Published in final edited form as:

Org Lett. 2013 April 5; 15(7): 1500–1503. doi:10.1021/ol400264a.

Selective Syntheses of $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ Butenolides from Allylic Cyclopropenecarboxylates via Tandem Ring Expansion/[3,3]-Sigmatropic Rearrangements

Xiaocong Xie, Yi Li, and Joseph M. Fox

Brown Laboratories, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716

Joseph M. Fox: jmfox@udel.edu

Abstract

Allylic cyclopropenecarboxylates undergo ring expansion reactions to give 2-allyloxyfuran intermediates, which subsequently rearrange to $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides via Claisen rearrangement or to the corresponding $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides via further Cope rearrangement. Also described are methods for chirality transfer in the rearrangement of non-racemic allylic esters.

Compounds with $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides substructures have received wide interest for their utility in synthesis¹ and their prevalence in biologically active molecules and natural products.² A number of methods for preparing $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides involve reactivity of furan derivatives, including asymmetric variants based on the Michael,³ Mukaiyama-Michael,⁴ vinylogous Mannich,⁵ Morita-Baylis-Hillman⁶ and aldol reactions⁷ that utilize siloxyfurans to provide enantiomerically enriched $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides. There are also a number of enantiospecific syntheses of $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides in which epoxides⁸ or allenates⁹ are used as precursors.

Relative to methods for preparing $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides,^{1d,10} the methods for accessing $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ isomers are few, especially for butenolides that bear a quaternary α -stereocenter. Cycloisomerization and iodolactonization reactions have been used in the construction of $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides that bear α -quaternary stereocenters.¹¹ Vedejs¹² and Smith¹³ have catalyzed carboxyl migration reactions of 5-arylfuran derived enol carbonates to give $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides.¹² Burger has demonstrated that allylic alkoxides can engage 2-fluoro-3-trifluoromethylfurans in tandem S_NAr /Claisen reactivity to produce $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides.¹⁴ Recently, Ma described iodide catalyzed, regioselective alkylation of 2-methoxyfuran-3-carboxylic esters to give $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides.¹⁵

Very recently, Arseniyadis and Cossy have elegantly reported enantioselective Tsuji-Trost type reactions¹⁶ of allyl furan-2-yl carbonates.¹⁷ Quaternary centers were established in 69–

Correspondence to: Joseph M. Fox, jmfox@udel.edu.

Supporting Information Available Full experimental details, two cif files, ¹H and ¹³C-NMR spectra are provided. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

90% ee to give $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides via Claisen rearrangement and the corresponding $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides via further Cope rearrangement.¹⁷

Cyclopropene carboxylic esters are attractive precursors for the preparation of butenolides,¹⁸ as they can be readily prepared by catalytic cyclopropanation of alkynes. The conversion of cyclopropene carboxylic esters to 2-alkoxyfurans is a well-known transformation that can be catalyzed by a variety of metals,¹⁹ and elegant studies have extended the scope of such reactions to the synthesis of fused heterocycles.¹⁸ Of the catalysts that promote ring-expansion of cyclopropenes, Rh-based catalysts are among the most useful, and one-pot syntheses of furans from alkynes and diazo compounds have been achieved.^{19–21} Furthermore, Rh(I) and Rh(II) catalysts lead to distinct regioselectivities in the ring-expansion. Liebeskind^{19a} and Padwa²² have proposed a mechanism that describes the differing regioselectivities induced by Rh(I) and Rh(II) catalysts.

We envisioned that readily prepared allylic cyclopropenecarboxylates (**A**) could engage in ring expansion reactions to give 2-allyloxyfuran intermediates (**B**), and that the resulting allyloxyfurans would subsequently rearrange to $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides (**C**) via Claisen rearrangement or to the corresponding $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides (**D**) via further Cope rearrangement (Scheme 1). Herein, we describe catalytic methods for realizing these processes and for selective formation of either $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ or $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides (**C** vs **D**). The procedure is not restricted to reactivity of simple allyl esters, but also functions for prenyl esters, propargyl esters and for esters derived from cyclic and acyclic secondary allylic alcohols. For more substituted analogs of **A**, we describe methods for controlling regioselectivity and chirality transfer from non-racemic allylic esters. Our work complements the very recent work of Arseniyadis and Cossy, where asymmetric catalysis is used to transfer unfunctionalized allyl groups.^{17a}

In general, allylic cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates could be prepared in good yields by alkylation of the corresponding acids with allylbromide/DBU or by Steglich esterification. The rearrangement to $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides was first studied with allylic esters of cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates without vinylic substitution. A number of catalysts were surveyed, and $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$ was found to be highly effective. Allyl 3-phenylcycloprop-2-enecarboxylate (**1a**) gave butenolide **2a** in 90% yield. Also studied were rearrangements of 3-phenylcycloprop-2-enecarboxylates (**1b–e**) derived from secondary allylic alcohols. Successful rearrangements were realized with substrates with *n*-pentyl (**1b,c**), phenyl (**1d**), or *o*-tolyl (**1e**) substituents at the allylic position to give **2b–e** in 58–81%

As shown in Scheme 2, cyclohex-2-en-1-yl ester **1f** rearranges to compound **2f** in 87% yield and with >95:5 diastereoselectivity. Propargyl ether **1g** also undergoes tandem ring-expansion/Claisen rearrangement to give α -allenyl- α -phenyl- $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolide (**2g**) in 85% yield. Also successful was the rearrangement a cyclopropene that is substituted both at the vinylic and allylic positions. Butenolide **2h** was obtained in 48% yield by a 2-step procedure, in which the intermediate ester was purified only by filtration through a plug of silica gel. The relatively low yield of **2h** was a result of the difficulty of this particular Steglich esterification, and not the Rh-catalyzed rearrangement.

A model set forth in Scheme 3 predicts that the tandem ring expansion/Claisen rearrangements would be stereospecific— controlled by a chair transition state (**F**) with the allylic substituent in an equatorial position. This model predicts that the absolute configuration of the butenolides **G** is set by the absolute configuration of the ester side chain of cyclopropene **E**, which can be readily derived from enantiomerically enriched allylic alcohols. Chirality transfer was measured for the rearrangements of cyclopropenes **1b** and **1c**. For **1b**, high conversion of enantiomeric excess (96% cee) was indeed observed, and the

absolute configuration confirmed by conversion to (*S*)-3-allyl-3-methylfuran-2(3*H*)-one.¹⁷ Chirality transfer was also observed for the reaction of **1c** to **2c** (at 60 °C), albeit with reduced conversion of enantiomeric excess (81% ee).²² The ready availability of non-racemic allylic alcohols makes the method presented in Scheme 2 an attractive method for the synthesis of enantiomerically enriched butenolides.

Rh(I) and Rh(II) catalysts lead to distinct regioselectivities in the ring-expansion of cyclopropenecarboxylates.^{17a,20} We hypothesized that allylic cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates with C-2 substitution would undergo rearrangement to allyloxyfurans and subsequently to $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides with catalyst-dependent regioselectivity (Scheme 4). Indeed, we found that treatment of **1i** with Wilkinson's catalyst in refluxing benzene gave **4** in 92% yield via putative intermediate **I**. Conversely, treatment of **1i** with $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$ leads to the complementary regioisomer **3** in 94% yield via putative **H**. Consistent with this mechanism,^{19a,22} non-racemic **1i** (82% ee) gives racemic **4** in a reaction catalyzed by Wilkinson's catalyst.

Because compounds **2** are 1,5-dienes, it was anticipated that they could undergo a Cope rearrangement subsequent to the Claisen rearrangement at elevated temperature, and that the sequence of ring-expansion/Claisen/Cope rearrangement could take place in one flask. As displayed in Scheme 5, a number of allylic cycloprop-2-enecarboxylate derivatives undergo rearrangement to $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides under the action of $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$ at 110 °C in toluene. Allyl 1-phenylcycloprop-2-enecarboxylate (**1a**), which rearranged to **2a** at 60 °C, rearranges to **5a** at 110 °C. Prenyl ester **1j** undergoes spontaneous Claisen/Cope rearrangement to give $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolide **5j**; the $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolide was not observed. We rationalize that the Thorpe-Ingold effect of the gem-dimethyl accelerates the rate of Cope rearrangement for the putative $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolide intermediate. For cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates derived from secondary allyl alcohols, sequential ring expansion/Claisen/Cope rearrangements can produce diastereomers. For such substrates (**5c**, **5d**, **5f**, **5k**), the diastereoselectivity was high (93:7). The stereoselectivity of the tandem rearrangement is rationalized via successive chair transition states, as shown at the bottom of Scheme 5. With enantiomerically enriched **1c**, compound **5c** was obtained with 83% ee. To see if the Cope rearrangement is Rh-catalyzed, the rate of the transformation of **2d** to **5d** was measured by ¹H NMR (0.04 M in toluene-*d*₆, 100 °C). Without catalyst, the rate was measured to be $6.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$. For an identical experiment with 10 mol% $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$, the rate was measured as $5.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$. These data suggest that the Cope rearrangement step is not catalyzed by $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$.

As was observed in the synthesis of $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides, catalyst-dependent regioselectivity could be realized for $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolide synthesis via the rearrangement cyclopropene **1i**, which is substituted at the vinylic position of the cyclopropene. Thus, **1i** rearranged to **6** in 94% yield under the action of Wilkinson's catalyst at 110 °C, whereas **7** was formed in 46% yield when $\text{Rh}_2(\text{OPiv})_4$ was employed as the catalyst (Scheme 6).

In summary, we describe that allylic cyclopropenecarboxylates engage in Rh-catalyzed ring expansion reactions to give 2-allyloxyfuran intermediates, and that the resulting allyloxyfurans would subsequently rearrange to $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides via Claisen rearrangement or to the corresponding $\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}$ butenolides via further Cope rearrangement. For allyloxy-cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates with C-2 substitution, regioselectivity can be controlled through catalyst choice. Enantiomerically enriched butenolides can be prepared with good levels of stereospecificity with cyclopropenecarboxylates derived from enantiomerically enriched allylic alcohols. Propargyl cycloprop-2-enecarboxylates also participate in tandem rearrangement to give $\Delta^{\beta,\gamma}$ butenolides with allenic substitution.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

For financial support we thank NIGMS (GM068650). For x-ray crystallography, we thank Glenn Yap (Delaware). NMR instrumentation was supported by NSF CHE0840401 and NIH S10RR026962.

References

1. (a) Rao YS. *Chem Rev.* 1964; 64:353.(b) Rao YS. *Chem Rev.* 1976; 76:625.(c) Hashem A, Senning A. *Adv Heterocycl Chem.* 1999; 73:275.(d) Hashem A, Kleinpeter E. *Adv Heterocycl Chem.* 2001; 81:107.
2. Ospina CA, Rodríguez AD. *Org Lett.* 2009; 11:3786. [PubMed: 19637917] (b) Yu ZG, Li J, Li ZY, Guo YW. *Chem Biodivers.* 2009; 6:858. [PubMed: 19551735]
3. Suga H, Kitamura T, Kakehi A, Baba T. *Chem Commun.* 2004:1414.
4. (a) Brown SP, Goodwin NC, MacMillan DWC. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:1192. [PubMed: 12553821] (b) Desimoni G, Faita G, Filippone S, Mella M, Zampori MG, Zema M. *Tetrahedron.* 2001; 57:10203.(c) Robichaud J, Tremblay F. *Org Lett.* 2006; 8:597. [PubMed: 16468720] (d) Ishihara K, Fushimi M. *Org Lett.* 2006; 8:1921. [PubMed: 16623585] (e) Yang H, Kim S. *Synlett.* 2008:555.
5. (a) Martin SF, Barr KJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1996; 118:3299.(b) Mandai H, Mandai K, Snapper ML, Hoveyda AH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:17961. [PubMed: 19053434] (c) Rassu G, Carta P, Pinna L, Battistini L, Zanardi F, Acquotti D, Casiraghi G. *Eur J Org Chem.* 1999:1395.(d) Martin SF, Barr KJ, Smith DW, Bur SK. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1999; 121:6990.(e) Carswell EL, Snapper ML, Hoveyda AH. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2006; 45:7230.(f) González AS, Arrayás RG, Rivero MR, Carretero JC. *Org Lett.* 2008; 10:4335. [PubMed: 18778078] (g) Wieland LC, Vieira EM, Snapper ML, Hoveyda AH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:570. [PubMed: 18980303] (h) Yuan ZL, Jiang JJ, Shi M. *Tetrahedron.* 2009; 65:6001.
6. Jiang YQ, Shi YL, Shi M. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:7202. [PubMed: 18479136]
7. (a) Szlosek M, Figadère B. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2000; 39:1799.(b) Szlosek M, Franck X, Figadère B, Cavé A. *J Org Chem.* 1998; 63:5169.(c) Evans DA, Kozlowski MC, Murry JA, Burgey CS, Campos KR, Connell BT, Staples RJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1999; 121:669.(d) Boeckman RK Jr, Pero JE, Boehmler DJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:11032. [PubMed: 16925414] (e) Nagao H, Yamane Y, Mukaiyama T. *Chem Lett.* 2007; 36:8.(f) Fabra MJ, Fraile JM, Herrerías CI, Lahoza FJ, Mayoral JA, Pérez I. *Chem Commun.* 2008:5402.(g) Frings M, Atodiresei I, Runsink J, Raabe G, Bolm C. *Chem Eur J.* 2009; 15:1566. [PubMed: 19123229] (h) Gao SH, Wang QL, Chen C. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:1410. [PubMed: 18998640]
8. Movassaghi M, Jacobsen EN. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2002; 124:2456. [PubMed: 11890792]
9. Liu HJ, Leow DS, Huang KW, Tan CH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:7212. [PubMed: 19422238]
10. (a) Van den Hoven BG, El Ali B, Alper H. *J Org Chem.* 2000; 65:4131. [PubMed: 10866631] (b) Zhang Q, Cheng M, Hu XY, Li BG, Ji JX. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:7256. [PubMed: 20455531] (c) Shi YL, Roth KE, Ramgren SD, Blum SA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:18022. [PubMed: 19929002]
11. (a) Trost BM, McClory A. *Angew, Chem Int Ed.* 2007; 46:2074.(b) Komeyama K, Takahashi K, Takaki K. *Chem Lett.* 2008; 37:602.(c) Dabrowski JA, Gao F, Hoveyda AH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:4778. [PubMed: 21384918] (d) Shi H, Fang L, Tan C, Shi L, Zhang W, Li C-C, Luo T, Yang Z. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:14944. [PubMed: 21861520] (e) Wang W, Xu B, Hammond GB. *Org Lett.* 2008; 10:3713. [PubMed: 18698785]
12. Shaw SA, Aleman P, Christy J, Kampf JW, Va P, Vedejs E. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:925. [PubMed: 16417383]
13. Joannesse C, Morrill L, Campbell C, Slawin A, Smith A. *Synthesis.* 2011; 2011:1865.

14. (a) Burger K, Fuchs A, Hennig L, Helmreich B. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2001;1657.(b) Burger K, Hennig L, Fuchs A, Greif D, Spengler J, Albericio F. *Monatsh Chem.* 2005; 136:1763.(c) Burger K, Fuchs A, Hennig L, Helmreich B, Greif D. *Monatsh Chem.* 2001; 132:929.
15. Chen J, Ni S, Ma S. *Adv Synth Catal.* 2012; 354:1114.
16. (a) Behenna DC, Stoltz BM. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2004; 126:15044. [PubMed: 15547998] (b) Burger EC, Tunge JA. *Org Lett.* 2004; 6:4113. [PubMed: 15496112] (c) Trost BM, Xu J. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2005; 127:2846. [PubMed: 15740108]
17. (a) Fournier J, Lozano O, Menozzi C, Arseniyadis S, Cossy J. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2013; 52:1257–1261.(b) Fournier J, Arseniyadis S, Cossy J. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2012; 51:7562.
18. Miege F, Meyer C, Cossy J. *Org Lett.* 2010; 12:248. [PubMed: 19994906]
19. (a) Cho SH, Liebeskind LS. *J Org Chem.* 1987; 52:2631.(b) Cui X, Xu X, Wojtas L, Kim MM, Zhang XP. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2012; 134:19981. [PubMed: 23205846] (c) Davies HML, Romines KR. *Tetrahedron.* 1988; 44:3343.(d) Müller P, Gränicer C. *Helv Chim Acta.* 1993; 76:521.(e) Müller P, Nicole P, Doyle MP, Bagheri V. *Helv Chim Acta.* 1990; 73:1233.(f) Komendantov MI, Domnin IN, Bulucheva EV. *Tetrahedron.* 1975; 31:2495.(g) Ma SM, Zhang JL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:12386. [PubMed: 14531663] (h) Bauer JT, Hadfield MS, Lee AL. *Chem Commun.* 2008:6405.
20. (a) Chuprakov S, Gevorgyan V. *Org Lett.* 2007; 9:4463. [PubMed: 17892296] (b) Sato H, Hiroi K. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2006; 47:5793.
21. (a) Pang W, Zhu SF, Xin Y, Jiang HF, Zhu SZ. *Tetrahedron.* 2010; 66:1261.(b) Li HY, Hsung RP. *Org Lett.* 2009; 11:4462. [PubMed: 19739617] (c) Peng LL, Zhang X, Ma M, Wang JB. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2007; 46:1905.(d) Hamaguchi M, Tomida N, Iyama Y. *J Org Chem.* 2007; 72:1326. [PubMed: 17288380] (e) Wyatt EE, Fergus S, Galloway WRJD, Bender A, Fox DJ, Plowright AT, Jessiman AS, Welch M, Spring DR. *Chem Commun.* 2006:3296.(f) Ma SM, Lu LH, Lu P. *J Org Chem.* 2005; 70:1063. [PubMed: 15675872] (g) Müller P, Allenbach YF, Bernardinelli G. *Helv Chim Acta.* 2003; 86:3164.(h) Padwa A, Straub CS. *J Org Chem.* 2003; 68:227. [PubMed: 12530844] (i) Tollari S, Palmisano G, Cenini S, Cravotto G, Giovenzana GB, Penoni A. *Synthesis.* 2001:735.(j) Lee YR, Suk JY. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2000; 41:4795.(k) Lee YR, Suk JY, Kim BS. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1999; 40:6603.(l) Padwa A, Hertzog DL, Nadler WR, Osterhout MH, Price AT. *J Org Chem.* 1994; 59:1418.(m) Padwa A, Hertzog DL. *Tetrahedron.* 1993; 49:2589.(n) Padwa A, Kinder FR. *J Org Chem.* 1993; 58:21.(o) Doyle MP, Pieters RJ, Taunton J, Pho HQ, Padwa A, Hertzog DL, Precado L. *J Org Chem.* 1991; 56:820.(p) Hoye TR, Dinsmore CJ, Johnson DS, Korkowski PF. *J Org Chem.* 1990; 55:4518.
22. Padwa A, Kassir JM, Xu SL. *J Org Chem.* 1991; 56:6971.

Scheme 1.
Tandem Ring expansion/Claisen rearrangements

Scheme 2.
Tandem Ring-expansion/Claisen Rearrangements

Scheme 3.
Model for Chirality Transfer

Scheme 4.
Regioselective expansion/Claisen Rearrangement

Scheme 5.
Expansion/Claisen/Cope Rearrangements

Scheme 6.
Catalyst control over regioselectivity