

Published on Web 01/06/2007

## Iridium(I)-Catalyzed Regio- and Enantioselective Decarboxylative Allylic Amidation of Substituted Allyl Benzyl Imidodicarbonates

Om V. Singh and Hyunsoo Han\*

Department of Chemistry, The University of Texas at San Antonio, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, Texas 78249-0698

Received November 10, 2006; E-mail: hyunsoo.han@utsa.edu

Transition-metal-catalyzed stereoselective allylic substitution has provided an important and convenient tool for carbon-carbon and carbon-heteroatom bond formation in organic synthesis1 and is still evolving to include more diverse allylic electrophiles, nucleophiles, and catalysts. Of particular interest is the recent development of transition-metal-catalyzed decarboxylative allylic substitution reactions.<sup>2</sup> Ru and, particularly, Pd metals have been employed, and synthetically useful levels of regio- and enantioselectivities have been achieved in the decarboxylative allylation reaction of allyl  $\beta$ -ketoacetate derivatives (X = -CH<sub>2</sub>- in eq 1). However, given the well-known fact that carbamic acids can undergo facile decarboxylation, it is rather surprising that the analogous decarboxylative allylic amidation (X = -NH- in eq 1) has never been realized. To the best of our knowledge, there has been only one report for the decarboxylative carbon-nitrogen bond formation, where Tunge et al. described Pd-catalyzed decarboxylative allylic amination, albeit reaction stereochemistry was not an issue.<sup>3</sup> Herein, we describe the first iridium(I)-catalyzed highly regio- and enantioselective decarboxylative allylic amidation reaction of substituted allyl benzyl imidodicarbonates (X = -NH- in eq 1).

$$R \xrightarrow{O} X \xrightarrow{R'} R' \xrightarrow{TM \text{ catalyst}} X \xrightarrow{R'} R' + R' \xrightarrow{X} X$$

$$X = -CH_{2-} \text{ or } -NH_{2-}$$

$$X = -CH_{2-} \text{ or } -NH_{2-}$$

$$(1)$$

Literature analysis on regio- and enantioselective allylic amination<sup>4–7</sup> revealed that reaction conditions involving [Ir(COD)-Cl]2, a phosphoramidite ligand such as L1-L3, and THF solvent could be a good starting point for the decarboxylative allylic amidation, and a base was required to generate the active catalyst.8 This led us to examine the effectiveness of various tertiary amines like TEA, DIPEA, DMAP, DABCO, DBU, and DBN in the decarboxylative allylic amidation reaction of 2-pentenyl benzyl imidodicarbonate (1a) by [Ir(COD)Cl]<sub>2</sub> and chiral phosphoramidite L3 in THF. As shown in entries 1 and 2 of Table 1, respectively, only with DBN and DBU the reaction proceeded to give the decarboxylative allylation products 2a and 3a in a good yield and with an excellent regioselectivity, while the other amines either failed to react or gave only a trace amount of products (<5%). DBU was further investigated, and 1 equiv of DBU was found to be optimal in terms of both reaction time and regioselectivity (entries 2-5 in Table 1). Next, the effects of different ligands (L1, L2, and L3) and solvents (THF, Et<sub>2</sub>O, EtOH, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, and DMF) were studied, and a combination of L3 and THF resulted in the fastest reaction and highest regionelectivity (entries 2 and 6-9).

As an initial attempt to validate the generality of the found reaction conditions, cinnamyl benzyl imidodicarbonate (**1b**) was tested, but disappointingly branched product **2b** was obtained only in 20% yield after 24 h (entry 10 of Table 1). Therefore, we sought additives to improve reaction time and yield. The addition of metal

**Table 1.** Decarboxylative Allylic Amidation of 2-Pentenyl- and Cinnamyl Benzyl Imidodicarbonates<sup>a</sup>

| entry | substrate | base(s)<br>(mol %) | solvent     | ligand | conversion <sup>b</sup> (%), reacn time (h) | <b>2/3</b> <sup>b</sup> | ee of <b>2</b><br>(%) |
|-------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|--------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1     | 1a        | DBN (100)          | THF         | L3     | 100, 1                                      | 98:02                   |                       |
| 2     | 1a        | DBU (100)          | THF         | L3     | 100, 1                                      | 98:02                   |                       |
| 3     | 1a        | DBU (10)           | THF         | L3     | 100, 1                                      | 95:05                   |                       |
| 4     | 1a        | DBU (50)           | THF         | L3     | 100, 1                                      | 96:04                   |                       |
| 5     | 1a        | DBU (500)          | THF         | L3     | 100, 2                                      | 95:05                   |                       |
| 6     | 1a        | DBU (100)          | THF         | L1     | 98, 16                                      | 93:07                   |                       |
| 7     | 1a        | DBU (100)          | THF         | L2     | 100, 1                                      | 95:05                   |                       |
| 8     | 1a        | DBU (100)          | $Et_2O$     | L3     | 98, 24                                      | 94:06                   |                       |
| 9     | 1a        | DBU (100)          | <b>EtOH</b> | L3     | 94, 24                                      | 89:11                   |                       |
| 10    | 1b        | DBU (100)          | THF         | L3     | <20, 24                                     | ND                      |                       |
| 11    | 1b        | DBU (100)          | THF         | L3     | 100, 1                                      | >99:1                   | >99                   |
|       |           | PS (100)           |             |        |   |                         |                       |

 $^a$  0.2 mmol scale with [Ir(COD)Cl] $_2$  (2 mol %) and L (4 mol %) in THF (0.5 mL) at room temperature.  $^b$  Based upon  $^1{\rm H}$  NMR of the crude reaction mixture.

salts (LiCl, LiBr, CuI, ZnBr<sub>2</sub>, etc.) did not help.<sup>9</sup> However, surprisingly, proton sponge (PS) increased the reaction rate by >100-fold, and excellent regio- and enantioselectivities were obtained (entry 11). Both DBU and PS were found to be necessary for the reaction, since the reaction did not proceed to completion in the absence of either.

The scope of the iridium(I)-catalyzed regio- and enantioselective decarboxylative allylic amidation was examined with a variety of substituted allyl benzyl imidodicarbonates, and the results were shown in Table 2. The decarboxylative allylic amidation appears to be quite general accommodating a wide range of substituents such as linear and branched alkyl (entries 1–4), conjugated alkenyl (entry 5), aryl (entry 6), heteroaryl (entry 7), heteroatom-functionalized alkyl (entries 8 and 9), and isolated alkenyl groups (entries 10 and 11). For the sterically more hindered (entries 3 and 4) and/or slow substrate (entry 9), higher catalyst load (4 mol %) and temperature (55 °C) were necessary to ensure good reaction yields as well as high regio- and enantioselectivities.

To probe the reaction mechanism, a crossover experiment was conducted with a 1:1 mixture of **4** and **5** to determine the intra- vs intermolecular nature of the reaction. Crossover products **7** and **8** formed along with usual products **6** and **9** in almost equal amounts (eq 2). This result is more consistent with the reaction mechanisms involving the  $Ir-\pi$ -allylic intermediate over intramolecular [3,3]-rearrangement (eq 3). Combined with the fact that the stereochemical outcome of the allylic amidation is the same as that of the allylic amination by  $\mathbf{L}$ ,  $^{6,7}$  the results of the crossover experiment further suggest that the actual nucleophile in the reaction may be

**Table 2.** Ir-Catalyzed Enantioselective Decarboxylative Allylic Amidation of Substituted Allylic Benzyl Imidodicarbonates

| Entry | Substrate (R-)   | Reaction condition <sup>a</sup> | Time (h) | Yield (%) | <sup>b</sup> <b>b/l</b> <sup>c</sup> | ee of <b>b</b><br>(%) <sup>d</sup> |
|-------|--|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1     |  | A                               | 1        | 92        | 98:02                                | 94                                 |
| 2     | - Arr  | A                               | 2        | 90        | 97:03                                | 96                                 |
| 3     | Port.  | В                               | 1        | 85        | 90:10                                | 96                                 |
| 4     | Contract Con | В                               | 1        | 85        | 98:02                                | 96                                 |
| 5     | - Court  | A                               | 3        | 80        | 98:02                                | 92                                 |
| 6     | C Profes   | A                               | 1        | 90        | >99:01                               | >99                                |
| 7     |  | A                               | 3        | 70        | 97:03                                | 94                                 |
| 8     | TBDPSO ()3   | A                               | 12       | 80        | 98:02                                | 98                                 |
| 9     | TBDPSO ()4   | В                               | 1        | 78        | 98:02                                | 99                                 |
| 10    | $\left\langle \cdot \right\rangle_{r}^{2}$   | A                               | 3        | 86        | 96:04                                | 96                                 |
| 11    | $\left\langle \cdot \right\rangle_{r}^{3}$   | A                               | 3        | 85        | 95:05                                | 95                                 |

<sup>a</sup> Reaction condition A: substrate (0.2 mmol), [Ir(COD)Cl]<sub>2</sub> (2 mol %), L3 (4 mol %), DBU (1 equiv), PS (1 equiv), THF (0.5 mL) at room temperature. Reaction condition B: same as the condition A except [Ir(COD)Cl]<sub>2</sub> (4 mol %) and L3 (8 mol %) at 55 °C. <sup>b</sup> Isolated yield of b and I. ° Ratio of regioisomers determined by ¹H NMR of the crude reaction mixture. <sup>d</sup> Enantiomeric excess determined by chiral HPLC.

completely liberated from the  $Ir-\pi$ -allylic complex and then attack the complex anti to iridium.

To shed light on the nature of the actual nucleophile and/or timing of decarboxylation (**I** vs **II** in eq 3), ethyl cinnamyl carbonate was treated with benzyl carbamate anion (generated in situ from benzyl carbamate and n-BuLi at 0 °C) under the reaction conditions. No product was observed even in trace, and all starting materials were recovered. Hence, it might be unlikely that the benzyl carbamate anion acts as the actual nucleophile to the  $Ir-\pi$ -allylic complex (**II** in eq 3). Rather, the carboxylate anion (after proton shift from the nitrogen to the oxygen), which is generated from the oxidative addition of the substrate to the Ir catalyst, attacks the  $Ir-\pi$ -allylic complex (**I** in eq 3) and decarboxylation occurs later in the reaction sequence. This is in sharp contrast to the decarboxylation takes place prior to the attack of a nucleophile to the  $\pi$ -allyl complex.  $^{2c}$ 

To demonstrate the synthetic utility of Cbz-protected chiral allylic amines generated and to establish absolute stereochemistry at the allylic carbon, compounds 10 and 13 were converted to 12 and 14,

## Scheme 1

respectively; analytical data of which matched with those of the corresponding known compounds (Scheme 1). Compound 10 was N-alkylated by KH and allyl bromide to give diene 11, which upon ring closing metathesis (RCM) by Grubbs second generation catalyst  $^{10}$  transformed to 12. $^{11}$  The intramolecular amidomercuration reaction of 13 with Hg(TFA) $_2$  in nitromethane afforded 14, which was previously used as a synthetic precursor for the stereoselective synthesis of (+)-isosolenopsin A. $^{12}$ 

In conclusion, we have successfully developed the iridium(I)-catalyzed highly regio- and enantioselective decarboxylative allylic amidation reaction, which is quite general and proceeds under mild reaction conditions. This, combined with the synthetic utility of optically pure Cbz-protected allylic amines, should make the developed decarboxylative allylic amidation of particular value in organic synthesis.

**Acknowledgment.** Financial support from National Institute of Health (Grant GM 08194) and The Welch Foundation (Grant AX-1534) is gratefully acknowledged. We are also thankful to Professor A. Alexakis and Dr. K. Ditrich for the generous gift of ligand **L3** sample and a chiral amine for the synthesis of ligand **L3**, respectively.

**Supporting Information Available:** Experimental procedures, spectroscopic data for new compounds, and their hard copies. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

## References

- (1) (a) Trost, B. M.; Crawley, M. L. Chem. Rev. 2003, 103, 2921. (b) Trost, B. M. J. Org. Chem. 2004, 69, 5813.
- (2) For the initial works: (a) Tsuda, T.; Chujo, Y.; Nishi, S.-I.; Tawara, K.; Saegusa, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 6381. (b) Shimizu, I.; Yamada, T.; Tsuji, J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1980, 21, 3199. For recent reviews: (c) Tunge, J. A.; Burger, E. C. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2005, 1715. (d) Tsuji, J. Proc. Jpn. Acad., Ser. B 2004, 80, 349. (e) You, S.-L.; Dai, L.-X. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2006, 45, 5246. For more recent articles: (f) Patil, N. T.; Huo, Z.; Yamamoto, Y. J. Org. Chem. 2006, 71, 6991. (g) Waetzig, S. R.; Rayabarapu, D. K.; Weaver, J. D.; Tunge, J. A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2006, 45, 4977. (h) Burger, E. C.; Tunge, J. A. Chem. Commun. 2005, 2835. (i) Mohr, J. T.; Behenna, D. C.; Harned, A. M.; Stoltz, B. M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2005, 44, 6924.
- Mellegaard-Waetzig, S. R.; Rayabarapu, D. K.; Tunge, J. A. Synlett 2005, 2759.
- (4) For a good review on Ir(I) chemistry: Takeuchi, R.; Kezuka, S. Synthesis 2006, 3349.
- (5) (a) Ohmura, T.; Hartwig, J. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 15164. (b) Leitner, A.; Shekhar. S.; Pouy, M. J.; Hartwig, J. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 15506. (c) Leitner, A.; Shu, C.; Hartwig, J. F. Org. Lett. 2005, 7 1093
- (6) (a) Tissot-Croset, K.; Polet, D.; Alexakis, A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2004, 43, 2426. (b) Polet, D.; Alexakis, A.; Tissot-Croset, K.; Corminboeuf, C.; Ditrich, K. Chem.—Eur. J. 2006, 12, 3596.
- (7) (a) Welter, C.; Koch, O.; Lipowsky, G.; Helmchen, G. Chem. Commun. 2004, 896. (b) Welter, C.; Dahnz, A.; Brunner, B.; Streiff, S.; Duebon, P.; Helmchen, G. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 1239.
- P.; Helmchen, G. *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 1239. (8) Kiener, C. A.; Shu, C.; Incarvito, C.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 14272.
- (9) (a) Shu, C.; Hartwig, J. F. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2004, 43, 4794.
   (b) Evans, P. A.; Leahy, D. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 7882.
   (c) Kim, H.; Lee, C. Org. Lett. 2002, 4, 4369.
   (d) Fagnou, K.; Lautens, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 26.
- (10) Grubbs, R. H.; Chang, S. Tetrahedron 1998, 54, 4413.
- (11) Hunt, J. C. A.; Laurent, P.; Moody, C. J. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1 2002, 2378.
- (12) Singh, O. V.; Han, H. Org. Lett. 2004, 6, 3067.

JA067966G