Published in final edited form as:

Org Lett. 2017 November 03; 19(21): 5860–5863. doi:10.1021/acs.orglett.7b02841.

An Epoxide-mediated Deprotection Method for Acidic Amide Auxiliary

Qing-Lan Pei[†], Guan-Da Che[†], Ru-Yi Zhu[‡], Jian He[‡], and Jin-Quan Yu[‡]

[†]Asymchem Life Science (Tianjin) Co., Ltd., 71 7th Avenue, TEDA Tianjin 300457, P. R. China

[‡]Department of Chemistry, The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 N. Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, California 92037, USA

Abstract

A practical method for the removal of a versatile acidic amide auxiliary has been developed. Facile alcoholysis of the amide in the presence of KOAc is enabled by an epoxide, which mechanistically resembles the removal of the Myers' auxiliary. The protocol has been applied to the removal of a variety of amide substrates and their C–H functionalization products with high efficiency and low cost, representing a step forward towards the development of a versatile directing group for C–H activation.

Graphical abstract

Designing effective auxiliary directing groups has been instrumental in developing a wide range of Pd-catalyzed C–H activation reactions.¹ While many factors are taken into account when evaluating the practicality of a directing group, the ease of its installation and removal is crucial. Guided by our main goal of developing new ligands, especially chiral bidentate ligands for Pd-catalyzed C–H activation, we have largely focused on developing weakly coordinating monodentate directing groups.² Among those, the acidic amide group (CONHAr_F, Ar_F = *p*-CF₃C₆F₄) has found broad utility, accommodating a wide range of transformations³ and asymmetric C–H activation reactions.⁴ This versatile auxiliary has also been adopted by both academic and industrial efforts.⁵ Currently, three main methods are used to remove this directing group: methanolysis promoted by a Lewis acid (BF₃•Et₂O); installing an electron-withdrawing group onto the nitrogen atom of the amide to promote methanolysis; hydrolysis by treating with CF₃SO₃H.⁵ However, many substrates are not compatible with these strongly acidic or basic conditions in synthetic applications. We report a convenient protocol for facile alcoholysis of amides using a mild base (KOAc). *N*-Alkylation of the amide with an epoxide and subsequent intramolecular alcoholysis facilitate the removal of the amide auxiliary, in similar fashion to that of the Myers' auxiliary.⁶

Correspondence to: Jin-Quan Yu.

Supporting Information **Available:** Experimental procedure and characterization of all new compounds (PDF). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

During our reaction development, we observed that the amide auxiliary can be readily *N*-alkylated by an epoxide coupling partner.⁷ This observation prompted us to test whether the tethered hydroxyl group can attack the amide to perform intramolecular alcoholysis. Then the product can potentially undergo transesterification with ethanol solvent to give the desired ester, thereby providing a facile deprotection method (Scheme 2). We therefore began to screen various epoxides and reaction conditions in the presence of an alcohol and mild bases. First, we chose the simple epoxide **2a**, the model substrate **1a**, and ethanol as the solvent to test different bases. As shown in Table 1, we started the screening with K₂CO₃ as the base. To our delight, the desired product was detected in 22% yield. Next, we evaluated a range of potassium salts with different anions. Encouragingly, the yield of the product was drastically increased to 74% by using KHCO₃. Then we found that basic potassium phosphates (K₃PO₄ and K₂HPO₄) gave much lower yields. The reaction was shut down when weakly acidic KH₂PO₄ was used. Potassium halides, such as KF and KCl, provided modest yields. Fortunately, KOAc and KOTFA were found effective and gave excellent yields. Considering the cost, KOAc was selected as the better choice. With acetate as the optimal anion, we also compared different cations and the results indicated that potassium ion was the best cation. Interestingly, organic base like triethylamine (TEA) could deliver the product in 72% yield. However, bulkier diisopropylethylamine (DIPEA) led to much worse reactivity. Having the best base in hand, we set out to probe different structures of epoxides. Changing the protecting group from methyl to benzyl resulted in an almost unnoticeable decrease in the yield. However, the yield nearly halved with a non-protected hydroxyl group of the epoxide, suggesting that the hydroxyl is needed for the reaction to proceed well. Replacing the methoxy group with hydrogen, chlorine, and a propyl group caused only a small decrease in the yield. In contrast, the reaction was suppressed significantly with a phenyl group at position 1 of the epoxide. Having an ester group instead at the same position led to a 68% yield. A few other aliphatic and branched alcohols were tested and all gave comparable alcoholysis yields. However, the epoxide-mediated hydrolysis of amide **1a** in water failed to give the desired acid product, instead, the ring opening of epoxide by water was observed as the major side product. Unfortunately, the racemization of **3a** was observed under current alcoholysis conditions.

Having optimized the condition, we proceeded to test it on other amide substrates. As shown in Scheme 3, it is clear that only acidic amides bearing electron-withdrawing groups can be cleaved to give ethyl esters. Non-acidic amides remained intact throughout the reaction, presumably due to (A) their reduced electrophilicity; (B) bad leaving groups; and (C) the *N*-alkylation not happening, as the substrates failed to be deprotonated by KOAc.

In order to test the generality of this method, we also examined structurally different substrates bearing the acidic amide auxiliary prior to C–H activation. α -Hydrogen containing substrates, including α -amino acid, cyclic, and acyclic acids, reacted smoothly, giving the corresponding ethyl esters in excellent yields (**3a**, **3b**, **3f**, **3g**). In addition, the method was similarly successful for bulkier α -quaternary substrates and α , β -unsaturated substrate (**3c**, **3d**, **3e**, **3h**). However, the alcoholysis was less efficient for benzamide derivative, where only a moderate yield was obtained. Next, we started to investigate the scope of C–H functionalized compounds. First, the method was applied to arylated products

of acyclic aliphatic acid substrates. The corresponding esters were obtained in excellent yields (**3j–3o**). For cyclic acid substrates, the C(sp³)–H arylation products underwent facile alcoholysis in good-to-excellent yields (**3p–3w**). Notably, the heteroarylated product was also compatible with this method (**3l**). Similarly, other C–H functionalized products, such as alkylated and alkynylated products, could be converted to esters effectively (**3x–3z**).

To further showcase the robustness of this protocol, a scale up reaction was conducted to give the ester product in 95% yield. Moreover, this method can be employed without purification of the C–H functionalization product.

In summary, we have developed a practical method for the removal of the versatile acidic amide directing group. A variety of acidic amide substrates and their C–H functionalized products can be converted to esters using mildly basic KOAc. The N-alkylation of the amide with an epoxide and subsequent intramolecular alcoholysis is responsible for this reactivity. The ready availability of this method is likely to facilitate the applications of C–H functionalization reactions directed by this amide auxiliary.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge Asymchem Life Science (Tianjin) Co., Ltd, The Scripps Research Institute and the NIH (NIGMS, 2R01GM084019) for financial support. R.-Y. Zhu was supported by the Boehringer Ingelheim Fellowship.

References

1. For selected reviews on C–H functionalizations: Daugulis O, Do H-Q, Shabashov D. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2009; 42:1074. [PubMed: 19552413] Lyons TW, Sanford MS. *Chem. Rev.* 2010; 110:1147. [PubMed: 20078038] Engle KM, Mei T-S, Wasa M, Yu J-Q. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2012; 45:788. [PubMed: 22166158] Zhu R-Y, Farmer ME, Chen Y-Q, Yu J-Q. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2016; 55:10578.
2. Engle KM, Yu J-Q. *J. Org. Chem.* 2013; 78:8927. [PubMed: 23565982]
3. (a) Wasa M, Chan KSL, Zhang X-G, He J, Miura M, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2012; 134:18570. [PubMed: 23116159] (b) Li S, Chen G, Feng C-G, Gong W, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2014; 136:5267. [PubMed: 24666182] (c) Zhu R-Y, He J, Wang X-C, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2014; 136:13194. [PubMed: 25208210] (d) Zhu R-Y, Tanaka K, Li G-C, He J, Fu H-Y, Li S-H, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2015; 137:7067. [PubMed: 26001406] (e) He J, Jiang H, Takise R, Zhu R-Y, Chen G, Dai H-X, Dhar TGM, Shi J, Zhang H, Cheng PTW, Yu J-Q. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2016; 55:785. (f) Zhu R-Y, Saint-Denis TG, Shao Y, He J, Sieber JD, Senanayake CH, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2017; 139:5724. [PubMed: 28391681]
4. (a) Chen G, Gong W, Zhuang Z, Andrä MS, Chen Y-Q, Hong X, Yang Y-F, Liu T, Houk KN, Yu J-Q. *Science.* 2016; 353:1023. [PubMed: 27701111] (b) Wu Q-F, Shen P-X, He J, Wang X-B, Zhang F, Shao Q, Zhu R-Y, Mapelli C, Qiao J, Poss M, Yu J-Q. *Science.* 2017; 355:499. [PubMed: 28154075]
5. Daniels MH, Armand JR, Tan KL. *Org. Lett.* 2016; 18:3310. [PubMed: 27388746]
6. Myers AG, Yang BH, Chen H, McKinsty L, Kopecky DJ, Gleason JL. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1997; 119:6496.
7. Cheng GL, Li T-J, Yu J-Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2015; 137:10950. [PubMed: 26274062]

Diverse transformations

Asymmetric catalysis

Removal of DG

Harsh conditions, poor functional group tolerance

Strong base, multistep

Scheme 1.

Versatility of the Acidic Amide in C–H Functionalizations and Conditions for Removal

Scheme 2.
The Proposed Strategy for the Alcoholysis of the Acidic Amide

Scheme 3.
The Scope of Different Amides

Scheme 4.
Alcoholysis of the Simple Acidic Amides

Scheme 5.

Alcoholysis of the C–H Functionalized Acidic Amides

Gram-scale synthesis **One-pot reaction**

Scheme 6.
Gram-Scale and One-Pot Synthesis

Table 1Optimization of Reaction Conditions^a

entry	base	epoxide	alcohol	yield (%) ^b
1	K ₂ CO ₃	2a	EtOH	22
2	KHCO ₃	2a	EtOH	74
3	K ₃ PO ₄	2a	EtOH	33
4	K ₂ HPO ₄	2a	EtOH	27
5	KH ₂ PO ₄	2a	EtOH	trace
6	KF	2a	EtOH	36
7	KCl	2a	EtOH	31
8	KOAc	2a	EtOH	93
9	KOTFA	2a	EtOH	95
10	NaOAc	2a	EtOH	87
11	LiOAc	2a	EtOH	90
12	NH ₄ OAc	2a	EtOH	0
13	Cu(OAc) ₂	2a	EtOH	trace
14	Mn(OAc) ₂	2a	EtOH	0
15	TEA	2a	EtOH	72
16	DIPEA	2a	EtOH	9
17	KOAc	2b	EtOH	92
18	KOAc	2c	EtOH	47
19	KOAc	2d	EtOH	69
20	KOAc	2e	EtOH	89
21	KOAc	2f	EtOH	87
22	KOAc	2g	EtOH	21
23	KOAc	2h	EtOH	68
24	KOAc	2a	MeOH	91
25	KOAc	2a	<i>i</i> PrOH	95
26	KOAc	2a	<i>t</i> BuOH	92
27	KOAc	2a	<i>i</i> AmylOH	87
28	KOAc	N/A	EtOH	trace
29	N/A	2a	EtOH	trace

^aReaction conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol), epoxide (0.6 mmol), base (0.2 mmol), EtOH (2.0 mL), N₂, 90 °C, 35 h.^bIsolated yields.