Published in final edited form as:

Chem Commun (Camb). 2011 September 28; 47(36): 10028–10030. doi:10.1039/c1cc14392a.

Catalytic enantioselective Grignard Nozaki–Hiyama methallylation from the alcohol oxidation level: chloride compensates for π -complex instability†‡

Abbas Hassan, Ian A. Townsend, and Michael J. Krische

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA. mkrische@mail.utexas.edu; Fax: + 1 613 9418447; Tel: + 1 512 2325892

Abstract

Methallyl chloride serves as an efficient allyl donor in highly enantioselective Grignard Nozaki–Hiyama methallylations from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation level *via* iridium catalyzed transfer hydrogenation. Under identical conditions, methallyl acetate does not react efficiently. Double methallylation of 1,3-propanediol provides the C_2 -symmetric adduct as a single enantiomer, as determined by HPLC analysis.

The reductive coupling of allylic chlorides to carbonyl compounds is typically conducted under Grignard conditions employing elemental magnesium as a terminal reductant.¹ To achieve enantioselective reductive coupling of allylic chlorides to carbonyl compounds, asymmetric variants of Fürstner's modification² of the Nozaki–Hiyama reaction may be used.^{3,4} In more recent studies, hydrogen exchange between alcohols and π -unsaturated reactants was found to trigger generation of electrophile–nucleophile pairs, enabling a variety of enantioselective carbonyl allylation processes.^{5,6} A remarkable feature of these transformations resides in the ability to perform carbonyl addition directly from the alcohol oxidation level in the absence of stoichiometric allylmetal reagents or (organo)metallic reductants.

One restriction associated with such iridium catalyzed carbonyl allylations relates to the requirement of allyl donors that incorporate monosubstituted olefins: higher degrees of olefin substitution are not tolerated. It has been established that the stability of late transition metal–olefin π -complex decreases with increasing olefin substitution.⁷ As olefin coordination is a prerequisite to ionization, the requirement of allyl donors that incorporate monosubstituted olefins likely stems from the shorter lifetime of more highly substituted iridium–olefin π -complexes. However, in prior studies on vinylogous aldol addition,⁶ⁱ LUMO-lowering substituents were found to increase the degree of π -backbonding^{8,9} thus compensating for steric destabilization of the transient π -complex arising from higher degrees of olefin substitution (Scheme 1).

†This article is part of the *ChemComm* 'Advances in catalytic C–C bond formations via late transition metals.

‡Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Characterization data for all new compounds (¹H NMR, ¹³C NMR, IR, HRMS, [α]). Absolute stereochemical assignments of **3g** *via* single crystal X-ray diffraction are provided. CCDC 835997. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/c1cc14392a

Correspondence to: Michael J. Krische.

†This article is part of the *ChemComm* 'Advances in catalytic C–C bond formations via late transition metals.

‡Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Characterization data for all new compounds (¹H NMR, ¹³C NMR, IR, HRMS, [α]). Absolute stereochemical assignments of **3g** *via* single crystal X-ray diffraction are provided. CCDC 835997. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/c1cc14392a

To enable efficient reactions of more highly substituted allyl donors in the absence of electronic effects, one may compensate for the shorter lifetime of the iridium–olefin π -complexes by employing a more reactive leaving group. For example, whereas methallyl acetate does not participate in efficient enantioselective iridium catalyzed carbonyl addition, methallyl chloride might serve as a feasible allyl donor.^{10–12} Given the paucity of studies devoted exclusively to enantioselective carbonyl methallylation,^{10h,11g,12a} this class of carbonyl additions was selected for investigation. In this account, we report that methallyl chloride does indeed participate in efficient enantioselective carbonyl methallylation from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation level, whereas methallyl acetate does not. More significantly, this work reveals key structural–interactional features of the catalytic system that should accelerate development of hitherto inaccessible C–C bond forming transfer hydrogenations.

Our studies began with an assay of various methallyl carboxylates, sulfonates and halides employing as a catalyst the chromatographically isolated cyclometallated iridium π -allyl complex “(R)-I”, which is prepared from [Ir(cod)Cl]₂, (R)-Cl,MeO-BIPHEP, allyl acetate and 4-cyano-3-nitrobenzoic acid (Scheme 2).

Using benzylic alcohol **1g** as a test reactant, it was found that methallyl carboxylates delivered only trace quantities of C–C coupling product **3g**. In contrast, under identical conditions, much higher conversions were observed using methallyl chloride, an inexpensive commercial material. However, these initial experiments, which were conducted at 70 °C over 48 hours, also revealed a major side-reaction: oxidation of the initially formed methallylation product **3g** to form the conjugated dimethyl enone **4g**.¹³ The formation of enone **4g** corroborates the poor coordinating ability of the methyl-substituted homoallylic olefin. Olefin dissociation at the stage of the homoallylic iridium alkoxide opens a coordination site, which induces β -hydride elimination to form a transient β,γ -enone that isomerizes to the conjugated enone **4g**.

It was found that oxidation of the initially formed methallylation product **3g** to form enone **4g** is suppressed at lower temperature (50 °C) and shorter reaction times (24 hours). Under optimal conditions involving the use of catalyst (R)-I (5 mol%), methallyl chloride (300 mol %) and potassium phosphate (100 mol%) in THF (1 M) at 50 °C, benzylic alcohol **1g** is transformed to the adduct **3g** in 83% isolated yield and 96% enantiomeric excess. These conditions were applied to alcohols **1a–1i**. The products of methallylation **3a–3i** were produced in good to excellent yields and with uniformly high levels of enantioselectivity. Notably, aliphatic alcohols **1a–1d** undergo methallylation to form adducts **3a–3d** with virtually complete suppression of further oxidation to form enones **4a–4d** (Table 1).

In the presence of isopropanol (200 mol%), but under otherwise identical conditions an equivalent set of adducts **3a–3i** can be generated from aldehydes **2a–2i**. In most cases, comparable isolated yields and enantioselectivities are observed. Thus, carbonyl methallylation is achieved with equal facility from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation level. As previously observed, competing enone formation is most evident in the case of adducts that embody allylic and benzylic secondary alcohols, which are more susceptible to β -hydride elimination (Table 1). The absolute stereochemistry of methallylation products **3a–3i** was made in analogy to that determined for bromide containing adduct **3g** by single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis using the anomalous dispersion method.

To showcase the utility of this methodology, double enantioselective methallylation of 1,3-propanediol was attempted under standard conditions.¹⁴ The corresponding C₂-symmetric diol **6** is produced in 66% isolated yield as a single enantiomer, as the minor enantiomer of the mono-adduct is transformed to the *meso*-stereoisomer of the product.¹⁵ Diol **6** was

converted to acetonide **7** and subjected to ozonolysis to provide the formal product of double acetone aldol addition **8** (Scheme 3).

The present study suggests that methallyl acetate does not serve as an efficient allyl donor due to the lower stability and, hence, shorter lifetime of the iridium–olefin π -complex that precedes formation of the requisite π -allyliridium complex. Through the use of methallyl chloride, which incorporates a more reactive leaving group, ionization to form the π -allyliridium complex becomes more rapid, compensating for the shorter lifetime of the more highly substituted olefin π -complex. Based on this insight into the requirements of the catalytic process, highly enantioselective Grignard–Nozaki–Hiyama methallylation is achieved from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation levels in the absence of stoichiometric metallic reagents or reductants. Future studies will focus on the development of related alcohol–alkyl halide C–C couplings.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgment is made to the Robert A. Welch Foundation (F-0038) and the NIH-NIGMS (RO1-GM069445) for partial support of this research. The Higher Education Commission of Pakistan is acknowledged for graduate student fellowship support (AH).

Notes and references

1. Grignard V. C R Hebd Séances Acad Sci. 1900; 130:1322.
2. Fürstner A, Shi N. J Am Chem Soc. 1996; 118:2533.
3. For selected reviews on catalytic Nozaki–Hiyama coupling, see: (a) Hargaden GC, Guiry PJ. Adv Synth Catal. 2007; 349:2407.; (b) Inoue M, Suzuki T, Kinoshita A, Nakada M. Chem Rec. 2008; 8:169. [PubMed: 18563811]
4. For selected examples of enantioselective carbonyl allylation and crotylation *via* catalytic Nozaki–Hiyama coupling, see: (a) Bandini M, Cozzi PG, Umani-Ronchi A. Polyhedron. 2000; 19:537.; (b) Bandini M, Cozzi PG, Umani-Ronchi A. Tetrahedron. 2001; 57:835.; (c) Bandini M, Cozzi PG, Umani-Ronchi A. Angew Chem Int Ed. 2000; 39:2327.; (d) Inoue M, Suzuki T, Nakada M. J Am Chem Soc. 2003; 125:1140. [PubMed: 12553795]; (e) Lee J-Y, Miller JJ, Hamilton SS, Sigman MS. Org Lett. 2005; 7:1837. [PubMed: 15844919]; (f) McManus HA, Cozzi PG, Guiry PJ. Adv Synth Catal. 2006; 348:551.; (g) Xia G, Yamamoto H. J Am Chem Soc. 2006; 128:2554. [PubMed: 16492037]; (h) Hargaden GC, Müller-Bunz H, Guiry PJ. Eur J Org Chem. 2007:4235.; (i) Hargaden GC, O'Sullivan TP, Guiry PJ. Org Biomol Chem. 2008; 6:562. [PubMed: 18219428]; (j) Liu X, Henderson JA, Sasaki T, Kishi Y. J Am Chem Soc. 2009; 131:16678. [PubMed: 19874019]; (k) White JD, Shaw S. Org Lett. 2011; 13:2488. [PubMed: 21462988]
5. For selected reviews on C–C bond forming hydrogenation and transfer hydrogenation, see: (a) Patman RL, Bower JF, Kim IS, Krische MJ. Aldrichimica Acta. 2008; 41:95.; (b) Bower JF, Kim IS, Patman RL, Krische MJ. Angew Chem Int Ed. 2009; 48:34.; (c) Han SB, Kim IS, Krische MJ. Chem Commun. 2009:7278.; (d) Bower JF, Krische MJ. Top Organomet Chem. 2011; 43:107. [PubMed: 21822399]
6. For enantioselective carbonyl allylation *via* iridium catalyzed C–C bond forming transfer hydrogenation, see: (a) Kim IS, Ngai M-Y, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2008; 130:6340. [PubMed: 18444616]; (b) Kim IS, Ngai M-Y, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2008; 130:14891. [PubMed: 18841896]; (c) Kim IS, Han SB, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2009; 131:2514. [PubMed: 19191498]; (d) Han SB, Kim IS, Han H, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2009; 131:6916. [PubMed: 19453190]; (e) Lu Y, Kim IS, Hassan A, Del Valle DJ, Krische MJ. Angew Chem Int Ed. 2009; 48:5018.; (f) Han SB, Han H, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2010; 132:1760. [PubMed: 20099821]; (g) Zhang YJ, Yang JH, Kim SH, Krische MJ. J Am Chem Soc. 2010; 132:4562.

- [PubMed: 20225853] ; (h) Han SB, Gao X, Krische MJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:9153. [PubMed: 20540509] ; (i) Hassan A, Zbieg JR, Krische MJ. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2011; 50:3493.; (j) Gao X, Townsend IA, Krische MJ. *J Org Chem.* 2011; 76:2350. [PubMed: 21375283] ; (k) Gao X, Zhang YJ, Krische MJ. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2011; 50:4173.
7. (a) Cramer R. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1967; 89:4621.(b) Jesse AC, Cordfunke EHP, Ouweltjes W. *Thermochim Acta.* 1979; 30:293.
8. (a) Dewar MJS. *Bull Soc Chim Fr.* 1951:C71.(b) Chatt J, Duncanson LA. *J Chem Soc.* 1953:2939. (c) Dewar MJS, Ford GP. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1979; 101:783.
9. (a) Stahl SS, Thorman JL, de Silva N, Guzei IA, Clark RW. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:12. [PubMed: 12515487] (b) Popp BV, Thorman JL, Morales CM, Landis CR, Stahl SS. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2004; 126:14832. [PubMed: 15535709]
10. For isolated examples of enantioselective carbonyl methallylation employing chirally modified methallylmetal reagents (withstanding ref. 10*h*), see: Boron: (a) Hoffmann RW, Herold T. *Chem Ber.* 1981; 114:375.; (b) Jadhav PK, Bhat KS, Perumal T, Brown HC. *J Org Chem.* 1986; 51:432.; (c) Short RP, Masamune S. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1989; 111:1892.; (d) Corey EJ, Yu C-M, Kim SS. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1989; 111:5495.; (e) Lachance H, Lu X, Gravel M, Hall DG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:10160. [PubMed: 12926924] ; (f) Gravel M, Lachance H, Lu X, Hall DG. *Synthesis.* 2004:1290.; (g) Chen W, Liu Y, Chen Z. *Eur J Org Chem.* 2005:1665.; (h) Román JG, Soderquist JA. *J Org Chem.* 2007; 72:9772. [PubMed: 17999524] ; Titanium: (i) Duthaler RO, Hafner A, Alsters PL, Rothe-Streit P, Rihs G. *Pure Appl Chem.* 1992; 64:1897.
11. For isolated examples of enantioselective methallyl employing chirally modified Lewis acid or Lewis base catalysts (withstanding ref. 11*g*), see: Boron: (a) Rauniyar V, Zhai H, Hall DG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:8481. [PubMed: 18540580] ; (b) Rauniyar V, Hall DG. *J Org Chem.* 2009; 74:4236. [PubMed: 19422213] ; Tin: (c) Keck GE, Krishnamurthy D, Grier MC. *J Org Chem.* 1993; 58:6543.; (d) Weigand S, Brückner R. *Chem–Eur J.* 1996; 2:1077.; (e) Yanigasawa A, Ishiba A, Nakashima H, Yamamoto H. *Synlett.* 1997:88.; (f) Konishi S, Hanawa H, Maruoka K. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry.* 2003; 15:1603.; (g) Kim JG, Camp EH, Walsh PJ. *Org Lett.* 2006; 8:4413. [PubMed: 16986913] ; Silicon: (h) Furuta K, Mouri M, Yamamoto H. *Synlett.* 1991:561.; (i) Nakajima M, Saito M, Shiro M, Hashimoto S. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1998; 120:6419.; (j) Nakajima M, Kotani S, Ishizuka T, Hashimoto S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2005; 46:157.; (k) Kotani S, Hashimoto S, Nakajima M. *Tetrahedron.* 2007; 63:3122.
12. For isolated examples of enantioselective Nozaki–Hiyama methallylation (withstanding ref. 12*a*), see: (a) Inoue M, Suzuki T, Nakada M. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:1140. [PubMed: 12553795] ; (b) Hargaden G, McManus HA, Cozzi PG, Guiry PJ. *Org Biomol Chem.* 2007; 5:763. [PubMed: 17315061]
13. Under the conditions of ruthenium catalysis, alcohols and allylic acetates couple to form enones, see: Kondo T, Mukai T, Watanabe Y. *J Org Chem.* 1991; 56:487.
14. For double enantioselective allylation of 1,3-propanediol, see: Lu Y, Krische MJ. *Org Lett.* 2009; 11:3108. [PubMed: 19586066] and ref. 6*e*.
15. This mechanism for enantiomeric enrichment has been documented previously: (a) Kogure T, Eliel EL. *J Org Chem.* 1984; 49:576.; (b) Midland MM, Gabriel J. *J Org Chem.* 1985; 50:1144.

Scheme 1.

Better leaving groups compensate for decreased π -complex stability, facilitating π -allyl formation.

Scheme 2.
Synthesis of iridium complex (R) -I.

Scheme 3. Double methallylation of propanediol to form the C_2 -symmetric adduct **8**.

Table 1

Enantioselective carbonyl allylation from the alcohol or aldehyde oxidation level^a

1a, R = (CH ₂) ₇ Me 1d, R = <i>c</i> -C ₆ H ₁₁ 1g, R = 4-BrC ₆ H ₄	1b, R = (CH ₂) ₂ OBn 1e, R = CH=CHPh 1h, R = piperonyl	1c, R = CMe ₂ CH ₂ OPMB 1f, R = geranyl 1i, R = 2-benzothienyl	2a, R = (CH ₂) ₇ Me 2d, R = <i>c</i> -C ₆ H ₁₁ 2g, R = 4-BrC ₆ H ₄	2b, R = (CH ₂) ₂ OBn 2e, R = CH=CHPh 2h, R = piperonyl	2c, R = CMe ₂ CH ₂ OPMB 2f, R = geranyl 2i, R = 2-benzothienyl
 80% Yield (>1% enone) 95% ee, 3a	 69% Yield (>1% enone) 96% ee, 3b	 90% Yield (>1% enone) 94% ee, 3c	 75% Yield (>1% enone) 97% ee, 3d	 55% Yield (>1% enone) 97% ee, 3e	 91% Yield (>1% enone) 97% ee, 3f
 72% Yield (>1% enone) 92% ee, 3d	 80% Yield (12% enone) 94% ee, 3e ^b	 80% Yield (>1% enone) 94% ee, 3f ^b	 74% Yield (>1% enone) 91% ee, 3d	 82% Yield (13% enone) 95% ee, 3e ^c	 75% Yield (6% enone) 93% ee, 3f ^c
 83% Yield (14% enone) 96% ee, 3g	 78% Yield (5% enone) 94% ee, 3h	 87% Yield (5% enone) 96% ee, 3i	 90% Yield (8% enone) 95% ee, 3g	 85% Yield (10% enone) 96% ee, 3h	 91% Yield (5% enone) 95% ee, 3i

^a See ESI† for detailed experimental procedure. ^b 200 mol% isopropanol. ^c 400 mol% isopropanol.