

Nucleophilic Trifluoromethylation of Carbonyl Compounds: Trifluoroacetaldehyde Hydrate as a Trifluoromethyl Source

G. K. Surya Prakash, Zhe Zhang, Fang Wang, Socrates Munoz, and George A Olah

J. Org. Chem., **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/jo400202w • Publication Date (Web): 20 Feb 2013

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on February 23, 2013

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



1
2
3
4 **Nucleophilic Trifluoromethylation of Carbonyl Compounds: Trifluoroacetaldehyde Hydrate**
5
6 **as a Trifluoromethyl Source**
7


8 G. K. Surya Prakash,* Zhe Zhang, Fang Wang, Socrates Munoz, George A. Olah

9
10
11 Loker Hydrocarbon Research Institute, Department of Chemistry, University of Southern

12
13
14 California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1661

15
16 gprakash@usc.edu

17
18
19 **TOC**



49 **Abstract**

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


A feasible nucleophilic trifluoromethylating protocol has been developed using trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate as an atom economical trifluoromethyl source. The reaction was found to be applicable to the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of a broad spectrum of carbonyl compounds with satisfactory yields in general. DFT calculations have been performed to provide mechanistic insight into the present and related reactions employing 2,2,2-trifluoro-1-methoxyethanol and hexafluoroacetone hydrate.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction


Among various synthetic pathways, the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of carbonyl compounds has provided a facile access to α -trifluoromethyl alcohols.¹⁻⁴ Although TMSCF₃ (the Ruppert-Prakash reagent) is a versatile reagent capable of transferring the CF₃ group (Scheme

1
2
3
4 1-a),^{5,6} chemists have also strived for alternative nucleophilic trifluoromethylating reagents
5
6 applicable to various synthetic purposes⁷⁻¹⁰ including direct deprotonation of trifluoromethane.⁴ In
7
8 recent years, a series of nucleophilic trifluoromethylation reactions has been established based on
9
10 the *in situ* formation of transient negatively charged species, which can release trifluoromethyl
11
12 anion (CF_3^-) along with a stable by-product (Scheme 1-b).¹¹ Langlois and others have
13
14 demonstrated the direct trifluoromethylation of various electrophiles using trifluoromethane
15
16 (CF_3H) in DMF via a trifluoromethylated hemiaminal derivative (CF_3^- -DMF adduct
17
18 analogue).¹²⁻¹⁹ Prakash *et al.* utilized phenyl trifluoromethyl sulfone (PhSO_2CF_3) and phenyl
19
20 trifluoromethyl sulfoxide (PhSOCF_3) in nucleophilic trifluoromethylation reactions, which
21
22 allowed the generation of CF_3^- via pentavalent and tetravalent sulfur intermediates, respectively.²⁰
23
24 In line with this work, an alkoxide-induced trifluoromethylation was also reported by Beier and
25
26 coworkers using diethyl trifluoromethylphosphate $[(\text{EtO})_2\text{POCF}_3]$.²¹ Recently, Colby *et al.*
27
28 elegantly showed that hexafluoroacetone hydrate amidinate complex could also be exploited as a
29
30 novel nucleophilic trifluoromethylating reagent.²²⁻²⁴ By releasing thermodynamically stable
31
32 trifluoroacetate anion (CF_3CO_2^-), such a reagent was able to incorporate the CF_3 moiety into
33
34 various electrophiles. On the basis of these reactions, we envisaged that ready available
35
36 trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetal derivatives (**1**) could enable nucleophilic trifluoromethylation by
37
38 expelling formates as leaving groups. Compared with other similar reagents, the advantages of **1**
39
40 lie in not only its high atom economy but also its maximum utilization of the CF_3 motif (Scheme
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Scheme 1. Generation of "CF₃⁻" synthon through the release of neutral or stable species.

Results and Discussion

Our initial effort was focused on the trifluoromethylation of benzaldehyde (PhCHO, **2a**) using 2,2,2-trifluoro-1-methoxyethanol (**1a**) and 2,2,2-trifluoro-1-ethoxyethanol (**1b**). By treating **1a** and **1b** with potassium *tert*-butoxide (*t*-BuOK) in DMF, neither CF₃H nor the desired α -trifluoromethyl alcohol (**3a**) was observed after numerous attempts (Scheme 2). This could be ascribed to the plausible reverse addition of CF₃⁻ to alkyl formates, which could significantly impede the trifluoromethylation of benzaldehyde (Scheme 2, Eq. 1).

Scheme 2. Generation of CF₃⁻ from different trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetal derivatives.

Considering the essential low electrophilicity of formate anion (HCO₂⁻), trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate (**1c**) was adopted in our further investigation to avoid the reverse

CF₃⁻-by-product addition (Scheme 2, Eq. 2). According to ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy, **3a** was obtained in 64% yield by treating **1c** (1.2 equiv.) with 6.0 equiv. of *t*-BuOK in DMF (Table 1, Entries 1-4). Further reaction condition screening was focused on alternative bases, reaction temperatures and the proportion of reagents; however, the yields did not improve (Table 1, Entry 5-11).

Table 1. Reaction condition optimization using **1c [CF₃CH(OH)₂·2H₂O] as a CF₃⁻ precursor.**

entry	solvent	base	T (°C)	hydrate:base:PhCHO	yield (%) ^b
1	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	-30	1.2:3.6:1.0	0 ^b
2	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	-30	1.2:4.8:1.0	33
3	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	-30	1.2:6.0:1.0	64
4	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	-30	1.2:7.2:1.0	21
5 ^d	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	-30	1.2:6.0:1.0	0 ^e
6	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	r.t.	1.2:3.6:1.0	47
7	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOK	r.t.	1.2:4.8:1.0	0
8	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuONa	r.t.	1.2:3.6:1.0	17
9	DMF	<i>t</i> -BuOLi	r.t.	1.2:3.6:1.0	0 ^e
10	DMF	NaH	r.t.	1.2:3.6:1.0	0

^a CF₃CH(OH)₂·2H₂O;

^b ¹⁹F NMR yield was determined using PhCF₃ as an internal standard;

^c Only CF₃H was observed;

^d Base was added dropwise to a solution of hydrate **1c** and **2a** in DMF at -30 °C;

^e **1c** was found to convert to CF₃CO₂K.

Whereas the above mentioned results seemed to be satisfactory, its practicality was largely limited by the requirement of large excess of base. This was presumably due to the fact that commercial **1c** was a dihydrate CF₃CH(OH)₂·2H₂O.²⁵ To remove the excess amount of H₂O, CF₃CH(OH)₂ was treated with various amines expecting the formation of the corresponding salts similar to the hexafluoroacetone hydrate amidinate salts.²⁴ However, no solid complexes could be obtained by these means, probably due to the lower acidity of CF₃CH(OH)₂ compared with (CF₃)₂C(OH)₂. We further exploited 4 Å molecular sieves as a drying agent, which unfortunately absorbed majority of CF₃CH(OH)₂ along with water. After a brief screening, calcium chloride (CaCl₂) was shown to be an efficient drying agent allowing recovery of 95% **1c** with a composition of CF₃CH(OH)₂·½H₂O.²⁶ With such processed **1c** in hand, the required *t*-BuOK:**1c** ratio was reduced from 5:1 to 4:1 (Table 1, Entry 4, Table 2, Entries 4 and 5). The optimal reaction conditions were found by treating **1c** (1.5 equiv.) with *t*-BuOK (6.0 equiv.) in DMF at -50 °C for

30 min, followed by the addition of PhCHO (1.0 equiv.) (Table 2, Entries 5-7). Noticeably, despite the fact that THF and DMSO allowed the release of CF_3^- from **1c**, the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of benzaldehyde did not take place (Table 2, Entries 8 and 9).

Table 2. Reaction condition optimization using **1c [$\text{CF}_3\text{CH}(\text{OH})_2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\text{H}_2\text{O}$] as a CF_3^- precursor.**

entry	solvent	hydrate:base:PhCHO	yield (%) ^b
1	DMF	1.2:4.8:1.0	66
2	DMF	1.2:4.2:1.0	62
3	DMF	1.2:3.6:1.0	64
4	DMF	1.2:3.0:1.0	61
5	DMF	1.5:6.0:1.0	89
6	DMF	1.8:7.2:1.0	77
7	DMF	2.0:8.0:1.0	83
8	THF	2.0:8.0:1.0	0 ^c
9	DMSO	2.0:8.0:1.0	0 ^c

^a $\text{CF}_3\text{CH}(\text{OH})_2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\text{H}_2\text{O}$

^b ^{19}F NMR yield was determined using PhCF_3 as an internal standard.

^c Only CF_3H was observed.

With the optimal reaction conditions, the scope of substrates was investigated. As shown in Table 3, various aldehydes and ketones readily reacted. Aryl aldehydes bearing electron-donating substituents and halides were shown to participate in the reaction to afford products in good to excellent yields (Table 3, Entries 1-5, 8-11, and 13). However, other strong electron-withdrawing moieties, such as NO_2 and CF_3 groups, on the phenyl ring impeded the reaction (Table 3, Entries 6 and 7). In comparison with the significant electronic effects, the steric hindrance of substituents did not play a major role in the reactivity of the substrates (Table 3, Entries 5 and 9-11). As anticipated, the trifluoromethylation reaction with enolizable aldehydes was quite sluggish under such strong basic conditions (Table 3, Entry 14). Similar to aryl aldehydes, various benzophenone derivatives were also found to be reactive (Table 3, Entry 12, 14, 15). Bulky phenyl ketone (**2s**) also reacted to yield the corresponding product in excellent yield (Table 3, Entry 19). Intriguingly, although enolizable acetophenone was not a viable substrate in the present reaction, adamantan-2-one (**2t**) was smoothly trifluoromethylated, due to its low enolizability (Table 3, Entry 20).

Table 3. Nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of carbonyl compounds **2 with trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate **1c** [CF₃CH(OH)₂-½H₂O].**

$$\text{F}_3\text{C}-\text{CH}(\text{OH})_2 \xrightarrow[\text{DMF, -50 }^\circ\text{C}]{t\text{-BuOK}} \text{R}_1\text{R}_2\text{C}(\text{OH})\text{CF}_3$$

$$\text{1c}^{\text{a}} \xrightarrow[\text{DMF, -50 }^\circ\text{C}]{\text{carbonyl compound (2)}} \text{3}$$

entry	Substrates	yield (%) ^b	entry	Substrates	yield (%) ^b
1		89/83	11		77/70
2		65/51	12		0/ ^c
3		64/58	13		65/57
4		64/56	14		0/ ^c
5		48/45	15		0/ ^c
6		0/ ^c	16		>99/90
7		0/ ^c	17		91/80
8		97/94	18		4/45
9		82/72	19		>99/96
10		57/53	20		>99/95

^a CF₃CH(OH)₂-½H₂O;

^b ¹⁹F NMR yield/isolated yield. ¹⁹F NMR yield was determined using PhCF₃ as an internal standard.


^c Not isolated.

^d ¹⁹F NMR yield not determined due to significant ¹⁹F NMR signal line broadening.

To elucidate mechanistic aspects of the reaction, theoretical calculations were performed at the B3LYP/6-31+G(d,p) level in DMF^{27,28} using Gaussian 09 package.^{29,30} As shown in Scheme 3, trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate **1c** preferentially underwent deprotonation in the presence of *t*-BuOK. Although further deprotonated intermediate **1c-K2** was slightly higher in energy by +0.7 kcal/mol, ca. 60% of **1c-K** could still be deprotonated with 4 eq. of *t*-BuOK under the reaction

conditions (Scheme 3, Eq. 2). It has also been found that salts **1c-K** and **1c-K₂** were thermodynamically unstable species tending to expel CF₃⁻. Since these processes involve a Gibbs free energy change of approximately -30 kcal/mol, the reversible addition of CF₃⁻ to HCO₂K was rather unlikely to occur (Scheme 3, Eq. 4 and 5). In contrast, the products **3a-K** and *t*-BuOH were found to be more stable than the corresponding starting materials (**2a**, *t*-BuOK, and benzaldehyde) by -1.7 kcal/mol (Scheme 3, Eq. 6). This has not only provided a theoretical support for the success in isolating **3a**, but also agreed with the observed essential stability of **3a** in the presence of *t*-BuOK in DMF. Overall, the Gibbs energy change was calculated to be downhill by -52.2 kcal/mol, which is mainly due to the highly exothermic deprotonation and degradation processes (Scheme 3, Eq. 7). Noticeably, the analogous hydride transfer by releasing trifluoroacetate was also found to be an exothermic reaction, which was however slightly less thermodynamically favorable (Table 1, Entry 9 and Scheme 3, Eq. 8).


Scheme 3. Calculated thermodynamics of the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation reaction using **1c and the related reactions.**



We further explored transition states to achieve a continuous reaction pathway from **1c** to **3a-K** (Figure 1). As mentioned above, both **1c-K** and **1c-K₂** could irreversibly degrade to release

CF₃H and HCO₂K. However, such fragmentation was more likely to proceed via **1c-K2** intermediate due to the significantly lower barrier involving **TS2** than **TS1** (+6.5 kcal/mol v.s. +21.0 kcal/mol). Whereas **TS2'** was also located on the reaction pathway suggesting the possible hydride transfer and trifluoroacetate formation, it was substantially unfavorable compared with **TS2**. This is in good agreement with the fact that the trifluoromethyl transfer predominated in the present reaction. The calculation of analogous transition states involving lithium counteractions also showed that the C-CF₃ bond cleavage is kinetically preferred over hydride transfer by 9.1 kcal/mol (see SI), which rationalizes the observed trifluoroacetate formation (Table 1, Entry 9). Presumably, the nucleophilic addition involved the deprotonation of CF₃H by *t*-BuOK, which was predicted to have a small barrier of +9.3 kcal/mol. In spite of the endothermic deprotonation by +5.6 kcal/mol, the forward nucleophilic addition was both thermodynamically favored and kinetically facile due to a rather small activation barrier of +19.4 kcal/mol (compared with CF₃H). Apparently, both of these two factors facilitated the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation under the present reaction conditions.


Figure 1. Calculated reaction coordinate from **1c** to **3a-K**.



In addition to the above mentioned studies, we also performed theoretical calculations to explore the mechanism of nucleophilic trifluoromethylations using trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetal (**1a**) and hexafluoroacetone hydrate (**5**). As show in Figure 2-A, although the deprotonation of **1a** was thermodynamically feasible, the exothermicity of the subsequent CF₃

release was rather insignificant (-2.9 kcal/mol), indicating a facile reverse addition of “CF₃” to methyl formate. This is indeed consistent with the observed low ability of trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetals to release the “CF₃” anion. Moreover, the formations of trifluoroacetaldehyde (via methoxide release) and methyl trifluoromethylacetate (via hydride release) were found to be highly endothermic, suggesting that the low reactivity of **1a** was mainly due to the reversibility of the “CF₃” release. Kinetically, the barrier to the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of benzaldehyde was found to be fairly similar to nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of methyl formate (+21.5 kcal/mol versus +19.4 kcal/mol). Considering the overall Gibbs energy change from **1a-K** to **3a-K** was -4.6 kcal/mol, the interconversion between these two species was essentially reversible (Figure 2-C).

Figure 2. Calculated reaction coordinate of nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of aldehyde using trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetal (1a**) and hexafluoroacetone hydrate (**5**).**



As shown in Figure 2-B, both the first and the second deprotonations of hexafluoroacetone hydrate (**5**) were highly exothermic due to the presence of geminal CF₃ groups. Although the release of the “CF₃” anion were thermodynamically downhill from both deprotonated products (**5-K** and **5-K₂**), a significantly higher kinetic barrier was found during the course of CF₃ release from **5-K** (+24.6 kcal/mol versus +5.6 kcal/mol). This resembled the CF₃ release coordinate of **1c**, therefore implying that the primary kinetic driving force for CF₃ release was the formation of the highly ionic dipotassium salts **1c-K₂** and **5-K₂**. In contrast, **1a** could only form a monopotassium-containing species **1a-K**, which thus retarded to expel CF₃⁻. Noticeably, the nucleophilic trifluoromethylation using **5** was calculated to be thermodynamically more favorable than that using **1c** by ca. 13 kcal/mol. This was presumably due to the generation of by-product CF₃CO₂K, whose conjugate acid is more acidic than formic acid. Since both reactions involving **1c-K₂** and **5-K₂** were highly exothermic processes, the substantially irreversible nature of these two reactions was not altered by such relatively small difference in Gibbs free energy release.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have developed a novel nucleophilic trifluoromethylation of carbonyl compounds using trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate **1c** as a CF₃⁻ precursor. The utilization of readily available trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate has not only provided a facile synthetic access towards α -trifluoromethyl alcohols, but also allowed maximum utilization of the CF₃ moiety in the precursor (compared with hexafluoroacetone hydrate). Theoretical calculations have suggested that both trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate deprotonation and subsequent CF₃ release from potassium salt **1c-K₂** were highly exothermic processes. These two steps contributed ca. +50 kcal/mol Gibbs free energy release as the actual driving force for the reaction. Further theoretical calculations of nucleophilic trifluoromethylations using trifluoroacetaldehyde hemiacetal **1a** and hexafluoroacetone hydrate **5** provided mechanistic rationalizations of their different reactivity from trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate **1c**.

Experimental Section

General Methods. Unless otherwise mentioned, all the chemicals were purchased from commercial sources and used without further purification. Preparative thin layer chromatography

1
2
3 or flash column chromatography were performed to isolate products with suitable eluent. ^1H , ^{13}C ,
4 and ^{19}F spectra were recorded on 400 MHz or 500 MHz NMR spectrometers. ^1H NMR chemical
5 shifts were determined relative to CDCl_3 as the internal standard at δ 7.26 ppm. ^{13}C NMR shifts
6 were determined relative to CDCl_3 at δ 77.16 ppm. ^{19}F NMR chemical shifts were determined
7 relative to CFCl_3 at δ 0.00 ppm. Mass spectra were recorded on a high resolution mass
8 spectrometer, in the EI, FAB or ESI modes.

9
10
11
12
13
14 **Typical Procedure for Removal of Excess Water from Commercial**
15 **Trifluoroacetaldehyde Hydrate 1c.** Commercial trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate **1c** (5.00 g, 32.9
16 mmol) in 100 mL anhydrous Et_2O was added CaCl_2 (1.21 g, 11.0 mmol) in small portions with
17 vigorous stirring. The mixture was stirred for 2 h and quickly subjected to suction filtration under
18 air. The solvent of the filtrate was removed under reduced pressure to give partially dried product
19 (4.11 g). The concentration of CF_3CHO in this sample was determined by ^{19}F NMR spectrum with
20 PhCF_3 as an internal standard, which indicated a formula of $\text{CF}_3\text{CH}(\text{OH})_2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and > 95% yield.
21 The newly prepared trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate was transferred into a tightly sealed vial and
22 stored in a glove box.
23

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 **Typical Procedure for Nucleophilic Trifluoromethylation of Carbonyl Compounds.** To a
32 stirred solution of trifluoroacetaldehyde hydrate (**1c**, 1.5 mmol) in DMF (1.0 mL) at -50 °C, a
33 solution of *t*-BuOK (673 mg, 6.0 mmol) in DMF (3.0 mL) was added dropwise over 5 min. The
34 reaction was stirred for 30 min while maintaining the temperature at -50 °C. A solution of
35 carbonyl compounds (**2**, 1.0 mmol) in DMF (1.0 mL) was then added into the reaction mixture at
36 -50 °C and stirred for 1 h. The reaction mixture was allowed to gradually warm up to room
37 temperature before quenching with water. The resulting mixture was extracted with diethyl ether
38 (3 \times 10 mL). The combined organic phase was then washed with saturated NH_4Cl aqueous solution,
39 water, and dried over Na_2SO_4 . The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue
40 was purified with silica gel flash chromatography using pentane-diethyl ether as eluent.
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 *1-Phenyl-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3a)*.²⁰ Colorless oil (146 mg, 83%). ^1H NMR (400 MHz,
53 CDCl_3) δ 7.55-7.37 (m, 5H), 5.00 (q, J = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 2.78 (br, 1H). ^{19}F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl_3)
54 δ -78.9 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3F).

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

50 *1-(4-Fluorophenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3b)*.³¹ Colorless oil (99 mg, 51%). ^1H NMR (400
51 MHz, CDCl_3) δ 7.48-7.44 (m, 2H), 7.15-7.05 (m, 2H), 5.01 (q, J = 6.6 Hz, 1H), 2.74 (br, 1H). ^{19}F

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -79.2 (d, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 3F), -112.4 (m, 1F).

1-(4-Chlorophenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3c).^{20,32} Colorless oil (122 mg, 58%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.48-7.33 (m, 4H), 5.01 (q, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (br, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -79.0 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 3F).

1-(4-Bromophenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3d).³³ Colorless oil (143 mg, 56%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.57-7.53 (m, 2H), 7.36-7.33 (m, 2H), 4.98 (dq, *J* = 4.3, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 2.83 (d, *J* = 4.3 Hz, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -79.0 (d, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 3F).

1-(4-Methylphenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3e).³³ Colorless oil (86 mg, 45%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.36 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 7.23 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 4.98 (q, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 2.56 (br, 1H), 2.38 (s, 3H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.9 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3F).

1-(4-Dimethylaminophenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3h).²⁴ Reddish solid (206 mg, 94%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.31 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 6.73 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 2H), 4.88 (q, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 2.97 (s, 6H), 2.66 (br, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.9 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3F).

1-(3-Methylphenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3i).⁴ Colorless oil (137 mg, 72%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.34-7.18 (m, 4H), 4.96 (q, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 2.68 (br, 1H), 2.39 (s, 3H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.8 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3F).

1-(2-Methylphenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3j).³⁴ Colorless oil (101 mg, 53%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.66-7.56 (m, 1H), 7.34-7.19 (m, 3H), 5.31 (dq, *J* = 6.6, 4.3 Hz, 1H), 2.67 (d, *J* = 4.5 Hz, 1H), 2.39 (s, 3H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.2 (d, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 3F).

1-(2,4,6-Trimethoxyphenyl)-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (3k). White solid (186 mg, 70%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 6.17 (d, *J* = 11.6 Hz, 2H), 5.44 (dq, *J* = 11.8, 7.8 Hz, 1H), 4.86 (d, *J* = 11.8 Hz, 1H), 3.83 (s, 6H), 3.80 (s, 3H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.6 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 3F). ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.1, 159.8, 125.3 (q, *J* = 284.4 Hz), 103.0, 91.4, 67.1 (q, *J* = 33.4 Hz), 56.1, 55.5. HRMS (EI-TOF): exact mass calcd for C₁₁H₁₃O₄F₃ [M⁺]: 266.0760, Found : 266.0770.

2,2,2-Trifluoro-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)ethanol (3m).²⁰ White solid (129 mg, 57%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.84 (d, *J* = 0.5 Hz, 1H), 7.81-7.73 (m, 3H), 7.49-7.40 (m, 3H), 5.06 (dq, *J* = 6.7, 4.2 Hz, 1H), 2.76 (d, *J* = 4.2 Hz, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -78.6 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3F).

2,2,2-Trifluoro-1,1-diphenylethanol (3p).²⁰ Colorless oil (227 mg, 90%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 7.58-7.53 (m, 4H), 7.43-7.37 (m, 6H), 3.06 (br, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -74.3 (s, 3F).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2,2,2-Trifluoro-1,1-bis(4-methoxyphenyl)ethanol (3q).²⁴ Colorless oil (250 mg, 80%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ. 7.41 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 4H), 6.89-6.85 (m, 4H), 3.80 (s, 6H), 3.03 (br, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -75.1 (s, 3F).

2,2,2-trifluoro-1-(4-nitrophenyl)-1-phenylethanol (3r).²⁰ Colorless oil (134 mg, 45%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ. 8.17 (t, *J* = 11.5 Hz, 2H), 7.68 (dd, *J* = 17.5, 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.54-7.51 (m, 2H), 7.4527.35 (m, 3H), 3.26 (s, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -74.7 (s, 3F).

1-Adamantan-1-yl-2,2,2-trifluoro-1-phenylethanol (3s). White solid (298 mg, 96%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ. 7.74-7.30 (m, 5H), 2.52 (s, 1H), 2.02 (s, 3H), 1.76 (dd, *J* = 49.5, 12.2 Hz, 6H), 1.61 (dd, *J* = 38.1, 12.2 Hz, 6H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -66.8 (s, 3F). ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 136.2, 128.1, 127.1 (q, *J* = 290.1 Hz), 127.9 (br), 127.3 (br), 127.2 (br), 82.4 (q, *J* = 25.4 Hz), 39.8, 36.71, 36.68, 28.5. HRMS (EI-TOF): exact mass calcd for C₁₈H₁₉F₃ [M-H₂O]⁺: 292.1433, Found : 292.1439.

2-(Trifluoromethyl)adamantan-2-ol (3t).²⁰ White solid (209 mg, 95%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ. 2.29-2.21 (m, 2H), 2.14-2.04 (m, 4H), 1.90 (s, 1H), 1.89-1.80 (m, 2H), 1.80-1.70 (m, 4H), 1.64-1.54 (m, 2H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, CDCl₃) δ -75.7 (s, 3F).

Theoretical Calculations. Theoretical calculations were performed at the B3LYP/6-31+G(d,p) level in DMF using Gaussian 09 package.^{29,30} Solvent effects were included implicitly through the self-consistent reaction field approach, as implemented in the default Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM) in Gaussian 09.^{27,28} Thermal and entropic corrections for PCM-optimized structures were obtained by frequency analysis at the B3LYP/6-31+G(d,p) level. The frequency analyses confirmed that all considered ground state structures were true minima on the PES. All transition states were also identified and validated using vibrational frequency analysis.

Associated Content

Supporting Information

¹⁹F and ¹H NMR spectra for all compounds. ¹³C NMR spectra and HRMS for new compounds: **3k** and **3s**. Details of theoretical calculations are included. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

Author Information**Corresponding Author**

(G. K. Surya Prakash) Tel: +1-213-740-5984. E-mail: gprakash@usc.edu.

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Acknowledgment

Support of our work by the Loker Hydrocarbon Research Institute is gratefully acknowledged. We appreciate grants from the NSF (DBI-0821671, CHE-0840366) and NIH (S10 RR25432) to support NMR spectrometers. The computational studies were supported by the University of Southern California Center for High-Performance Computing and Communications. Mr. J.-P. Jones is gratefully acknowledged for providing additional computational resources.

References

- (1) Uneyama, K. *Organofluorine Chemistry*, Blackwell Publish, Oxford, **2006**.
- (2) The applications of organofluorine compounds have been thoroughly summarized, Kirsch, P. *Modern Fluoroorganic Chemistry: Synthesis, Reactivity, Applications*, Wiley-VCH, **2004**.
- (3) Prakash, G. K. S.; Wang, F. *Flourishing Frontiers in Organofluorine Chemistry*, in *Organic Chemistry-Breakthroughs and Perspectives* (eds K. Ding and L.-X. Dai), Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, Germany, pp. 413-473, **2012**.
- (4) Prakash, G. K. S.; Jog, P. V.; Batamack, P. T. D.; Olah, G. A. *Science* **2012**, 338, 1324-1327.
- (5) Prakash, G. K. S.; Krishnamurti, R.; Olah, G. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, 111, 393-395.
- (6) Prakash, G. K. S.; Mandal, M. J. *Fluorine Chem.* **2001**, 112, 123-131.
- (7) Ait-Mohand, S.; Takechi, N.; Medebielle, M.; Dolbier Jr. W. R. *Org. Lett.* **2001**, 3, 4271-4273.
- (8) Takechi, N.; Ait-Mohand, S.; Medebielle, M.; Dolbier Jr. W. R. *Org. Lett.* **2002**, 4, 4671-4672.
- (9) Xu, W.; Dolbier Jr. W. R. *J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, 70, 4741-4745.
- (10) Zhao, Y.; Zhu, J.; Ni, C.; Hu, J. *Synthesis* **2010**, 1899-1904.
- (11) The mechanism of these reactions is also conceptually similar to the trifluoromethylation using TMSCF₃, which is achieved via *in situ* formation of metastable pentavalent silicon intermediates.
- (12) Shono, T.; Ishifume, M.; Okada, T.; Kashimura S. *J. Org. Chem.* **1991**, 56, 2-4.
- (13) Barhdadi, R.; Troupel, M.; Perichon, J. *Chem. Commun.* **1998**, 12, 1251-1252.
- (14) Folleas, B.; Marek, I.; Normant, J.-F.; Saint-Jalmes, L. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1998**, 39, 2973-2976.
- (15) Folleas, B.; Marek, I.; Normant, J.-F.; Saint-Jalmes, L. *Tetrahedron* **2000**, 56, 275-283.

- 1
2
3 (16) Russell, J.; Roques, N. *Tetrahedron* **1998**, *54*, 13771-13782.
4 (17) Large, S.; Roques, N.; Langlois, B. R. *J. Org. Chem.* **2000**, *65*, 8848-8856.
5 (18) Roques, N.; Mispelaere, C. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1999**, *40*, 6411-6414.
6 (19) Billard, T. B.; Langlois, B. R. *Org. Lett.* **2000**, *2*, 2101-2103.
7 (20) Prakash, G. K. S.; Hu, J.; Olah, G. A. *Org. Lett.* **2003**, *5*, 3253-3256.
8 (21) Cherkupally, P.; Beier, P. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2010**, *51*, 252-255.
9 (22) Han, C.; Kim, E. H.; Colby, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 5802-5805.
10 (23) Han, C.; Kim, E. H.; Colby, D. A. *Synlett* **2011**, *23*, 1559-1563.
11 (24) Riofski, M. V.; Hart, A. D.; Colby, D. A. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*, 208-211.
12 (25) The formula of **1c** was determined via ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy by mixing **1c** (of a given mass,
13 generally ca. 100 mg) with PhCF₃ (20 μL, 0.163 mmol, an internal standard) in 0.5 mL
14 CD₃OD.
15 (26) The procedure was modified based on a known method. Junji, N.; Shozo, K.; Yoshifumi, Y.;
16 Yoshikazu, S.; Yukio, H.; Yuzuru, M. *Brit. UK Pat. Appl.* **1993**, GB 2260322 A 19930414.
17 (27) Solvent effects were included implicitly through the self-consistent reaction field approach,
18 as implemented in the default Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM) in Gaussian 09. Miertuš,
19 S.; Scrocco, E.; Tomasi, J. *Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *55*, 117-129.
20 (28) Scalmani, G.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *132*, 114110-114115.
21 (29) Gaussian 09, Revision **A.1**, Frisch, M. J. *et al.* Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2009. See
22 Supporting Information for the complete citation.
23 (30) Thermal and entropic corrections for PCM-optimized structures were obtained by frequency
24 analysis at the B3LYP/6-31+G(d,p) level. The frequency analyses also confirmed that all
25 considered structures were true minima on the PES.
26 (31) Tordeux, M.; Francese, C.; Wakselman, C.; *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1* **1990**, 1951-1957.
27 (32) Matsuda, T.; Harada, T.; Nakajima, N.; Itoh, T.; Nakamura, K. *J. Org. Chem.* **2000**, *65*,
28 157-163.
29 (33) Motherwell, W. M.; Storey, L. J. *Synlett* **2002**, *4*, 646-648.
30 (34) Chang, Y.; Cai, C. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2005**, *46*, 3161-3164
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60