Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2018 May 23; 140(20): 6212–6216. doi:10.1021/jacs.8b03063.

An Enantioselective Cross Dehydrogenative Coupling Catalysis Approach to Substituted Tetrahydropyrans

Ansoo Lee, Rick C. Betori, Erika A. Crane, and Karl A. Scheidt*

Department of Chemistry, Center for Molecular Innovation and Drug Discovery, Northwestern University, 2145 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60208, United States

Abstract

An enantioselective cross-dehydrogenative coupling (CDC) reaction to access tetrahydropyrans has been developed. This process combines *in situ* Lewis acid activation of a nucleophile in concert with the oxidative formation of a transient oxocarbenium electrophile, leading to a productive and highly enantioselective CDC. These advances represent one of the first successful applications of CDC for the enantioselective couplings of unfunctionalized ethers. This system provides efficient access to valuable THP motifs found in many natural products and bioactive small molecules.

Abstract

Tetrahydropyrans (THPs) are key structural elements in numerous bioactive natural products and medicinally relevant compounds.¹ Due to the prevalence of THPs, multiple stereoselective processes have been developed for their construction, including Prins cyclizations,² hetero-Diels-Alder reactions,³ and intramolecular nucleophilic conjugate additions.⁴ Established methods to construct THPs in an enantioselective fashion typically focus on conjugate additions⁵ or activation by enamine/iminium intermediates,⁶ two approaches that are deployed extensively in total synthesis. Inspired by natural product targets of interest in our laboratory, as well as small molecules possessing intriguing biological activity, we envisioned a complementary and direct method for the enantioselective synthesis of substituted tetrahydropyran-4-ones. We have disclosed the use of β -hydroxy dioxinones as nucleophiles with aldehydes and isatins to undergo mild and

*Corresponding Author, scheidt@northwestern.edu.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supp. Info. Experimental procedures and spectroscopic, and crystallographic details. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

stereoselective cyclizations in the presence of catalytic Lewis or Brønsted acids to access enantioenriched THPs.⁷ Our efforts in this area have enabled total syntheses of various natural products including exigulide,⁸ neopeltolide,⁹ okilactomycin,¹⁰ and other naturally occurring compounds containing THPs.¹¹ Conceptually, moving beyond preformed nucleophiles such as dioxinones to simple β -ketoester systems presents opportunities for enantiocontrol, most likely through two-point/chelate binding, but also requires different activation modes to operate simultaneously in a single reaction flask.

Cross-dehydrogenative coupling (CDC) reactions have emerged as powerful approaches to forge C—C bonds from inert C—H bonds.¹² As a subset of C—H functionalization processes,¹³ CDC reactions are attractive because they do not require prefunctionalized starting materials, relying instead on oxidative activation followed by net loss of H₂ to facilitate C—C bond formation. Specifically, 2,3-dichloro-5,6-dicyano-1,4-benzoquinone (DDQ) a strong oxidizing agent, promotes the formation of stabilized carbocations by benzylic and allylic C—H bond activation, and subsequent C—C bond formation.¹⁴ Mechanistically, DDQ mediated CDC reactions proceed via single electron transfer to form stabilized radical cations, followed by hydrogen atom abstraction to form the electrophilic coupling partner (e.g., oxocarbenium ion, iminium ion). Floreancig has effectively demonstrated that DDQ activation can facilitate racemic access to carbocycles and heterocycles via the oxidation of allylic ethers.¹⁵ Although enantioselective CDC reactions have been reported during the last decade,¹⁶ there is a dearth of highly enantioselective CDC reactions using oxocarbenium ion electrophiles in contrast to a plethora of enantioselective CDC reactions using iminium electrophiles (Scheme 1b).¹⁷ A major challenge to this approach is successfully integrating strongly oxidative conditions for oxocarbenium ion formation (e.g., DDQ) with stereodefining catalysts necessary for nucleophile activation (e.g., chiral Lewis acids) to a) promote a productive reaction, and b) induce stereocontrol around a transient, highly reactive oxocarbenium ion. Herein we report an enantioselective CDC of β -ketoesters with oxocarbenium ions to access substituted tetrahydropyrans with high yields and enantioselectivity through a merged chiral Lewis acid/oxidation strategy (Scheme 1c).

We initiated our investigations of this chiral Lewis acid/oxidant process using β -ketoester substrate **1a** and found that Cu(II)-bisoxazoline (BOX) complex **L1**•Cu(OTf)₂ gave the desired product **2a** as the sole diastereomer in 72% yield and 92:8 er at -70 °C (Scheme 2). Additional screening with chiral BOX ligands **L2**–**L5** identified ligand **L3** as optimal, furnishing **2a** in 83% yield and 95:5 er upon further reaction dilution to 0.02 M. Finally, substrates bearing more sterically encumbered esters were screened with no improvement in observed stereoselectivity (see Supp. Info.).

After optimization the basic asymmetric CDC reaction with β -ketoester **1a**, the general scope was explored (Table 1). When the aromatic ring on the cinnamyl ether was substituted with electron-donating groups at its *para*, *meta*, or *ortho* position, the reactions provided desirable tetrahydropyran-4-ones **2c**–**2g** in high yields and stereoselectivity with exception of **2b**. We observed that substrate **1b** possessing a *p*-methoxycinnamyl group produced side products due to over-oxidation. Furthermore, reaction of **1b** without a Cu(II) catalyst produced *rac*-**2b** in 70% yield in only 1 hour, suggesting the competitive background

reaction of this highly reactive substrate also contributed to the observed reduction in stereoselectivity.

We then evaluated substrates substituted with electron-withdrawing groups at *para*, *meta*, and *ortho* positions. The reactions of **1h–1k** provided desired products **2h–2k** in moderate yields and high stereoselectivity. The results showed that high yields and stereoselectivity were observed for **1l** and **1m** containing naphthyl groups. The reaction of **1n** containing a trisubstituted cinnamyl alkene afforded **2n** in 87% yield and 97:3 er, while heteroaryl and conjugated ethers **1o–1q** gave tetrahydropyran-4-ones **2o–2q** in somewhat decreased yields and stereoselectivities. A survey of benzyl ethers revealed that only 4-methoxy-substituted substrates **1r–1t** were capable of producing desired products **2r–2t** with high stereoselectivity and moderate yield. Under the current conditions, we have not observed productive reactions using propargylic, unsubstituted allylic, alkyl, or ether substrates leading to tetrahydrofurans (i.e., 5 atom tether length). Instead, over-oxidation, resulting in 2,3-dihydropyran-4-one, or no oxidation is observed (see Supp. Info.). However, with this successful proof of concept, investigations with various oxidation methods and Lewis acids to engage an even larger range of substrate classes are ongoing.

Attempts to access enantioenriched tetrahydropyran-4-ones without the β -ketoester were unsuccessful, as enol acetate **3** provided racemic **4** in 68% yield (Scheme 3a). This observation supports the hypothesis that the β -ketoester is crucial for stereoselectivity by coordination with the Cu(II)/BOX catalyst. In an attempt to probe whether an enantioselective *intermolecular* CDC reaction was possible, cinnamyl methyl ether was exposed to methyl acetoacetate in the presence of **L3**•Cu(OTf)₂ to afford **5** (Scheme 3b). Although the intermediate oxocarbenium ion could potentially undergo both 1,2- and 1,4-addition, the 1,2-addition adduct **5** was observed (as detected by NMR spectroscopy). Unfortunately, attempts to isolate **5** have been unsuccessful, due to facile elimination of the β -methoxy group to form enone **6** (2.7:1 *E/Z* mixture). Lastly, we evaluated α -methyl- β -ketoester **1z**, which would forge a quaternary C-center (Scheme 3c). To our satisfaction, the reaction of **1z** provided the desired (2*R*,3*R*)-**7** in 65% yield (>20:1 dr, 96:4 er)²³ which provides a roadmap for future intermolecular asymmetric CDC reactions.

The stereochemical model of the reaction with **1a**, Cu(II)/BOX and DDQ is based on a reported X-ray crystal structure of [**L1**•Cu(H₂O)₂](SbF₆)₂ by replacement of H₂O ligands with the oxocarbenium ion of **1a** (Figure 1).¹⁹ With the oxidized substrate bound to the Cu(II) center via bidentate chelation, the bulky *tert*-butyl group of the **L3**•Cu(II) complex shields the top face of the bound substrate (*Si* face) which in turn places the transient oxocarbenium ion below. During the reaction, the metal-bound enol(ate) adds to the *Re* face of the oxocarbenium ion via a pseudo chair-like conformation to provide product **2a** with *S* configuration at the C1' position, consistent with observed stereochemistry. This model also supports the observed relative C1'-C2' *trans* relationship of the products.

A practical advantage of this strategy is the ease of synthetically elaborating these β -keto esters (Scheme 4). Conventional heating in DMF/H₂O provided the decarboxylated product **4** in 77% yield, where methylation of **2a** gave 3,3-disubstituted tetrahydropyran-4-one (2*R*,3*S*)-**7** in excellent yield with 13:1 dr.²³ Exposure of β -ketoesters **2a** or **7** to L-selectride

provided the corresponding tetrahydropyran-4-ol **8** or **9**, while LiAlH_4 reduction of **7** furnished diol **10**.²⁰ Functionalization of the 6-position of the **7** has also been demonstrated. First, cyclic enone **11** was prepared via dehydrogenation using 1 atm of O_2 in the presence of $\text{Pd}(\text{TFA})_2$ in DMSO.²¹ Rh(I)-catalyzed 1,4-addition of phenylboronic acid produced **12**,²² and conjugate addition of an alkyl cuprate provided **13** as the *trans* diastereomers in both reactions.^{20,23} Lastly, a Mukaiyama-Michael addition proceeded to afford **14** with 10:1 diastereomeric ratio.^{23,24} Notably, while many synthetic methods exist for *cis*-2,6-tetrahydropyran structures,²⁵ there are far fewer preparations for *trans*-2,6-tetrahydropyrans.²⁶

To substitute DDQ as a reagent, we investigated complementary oxidation processes to form the oxocarbenium ion. A recent report of photoredox catalysis being used to generate oxocarbenium ions²⁷ inspired us to leverage this approach and trap the oxocarbenium ion with our tethered carbon nucleophile. Gratifyingly, the use of $\text{Sc}(\text{OTf})_3$, $\text{Ir}[\text{dF}(\text{CF}_3)\text{ppy}]_2(\text{dtbbpy})\text{PF}_6$, blue LEDs, and bromochloroform provided access to *rac*-**2a** in 90% yield (Scheme 5). To date, these photoredox conditions are not yet compatible with various chiral ligands to induce enantioselectivity.²⁸

In summary, a chiral Lewis acid-catalyzed intramolecular cross-dehydrogenative coupling of β -ketoesters has been developed. This oxidative process utilizes unfunctionalized starting materials to provide chiral 2-substituted tetrahydropyrans with excellent yields and stereoselectivity. The *in situ* generation of both nucleophilic and electrophilic partners specifically provides new opportunities for enantioselective oxocarbenium ion-driven reactions and CDC processes in general. Investigations in our laboratory towards leveraging this chiral Lewis acid/oxidation system with new substrate classes as well as the use of visible light mediated oxidation in asymmetric transformations are currently underway.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Financial support for this work has been provided by the NCI (R01 CA126827) and the American Cancer Society (Research Scholar award 09-016-01 CDD). RCB acknowledges financial support from the NIGMS (T32GM105538). The authors thank Charlotte Stern (Northwestern) for assistance with X-ray crystallography.

REFERENCES

- (1) (a). Boivin TLB. *Tetrahedron*. 1987; 43:3309–3362.(b) Marmsäter FP, West FG. *Chem. Eur. J.* 2002; 8:4346–4353. [PubMed: 12355522]
- (2) (a). Adams DR, Bhatnagar SP. *Synthesis*. 1977; 1977:661–672.(b) Cloninger MJ, Overman LE. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1999; 121:1092–1093.(c) Jasti R, Vitale J, Rychnovsky SD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2004; 126:9904–9905. [PubMed: 15303848]
- (3) (a). Dossetter AG, Jamison TF, Jacobsen EN. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 1999; 38:2398–2400.(b) Heravi MM, Ahmadi T, Ghavidel M, Heidari B, Hamidi H. *RSC Advances*. 2015; 5:101999–102075.
- (4) (a). Clarke PA, Santos S. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* 2006; 2006:2045–2053.(b) Larrosa I, Romea P, Urpí F. *Tetrahedron*. 2008; 64:2683–2723.

- (5) (a). Nising CF, Brase S. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2008; 37:1218–1228. [PubMed: 18497934] (b) Nising CF, Brase S. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2012; 41:988–999. [PubMed: 21796323]
- (6) (a). Vetica F, Chauhan P, Dochain S, Enders D. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2017; 46:1661–1674. [PubMed: 28262863]
- (7) (a). Betori RC, Miller ER, Scheidt KA. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2017; 359:1131–1137. [PubMed: 29104524] (b) Morris WJ, Custar DW, Scheidt KA. Org. Lett. 2005; 7:1113–1116. [PubMed: 15760152] (c) Wang J, Crane EA, Scheidt KA. Org. Lett. 2011; 13:3086–3089. [PubMed: 21591768]
- (8). Crane EA, Zabawa TP, Farmer RL, Scheidt KA. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:9112–9115.
- (9) (a). Custar DW, Zabawa TP, Hines J, Crews CM, Scheidt KA. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009; 131:12406–12414. [PubMed: 19663512] (b) Custar DW, Zabawa TP, Scheidt KA. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008; 130:804–805. [PubMed: 18161979]
- (10). Tenenbaum JM, Morris WJ, Custar DW, Scheidt KA. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:5892–5895.
- (11) (a). Lee K, Kim H, Hong J. Org. Lett. 2011; 13:2722–2725. [PubMed: 21528873] (b) Lee K, Kim H, Hong J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2012; 51:5735–5738. (c) Han X, Peh G, Floreancig PE. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2013; 2013:1193–1208. (d) Nasir NM, Ermanis K, Clarke PA. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2014; 12:3323–3335. [PubMed: 24744139]
- (12) (a). Li C-J. Acc. Chem. Res. 2009; 42:335–344. [PubMed: 19220064] (b) Yeung CS, Dong VM. Chem. Rev. 2011; 111:1215–1292. [PubMed: 21391561] (c) Girard SA, Knauber T, Li C-J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2014; 53:74–100.
- (13) (a). Yi H, Zhang G, Wang H, Huang Z, Wang J, Singh AK, Lei A. Chem. Rev. 2017; 117:9016–9085. [PubMed: 28639787] (b) Davies HML, Morton D. J. Org. Chem. 2016; 81:343–350. [PubMed: 26769355] (c) Gensch T, Hopkinson MN, Glorius F, Wencel-Delord J. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2016; 45:2900–2936. [PubMed: 27072661] (d) Arockiam PB, Bruneau C, Dixneuf PH. Chem. Rev. 2012; 112:5879–5918. [PubMed: 22934619] (e) Colby DA, Tsai AS, Bergman RG, Ellman JA. Acc. Chem. Res. 2012; 45:814–825. [PubMed: 22148885] (f) Gutekunst WR, Baran PS. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2011; 40:1976–1991. [PubMed: 21298176] (g) Lyons TW, Sanford MS. Chem. Rev. 2010; 110:1147–1169. [PubMed: 20078038]
- (14) (a). Ying B-P, Trogden BG, Kohlman DT, Liang SX, Xu Y-C. Org. Lett. 2004; 6:1523–1526. [PubMed: 15128226] (b) Zhang Y, Li C-J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2006; 45:1949–1952.
- (15) (a). Brizgys GJ, Jung HH, Floreancig PE. Chem. Sci. 2012; 3:438–442. (b) Cui Y, Floreancig PE. Org. Lett. 2012; 14:1720–1723. [PubMed: 22420412] (c) Liu L, Floreancig PE. Org. Lett. 2009; 11:3152–3155. [PubMed: 19552390] (d) Liu L, Floreancig PE. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2010; 49:5894–5897. (e) Tu W, Liu L, Floreancig PE. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2008; 47:4184–4187.
- (16) (a). Guo C, Song J, Luo S-W, Gong L-Z. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2010; 49:5558–5562. (b) Zhang G, Zhang Y, Wang R. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:10429–10432. (c) Zhang J, Tiwari B, Xing C, Chen X, Chi YR. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2012; 51:3649–3652. (d) Tan Y, Yuan W, Gong L, Meggers E. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2015; 54:13045–13048. (e) Sun S, Li C, Floreancig PE, Lou H, Liu L. Org. Lett. 2015; 17:1684–1687. [PubMed: 25781505] (f) Xie Z, Liu X, Liu L. Org. Lett. 2016; 18:2982–2985. [PubMed: 27269737] (g) Xie Z, Zan X, Sun S, Pan X, Liu L. Org. Lett. 2016; 18:3944–3947. [PubMed: 27483043] (h) Yang Q, Zhang L, Ye C, Luo S, Wu L-Z, Tung C-H. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2017; 56:3694–3698.
- (17) (a). Cui Y, Villafane LA, Clausen DJ, Floreancig PE. Tetrahedron. 2013; 69:7618–7626. [PubMed: 23913987] (b) Meng Z, Sun S, Yuan H, Lou H, Liu L. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2014; 53:543–547. (c) Wan M, Sun S, Li Y, Liu L. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2017; 56:5116–5120. (d) Lu R, Li Y, Zhao J, Li J, Wang S, Liu L. Chem. Commun. 2018; doi: 10.1039/C8CC01276H
- (18). CCDC 1817530 (**2h**) contains the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. This data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.
- (19) (a). Evans DA, Johnson JS, Olhava EJ. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000; 122:1635–1649. (b) Evans DA, Scheidt KA, Johnston JN, Willis MC. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2001; 123:4480–4491. [PubMed: 11457234]
- (20). Clarke PA, Sellars PB, Nasir NM. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2015; 13:4743–4750. [PubMed: 25804802]

- (21). Diao T, Stahl SS. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2011; 133:14566–14569. [PubMed: 21851123]
- (22) (a). Kumaraswamy G, Ramakrishna G, Naresh P, Jagadeesh B, Sridhar B. *J. Org. Chem.* 2009; 74:8468–8471. [PubMed: 19817354] (b) Ramnauth J, Poulin O, Bratovanov SS, Rakhit S, Maddaford SP. *Org. Lett.* 2001; 3:2571–2573. [PubMed: 11483063]
- (23) (a). The stereochemistry of the products was determined by NOESY experiments. See Figure S1–S4 for details.
- (24). Chua S-S, Alni A, Jocelyn Chan L-T, Yamane M, Loh T-P. *Tetrahedron.* 2011; 67:5079–5082.
- (25) (a). Carpenter J, Northrup AB, Chung d., Wiener JJM, Kim S-G, MacMillan DWC. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2008; 47:3568–3572. (b) Smith AB, Tomioka T, Risatti CA, Sperry JB, Sfougataki C. *Org. Lett.* 2008; 10:4359–4362. [PubMed: 18754594] (c) Olier C, Kaafarani M, Gastaldi S, Bertrand MP. *Tetrahedron.* 2010; 66:413–445.
- (26) (a). Ferrié L, Reymond S, Capdevielle P, Cossy J. *Org. Lett.* 2007; 9:2461–2464. [PubMed: 17536809] (b) Brazeau J-F, Guilbault A-A, Kochuparampil J, Mochirian P, Guindon Y. *Org. Lett.* 2010; 12:36–39. [PubMed: 20035562]
- (27). Tucker JW, Narayanam JMR, Shah PS, Stephenson CR. *J. Chem. Commun.* 2011; 47:5040–5042.

Figure 1. Stereochemical induction model with **1a**/DDQ intermediate (see Supp. Info. for details)

(a) General Concept of CDC Reactions

- Simple starting materials
- C-H functionalization
- Multiple reaction modes (metals, oxidants, light)

(b) Potential Enantioselective CDC Substrates: **(c) This Work**

Scheme 1.
CDC Processes and Reaction Design

Scheme 2. Ligand Screening for CDC Reactions^a

^aThe reactions were performed with **1a** (0.2 mmol), **L**•Cu(OTf)₂ (10 mol %), DDQ (0.26 mmol), Na₂HPO₄ (0.4 mmol), and MS 4 Å (250 mg) in CH₂Cl₂ (0.04 M). Absolute configuration of **2a** was determined based on X-ray crystal analysis of **2h**.¹⁸ ^bYield of isolated product. ^cDetermined by chiral-phase SFC analysis.

(a) CDC Reaction of Enol Acetate **3**

(b) Intermolecular CDC Reaction

(c) CDC Reaction of α -Methyl- β -Keto Ester **1z**

Scheme 3.
CDC Reaction Extension

Scheme 4. Transformations of 2a

^aConditions: (a) DMF/H₂O, 130 °C, 77% (b) MeI, NaH, 97%, 13:1 dr (c) L-selectride, 64% for **8**, 71% for **9** (d) LiAlH₄, 62% (e) Pd(TFA)₂, O₂, 67% (f) Rh(cod)₂BF₄, PhB(OH)₂, 75%, 20:1 dr (g) *n*Bu₂CuLi, TMSCl, 76%, 20:1 dr (h) **15**, InCl₃, 93%, 10:1 dr

Scheme 5.
Photoredox-Catalyzed CDC Reaction

Table 1.

Substrate Scope of β -Keto Esters 1^a

^aSee Supp. Info. for reaction details. Er determined by chiral-phase SFC analysis. Products **2** were obtained with >20:1 dr (trans/cis).

^bPerformed at -30 °C.