Published in final edited form as:

Org Lett. 2012 February 3; 14(3): 760–763. doi:10.1021/ol203303b.

Efficient Palladium-Catalyzed Cross-Coupling of Highly Acidic Substrates, Nitroacetates

Alison E. Metz[†], Simon Berritt[†], Spencer D. Dreher[‡], and Marisa C. Kozlowski[†]

Penn Merck High Throughput Experimentation Laboratory, Department of Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 1910-6323 (USA) and Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, NJ 07065 (USA)

Spencer D. Dreher: spencer_dreher@merck.com; Marisa C. Kozlowski: marisa@sas.upenn.edu

Abstract

Palladium-catalyzed cross coupling conditions were developed that efficiently afford 2-aryl-2-nitroacetates from aryl bromides and the very acidic nitroacetates.

Formation of C–C bonds via metal-catalyzed cross-couplings has become a broadly useful tool for the construction of organic molecules. In the redox neutral variant (i.e. Stille, Negishi, Kumada, Suzuki, etc.) many nucleophiles have been successfully coupled with a range of halide electrophiles.¹ In addition, numerous obstacles, such as metal coordination and cross-reactivity, have also been overcome in the coupling of nucleophiles generated *in situ* from acidic species. For example, thiolation of aryl halides was one of the first intermolecular cross-couplings involving *in situ* nucleophile formation.^{2,3} Subsequently, Hartwig and Buchwald were the first to cross-couple aryl halides with amines and alcohols without the need to preform the corresponding stannyl nucleophiles.^{4,5} Concurrently, reductive elimination utilizing softer carbon nucleophiles was being accomplished. Intermolecular cyanoacetate coupling with phenylbromide was first reported in 1985.^{5,6} Since then couplings have been expanded to include α -arylation of ketones, azlactones, glycine imines, 1,3-dicarbonyls, sulfones, imines, sulfoximines, and nitroalkanes.⁷

In this communication, we describe a parallel microscale experimentation (PME) approach to discover suitable conditions for the hitherto unreported coupling of nitroacetates with aryl bromides to generate 2-aryl-2-nitroacetates (Scheme 1). There are few reports⁸ on the synthesis of 2-aryl-2-nitroacetates, highlighting a need for development in this area.

Correspondence to: Spencer D. Dreher, spencer_dreher@merck.com; Marisa C. Kozlowski, marisa@sas.upenn.edu.

[†]The University of Pennsylvania

[‡]Merck & Co., Inc.

Supporting Information **Available:** Experimental procedures and full spectroscopic data for all new compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

The higher acidity of nitroacetates (pK_a 5.8)⁹ combined with a disposition toward chelation poses a new set of challenges in cross-coupling with aryl halides compared to similar activated methylene compounds such as acyclic 1,3-dicarbonyls (pK_a 9-13) and nitroalkanes (pK_a 10) (Scheme 2).¹⁰⁻¹² This high acidity would lead to the expectation that only a very mild base would be needed. However, the resultant anion is a very poor nucleophile and is poised to form highly favorable O,O'-bound intermediates such as **4a** (Scheme 1). Rearrangement to the C-bound form **4b**, a prerequisite for C-C reductive elimination and formation of **5**,¹¹ would require considerable reorganization and potentially the participation of a second ligand. Initial trials utilizing NaH with tris-*tert*-butylphosphine and with Pd₂dba₃ as reported for the related malonates^{10a} (Scheme 2) were unsuccessful (Table 1, entry 1). Reasoning that milder bases could be used, a range of alternate bases was examined to no avail (entries 2-5). To determine if the reductive elimination step was problematic, a more electron-rich aryl bromide was utilized, but no improvement was seen (entries 6-7). Finally, the optimal ligand for nitroalkanes^{12a} (Scheme 2) was studied with similar poor results (entry 8).

While the preliminary results secured that conversion of **2** to **5** is achievable, it was clear that the conditions highly effective for malonates and nitroalkanes were not translatable to nitroacetates. Since our understanding of how the reaction variables effect the mechanism was incomplete, a range of palladium sources, ligands, and bases needed to be examined. To effectively complete this study, parallel microscale experimentation was utilized.¹³ By using 1-mL vials with 100 μ L reaction volumes at 0.2 M concentration (4.4 μ L nitroacetate per vial), it was straightforward to undertake 96 reactions in a single plate. In addition to contributing to efficiency (3 d total time for set-up, reaction and analysis), only 422 μ L (3.84 mmol) of nitroacetate was needed to screen 96 sets of conditions.

Based upon the results in Table 1 an unbiased screen of various phosphines (monodentate, bidentate, hindered, biphenyl, etc.) was undertaken at 75 °C in combination with two palladium sources and four bases spanning a broad pK_a range (Figure 1). The conversion as indicated by the product/internal standard ratio is illustrated in the 3-D plot in Figure 1. Table 2 lists the top screening results along with selected isolated yields when performed on a larger scale.

This screen revealed that only three ligands, BrettPhos **L10**, Me₄ *t*-BuXPhos **L15**, and *t*-BuXPhos **L14** (Figure 1) provided *any* product with the latter two proving superior. Di-*tert*-butyl substituted biphenylphosphine ligands seem to be superior for cross-couplings of weak nucleophiles as seen here and in other reports.^{14,15} In this case, this narrow window suggests that the biphenyl η -1 coordination¹⁵ is critical to forming a reactive species. In addition, blocking of palladacycle formation with the isopropyl groups is necessary.¹⁵ Most surprising was the narrow range of sterically acceptable ligands with the smaller XPhos **L9** failing while the two methoxy groups of BrettPhos **L10** offset the smaller phosphine cyclohexyl substituents (**L9** < **L10** << **L15** < **L14**). On the other end, Me₄ *t*-BuXPhos **L15** appears too large.

Holding the *t*-BuXPhos (**L14**) ligand and the CsHCO₃ base constant, further parallel microscale experimentation was undertaken to identify the optimal temperature, Pd source, and solvent (Figure 2). On the whole, lower temperatures (75 °C versus 110 °C) provided better results, presumably due to product decomposition at the higher temperature. With every solvent combination, Pd₂dba₃ · CHCl₃ and a preformed palladacycle containing the optimal *t*-BuXPhos ligand {chloro(2-di-*tert*-butylphosphino-2',4',6'-trisisopropyl-1,1'-biphenyl)[2-(2-aminoethyl)phenyl] palladium(II)}¹⁷ gave consistent results, whereas [(allyl)PdCl]₂ and Pd(OAc)₂ were less consistent. Upon scale up, Pd₂dba₃ · CHCl₃ provided high isolated yields (93%) with the preformed catalyst being less effective (88%). In line

with the initial screening results, the next most effective palladium source was [(allyl)PdCl]₂ whereas Pd(OAc)₂ was significantly poorer. Reaction was observed in most of the solvents with the nonpolar solvents (toluene and cyclopentyl methyl ether) performing better than polar solvents (dioxane, DME, *tert*-amyl alcohol, THF).

Further experiments indicated that a 2:1 ligand:palladium ratio was the most effective, in line with other results with enolates.^{10,12} As expected for this reaction where deprotonation of the nitroacetate is a key step, a base was crucial to the success of the process (Table 3, entry 1). An examination of bases (Table 3) found that relative to CsHCO₃ (entry 2) stronger bases (K₃PO₄, Cs₂CO₃, Figure 1; CsOH, NaO*t*-Bu, entries 3-4) were not as successful. Presumably, stronger bases generate larger amounts of the nitroacetate anion, which is not very soluble.^{10a} Bases with harder cations (KHCO₃, NaHCO₃, Li₂CO₃, entries 5-7) provided little or no product formation, either due to lower solubility or greater bonding to the nitronate anion, which would impede ligand exchange. On the other end of the spectrum, even softer counterions (Rb₂CO₃, entry 8) performed similarly relative to cesium. CsF (entry 9) with the optimal counterion and a similar pK_a relative to CsHCO₃ was effective, but less so, indicating that the fluoride anion may remain involved. A variety of amine bases were completely ineffective (entries 10–13).

The best reaction conditions were 2.5 mol % Pd₂dba₃·CHCl₃, 10 mol % *t*-BuXPhos, 1.2 equiv CsHCO₃ in toluene at 75 °C, which afforded the products from various aryl bromides and ethyl nitroacetate in isolated yields of 52-96% (Table 4). Notably, electron-rich and electron-poor aryl halides reacted well reinforcing the notion that oxidative addition is not the problematic step in the reaction pathway. In addition, heterocyclic compounds (entries 7 and 11) could be employed. Interestingly, ketones did not undergo competing reaction with the nitroacetate anion (entry 4). Reaction selectivity for aryl bromides over aryl chlorides was observed (entry 12) with only a small amount of the dicoupled product isolated (16%).

On the other hand, the method was not suitable for aryl iodides, triflates, and chlorides. Since such species undergo oxidative addition under these conditions, we speculate that the nature of the counterion is critical to the transmetalation of **3** to **4** (Scheme 2) in line with related reports on other enolates.¹⁸

While moderately hindered aryl bromides couple (Table 4, entry 3), more hindered compounds such as 1-bromonaphthalene or *ortho*-bromotoluene were not successful. Hartwig and Culkin notice this downfall in the α -arylation of ketones¹¹ and propose it arises from the inability of the O,O-bound palladium intermediate **4a** to rearrange to the carbon-bound intermediate **4b**, an already difficult proposition in this system (Scheme 1).

To further probe the reactivity of this system methyl, *tert*-butyl, and benzyl nitroacetates were synthesized.¹⁹ These nitroacetate couplings afforded product in moderate to good yields (Table 5). The increased tendency of methyl nitroacetate to hydrolyze and decarboxylate lowers the isolated yield (entry 1).

In summary, we have developed conditions for the catalytic cross coupling of nitroacetates with aryl bromides to generate 2-aryl-2-nitroacetates. A key requirement in the palladium catalyzed coupling is the use of *t*BuXPhos as ligand, which is likely a result of the high acidity of the nitroacetate substrate as well as O,O'-chelation competing with C-coordination to palladium. An improved understanding of ligand requirements is critical to the more rapid development of these important processes.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Mr. Trung Cao for training on the Penn Merck PME equipment (NSF GOALI CHE0848460) and are grateful to the NIH (RO1GM087605) for financial support. Partial instrumentation support was provided by the NIH for MS (1S10RR023444) and NMR (1S10RR022442).

References

1. For a recent review refer to: Jana R, Pathak TP, Sigman MS. *Chem Rev.* 2011; 111:1417–1492. [PubMed: 21319862]
2. For a recent review of cross coupling to form C-S bonds refer to: Eichman CC, Stambuli JP. *Molecules.* 2011; 16:590–608. [PubMed: 21242940]
3. Kosugi M, Shimizu T, Migita T. *Chem Lett.* 1978:13–14.
4. For a recent review of C-O bond formation via reductive elimination refer to: Enthaler S, Company A. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2011; 40:4912–4924. [PubMed: 21643619]
5. For select recent reviews of reductive elimination to form a carbon heteroatom bond refer to: Sadig JER, Willis MC. *Synthesis.* 2011; 1:1–22. Hartwig J. *Acc Chem Res.* 1998; 31:852–860.
6. Uno M, Seto K, Ueda W, Masuda M, Takahashi S. *Synthesis.* 1985; 5:506–508.
7. For recent reviews refer to: a) Bellina F, Rossi R. *Chem Rev.* 2010; 110:1082–1146. [PubMed: 19610600] b) Johansson CCC, Colacot TJ. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2010; 49:676–707.
8. a) Lehr F, Gonnermann J, Seebach D. *Helv Chem Acta.* 1979; 62:2258–2275. b) Ram S, Ehrenkauf RE. *Synthesis.* 1986; 16:133–135. c) Hugener M, Heimgartner H. *Helv Chim Acta.* 1995; 78:1490–1498. d) Kozyrod RP, Pinhey JT. *Aust J Chem.* 1985; 38:713–721.
9. Adolph HG, Kamlet MJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1966; 88:4761–4763.
10. a) Beare NA, Hartwig JF. *J Org Chem.* 2002; 67:541–555. [PubMed: 11798329] b) Fox JM, Huang X, Chieffi A, Buchwald SL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122:1360–1370.
11. Hartwig JF, Culkin DA. *Acc Chem Res.* 2003; 36:234–245. [PubMed: 12693921]
12. a) Vogl EM, Buchwald SL. *J Org Chem.* 2002; 67:106–111. [PubMed: 11777446] b) Muratake H, Nakai H. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1999; 40:2355–2358.
13. Dreher SD, Dormer PG, Sandrock DL, Molander GA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:9257–9259. [PubMed: 18582050]
14. Rosen BR, Ruble JC, Beauchamp TJ, Navarro A. *Org Lett.* 2011; 13:2564–2567. [PubMed: 21510692]
15. Barder TE, Walker SD, Martinelli JR, Buchwald SL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2005; 127:4685–4696. [PubMed: 15796535]
16. a) Burgos CH, Barder TE, Huang X, Buchwald SL. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2006; 45:4321–4326. b) Johansson CCC, Colacot TJ. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2010; 49:676–707.
17. Biscoe MR, Fors BP, Buchwald SL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:6686–6687. [PubMed: 18447360]
18. Liao X, Weng Z, Hartwig JF. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:195–200. [PubMed: 18076166]
19. Vanier SF, Larouche G, Wurz RP, Charette AB. *Org Lett.* 2010; 12:672–675. [PubMed: 20055454]

Figure 1.
Graphical summary of PME screen #1 (eq 1, $R = H$, $T = 75\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$)

Figure 2.
Graphical summary of PME screen #2 results (eq 1, R = H, base = CsHCO₃, ligand = *t*-BuXPhos) (CPME = cyclopentyl methyl ether, *t*-amylOH = *tert*-amyl alcohol).

Scheme 1.
Nitroacetate coordination to palladium.

Scheme 2.

Hartwig's coupling of malonates and Buchwald's coupling of nitroalkanes.

Table 1

Initial benchtop results (eq 1).^a

entry	R	base	solvent	ligand	conversion ^b (%)
1	H	NaH	THF	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	0
2	H	C ₅ H ₅ CO ₃	THF	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	0
3	H	C ₅ H ₅ CO ₃	DME	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	7
4	H	C ₅ H ₅ CO ₃	DME	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	2
5	H	NaOAc	DME	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	4
6	OMe	C ₅ H ₅ CO ₃	toluene	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	3
7	OMe	NaOAc	toluene	P(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₃	7
8	H	C ₅ H ₅ CO ₃	toluene	<i>t</i> -BuMePhos	6

^aReaction conditions: Pd₂dba₃ (2.5 mol %), nitroacetate (2 equiv), aryl bromide (1 equiv), base (1.2 equiv), and solvent (0.2 M).

^bDetermined by ¹H NMR with respect to ethyl nitroacetate starting material.

Table 2

Top screening results from PME screen #1 and scale up (eq 1, R = H).

entry	ligand	Pd	base	solvent	product/IS ^a , yield ^b
1	<i>t</i> -BuXPhos	Pd ₂ dba ₃ • CHCl ₃	CsHCO ₃	toluene	6.9, 93%
2	<i>t</i> -BuXPhos	(allyl)PdCl) ₂	CsHCO ₃	DME	5.1, 46%
3	Me ₄ <i>t</i> -Bu XPhos	Pd ₂ dba ₃ • CHCl ₃	Cs ₂ CO ₃	toluene	4.5, N/A ^c
4	Me ₄ <i>t</i> -BuXPhos	Pd ₂ dba ₃ • CHCl ₃	CsHCO ₃	toluene	3.7, N/A ^c
5	<i>t</i> -BuXPhos	(allyl)PdCl) ₂	K ₃ PO ₄	DME	3.0, N/A ^d
6	Me ₄ <i>t</i> -BuXPhos	(allyl)PdCl) ₂	Cs ₂ CO ₃	DME	1.8, N/A ^d
7	<i>t</i> -BuXPhos	(allyl)PdCl) ₂	Cs ₂ CO ₃	DME	1.8, 53%
8	Me ₄ <i>t</i> -BuXPhos	(allyl)PdCl) ₂	CsHCO ₃	DME	1.04, N/A ^d

^aRelative conversions from screen (IS = internal standard).

^bIsolated yields upon scale up (0.25 mmol scale).

^cNot isolated because conversion by ¹H NMR was low.

^dNot scaled up.

Table 3

Benchtop screen of bases (eq 1, R = H).^a

entry	base	conversion ^b (%), yield ^c (%)	entry	base	conversion ^b (%), yield ^c (%)
1	none	0, 0	8	Rb ₂ CO ₃	100, 90
2	CsHCO ₃	100, 93	9	CsF	60, 60
3	CsOH	41, N/A ^d	10	(<i>i</i> -Pr) ₂ NEt	0, 0
4	NaOt-Bu	0, 0	11	DMAP	0, 0
5	KHCO ₃	19, N/A ^d			
6	NaHCO ₃	0, 0	12	2,6-(<i>t</i> -Bu) ₂ -4-MePy	0, 0
7	Li ₂ CO ₃	0, 0	13	DBU	10, N/A ^d

^a Reaction conditions: Pd₂dba₃ • CHCl₃ (2.5 mol %), nitroacetate (2 equiv), aryl bromide (1 equiv), base (1.2 equiv), and toluene (0.2 M) at 75 °C.

^b Conversion by ¹H NMR with respect to remaining ethyl nitroacetate.

^c Isolated yields.

^d Not isolated.

Table 4

Reaction of ethyl nitroacetate with aryl bromides (eq 2).^a

entry	aryl bromide	yield (%)	entry	aryl bromide	yield (%)
1		93	7		52
2		79	8		80
3 ^b		69	9		77
4		96	10		76
5		71	11		95
6		81	12		61

^a Reaction conditions: 5 mol % Pd, 10 mol % ligand, ethyl nitroacetate (2 equiv), aryl bromide (1 equiv), CsHCO₃ (1.2 equiv), and toluene (0.2 M).

^b 20 mol % Pd.

Table 5Reaction of various nitroacetates with bromobenzene (eq 3).^a

^a Reaction conditions: 5 mol % Pd, 10 mol % *t*-BuXPhos, nitroacetate (2 equiv), aryl bromide (1 equiv), CsHCO₃ (1.2 equiv), and toluene (0.2 M).