Tetrahedron Letters 53 (2012) 1855-1858

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

Tetrahedron Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tetlet

Michael addition kinetics of ethyl acetoacetate and 2-ethylhexyl acrylate in ionic liquids

Brandy N. Bradford, Kevin M. Miller*

Department of Chemistry, Murray State University, Murray, KY 42071-3300, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 14 December 2011 Revised 30 January 2012 Accepted 1 February 2012 Available online 9 February 2012

Keywords: Ionic liquid Michael addition Imidazolium Phosphonium Conjugate addition

ABSTRACT

The Michael addition is one of the most common and versatile methods for making carbon–carbon bonds, however little is known about the potential of utilizing ionic liquids as solvents in these reactions. Initial work from our laboratory is presented, showing that model imidazolium- and phosphonium-based ionic liquid solvents can be used as effective reaction media in the Michael addition. Kinetic data are also reported and the results indicate that the use of ionic liquids as reaction media resulted in an observed rate enhancement when compared with more common organic solvents such as toluene, THF, and DMF. Observed rates were comparable to those observed in DMSO.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

An ionic liquid is typically defined as a salt consisting completely of transient cation–anion pairs that exists in a liquid state below 100 °C. Over the past decade, it has been shown that many ionic liquids possess low vapor pressures, flammabilities, and toxicity levels.¹ For this reason ionic liquids have been viewed as possible 'greener' reaction media and continue to be placed at the fore-front of ongoing research as potential replacements for more common volatile organic solvents.

Current research efforts are primarily focused on ionic liquids as solvents in more 'classical' organic reactions. A number of such reactions have already been investigated and reported in the literature, some of which include Diels–Alder cycloadditions,² Grignard,³ Friedel–Crafts,⁴ aromatic nitration⁵ as well as more fundamental S_N1 and S_N2 reactions.^{6,7} In these reactions, various combinations of cations and anions were employed to determine their effects on reaction products, yields, and occasionally kinetics.

In this Letter, we report a series of studies which focus on the initial effects of imidazolium- and phosphonium-based ionic liquids as reaction media for the Michael addition reaction. This reaction is one of the most efficient and versatile methods of forming a carbon–carbon bond in organic chemistry, and therefore finding alternative solvents in which to perform the reaction is attractive. The Michael addition involves the 1,4-conjugate addition of an enolate anion (referred to as the Michael donor) to an activated α , β -unsaturated carbonyl containing compound (the Michael acceptor). Conjugate addition is favored over the competing 1,

2-addition of the enolate since the more stable carbon–oxygen π bond is maintained (versus the less stable carbon–carbon π bond).

The work described here is a follow-up to results previously published in part by our research group on the effects of catalyst and solvent on the rate of the reaction between ethyl acetoacetate and 2-ethylhexyl acrylate.⁸ As shown in Scheme 1, a base catalyst is employed to deprotonate ethyl acetoacetate ($pK_a = 10.7$), generating the enolate anion **1**.^{9,10} The enolate will then react with the electrophilic acrylate at the β -position, producing another enolate anion **2**. Rapid proton transfer is the last step of the reaction and



Scheme 1. Michael addition mechanism.





^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 270 809 3543; fax: +1 270 809 6474. *E-mail address:* kmiller38@murraystate.edu (K.M. Miller).

^{0040-4039/\$ -} see front matter \odot 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.tetlet.2012.02.003

serves to regenerate the base catalyst and produce the final Michael adduct **3**.

The reaction kinetics of the Michael addition have been studied extensively and are dependent upon base type and concentration as well as the concentrations of both the Michael donor (acetoace-tate in this case) and the Michael acceptor (acrylate).¹⁰ We have previously shown in our group that when moderate base catalysts such as amines are employed, the concentration of the enolate anion is approximately equal to the concentration of the base when the acetoacetate is allowed to pre-equilibrate with the catalyst prior to the addition of the acrylate.^{8,9} This results in a steady-state concentration of the enolate anion and a rate law which follows pseudo-first order kinetics with respect to the concentration of the Michael acceptor (acrylate):

$Rate = k_{obs}[Acrylate]$

Michael addition reactions have been conducted in a number of different molecular solvents ranging from non-polar solvents such as toluene and tetrahydrofuran to polar solvents such as N,Ndimethylformamide (DMF) and dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO). Ionic liquids provide a unique alternative to these more common molecular solvents but have been reported sparingly in the literature. Ranu and co-workers have shown that imidazolium ionic liquids with a hydroxide counter-anion will self-catalyze the Michael addition of activated methylene compounds to conjugated ketones and esters.¹¹ Toma and co-workers investigated the kinetics of the addition of highly acidic/active methylene compounds to chalcone and have found the reaction to proceed readily in imidazolium ionic liquids; however, residual *N*-methylimidazole from the ionic liquid synthesis is thought to have compromised the rate data.¹² In the present work, the system chosen avoids this complication since ethyl acetoacetate that is not sufficiently acidic enough to be deprotonated by residual ionic liquid precursors such as Nmethylimidazole.

The present study will look to investigate the effects of various solvents, including two model ionic liquids, on the Michael addition reaction of ethyl acetoacetate and 2-ethylhexyl acrylate using the base catalyst DBU (1,8-diazobicyclo[5.4.0]undec-7-ene). The molecular solvents chosen have a wide range in dielectric constants and include toluene, tetrahydrofuran (THF), *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF), and dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO). The two model ionic liquids that were prepared and used include *N*-pentyl-*N'*-methyl-imidazolium bis(trifluoromethylsulfonamide) [pnmim][NTf₂] and trihexyltetradecyl-phosphonium bis(tri-fluoromethylsulfonamide) [THTDP][NTf₂].

The syntheses of the model ionic liquids are shown in Scheme 2 and are based upon procedures previously reported in the literature.¹³ The preparation of $[pnmim][NTf_2]$ involved first the synthesis of [pnmim][Br] **4** through the reaction of *N*-methylimidazole and 1-bromopentane. Anion exchange with lithium bis(trifluoromethylsulfonimide) resulted in the desired ionic liquid **5**. The phosphonium ionic liquid **6** was prepared by anion exchange of commercially available [THTDP][Br] with lithium bis(trifluoromethylsulfonimide). Once the desired ionic liquids were isolated, they were dried in a vacuum oven at 60 °C until a constant mass was obtained to ensure that any trace solvent and/ or moisture had been removed (<0.01% water).

Once the ionic liquids were isolated and structural analysis completed, a series of kinetic studies were conducted in which the pseudo-first order loss of 2-ethylhexyl acrylate was monitored by ¹H NMR over time. Concentrations of DBU were held at either 1 or 3 mol %. Rate data, half-lives, solvent choice, and catalyst levels are provided in Table 1. All kinetic runs were completed at 35 °C in duplicate with an error of ±2% and correlation coefficients of 0.998 or greater.

The data in Table 1 show that both catalyst concentration and solvent choice have a significant effect on the reaction rate of the Michael addition. Increasing the catalyst level from 1 to 3 mol % increases the steady-state concentration of enolate anion and thus results in an expected rate enhancement.

When the catalyst level was held constant, molecular solvents such as the relatively non-polar toluene and THF resulted in the lowest observed reaction rates (entries 4–7), use of the more polar DMF resulted in a moderate increase in observed reaction rates (entries 8–9) while reactions in the highly polar DMSO gave rise to the largest rate enhancements (entries 10–11). This relative rate profile for molecular solvents observed here was expected and follows work we previously reported on for the Michael addition as well as reports of other enolate addition reactions.^{8,14,15} Highly polar solvents such as DMSO are known to disrupt enolate aggregation through cation solvation,¹⁴ thus providing a stabilized transition state(s) for the reaction, leading to lower activation energies and faster kinetics.

Use of the ionic liquids [pnmim][NTf₂] and [THTDP][NTf₂] as reaction media (entries 12–13 and 15–16 respectively) resulted in observed rates that were comparable to DMSO. This large rate enhancement was unexpected since the reported studies concerning the polarities of ionic liquids place them in the same range as short chain alcohols (ε_T = 11.45 for [pnmim][NTf₂]).¹⁶ The source of this unexpected rate enhancement cannot be fully explained given the limited data presented here, however it has been speculated that nucleophilicity may be enhanced in ionic liquids due to some reduction in the degree of ion pairing.^{7,17} Additionally, one could envision that the imidazolium and phosphonium cations



Scheme 2. Ionic liquid syntheses.

Table 1							
Observed	Michael	addition	rate	data	at	35	°C

Entry	Solvent	Catalyst	Catalyst load (%)	Rate constant ^a ($k_{ m obs} imes 10^{-2}$)	Relative rate ^b	Half-life $t_{1/2}$ (min)
1	None	DBU	1 mol	1.11	1.00	62.5
2	None	DBU	3 mol	4.66	1.00	14.9
3 ^c	None	N-Methylimidazole	3 mol	_	_	_
4	Toluene	DBU	1 mol	0.17	0.15	400
5	Toluene	DBU	3 mol	0.75	0.16	91.9
6	THF	DBU	1 mol	0.26	0.23	266
7	THF	DBU	3 mol	0.92	0.20	75.1
8	DMF	DBU	1 mol	0.95	0.86	73.1
9	DMF	DBU	3 mol	3.34	0.72	20.8
10	DMSO	DBU	1 mol	2.69	2.39	25.8
11	DMSO	DBU	3 mol	10.2	2.19	6.78
12	[pnmim][TNf ₂]	DBU	1 mol	2.50	2.55	27.8
13	[pnmim][TNf ₂]	DBU	3 mol	10.1	2.17	6.89
14 ^c	[pnmim][TNf ₂]	No catalyst	-	_	-	_
15	[THTDP][NTf ₂]	DBU	1 mol	2.81	2.53	24.6
16	[THTDP][NTf ₂]	DBU	3 mol	11.1	2.38	6.25
17 ^c	[THTDP][NTf2]	No catalyst	-	_	-	-

^a Average of duplicate runs (error ± 2 %).

^b Relative rates were determined for each catalyst load level (1 and 3 mol %).

^c No reaction was observed.

added to the solution are less likely to be strongly enthalpically bound to the enolate, thereby providing little solvent stabilization and increasing reactivity. Ionic liquids may also improve the dispersion of charge in the transition state, resulting in increased stabilization. Additional studies are warranted in conjunction with the present system to better identify the source of the unexpected rate enhancements.

One potential issue with the use of imidazolium ionic liquids in base-catalyzed reactions is the potential formation of *N*-heterocyclic carbenes (NHCs) as a result of deprotonation at the 2-position on the imidazolium ring.¹⁸ The deprotonation, which has been reported to occur despite an unfavorable difference in pK_a values,¹⁹ generally leads to substitution products. In the present kinetic studies however, no evidence of imidazolium substitution over the course of the experiment was observed.

Furthermore, no reaction was observed in $[pnmim][NTf_2]$ or $[THTDP][NTf_2]$ without catalyst after several days at 35 °C. It was also noted that *N*-methylimidazole (the precursor to the imidazo-lium ionic liquids), at a concentration of 3 mol %, did not result in any observable reaction over several days at 35 °C. This supports the hypothesis that the observed rate enhancements are truly

due to the properties of the ionic liquid as a solvent and that they do not self-catalyze the reaction.

Figure 1 shows a comparative pseudo-first order plot of the logarithm of acrylate concentration verses time in the presence of 3 mol % DBU. The starting acrylate concentrations were normalized to allow for an accurate comparison. Note that use of the imidazolium and phosphonium-based ionic liquids resulted in a rate enhancement when compared to non-polar solvents such as toluene and THF or even the more polar solvent DMF. Observed rates were comparable to those found in DMSO. Any rate effects observed in comparison to the solventless system are believed to be due to a combination of factors, including solvent polarity and dilution.

Figure 2 shows a comparative first-order plot of the logarithm of acrylate concentration verses time in the presence of 1 mol % DBU. As with the previously described data at 3 mol %, the model ionic liquids show similar effects on the reaction rates in comparison to other solvent systems.

In summary, initial attempts at employing ionic liquids as reaction media in the Michael addition of ethyl acetoacetate and 2-ethylhexylacrylate were successful and reaction rates were



Figure 1. Pseudo-first order plot of ln[acrylate] versus time in various solvent systems at 3 mol % DBU.



Figure 2. Pseudo-first order plot of ln[Acrylate] versus time in various solvent systems at 1 mol % DBU.

determined for systems in which model imidazolium and phosphonium-based ionic liquids were used as solvents. When compared to more common molecular solvents typically used in Michael addition reactions, the observed rates in ionic liquids were faster than those found in toluene or THF by a factor of 10 or more, twice as fast as rates in DMF and analogous to rates in DMSO. A better understanding of the source of this unexpected rate enhancement will be the subject of future research.

Experimental

General

Anhydrous solvents such as tetrahydrofuran (THF), *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF), toluene, and dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) were purchased from Acros Organics and used without any further purification. All other reagents were used as received from Acros Organics or Sigma–Aldrich Chemicals. All water used in the ionic liquid syntheses and/or purification was deionized to 18 MΩ using an ELGA Purelab[®] Ultra filtration device. All ionic liquids were analyzed by ¹H NMR on a JEOL-ECS spectrometer at 400 MHz and matched data which have been previously reported for these compounds.¹³

Kinetic studies

All kinetic studies were performed using a previously published protocol developed by our group.⁸ In a sample experiment, ethyl acetoacetate (0.92 g, 7.1 mmol) was dissolved in [pnmim][NTf₂] (2.23 g, a 50% dilution overall) and added to a round bottomed flask containing DBU (65 mg, 0.43 mmol, 3 mol %) and a magnetic stir bar. The resulting solution was stirred at 35 °C for 2 h. This solution was then mixed with 2-ethylhexyl acrylate (1.31 g, 7.1 mmol, pre-warmed to 35 °C) and held for two minutes at 35 °C prior to the beginning of the kinetic run. Samples (\sim 5 mg) were taken periodically, quenched in a 0.4 M solution of acetic acid in CDCl₃, and analyzed by ¹H NMR. For each datapoint, the multiplet which accounts for the two methyl groups of 2-ethylhexyl acrylate at 0.85 ppm was used as the standard in which to measure the disappearance of the vinylic signal at 5.80 ppm over time. Experiments were followed for at least two half-lives and were completed in duplicate with calculated rate constants (±2% error). Pseudo-first order plots of the logarithm of acrylate concentration versus time yielded linear trends with correlation coefficients equal to or greater than 0.998. Product analysis during the kinetic experiments indicated the formation of only Michael adduct **3**, the analysis of which matched the previously described data.⁸

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the Department of Chemistry at Murray State University and The Research Corporation for Science Advancement (Cottrell College Science Award) for financial support of this work.

References and notes

- 1. Welton, T. Chem. Rev. 1999, 99(8), 2071-2084.
- 2. Hallett, J. P.; Welton, T. Chem. Rev. 2011, 111, 3508-3576.
- 3. Ramnial, T.; Ino, D. D.; Clyburne, J. A. Chem. Commun. 2005, 325-327.
- Earle, M. J.; Hakala, U.; Hardacre, C.; Karkkainen, J.; McAuley, B. J.; Rooney, D. W.; Seddon, K. R.; Thompson, J. M.; Wähälä, K. Chem. Commun. 2005, 903–905.
- 5. Lancaster, N. L.; Llopis-Mestre, V. Chem. Commun. 2003, 2812-2815.
- 6. Creary, X.; Willis, E. D.; Gagnon, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 18114-18120.
- (a) Lancaster, N. L.; Salter, P. A.; Welton, T.; Young, G. B. J. Org. Chem. 2002, 67, 8855–8861; (b) Lancaster, N. L.; Welton, T. J. Org. Chem. 2004, 69, 5986–5992; (c) Crowhurst, L.; Lancaster, N. L.; Arlandis, J. M. P.; Welton, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 11549–11555.
- Williams, S. R.; Miller, K. M.; Long, T. E. Prog React. Kin. and Mech. 2007, 32(4), 166–194.
- Mather, B. D.; Viswanathan, K.; Miller, K. M.; Long, T. E. Prog. Polym. Sci. 2006, 31, 487–531.
- 10. Clemons, R. D.; Rector, F. D. J. Coatings Tech. 1989, 61, 83-91.
- 11. Ranu, B. C.; Banerjee, S. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 3049-3052.
- (a) Mečiarová, M.; Toma, S. Chem.-Eur. J. 2007, 13, 1268–1272; (b) Mečiarová, M.; Cigáň, M.; Toma, S.; Gáplovsky, A. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2008, 4408–4411.
- (a) Corley, C. Proceedings Electrochemical Society 2006, 326-339. 2004-24 (Molten Salts XIV); (b) Fredlake, C. P.; Croswaite, J. M.; Hert, D. G.; Aki, S. N. V. K.; Brennecke, J. F. J. Chem. Eng. Data 2004, 49, 954-964; (c) Ab Rani, M. A.; Brant, A.; Crowhurst, L.; Dolan, A.; Lui, M.; Hassan, N. H.; Hallett, J. P.; Hunt, P. A.; Niedermeyer, H.; Perez-Arlandis, J. M.; Schrems, M.; Welton, T.; Wilding, R. Phys. Chem. Phys. 2011, 13, 16831–16840.
- 14. Zook, H. D.; Miller, J. A. J. Org. Chem. 1971, 36, 1112–1116.
- 15. Reichardt, C. Solvents and Solvent Effects in Organic Chemistry, 2nd. ed.; VHC: NY, 1988.
- Daguenet, C.; Dyson, P. J.; Krossling, I.; Oleinkova, A.; Slattery, J.; Wakai, C.; Weingärtner, H. J. J. Phys. Chem. B 2006, 110, 12682–12688.
- (a) Harper, J. B.; Kobrak, M. N. *Mini-Rev. Org. Chem.* **2006**, 3, 253–269; (b) Man,
 B. Y. W.; Hook, J. M.; Harper, J. B. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2005**, 46, 7641–7645.
- (a) Arduengo, A. J.; Harlow, R. L.; Kline, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1991**, 113, 361–363;
 (b) Aggarwal, V. K.; Emme, I.; Mereu, A. Chem. Comm. **2002**, 1612–1613; (c) Alder, R. W.; Allen, P. R.; Williams, S. J. Chem. Comm. **1995**, 1267–1268.
- (a) Hine, J.; Chen, Y.-J. J. Org. Chem. 1987, 52, 2091–2094; (b) Bordwell, F. G. Acc. Chem. Res. 1988, 21, 456–463; (c) Taft, R. W.; Bordwell, F. G. Acc. Chem. Res. 1988, 21, 463–469.