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Abstract

We report a catalytic system comprised of nitrogen-centered di- or triphosphine ligands in conjunction with rhodium that is capable of delivering branched aldehydes from terminal olefin substrates which commonly give more linear aldehydes than branched. The incorporation of an apical nitrogen atom into the ligand backbone dramatically improves the reaction rate. Mechanistic and labelling studies suggest the unusual selectivity is due to the irreversible trapping of the Rh–alkyl species along the branched pathway, in comparison to the more reversible linear pathway. A pre-catalytic equilibrium mixture of rhodium species was observed by high-pressure in situ NMR spectroscopy, suggesting this equilibrium is the catalytic resting state.
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**Introduction**

The production of aldehydes from olefins *via* hydroformylation annually amounts to a global production of more than 10 million tons of so-called “oxo” products.\(^1\) As such, it is one of the most extensively studied homogeneous catalytic processes in both academia and industry.\(^2\) Due to the commercial interest in plasticizers derived from linear alcohols (*e.g.* bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate derived from *n*-butanal),\(^1\)\(^a\) the production of linear aldehydes have traditionally been the most desired products, with many known catalysts now capable of very high linear-selectivity.\(^3\)

Branched aldehydes, which result from the branched-selective hydroformylation of terminal olefins, usually require special substrates, such as allenes, vinylarenes or vinylacetate to ensure high regioselectivity.\(^1\)\(^4\)\(^5\) In this context, the branched-selective transformation of easily available bulk terminal olefins represents a challenging but increasingly desirable reaction. These products would have broad utility in the fragrance and flavor, and life-sciences industries, as well as being important intermediates in organic synthesis.\(^6\)

To date, few examples of catalyst systems capable of performing branched-selective hydroformylation of non-activated terminal olefins have been reported.\(^7\) Two notable examples of highly selective systems that represents the current state-of-the-art for this reaction are a rhodium encapsulation complex reported by Reek and co-workers\(^8\) and a Rh/BOBPHOS system reported by Clarke and co-workers.\(^9\)\(^1\)\(^0\) The former is constructed from a tripyridylphosphine ligand that coordinates to a rhodium center through phosphorus, and three metallo–porphyrin
units via the three nitrogens within the pyridyl moieties of the ligand (Chart 1, bottom left). Reek’s encapsulated rhodium catalyst is able to distinguish between not only the 1- and 2-positions of 1-octene, but also between the 2- and 3-positions of trans-oct-2-ene.\[8f\] Similar internal olefin differentiation has also been reported using a bulky tris-binaphthyl monophosphite ligand, but in this case the selectivity was proposed to stem from favorable interactions between the metal center and terminal ester groups incorporated within the substrate.\[11\]

The Clarke system utilizes a phosphite–phospholane bidentate ligand (Chart 1, bottom right), and owes its branched-selectivity to subtle substrate–ligand interactions that render otherwise low energy pathways to linear aldehydes unproductive.\[10\] This system shows not only high branched selectivity for a range of substrates including alkyl olefins and allyl arenes, but also delivers chiral aldehydes with a high degree of enantiomeric selectivity.\[9a\] Beyond an academic setting, the Rh/BOBPHOS system has been used for the hydroformylation of allylglycine derivatives, capable of affording a chiral intermediate that is a key compound for the synthesis of new antibiotics.\[9b\]
**Chart 1.** Branched-selective Rh-catalyzed hydroformylation of olefins. The ligands and complex discussed in this study (center) and ligands reported in previous studies (bottom).
Herein, we report a simple achiral catalyst system formed \textit{in situ} from nitrogen-centered di- or triphosphine ligands 1 and [Rh(acac)(CO)$_2$] (acac = acetylacetonate) and their application to the hydroformylation of terminal olefins described in Chart 1, top. While the substrates commonly undergo linear-selective hydroformylation, rather unusual branched-selectivities were detected in this study. The triphosphine ligand 1a remained selective even at relatively low loadings and temperatures, while bidentate ligand 2 afforded predominantly linear aldehydes under these conditions. The results will be discussed in comparison to the conventional triphosphine ligand 3. Isolation of \textit{bis}-ligated complex 4 and its behavior as a catalyst precursor are also discussed.

\textbf{Results and Discussion}

1. \textbf{Hydroformylation of 1-hexene catalyzed by Rh complexes of aza-triphosphine ligands 1a--e.} The tridentate ligands 1a--e were synthesized in a modular fashion by adapted literature procedures,$^{[12]}$ allowing facile generation of a series of tridentate phosphine ligands with various substituents on the phosphorus atom (Scheme 1). With this family of ligands in hand, we investigated their competency for the hydroformylation of 1-hexene as a model substrate when combined with [Rh(acac)(CO)$_2$] \textit{in situ}. In addition, we compared the nitrogen-centered ligands (1a--e and 2) with the carbon-centered analogue, CH$_3$C(CH$_2$PPh$_2$)$_3$ (3).
Scheme 1. Synthetic procedure for the facile generation of ligands 1a–e.

1.1. Catalytic Study with [Rh(acac)(CO)₂]/1a.

As a starting point, tris(diphenylphosphinomethyl)amine 1a was used in conjunction with [Rh(acac)(CO)₂] as the catalyst for the hydroformylation of 1-hexene. Representative results are summarized in Table 1. In all cases, only 1-heptanal and 2-methylhexanal products were observed unless otherwise stated. When the reaction was performed with 1 mol % Rh loading, a Rh:L = 1:2 at 100 °C under CO/H₂ (1:1) = 2.0 MPa for 3.5 h ([Rh] = 5 mM, [L] = 10 mM), this resulted in the production of aldehydes in high yields and a slight regioselective bias towards the branched product (99.4%, b/l = 1.10, Table 1, entry 1). This was somewhat unexpected, as the structurally related carbon-centered ligand tris(diphenylphosphinomethyl)ethane (3) was reported to be linear-selective under only slightly different conditions (b/l = 0.22–0.93) [13,14]. To establish whether the divergent regioselectivities are a direct result of the introduction of an apical nitrogen atom to the ligand, a control experiment using 3 under identical conditions was conducted (Table 1, entry 2). In this case, unlike the reported data, slightly improved branched-selectivity was observed but at the expense of a greatly reduced rate, thus only 16.1% of 1-hexene was consumed (see 2.4. Proposal for the active species and catalytic cycle for further
discussion). In the presence of ligand, no isomerization of 1-hexene to 2-hexene or 3-hexene was observed, however a control reaction without ligand afforded aldehydes derived from isomerized hexenes as well as hydrogenated side-product hexane (Table 1, entry 3). The bite angle of multidentate ligands has previously been shown to influence the regioselectivity during hydroformylation. The bite angle for 1a when coordinated to Rh cannot be assessed with great precision due to the absence of published crystal structures, but low-quality data obtained within our laboratory has allowed us to estimate its bite angle to be 88°, while that of carbon-centered 3 is 89° based on crystal structure data. Consequently, bite angle does not appear to be a differentiator between these two ligands.

**Table 1.** Hydroformylation of 1-hexene with azatriphos (1a)/Rh under various reaction conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>[Rh] (mM)</th>
<th>pCO (MPa)</th>
<th>pH2 (MPa)</th>
<th>CHO (%)b</th>
<th>TOF (h⁻¹)</th>
<th>b/lb</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Control with 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Control without ligand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Figure 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>CO (MPa)</td>
<td>Pressure (MPa)</td>
<td>CO Selectivity</td>
<td>H₂ Selectivity</td>
<td>Reaction Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>[Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)₂]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>[Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)₂]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>[Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)₂]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>pCO = 0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>pH₂ = 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>pH₂ = 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>pH₂ = 0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>pH₂ = 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>pH₂ = 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aReaction conditions: toluene (3.75 mL), 1-hexene (250 μL, 500 mM), [Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)₂], L = 1a, Rh:L = 1:2, 1 h; branched and linear aldehydes were the only products in all cases.*

*bDetermined by GC, confirmed by NMR; b = 2-methylhexanal, l = 1-heptanal. *c3.5 h. *d3.5 h, L = 3. *eNo ligand, hexane formed (12.4%).

In order to investigate the reaction mechanism several parameters were examined, including temperature, substrate and catalyst concentration, and partial pressures of CO and H₂. Firstly, temperature was varied from 25–100 °C at constant CO/H₂ pressure (Table 1, entries 4–10). At lower temperatures a significant increase in selectivity is observed (b/l up to 5.46 at 50 °C); but at temperatures below 100 °C the overall activity is also significantly reduced (Figure 1), with no reaction occurring at room temperature over 3.5 hours under 2.0 MPa CO/H₂ (Table 1, entry 10). Reducing the catalyst loading from 1.0–0.05 mol % ([Rh] = 5–0.025 mM) while keeping the Rh:L ratio at 1:2 ([L] = 10–0.05 mM) did not affect the selectivity (Table 1, entries 11–13). This suggests higher nuclearity species, for instance dimeric compounds with Rh–Rh bonds or featuring 1a in a bridging mode between two Rh centers, are less likely to be responsible for the
observed selectivity (*vide infra*). Additionally, kinetic analysis of the rate compared to [Rh] and [1-hexene] revealed both to be first order (Figure S54 and S55), suggesting coordination of olefin to a monometallic active species to be rate-determining.

**Figure 1.** Temperature dependence of total yield of aldehydes and b/l selectivity for data in entries 4–9 in Table 1.

Varying the partial pressure of CO had a dramatic effect on catalyst activity, with increased pressures severely hindering the reaction (Table 1, entries 14–16). In parallel to decreasing the overall reaction rate, a small increase in regioselectivity towards the branched product was observed, with b/l increasing from 1.09 to 1.13 when CO pressure is increased from 0.5 to 3.0 MPa at 100 °C. To probe the dependence on CO pressure further, this parameter was also evaluated at 50 °C, as this temperature was shown to promote the formation of branched products (Figure S57). Again, a similar decrease in catalyst activity was observed with increasing CO pressure, while overall the selectivity also increased from 1.60 to 2.09 as the CO pressure is increased from 0.2 to 2.0 MPa. A slightly lower pressure range was used for the
analysis at 50 °C as at pressures above 2.0 MPa at this temperature only trace amounts of products are formed, making accurate analysis impossible. In fact, even at 2.0 MPa, very small amounts of aldehydes were formed (<2%), with values approaching the accurate detection limits of the instruments. Consequently, although a general increase in branched selectivity was observed with CO pressure, this relationship needs to be evaluated to a greater degree of accuracy for conclusive results. Other mechanistic studies have also shown that CO pressure can significantly affect the regioselectivity observed during hydroformylation, normally to a much greater degree.\textsuperscript{[15]} For instance, Rosales \textit{et al.} reported that during the hydroformylation of 1-hexene with ligand 3, increasing the CO pressure from 0.1 to 0.55 MPa resulted in an increase in \textit{linear} aldehydes from \(l/b = 1.5\) to 5.8.\textsuperscript{[14]} Under their catalytic conditions, olefin coordination is regio-determining, and is consequently highly affected by CO pressure which competes for coordination to the metal center. On the other hand, the regio-determining step in the present system is likely to be hydride migration (see section 2.1. Deuterioformylation) and is consequently less effected by CO pressure. The partial pressure of \(\text{H}_2\) had a smaller effect on the activity, showing only a slight rate enhancement at high pressures, and also had no effect on the selectivity (Table 1, entries 17–19). Preliminary kinetic analysis of this data at 100 °C shows an order of -0.6 in \(p_{\text{CO}}\) and +0.15 in \(p_{\text{H}_2}\) (Figures S54 and S56, respectively).

\textbf{1.2. Comparison of ligands 1a–1e: Electronic and steric effects}\n
By modulating the substituents at phosphorus, the electronic and steric properties of the ligand can be easily tuned. To this end, several triphosphine derivatives were examined that contain various groups at phosphorus (Table 2). The introduction of electron withdrawing \textit{meta}-difluorophenyl substituents (1b)\textsuperscript{[12c]} did not retard the rate, but did alter the selectivity towards
more linear-selective products (Table 2, entry 1). On the other hand, the incorporation of electron-donating but sterically small substituents para-methoxyphenyl (1c) or para-N,N-dimethylaminophenyl (1d) improves the branched-selectivity marginally (Table 2, entries 2 and 3) with a concomitant decrease in activity. This implies there is a slight electronic preference for branched aldehyde formation with increasingly electron-donating ligands.

The electronic nature of coordinating ligands has been extensively explored for mono- and bidentate systems during hydroformylation. In general, less basic phosphorus containing moieties such as (di)phosphites (rather than phosphines) afford aldehydes with greater linear selectivity.\textsuperscript{[16,17]} This was reasoned to be due to faster β-hydride elimination from the branched Rh–alkyl species but not the linear species.\textsuperscript{[16a]} In the present system, however, formation of the branched Rh–alkyl complex is suggested to be irreversible (see section 2.1. Deuterioformylation), so the observed effect must be more subtle. In a separate line of thought, the regioselectivity dependence on ligand electronic parameters was thought to originate from a perturbation of the equatorial–equatorial:equatorial–axial (ee:ea) isomer ratio present during catalytic turnover when bidentate ligands are used. Upon changing the electron donating ability across a series of diphosphine ligands, the resultant complexes showed a higher proportion of the ee isomer, which is known to give more linear aldehydes.\textsuperscript{[18–20]} Subsequent investigations, however, have revealed this relationship to be primarily steric in nature.\textsuperscript{[17,20]} In the present system, the more basic ligand could have caused the higher ‘hydricity’ of the Rh–H species\textsuperscript{[21]} to increase the proportion of branched Rh–alkyl species present since the terminal olefinic carbon is more positive than the internal one.\textsuperscript{[22]} As for the reaction rate, electron donating ligands generally lower the hydroformylation rate due to a strengthening of the Rh–CO bonds, retarding CO dissociation and the formation of the required unsaturated species for olefin coordination.\textsuperscript{[17]}
As may be expected, the use of an electron-donating but sterically encumbering substituent, ortho-tolyl (1e), results in an increased linear bias (Table 2, entry 6), presumably due to localized steric pressure around the metal center.

As had been confirmed by the temperature dependence study, lowering the temperature from 100 to 50 °C gave improved branched-selectivity using 1a as the ligand. Indeed, under otherwise standard conditions (*i.e.* 3.5 h, CO/H₂ (1:1) = 2.0 MPa, [Rh] = 5 mM, [L] = 10 mM), reducing the temperature to 50 °C, increased *b/l* from 1.10 at 100 °C to 1.66 using 1a (Table 1, entry 1 and Table 2, entry 7). A similar selectivity enhancement was observed for the most branched-selective ligand, 1d (Table 2 entries 3 and 4), showing very high selectivity at 50 °C (*b/l* = 5.91), albeit with low activity.

To increase the activity and maintain high branched-selectivity, low CO pressures (0.2 MPa) and low temperatures (50 °C) were implemented using 1a and 1d as ligands. Utilizing 1a, conversion was relatively high, while selectivity was somewhat reduced compared to the standard conditions (Table 2, entry 8). This further suggests higher CO pressures are indeed beneficial for the formation of branched aldehydes. Still, this represents one of the best catalytic systems capable of producing large quantities (>80% conversion) of branched aldehydes (*b/l* = 1.29) using relatively short reaction times (24 hours) reported to date. For comparison, the BOBPHOS system gave 78% conversion after 46 hours (*b/l* = 3.0) for 1-hexene, and additionally showed high selectivity and activity across a series of unactivated olefins (*b/l* > 4 and TOF up to 417 h⁻¹).[^9a] Using 1d under these low pressure and temperature conditions resulted in significant amounts of hydrogenated products (68% hexane), and showed poor selectivity (Table 2, entry 5). In this case, the migration of CO to form a Rh–acyl is likely severely retarded due to the low CO
pressure, and strong Rh–CO bond from the increased electron density at rhodium from the donating ligand.

### Table 2. Catalytic data for the hydroformylation of 1-hexene with different azatriphos ligands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>pCO (MPa)</th>
<th>pH₂ (MPa)</th>
<th>CHO (%)(^b)</th>
<th>TOF (h(^{-1}))</th>
<th>b/l(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^c)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1b</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^c)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^c)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1d</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(^c)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1d</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(^d,e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Rh]/1e</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(^c)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(^e)</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Reaction conditions: toluene (3.75 mL), 1-hexene (250 μL, 500 mM), [Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)₂] (1.0 mol %, 5 mM), 1 (2.0 mol %, 10 mM), CO (1.0 MPa), H₂ (1.0 MPa), 3.5 h; branched and linear aldehydes were the only products in all cases unless otherwise stated. \(^b\)Determined by GC, confirmed by NMR; \(b\) = 2-methylhexanal, \(l\) = 1-heptanal. \(^c\)Average of two separate runs.

\(^d\)Significant hexane formed (67.9%). \(^e\)24 h.

### 1.3. Comparison with aza-diphosphine ligand 2.

Mechanistic studies suggest that during catalysis the triphosphine ligands only coordinates to rhodium through two arms, leaving one free phosphine ‘dangling’ (\emph{vide infra}). This begs the
question as to whether the third arm of each ligand is necessary for the observed regioselectivity. To this end, a diphosphine ligand, $^\text{a}$BuN(CH$_2$PPh$_2$)$_2$ (2) that contains a $n$-butyl carbon chain instead of a third phosphine arm,$^{[23]}$ was evaluated and showed similar catalytic activity to 1a under standard reaction conditions ([Rh] = 5 mM, [L] = 10 mM, 100 °C, CO/H$_2$ (1:1) = 2.0 MPa: Table 3, entries 1 and 5). However, at lower ligand loadings ([L] = 5 mM) under optimized CO/H$_2$ pressures (0.2/0.8 MPa) and low temperatures (25–50 °C), the tridentate 1a system not only maintains, but shows greater branched-selectivity (Table 3, entry 4), while the bidentate 2 system changes to give predominantly linear aldehydes (Table 3, entry 8). Additionally, at lower ligand loadings using 2 afforded more hexane (2%) in contrast to 1a, which remains highly chemoselective.

These observations show that under these conditions there is a switch in regioselectivity depending on whether di- or triphosphine ligands are used. This may be due to a change in regio-determining step, or the result in different speciation at lower temperatures. Although we are uncertain what change is responsible, it is clear that the tridentate ligand engenders divergent reactivity compared to the bidentate analogue.

**Table 3.** Catalytic data for the hydroformylation of 1-hexene comparing bi- and tridentate ligands$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>[Rh] (mM)</th>
<th>[L] (mM)</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>$p_{CO}$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$p_{H_2}$ (MPa)</th>
<th>CHO (%)$^b$</th>
<th>TOF (h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$b/l^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. Substrate scope.

Next the substrate scope for this catalytic system was evaluated with several terminal olefins which have previously been targeted for branched-selective hydroformylation (Table 4). These substrates were subjected to the standard hydroformylation conditions using both 1a and 2 as ligands. Substrates with phenyl (Table 4, entries 1 and 4) and cyano groups were investigated (Table 4, entries 2 and 5), as well as an alcoholic substrate, 3-butenol (Table 4, entries 3 and 6).

Allylbenzene was found to perform similar to 1-hexene, producing only aldehydes and predominantly branched-selective products ($b/l = 1.33$) whether ligand 1a or 2 were used. Allyl cyanide showed exceptionally high branched-selectivity (up to $b/l = 6.12$), with 1a performing better than 2, but with greatly reduced chemoselectivity compared to substrates without heteroatoms (31.8–40.2% selectivity for aldehyde products). 3-Butanol, on the other hand, did not afford aldehyde products at the end of the reaction, as both linear and branched products had been cyclized to form lactols (Scheme 2). The amount of five- versus six-membered ring lactols allows us to determine how much branched and linear aldehydes had been formed, respectively,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>93.1</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>1.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Rh]/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&gt;99.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aReaction conditions: toluene (3.75 mL), 1-hexene (250 μL, 500 mM), [Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)$_2$] (1.0 mol %), 3.5 h; branched and linear aldehydes were the only products in all cases unless otherwise stated. bDetermined by GC, confirmed by NMR; $b$ = 2-methylhexanal, $l$ = 1-heptanal. c24 h.
giving a selectivity of $b/l = 1.33$–$1.39$ depending on which ligand was used. Again, despite giving lactol products, the alcoholic moiety did not affect the regioselectivity of the system.

**Table 4.** Catalytic data for the hydroformylation of various substrates using ligands 1a and 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Aldehydes/Cyclised Products</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
<th>TOF (h⁻¹)</th>
<th>$b/l$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>allylbenzene</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>allyl cyanide</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>3-butenol</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.39c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[Rh]/1a</td>
<td>allylbenzene</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Rh]/2</td>
<td>allyl cyanide</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Rh]/2</td>
<td>3-butenol</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.33c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aReaction conditions: toluene (total volume 4.0 mL), substrate (2 mmol, 500 mM), [Rh] = [Rh(acac)(CO)$_2$] (1.0 mol %, 5 mM), ligand (2.0 mol %, 10 mM), 100 °C, CO/H$_2$ (1:1) = 2.0 MPa, 3.5 h. *$^b$Determined by NMR, in each case starting material showed quantitative conversion.

*$^c$Five-membered lactol/six-membered lactol.

**Scheme 2.** Hydroformylation of 3-butenol and subsequent cyclization to form lactols.
2. Mechanistic studies. Recently, Clarke and co-workers reported a similar kinetic profile for the asymmetric hydroformylation of allylbenzene using BOBPHOS as that observed in the current system, both of which showed high branched-selectivity.\textsuperscript{[10]} Additionally, several kinetic studies of diphosphine systems have also been reported, which revealed similar CO and H\textsubscript{2} dependencies.\textsuperscript{[25]} Several energetically similar steps were found to contribute to the overall rate of the reaction, including the olefin insertion/hydride transfer and product forming hydrogenolysis steps, suggesting a similar mechanism may be operational in this work. In Clarke’s BOBPHOS system, the selectivity was determined during an irreversible olefin insertion step to Rh–H, which was confirmed by a labeling study. In the present study with Rh/1a, the olefin insertion step is also likely to be regio-determining as neither substrate concentration nor H\textsubscript{2} pressure affected the b/l ratio (Table 1, entries 17–19). To confirm whether the olefin insertion is reversible or not, a deuterioformylation study was first conducted.

2.1. Deuterioformylation

By treatment of 1-hexene with D\textsubscript{2} and CO in the presence of Rh/1a, it was confirmed that hydride migration is largely irreversible for branched Rh–alkyl formation, while it is reversible for linear Rh–alkyl formation. The deuterioformylation was conducted using [Rh(acac)(CO)\textsubscript{2}] (5 mM) and 1a (10 mM) under a 1:1 CO/D\textsubscript{2} mixture at 1.0 MPa for 1 hour. The products were analyzed by \textsuperscript{1}H, \textsuperscript{2}H and GC/GC-MS (Figure S59) and compared to previously reported deuterium incorporated products from the deuterioformylation of the same substrate.\textsuperscript{[26]} The results are summarized in Figure 2. The recovery of the unreacted 1-hexene was 20.4%. The branched aldehyde (branched-CHO) and the linear aldehyde (linear-CHO) with deuterium incorporated at the β-position to the -CDO group were obtained in 29.8% and 36.4% yield, respectively. The
other detected products were, 2-deuterio-1-hexene (hexane-2d, 5.6%) and branched product 2-methylhexanal with deuterium labels at the α- and aldehyde carbons (branched-CHO*, 2.7%), both of which are exclusive products from the reverse hydride migration from an initial linear Rh–alkyl intermediate. Notably, no products were observed that are the result of β-hydride elimination of a branched Rh–alkyl species such as hexane-1d or linear-CHO*. This demonstrates that formation of linear Rh–alkyl intermediates is somewhat reversible while formation of the analogous branched Rh–alkyl intermediate is not.

![Diagram showing product distribution](image)

**Figure 2.** Graphical representation of the product distribution observed during deuterioformylation. Percentages represent total amounts based on initial substrate loading.

2.2. *NMR studies in the absence of olefin.*

The following NMR studies provided some information towards determining the identity of potentially active species. After subjecting the pre-catalytic 1:2 mixture of [Rh(acac)(CO)₂] and
azatriphos 1a to the catalytic conditions ([Rh] = 5 mM, [1a] = 10 mM, CO/H₂ (1:1) = 2.0 MPa, 100 °C, 0.5 h), the major species detected after removal of the solvent and any volatiles was the bis-ligated monohydride complex [RhH(κ²⁻¹a)₂] (4) by ³¹P{¹H} NMR (δ_P: 15.4 (d, J_{PRh} = 141.0 Hz, 4P), -30.9 (s, 2P)) (Scheme 3). This was confirmed to be the correct assignment by a separate synthesis (see Supporting Information), and in solution is probably tetrahedral with the hydride jumping from face to face, as evidenced from broadening of the hydride signal by ¹H NMR spectroscopy (Figure S46) as well as broadening of the coordinated phosphorus signals by ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectroscopy at −50 °C (Figure S49).²⁷ When complex 4 was used as the catalyst under otherwise identical conditions (Table 2, entries 9 and 10), the same reactivity and selectivity was observed as the in situ generated catalyst, confirming that this complex is at least a competent pre-catalytic species. Interestingly, this differs significantly from the carbon-centered triphos ligand 3, with which the mono-ligated tridentate complex [RhH(CO)(κ³⁻₃)] was isolated and reported to be the catalytic resting state.¹⁴ Although the corresponding tridentate complex [RhH(CO)(κ³⁻₁a)] (A) with ligand 1a was observed under pressures of CO/H₂ (vide infra), this complex is probably less stable compared to 4 (see section 2.5. Comparison of azatriphos 1a and carbon-centered triphos 3 for further discussion). The propensity for bis-κ²-ligation of 1a to Rh over κ³-ligation is evident from the reaction of 1a with [RhCl(CO)(PPh₃)₂] in a 1:1 stoichiometry, which exclusively forms 0.5 equiv. [Rh(κ²⁻¹a)₂][Cl] and leaves 0.5 equiv. [RhCl(CO)(PPh₃)₂] unreacted (Scheme 3).
Scheme 3. Formation of bis-ligated complex 4 with 1a and mono-ligated complex with 3.

The catalyst precursor 4 was converted to Rh carbonyl complexes upon treatment with CO or with a mixture of CO and H₂ as shown in Figure 3. Exposure of complex 4 (7.5 mM) in C₆D₆ to CO (5 bar) provided an equilibrium mixture of several species (Figure 3, top). The three major species in equilibrium have been assigned as [RhH(CO)(κ₃-1a)] (A), [Rh(CO)(μ-CO)(κ₂-1a)]₂ (B), and [RhH(CO)(κ²-1a)] (C) based on 'H, ¹³C{'¹H} ³¹P{'¹H}, ¹H-³¹P HMBC and DOSY NMR spectroscopy (Figures S58–S63), as well as by comparison to similar reported compounds (see Supporting Information for discussion on assignment).[¹⁴,²⁸] These three species existed in the ratio A:B:C = 1.0:9.0:6.4 at room temperature and free 1a and H₂ (from the formation of dimeric B, 76% accounted for by 'H NMR spectroscopy) were also observed. Two species (B and C) were observed when 4 was treated with CO/H₂ (1:1, 5 bar), in a ratio of B:C = 1.0:2.4 at 25 °C (Figure 3, bottom). The considerably broader peaks detected by 'H NMR spectroscopy suggest increased fluxionality in comparison to exposure to only CO. Heating the mixture of 4/CO/H₂ from 25–80 °C resulted in the formation of species A in addition to B and C, while cooling back to 25 °C reestablishes the original equilibrium mixture (Figure S66). When these experiments
were performed using a 1:2 mixture of [Rh(acac)(CO)₂] and 1a instead of pre-formed 4, the same equilibrium mixture of A–C was observed.

Figure 3. Stacked ¹H NMR spectra of complex 4 under 5 bar CO (left top) and CO/H₂ (left bottom); stacked ¹H NMR spectra of hydride region of complex 4 under 5 bar CO (middle top) and CO/H₂ (middle bottom); and stacked ³¹P{¹H} spectra of complex 4 under 5 bar CO (right top) and CO/H₂ (right bottom): showing equilibrium mixture of species A–C.

2.3. NMR studies in the presence of olefin.

In an attempt to observe Rh–acyl species, the behavior of complex 4 in the presence of 1-hexene and either CO or CO/H₂ was investigated (Figure 4). In the absence of CO or H₂, complex 4 is unreactive towards 20 equiv. 1-hexene (Figure 4b). Although, Rh–acyl species could not be detected when the mixture of 4 and 1-hexene were exposed to CO (5 bar), an almost identical
equilibrium mixture of species was observed as in the absence of olefin (A:B:C = 1.0:8.0:6.2, Figure 4c). Upon changing the atmosphere to H₂, aldehyde production was observed (Figure 4d); suggesting at least one of the species generated from 4/CO is active. Furthermore, a branched-selective bias in aldehyde production was observed \((b/l = 1.05)\), supporting the involvement of these species within the actual catalytic cycle. On the onset of aldehyde production, the \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\} NMR\) spectra are simplified, showing only two detectable species: 4 and A (Figure 4e–g). Complexes 4 and A are also the only resolvable species by \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\} NMR\) spectroscopy when a mixture of 4 (12.6 mM) and 1-hexene (20 equiv.) are directly exposed to CO/H₂ (5 bar), with concomitant production of aldehyde, even at 25 °C under these low CO pressures. This further implicates olefin coordination after CO dissociation to be at least partially rate determining.

**Figure 4.** Stacked \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\} NMR\) spectra showing sequential reaction of 4 with CO, then H₂ in the presence of 1-hexene (left) and stacked \(^1\text{H}\) NMR spectra showing onset of aldehyde production (middle) and Rh–H signals (right).
2.4. Proposal for the active species and catalytic cycle.

Although only bis-ligated complex 4 and tridentate complex A are observed during catalytic turnover, these species must lie off-cycle as they are coordinatively saturated 18-electron compounds with no bound olefin, alkyl or acyl moiety. In order to account for the large negative dependence on CO pressure with respect to rate, the active catalytic species is likely to be present as a fast, unresolvable equilibrium on the NMR time-scale. From the mechanistic results, as well as the identification of B and C, the following catalytic cycle may be reasonably proposed (Figure 5). In this cycle, an equilibrium exists as the resting state, with only 4 and A in sufficient quantities or of sufficient lifetime to be detected by NMR spectroscopy during catalytic turnover. The dissociation of CO and subsequent olefin coordination to form olefin complex E is predominantly rate determining. Next, olefin insertion takes place accompanied by additional CO coordination to form linear or branched Rh–alkyl species F. While formation of the branched Rh–alkyl was irreversible, the formation of the linear Rh–alkyl species was proven to be reversible to some extent. In conjunction with higher CO pressures increasing branched selectivity, it seems the reversibility of the linear pathway acts to enhance an intrinsic propensity for branched Rh–alkyl formation during olefin insertion, making this step likely to be regio-determining. Once F is formed, CO insertion followed by hydrogenolysis of the Rh–acyl species completes the cycle.
2.5. Comparison of azatriphos 1a and carbon-centered triphos 3

As noted during the catalytic studies, the incorporation of a nitrogen atom into an otherwise entirely hydrocarbon ligand backbone (i.e. comparing ligand 1a and 3) led to a dramatic rate enhancement, which has also been reported for a related diphosphine systems. Similar rate enhancements are also observed for instance in CO₂ hydrogenation when pendent amines are tethered to diphosphine ligands. Although the cause of this rate enhancement remains debated, several explanations have been proposed such as the amines acting to assist in the heterolytic cleavage of H₂.
Within the context of the present system, CO pressure was found to be the most important parameter in altering the rate of reaction, not H\textsubscript{2} pressure. Accordingly, formation of a species with a vacant site (species D in Figure 5) to allow olefin coordination is vital to improve the rate. With a bidentate coordinated 1a or 3, this vacant site could be occupied by olefin, CO or phosphine during catalysis.

In the case of 3, we know the tridentate complex was the sole species observed under catalytic conditions,\textsuperscript{[14]} however ligand 1a prefers to bind in a bidentate fashion (e.g. species 4, B and C), therefore increasing the amount of unsaturated species present (Scheme 3 and Figure 3). We propose that the propensity of 1a to not coordinate through all three phosphine groups due to electronic instability could be advantageous to form species D leading to the observed rate enhancement. The electronic instability when 1a coordinates through all three phosphine moieties is due to the lone pair on the apical nitrogen, which is donated into the three flanking C\textsubscript{methylene}–P σ*-orbitals, hindering backdonation from rhodium to phosphorus and resulting in a disproportionately electron rich metal center (Chart 2).\textsuperscript{[12e,29]} This electron donation does not exist for carbon-centered 3 which favors tridentate coordination due to chelation.\textsuperscript{[14]}

![Chart 2. Electronic instability of tridentate coordination of 1a.](image)

Conclusions
In conclusion, a series of nitrogen-centered di- and triphosphine ligands have been synthesized with various substituents at phosphorus and tested in conjugation with Rh for the hydroformylation of terminal olefins. For 1-hexene, allylbenzene, allyl cyanide, and 3-butenol, branched-selectivity was observed, ultimately delivering branched aldehydes, except when phosphines with bulky substituents were used, forming predominantly linear products. Notable divergent reactivity between the di- and triphosphine analogues occurred at low loadings and low pressures where the triphosphines maintain branched selectivity, while diphosphines did not.

Kinetic studies demonstrated that increasing H₂ pressure results in a slight rate increase while regioselectivity was negligible. On the other hand, increasing CO pressure dramatically reduces the overall reactivity, and results in some selectivity enhancement towards the branched product. A deuterioformylation study confirmed olefin insertion to be irreversible for the branched pathway and likely regio-determining. The rare selectivity observed in this system likely stems from a trapping of the branched Rh–alkyl species which inevitably forms branched aldehydes, while the corresponding linear Rh–alkyl species shows some reversibility. Mechanistic studies allowed the characterization of several rhodium species that likely exist in a dynamic equilibrium as the catalytic resting state.
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