>3</sub>·3H<sub>2</sub>O and Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub> were obtained from commercial sources, and the complex **1** was prepared by following a reported procedure.<sup>23</sup> The <sup>1</sup>H, <sup>2</sup>H, <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian Mercury 300 or 400 MHz FT-NMR spectrometer. Mass spectra were recorded from a Agilent 6850 GC/MS spectrometer. The conversion of organic products was measured from a Hewlett-Packard HP 6890 GC spectrometer. Elemental analyses were performed at the Midwest Microlab, Indianapolis, IN.

### General Procedure of the Catalytic Reaction

In a glove box, a carboxylic acid (1.0 mmol), a terminal alkyne (2.0 mmol) and the ruthenium catalyst **1** (14 mg, 2 mol %) were dissolved in 3 mL of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (or THF) in a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a Teflon stopcock and a magnetic stirring bar. The reaction tube was brought out of the box, and was stirred in an oil bath at 90–95 °C for 10–12 h. The tube was opened to air at room temperature, and the crude product mixture was analyzed by GC. Analytically pure organic product was isolated by a column chromatography on silica gel (hexanes/EtOAc). While we have not encountered any problems, the reaction in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> must be carried out with extra caution because of its relatively low boiling point. A thick-walled Schlenk tube with enough volume reservoir is strongly recommended.

### Phosphine Inhibition Study

In a glove box, benzoic acid (24 mg, 0.20 mmol), phenylacetylene (40mg, 0.40 mmol), **1** (3 mg, 2 mol %) and C<sub>6</sub>Me<sub>6</sub> (5 mg, internal standard) were dissolved in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (0.5 mL) in a J-Young NMR tube with a Teflon screw cap. A predissolved PCy<sub>3</sub> in CDCl<sub>3</sub> solution (5–15 μL, 10–30 mM) was added to the tube via syringe. The tube was brought out of the glove box and was heated in an oil bath at 95 °C. The reaction was monitored by <sup>1</sup>H NMR in 30 min intervals. The rate was measured by the <sup>1</sup>H integration of the product peak at δ 5.61 (=CH<sub>2</sub>), and was normalized against the internal standard peak. The *k*<sub>obs</sub> was estimated from the first order plot of *ln*[product] vs reaction time.

### Isotope Labeling Study

In a glove box, benzoic acid (122 mg, 1.0 mmol) and DC≡CPh (206 mg, 2.0 mmol) were added via syringe to a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar and Teflon stopcock. The pre-dissolved catalyst **1** (14 mg, 2 mol %) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> or THF (3 mL) was added to the reaction tube. The reaction tube was brought out of the box, and was stirred in an oil bath at 95 °C for 10 h. The solvent was removed from a rotary evaporator, and the organic product



was isolated by a column chromatography on silica gel (hexanes/ $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  = 3:2). The deuterium content of the product **2c** and **3c** was measured from both  $^1\text{H}$  NMR ( $\text{CDCl}_3$  with 10 mg cyclohexane as the external standard) and  $^2\text{H}$  NMR ( $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  with 50  $\mu\text{L}$   $\text{CDCl}_3$ ).

### Hammett Study: Reaction in $\text{CDCl}_3$

In a glove box, a *para*-substituted acid  $p\text{-X-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{CO}_2\text{H}$  ( $\text{X} = \text{OMe}, \text{CH}_3, \text{H}, \text{CF}_3, \text{CN}$ ) (0.20 mmol), phenylacetylene (40 mg, 0.40 mmol), **1** (3 mg, 2 mol %) and  $\text{C}_6\text{Me}_6$  (5 mg, internal standard) were dissolved in  $\text{CDCl}_3$  (0.5 mL) solution in a J-Young NMR tube with a Teflon screw cap. The tube was brought out of the glove box and was heated in an oil bath set at 95  $^\circ\text{C}$ . The reaction was monitored by  $^1\text{H}$  NMR in 10 min intervals. The  $k_{\text{obs}}$  was estimated from a first-order plot of  $\ln[\text{product}]$  vs reaction time by measuring the  $^1\text{H}$  integration of the product peak ( $=\text{CH}_2$ ,  $\delta$  5.61 ppm), which was normalized against the internal standard peak. **Reaction in THF:** In a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a Teflon stopcock and a magnetic stirring bar, a *para*-substituted acid  $p\text{-X-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{CO}_2\text{H}$  ( $\text{X} = \text{OMe}, \text{CH}_3, \text{H}, \text{CF}_3, \text{CN}$ ) (0.20 mmol), phenylacetylene (40 mg, 0.40 mmol), **1** (3 mg, 2 mol %) and  $\text{C}_6\text{Me}_6$  (5 mg, internal standard) were dissolved in THF (3 mL) in a glove box. The tube was brought out of the glove box, and was heated in an oil bath at 95  $^\circ\text{C}$ . The reaction was monitored by GC in 10 min intervals. The  $k_{\text{obs}}$  was estimated from a first-order plot of  $\ln[\text{product}]$  vs reaction time by measuring the amount of the products against the internal standard.

### Kinetic Profile Experiment

In a glove box, **1** (14 mg, 0.02 mmol), 4-methoxybenzoic acid (30 mg, 0.20 mmol) and  $\text{HC}\equiv\text{CPh}$  (31 mg, 0.30 mmol) were dissolved in THF (0.5 mL) in a J-Young NMR tube with a Teflon screw cap. The tube was brought out of the glove box, and was placed in NMR probe which was preset at 60  $^\circ\text{C}$ . The appearance and disappearance of the phosphine signals for **8** ( $\delta$  24.4), **6** ( $\delta$  25.9) and **7** ( $\delta$  23.4) were monitored by  $^{31}\text{P}$  NMR at 60  $^\circ\text{C}$  in 5 min intervals. The rate of the product formation was determined by measuring the integration of the product peaks against the disappearance of the complex **8**. By using a non-linear regression technique (Sigmaplot Version 10), the experimental data was globally fitted to the kinetic equation as shown in Figure 6. The rate constants  $k_1 = 0.039 \text{ min}^{-1}$  and  $k_2 = 0.013 \text{ min}^{-1}$  were obtained from this analysis.

### Synthesis of $(\text{PCy}_3)_2(\text{CO})(\text{Cl})\text{Ru}(\kappa^2\text{-O}_2\text{CC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-OMe})$ (**6**)

In a glove box, 4-methoxybenzoic acid (13 mg, 0.10 mmol), phenylacetylene (10 mg, 0.10 mmol), and complex **1** (73 mg, 0.10 mmol) were dissolved in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  (3 mL) in a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a Teflon screw cap stopcock and a magnetic stirring bar. The tube was brought out of the box, and was stirred at room temperature for 10 h. The solvent was evaporated and the residue was washed with hexanes (3 mL  $\times$  3 times) to obtain **6** in 87% yield. Single crystals suitable for X-ray crystallographic study were obtained from hexanes/ $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ .

For **6**:  $^1\text{H}$  NMR (400 MHz,  $\text{CDCl}_3$ )  $\delta$  7.88 (d,  $J = 8.7$  Hz, Ph), 6.89 (d,  $J = 8.7$  Hz, Ph), 3.86 (s,  $\text{OCH}_3$ ), 2.30–1.01 (m,  $\text{PCy}_3$ );  $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (100 MHz,  $\text{CDCl}_3$ )  $\delta$  208.8 (t,  $J_{\text{CP}} = 13.3$  Hz, CO), 179.0 (s,  $\text{CO}_2$ ), 162.9, 130.3, 125.1 and 113.6 ( $\text{C}_{\text{Ar}}$ ), 55.5 ( $\text{OCH}_3$ ), 34.1, 30.2, 29.7, 28.3 and 26.8 ( $\text{PCy}_3$ );  $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (161 MHz,  $\text{CDCl}_3$ )  $\delta$  28.7 (s,  $\text{PCy}_3$ ); IR (KBr)  $\nu_{\text{CO}} = 1913 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

### Synthesis of $(\text{PCy}_3)_2(\text{CO})(\text{Cl})\text{RuC}(=\text{CHPh})\text{O}_2\text{CC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-OMe}$ (**7**)

In a glove box, the Ru-carboxylate complex **6** (44 mg, 50  $\mu\text{mol}$ ) and phenylacetylene (6 mg, 60  $\mu\text{mol}$ ) were dissolved in THF (3 mL) in a 25 mL Schlenk tube equipped with a Teflon screw cap stopcock and a magnetic stirring bar. The tube was brought out of the glove box and was heated in an oil bath at 95  $^\circ\text{C}$  for 10 h. The solvent was removed under high vacuum, and the

residue was washed with hexanes (5 mL  $\times$  3 times) to obtain analytically pure **7** in 85% yield. Single crystals suitable for X-ray crystallographic study were obtained from hexanes/ $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ .

For **7**:  $^1\text{H}$  NMR (400 MHz,  $\text{C}_6\text{D}_6$ )  $\delta$  8.44 (d,  $J$  = 8.7 Hz, 2H, Ph), 7.76 (d,  $J$  = 7.7 Hz, 2H, Ph), 7.36–6.63 (m, Ar), 6.24 (s, =CHPh), 2.98 (s,  $\text{OCH}_3$ ), 2.71–0.8 (m,  $\text{PCy}_3$ );  $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (100 MHz,  $\text{CDCl}_3$ ) 209.8 (t,  $J_{\text{PC}}$  = 14.4 Hz, CO), 190.2 (t,  $J_{\text{PC}}$  = 12.2 Hz, Ru-C=CH), 173.8 ( $\text{CO}_2$ ), 167.9, 165.4, 138.4, 133.8, 129.1, 125.0, 122.5 and 120.0 ( $\text{C}_{\text{Ar}}$ ), 115.1 (=CH), 55.4 ( $\text{OCH}_3$ ), 35.2, 31.1, 30.6, 29.8, 28.8 and 27.3 ( $\text{PCy}_3$ );  $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (161 MHz,  $\text{CDCl}_3$ )  $\delta$  27.0 (s,  $\text{PCy}_3$ ); IR (KBr)  $\nu_{\text{CO}}$  = 1922  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ .

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.


## Acknowledgments

Financial support from the National Institute of Health, General Medical Sciences (R15 GM55987) is gratefully acknowledged. We also thank Dr. Sergey Lindeman (Marquette University) for X-ray crystallographic determination of the ruthenium complexes.


## References

- (a) Nair V, Deepthi A. Chem Rev 2007;107:1862–1891. [PubMed: 17432919] (b) Urabe H, Suzuki D, Sasaki M, Sato F. J Am Chem Soc 2003;125:4036–4037. [PubMed: 12670210] (c) Hara H, Hirano M, Tanaka K. Org Lett 2008;10:2537–2540. [PubMed: 18476712]
- (a) Brown, JM. Comprehensive Asymmetric Catalysis. Jacobsen, EN.; Pfaltz, A.; Yamamoto, H., editors. Springer; Berlin, Germany: 1999. (b) Ohkuma, T.; Kitamura, M.; Noyori, R. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. Ojima, I., editor. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim, Germany: 2000. (c) Tang W, Zhang X. Chem Rev 2003;103:3029–3070. [PubMed: 12914491]
- Trost BM, Toste FD, Pinkerton AB. Chem Rev 2001;101:2067–2096. [PubMed: 11710241]
- (a) Masuyama Y, Kobayashi Y, Kurusu Y. Chem Commun 1994:1123. (b) Yanagisawa A, Matsumoto Y, Asakawa K, Yamamoto H. J Am Chem Soc 1999;121:892–893. (c) Karlsson S, Högborg HE. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 2001;12:1977–1982. (d) Isambert N, Cruz M, Arévalo MJ, Gómez E, Lavilla R. Org Lett 2007;9:4199–4202. [PubMed: 17867693] (e) Clarke PA, Zaytsev AV, Morgan TW, Whitwood AC, Wilson C. Org Lett 2008;10:2877–2880. [PubMed: 18533668]
- DeBergh JR, Spivey KM, Ready JM. J Am Chem Soc 2008;130:7828–7829. [PubMed: 18517202]
- (a) Wang S, Zhang L. J Am Chem Soc 2006;128:8414–8415. [PubMed: 16802803] (b) Wang S, Zhang L. Org Lett 2006;8:4585–4587. [PubMed: 16986956] (c) De Brabander JK, Liu B, Qian M. Org Lett 2008;10:2533–2536. [PubMed: 18505261] (d) Peng Y, Cui L, Zhang G, Zhang L. J Am Chem Soc 2009;131:5062–5063. [PubMed: 19301899]
- Yoo JW, Li CJ. J Org Chem 2006;71:6266–6268. [PubMed: 16872217]
- Schaefer C, Fu GC. Angew Chem, Int Ed 2005;44:4606–4608.
- (a) House, HO. Modern Synthetic Reactions. 2. Benjamin/Cummings; Menlo Park, CA: 1972. (b) Smith, MB.; March, M. Advanced Organic Chemistry. 5. Wiley; New York: 2001.
- Selected review articles: (a) Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. Acc Chem Res 1999;32:311–323. (b) Drozdak D, Allaert B, Ledoux N, Dragutan I, Dragutan V, Verpoort F. Adv Synth Cat 2005;347:1721–1743.
- (a) Bianchini C, Meli A, Peruzzini M, Zanolini F, Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. Organometallics 1990;9:1155–1160. (b) Doucet H, Höfer J, Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. Chem Commun 1993:850–851. (c) Melis K, Opstal T, Verpoort F. Eur J Org Chem 2002:3779–3784. (d) Nakagawa H, Okimoto Y, Sakaguchi S, Ishii Y. Tetrahedron Lett 2003;44:103–106. (e) Hua R, Tian X. J Org Chem 2004;69:5782–5784. [PubMed: 15307759] (f) Doherty S, Knight JG, Rath RK, Clegg W, Harrington RW, Newman CR, Campbell R, Amin H. Organometallics 2005;24:2633–2644.


12. (a) Mitsudo T, Hori Y, Yamakawa Y, Watanabe Y. *J Org Chem* 1987;52:2230–2239. (b) Ho JHH, Black DS, Messerle BA, Clegg JK, Turner P. *Organometallics* 2006;25:5800–5810.
13. Doucet H, Martin-Vaca B, Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. *J Org Chem* 1995;60:7247–7255.
14. Le Paih J, Monnier F, Dérien S, Dixneuf PH, Clot E, Eisenstein O. *J Am Chem Soc* 2003;125:11964–11975. [PubMed: 14505418]
15. (a) Cherry K, Parrain JL, Thibonnet J, Duchêne A, Abarbri M. *J Org Chem* 2005;70:6669–6675. [PubMed: 16095285] (b) Wang Y, Burton DJ. *J Org Chem* 2006;71:3859–3862. [PubMed: 16674060] (c) Ueura K, Satoh T, Miura M. *Org Lett* 2007;9:1407–1409. [PubMed: 17346060] (d) Kim H, Goble SD, Lee C. *J Am Chem Soc* 2007;129:1030–1031. [PubMed: 17263374]
16. (a) Yi CS, He Z, Lee DW. *Organometallics* 2001;20:804–807. (b) Yi CS, Yun SY, Guzei IA. *Organometallics* 2004;23:5392–5396. (c) Yi CS, Yun SY. *Org Lett* 2005;7:2181–2183. [PubMed: 15901164]
17. (a) Yi CS, Liu N. *Synlett* 1999:281–287. and references cited therein. (b) Yi CS, Yun SY, Guzei IA. *J Am Chem Soc* 2005;127:5782–5783. [PubMed: 15839664]
18. (a) Rybtchinski B, Milstein D. *J Am Chem Soc* 1999;121:4528–4529. (b) Feller M, Iron MA, Shimon LJW, Diskin-Posner Y, Leitun G, Milstein D. *J Am Chem Soc* 2008;130:14374–14375. [PubMed: 18847193]
19. Swartz BD, Reinartz NM, Brennessel WW, Garca JJ, Jones WD. *J Am Chem Soc* 2008;130:8548–8554. [PubMed: 18540608]
20. (a) Grimster NP, Gauntlett C, Godfrey CRA, Gaunt MJ. *Angew Chem, Int Ed* 2005;44:3125–3129. (b) Ranu BC, Chattopadhyay K, Adak L. *Org Lett* 2007;9:4595–4598. [PubMed: 17902686] (c) Cheng J-S, Wei G-F, Huang S-W, Zhao J, Jiang H-F. *J Mol Cat* 2007;263:169–174. (d) Zott AD, Prat FI, Baratta W, Zangrando E, Rigo P. *Inorg Chim Acta* 2009;362:97–104.
21. (a) Bruce MI. *Chem Rev* 1991;91:197–257. (b) Tani, K.; Kataoka, Y. *Catalytic Heterofunctionalization*. Togni, A.; Grützmacher, H., editors. VCH-Wiley; Weinheim: 2001. p. 199–207. (c) Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. *Angew Chem, Int Ed* 2006;45:2176–2203.
22. (a) Grotjahn DB, Incarvito CD, Rheingold AL. *Angew Chem, Int Ed* 2001;40:3884–3887. (b) Tokunaga M, Suzuki T, Koga N, Fukushima T, Horiuchi A, Wakatsuki Y. *J Am Chem Soc* 2001;123:11917–11924. [PubMed: 11724598] (c) Grotjahn DB, Lev DA. *J Am Chem Soc* 2004;126:12232–12233. [PubMed: 15453733] (d) Labonne A, Kribber T, Hintermann L. *Org Lett* 2006;8:5853–5856. [PubMed: 17134289]
23. (a) Yi CS, Lee DW, Chen Y. *Organometallics* 1999;18:2043–2045. (b) Yi CS, Lee DW. *Organometallics* 1999;18:5152–5156.
24. See Supporting Information for the derivation of kinetic equation.



**Figure 1.**  
Plot of the Initial Rate ( $v_i$ ) vs  $[\text{PCy}_3]$  for the Coupling Reaction of Benzoic Acid and Phenylacetylene.




**Figure 2.** Hammett plots of the coupling reaction of *para*-substituted  $p$ -X-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CO<sub>2</sub>H (X = OMe, CH<sub>3</sub>, H, CF<sub>3</sub>, CN) with phenylacetylene in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (●) and in THF (■).




**Figure 3.** Hammett plots of the coupling reaction of benzoic acid with *para*-substituted  $p\text{-Y-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{C}\equiv\text{CH}$  (Y = OMe, CH<sub>3</sub>, H, F, CF<sub>3</sub>) in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (●) and in THF (■).







**Figure 4.**  
Molecular Structure of **6**.




**Figure 5.**  
Molecular Structure of **7**.




**Figure 6.**  
Kinetic Profile of the Conversion of **8** to **7**. Notations: **8** (▲), **6** (●), **7** (■).



Scheme 1.



Scheme 2.



**Scheme 3.**  
Proposed Mechanism of the Coupling Reaction of Carboxylic Acids and Terminal Alkynes.



**Table 1**Catalyst Survey on the Coupling Reaction of Benzoic Acid and 4-Ethynylanisole.<sup>a</sup>


entry	catalyst	yield (%) <sup>b</sup>	2a:(Z)-3a:(E)-3a
1	(PCy <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> (CO)RuHCl ( <b>1</b> )	>95	100:0:0
2	(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (CO)RuH <sub>2</sub>	0	
3	(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> RuCl <sub>2</sub>	0	
4	(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> RuHCl	0	
5	RuCl <sub>3</sub> ·3H <sub>2</sub> O	0	
6	[RuCl <sub>2</sub> (COD)] <sub>x</sub>	0	
7	Ru <sub>3</sub> (CO) <sub>12</sub>	90	8:17:75
8	Cp*Ru(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> Cl	50	15:50:35
9	Cp*Ru(COD)Cl	60	22:78 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Reaction conditions: benzoic acid (0.10 mmol), 4-ethynylanisole (0.15 mmol), catalyst (2 mol %), CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (2 mL), 95 °C, 8 h.<sup>b</sup>GC yields based on benzoic acid.<sup>c</sup>The ratio of **2a** and 1:2 coupling products.


**Table 2**Solvent Effect on the Coupling Reaction of Benzoic Acid and 4-Ethynylanisole Catalyzed by **1**.<sup>a</sup>

entry	solvent	2a:(Z)-3a:(E)-3a	yield (%) <sup>b</sup>
1	benzene	51:40:9	80
2	toluene	68:26:6	70
3	<i>n</i> -hexane	71:18:11	75
4	<b>CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>99:1:0</b>	<b>&gt;99</b>
5	Et <sub>2</sub> O	13:20:67	60
6	CH <sub>3</sub> CN	33:55:13	55
7	DME	5:74:21	50
8	DMSO	2:48:50	53
9	H <sub>2</sub> O	3:44:53	73
10	<b>THF</b>	<b>0:100:0</b>	<b>&gt;99</b>





<sup>a</sup> Reaction conditions: benzoic acid (0.10 mmol), 4-ethynylanisole (0.15 mmol), **1** (14 mg, 2 mol %), solvent (2 mL), 95 °C, 8 h.<sup>b</sup> GC yields based on benzoic acid.

alkyne	solvent	product ratio (2:(Z)-3:(E)-3)	yd (%) <sup>b</sup>
	R = OMe	<b>2a</b> :(Z)- <b>3a</b> :(E)- <b>3a</b> = 100:0:0	91
	R = Me	<b>2b</b> :(Z)- <b>3b</b> :(E)- <b>3b</b> = 100:0:0	87
	R = H	<b>2c</b> :(Z)- <b>3c</b> :(E)- <b>3c</b> = 100:0:0	98
	R = Br	<b>2d</b> :(Z)- <b>3d</b> :(E)- <b>3d</b> = 100:0:0	89
	R = CF <sub>3</sub>	<b>2e</b> :(Z)- <b>3e</b> :(E)- <b>3e</b> = 100:0:0	90
	R = F	<b>2f</b> :(Z)- <b>3f</b> :(E)- <b>3f</b> = 100:0:0	87



alkyne	solvent	product ratio (2 $:(Z)$ -3 $:(E)$ -3)	yd (%) <sup>b</sup>
	R = OMe	2a $:(Z)$ -3a $:(E)$ -3a = 0:100:0	95
	R = Me	2b $:(Z)$ -3b $:(E)$ -3b = 0:86:14	90
	R = H	2c $:(Z)$ -3c $:(E)$ -3c = 0:87:13	98
	R = Br	2d $:(Z)$ -3d $:(E)$ -3d = 0:94:6	89
	R = CF <sub>3</sub>	2e $:(Z)$ -3e $:(E)$ -3e = 0:93:7	90
	R = F	2f $:(Z)$ -3f $:(E)$ -3f = 0:90:10	87
THF			
1-hexyne HCCCH <sub>2</sub> Ph 3-methyl-3-buten-1-yne 2-ethynyl-6-methoxynaphthalene	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	2g $:(Z)$ -3g $:(E)$ -3g = 100:0:0	97
		2h $:(Z)$ -3h $:(E)$ -3h = 100:0:0	96
		2i $:(Z)$ -3i $:(E)$ -3i = 100:0:0	97
		2j $:(Z)$ -3j $:(E)$ -3j = 100:0:0	87


alkyne	solvent	product ratio (2:(Z)-3:(E)-3)	yd (%) <sup>b</sup>
1-hexyne	THF	2g:(Z)-3g:(E)-3g = 100:0:0	97
HCCCH <sub>2</sub> Ph		2h:(Z)-3h:(E)-3h = 100:0:0	96
3-methyl-3-buten-1-yne		2i:(Z)-3i:(E)-3i = 100:0:0	97
2-ethynyl-6-methoxynaphthalene		2j:(Z)-3j:(E)-3j = 0:100:0	89

alkyne	solvent	product ratio (2:(Z)-3:(E)-3)	yd (%) <sup>b</sup>
		X = OMe 2k:(Z)-3k:(E)-3k = 100:0:0	83
		X = Me 2l:(Z)-3l:(E)-3l = 100:0:0	90
		X = Br 2m:(Z)-3m:(E)-3m = 100:0:0	68
		X = CN 2n:(Z)-3n:(E)-3n = 100:0:0	89
		X = CF <sub>3</sub> 2o:(Z)-3o:(E)-3o = 100:0:0	90
	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>		
	THF	X = OMe 2k:(Z)-3k:(E)-3k = 0:90:10	95
		X = Me 2l:(Z)-3l:(E)-3l = 0:90:10	93
		X = Br 2m:(Z)-3m:(E)-3m = 0:92:8	90
		X = CN 2n:(Z)-3n:(E)-3n = 3:92:5	83
		X = CF <sub>3</sub> 2o:(Z)-3o:(E)-3o = 8:81:11	85
	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	2p:(Z)-3p:(E)-3p = 100:0:0	90
		2q:(Z)-3q:(E)-3q = 100:0:0	93
		2p:(Z)-3p:(E)-3p = 3:92:5	97
	THF	2q:(Z)-3q:(E)-3q = 100:0:0	96



alkyne	solvent	product ratio (2s:(Z)-3s:(E)-3s)	yd (%) <sup>b</sup>
$\text{H}-\text{C}\equiv\text{C}-\text{Ph}$	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	2r:(Z)-3r:(E)-3r = 88:12:0	90
	THF	2r:(Z)-3r:(E)-3r = 0:93:7	93
$\text{H}-\text{C}\equiv\text{C}-\text{Ph}$	CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	2s:(Z)-3s:(E)-3s = 89:11:0	91
	THF	2s:(Z)-3s:(E)-3s = 0:90:10	91


**Table 4**Coupling Reaction of Carboxylic Acids with Propargylic Alcohols and Dienes.<sup>a</sup>

entry	acid
1	 <chem>O=C(O)c1ccccc1</chem>
2	

entry	acid
3	

4


5




entry

acid

6




7



entry

acid

8<sup>c</sup>9<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Reaction conditions: carboxylic acid (1.0 mmol), alkyne (2.0 mmol), **1** (14 mg, 2 mol %), CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (2–3 mL), 90–95 °C, 8–12 h.

<sup>b</sup> Isolated yield.

<sup>c</sup> 48 h of the reaction time.