Selective Ketone Formations via Cobalt-Catalyzed β -Alkylation of Secondary Alcohols with Primary Alcohols

Bedraj Pandey,^{†,§} Shi Xu,^{†,§} and Keying Ding^{*,†,‡}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37132, United States [‡]Molecular Biosciences Program, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37132, United States

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: A homogeneous cobalt-catalyzed β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols to selectively synthesize ketones via acceptorless dehydrogenative coupling is reported for the first time. Notably, this transformation is environmentally benign and atom economical with water and hydrogen gas as the only byproducts.

omogeneous transition-metal-catalyzed carbon-carbon bond formations are among the paramount methods for value-added products.¹ In the conventional β -alkylation of secondary alcohols to synthesize ketones or alcohols, a multistep process is required, e.g., stoichiometric oxidation and alkylation with toxic and mutagenic alkyl halides, generating copious wastes.² Thus, it is highly desirable to develop alternative methods that are environmentally friendly and atom and process efficient, using readily available and less toxic substrates, e.g., alcohols. One such prominent synthetic strategy is acceptorless dehydrogenative coupling (ADC).^{3,4} In a typical ADC pathway to ketones, primary and secondary alcohols are first dehydrogenated to aldehydes and ketones, respectively, with the catalyst taking the hydrogen atoms. The electrophilic aldehydes are attacked by the enolates formed via removal of the α -C–H of the ketones by a base, leading to the ketone products with loss of water. Finally, hydrogen gas is liberated from the hydrogenated catalyst. Alternatively, the hydrogenated catalyst can reduce the formed ketones, affording the alcohol products. This process is known as borrowing hydrogen (BH).^{3,4} Offering great advantages over conventional methods, ADC and BH have recently attracted enormous interests.

Currently, precious metal catalysts based on Rh,⁵ Ir,⁶ Ru,⁷ and Pd^8 dominate the β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols. With increasing concerns on sustainability and environment, less toxic and earth-abundant base metal analogues such as Fe,⁹ Co,¹⁰ Mn,¹¹ Ni,¹² and Cu¹³ are becoming more appealing and have witnessed rapid recent developments. However, examples of homogeneous base metal catalyzed such transformations for ketone synthesis are rare.

In the Cu case, high catalyst and base loadings of 10% and 50% were mandatory, respectively.^{13b} In the Mn version, unfortunately, very limited substrates were reported with moderate to good yields.^{11c} Transition-metal-free examples are also available.¹⁴ To the best of our knowledge, no homogeneous Co catalyst has been reported for β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols for selective



ketone synthesis to date. Instead, there is just one example of alcohol formations via the BH process by a PNP–Co catalyst¹⁰ (Scheme 1a). Methods for Co-catalyzed α -alkylation of





ketones with primary alcohols to generate ketones are also known¹⁵ (Scheme 1b). As the ketone reactants are normally obtained from stoichiometric oxidation of the secondary alcohols, it is more desirable to directly utilize secondary alcohols for the ketone formations (Scheme 1c). However, as H₂ is one of the byproducts, the formed ketones could be further hydrogenated to alcohols, imposing a challenge in product selectivity.¹⁰ Herein, we report the first systematic study of homogeneous Co-catalyzed β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols to selectively synthesize ketones via ADC. Notably, this reaction is environmentally benign and atom efficient with water and hydrogen gas as the only byproducts.

We have recently developed a new family of base transitionmetal complexes supported by a ^{iPr}PPPN^HPy^{Me} tetradentate

Received: August 2, 2019

ligand.¹⁶ The Co complex **1a** is an efficient catalyst for dehydrogenation of secondary alcohols to ketones¹⁶ and dehydrogenative coupling of primary alcohols to esters.¹⁷ We speculate that **1a** is a potentially efficient catalyst to mediate the β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols to synthesize ketones.

Initially, benzyl alcohol **2a** and 1-phenylethanol **2b** were chosen as the standard substrates. Different base additives were examined, and KO^tBu turned out to be more suitable. Other reaction parameters were also optimized. Gratifyingly, the optimal results with 90% yield of 3-phenylpropiophenone **2c** were obtained using 2.5 mol % of **1a** and 7.5 mol % of KO^tBu in toluene at 125 °C for 24 h under argon flow (Table 1, entry

Table 1. Optimization of Reaction Conditions^a

		он	C		
\bigcirc	^ОН +		t., base		- H ₂ + H ₂ O
2a	2b		2c		
entry	cat.	base	solvent	temp (°C)	yield ^b (%)
1	1a	KO ^t Bu	toluene	105	31
2	1a	KO ^t Bu	toluene	125	90 (86) ^c
3	1a	KO ^t Bu	toluene	140	84
4 ^{<i>d</i>}	1a	KO ^t Bu	toluene	125	0
5		KO ^t Bu	toluene	125	<1
6	1a		toluene	125	0
7	1a	KO ^t Bu	1,4-dioxane	125	0
8	1a	NaO ^t Bu	toluene	125	78
9	1a	KHMDS	toluene	125	59
10	1a	КОН	toluene	125	<1
11	1a	K ₂ CO ₃	toluene	125	0

^{*a*}General conditions: catalyst (2.5 mol %), base (7.5 mol %), **2a** (0.25 mmol), **2b** (0.3 mmol), and solvent (1.5 mL) for 24 h under an argon flow atmosphere. ^{*b*}Yields were determined by ¹H NMR with 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene as an internal standard. ^{*c*}1 mmol scale, isolated yield. ^{*d*}KO'Bu (5 mol %) was used.

2). It is noteworthy that the selectivity is excellent with a 2c/1,3-diphenylpropanol 2d ratio of 100:0, despite the fact that 2d is known as the major side product of such transformation in the literature.^{7e,12b,13b} Interestingly, when 5 mol % of KO^tBu was utilized, which was exactly the amount of base used for activation of 2.5 mol % of 1a, no 2c product was observed, indicating the crucial role of base besides precatalyst activation (Table 1, entry 4). Further, control experiments showed both 1a and base were essential for this reaction (Table 1, entries 5 and 6). Mercury tests demonstrated a homogeneous catalytic process. H₂ was confirmed by GC from the gas phase, suggesting an ADC pathway (see the SI).

Having established the optimized reactions, we next explored the substrate scope and efficiency of the reaction. We first investigated the scope of primary alcohols. Aromatic primary alcohols with electron-donating groups like -Me, -iPr, and -OMe at the *para* position furnished the corresponding ketones in excellent 90–93% yields (Table 2, 3c-5c). Primary alcohols with electron-withdrawing groups at the *para* position also reacted smoothly (Table 2, 6c, 7c). Notably, *meta*-substituted substrates were transformed to the corresponding ketones as well (Table 2, 8c-11c). Sterically hindered 2-methyl benzyl alcohol 12a also proceeded in a good yield (Table 2, 12c). Aliphatic primary alcohols afforded the desired ketones in 73–80% yields (Table 2, 16c-18c).





^{*a*}General conditions: **1a** (2.5 mol %), KO'Bu (7.5 mol %), **2a** (0.25 mmol), **2b** (0.3 mmol), and toluene (1.5 mL) for 24 h under an argon flow atmosphere. ^{*b*}Isolated yield. ^{*c*}**1a** (5 mol %) and KO'Bu (15 mol %) were used. ^{*d*}**1a** (5 mol %) and KO'Bu (60 mol %) were used.

Next, we investigated the scope of secondary alcohols. Parasubstituted aromatic secondary alcohols reacted with 2a delivering the corresponding ketones in good to excellent yields (Table 2, 19c-22c). Meta-substituted 1-(3methoxyphenyl)ethanol 24b showed a diminished activity (Table 2, 24c). Aliphatic secondary alcohols were also amenable to this method, albeit under harsher conditions (Table 2, 26c, 27c). It is noteworthy that the reaction of nhexanol 28a and 2-hexanol 28b proceeded smoothly, giving an 80% yield (Table 2, 28c). To the best of our knowledge, β alkylation of aliphatic secondary alcohols with primary alcohols to ketones mediated by homogeneous base transition-metal catalyst has not been disclosed before. Unfortunately, heterocyclic substrates were not tolerated. Couplings of different secondary alcohols, e.g., 2b and cyclohexanol 29b, were incompatible with this method.

We then sought a mechanistic understanding of this reaction. First, two derivatives of **1a** (**1b** and **1c**, Figure 1) were investigated. Compound **1b** bearing a dearomatized pyridine arm shows comparable activity to **1a** in an 81% yield, indicating **1b** is also a precatalyst. To test if metal ligand cooperativity (MLC) from the N–H linker plays a role, a $i^{Pr}PPPN^{Me}Py^{Me}$ complex **1c** was tested as the precatalyst. A 66% yield of **2c** and 22% yield of **2d**, a further hydrogenated product from **2c**, were recorded, suggesting MLC may not have a crucial effect.



Figure 1. Derivatives 1b and 1c of compound 1a examined.

Our prior work showed that 1a was capable of mediating dehydrogenation of primary and secondary alcohols to esters (via aldehydes)¹⁷ and ketones,¹⁶ respectively. In the current study, when benzaldehyde 2e reacted with acetophenone 2f in the presence of 7.5 mol % of KO^tBu (Scheme 2a), a 77% yield

Scheme 2. Control Experiments



of chalcone 2g was observed, which suggested that the $\alpha_{,\beta}$ unsaturated ketone is likely one of the intermediates in the alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols. Interestingly, in a transfer hydrogenation experiment employing 2b as the hydrogen source in a sealed reaction vessel, 2g can be hydrogenated to 2c (56% yield) and 2d (9% yield) by 2.5 mol % of KO^tBu alone (Scheme 2b). This suggests a basemediated Meerwein-Ponndorf-Verley (MPV) type reduction pathway.^{14,18} Alternatively, with 5 mol % of 1a and 12.5 mol % of KO^tBu,¹⁹ a 20% yield of 2c and a 40% yield of 2d were observed, suggesting that 1a may favor alcohol formations under these conditions. To further testify this proposal, we explored the transfer hydrogenation of 2c with 2b in a seal reaction vessel (Scheme 2c). Using 2.5 mol % of KO^tBu alone, a 71% yield of 2d was obtained, advocating an operational MPV reduction. Notably, in the presence of 12.5 mol % of KO^tBu and 5 mol % of 1a,¹⁹ a slight increase in 2d yield (77%) was observed. In addition, when the standard reaction (Table 1, entry 2) was carried out in a sealed reaction vessel, only a 34% yield of 2c resulted together with a 26% yield of 2d, suggesting the essential role of utilizing open systems for the selective ketone synthesis, in which extrusion of hydrogen gas could efficiently suppress the formation of the alcohol sideproducts.

In summary, we reported the first homogeneous cobaltcatalyzed β -alkylation of secondary alcohols with primary alcohols to form ketones. Remarkably, this is an environmentally benign and atom-efficient process, which contributes to sustainable synthesis by base transition-metal catalysts.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.or-glett.9b02727.

Experimental details, additional figures, and other results (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: keying.ding@mtsu.edu.

ORCID

Keying Ding: 0000-0002-7367-129X

Author Contributions

[§]B.P. and S.X. contributed equally.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We appreciate supports from National Science Foundation. (CHE-1465051 and MRI CHE-1626549) We also thank FRCAC, URECA, and Clean Energy Fee Funds of MTSU.

REFERENCES

(1) Hartwig, J. Organotransition Metal Chemistry: From Bonding to Catalysis; University Science Books, 2009.

(2) (a) Sawatari, K.; Nakanishi, Y.; Matsushima, T. Ind. Health 2001, 39, 341–345. (b) Trost, B. M.; Fleming, I. Comprehensive organic synthesis: selectivity, strategy, and efficiency in modern organic chemistry; Pergamon Press: New York, 1991. (c) Otera, J. Modern Carbonyl Chemistry; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2000.

(3) For recent reviews, see: (a) Filonenko, G. A.; van Putten, R.; Hensen, E. J. M.; Pidko, E. A. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2018, 47, 1459–1483.
(b) Mukherjee, A.; Milstein, D. ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 11435–11469.
(c) Kallmeier, F.; Kempe, R. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2018, 57, 46–60.
(d) Gorgas, N.; Kirchner, K. Acc. Chem. Res. 2018, 51, 1558–1569.
(e) Alig, L.; Fritz, M.; Schneider, S. Chem. Rev. 2019, 119, 2681– 2751. (f) Irrgang, T.; Kempe, R. Chem. Rev. 2019, 119, 2524–2549.
(g) Ai, W.; Zhong, R.; Liu, X.; Liu, Q. Chem. Rev. 2019, 119, 2876– 2953. (h) Junge, K.; Papa, V.; Beller, M. Chem. - Eur. J. 2019, 25, 122–143.

(4) For selective examples, see: (a) Zhang, G.; Hanson, S. K. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 650-653. (b) Zhang, G.; Yin, Z.; Zheng, S. Org. Lett. 2016, 18, 300-303. (c) Saha, B.; Wahidur Rahaman, S. M.; Daw, P.; Sengupta, G.; Bera, J. K. Chem. - Eur. J. 2014, 20, 6542-6551. (d) Midya, S. P.; Pitchaimani, J.; Landge, V. G.; Madhu, V.; Balaraman, E. Catal. Sci. Technol. 2018, 8, 3469-3473. (e) Mastalir, M.; Glatz, M.; Gorgas, N.; Stöger, B.; Pittenauer, E.; Allmaier, G.; Veiros, L. F.; Kirchner, K. Chem. - Eur. J. 2016, 22, 12316-12320. (f) Fertig, R.; Irrgang, T.; Freitag, F.; Zander, J.; Kempe, R. ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 8525-8530. (g) Mukherjee, A.; Nerush, A.; Leitus, G.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Ben-David, Y.; Espinosa Jalapa, N. A.; Milstein, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 4298-4301. (h) Deibl, N.; Kempe, R. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2017, 56, 1663-1666. (i) Elangovan, S.; Neumann, J.; Sortais, J.-B.; Junge, K.; Darcel, C.; Beller, M. Nat. Commun. 2016, 7, 12641. (j) Neumann, J.; Elangovan, S.; Spannenberg, A.; Junge, K.; Beller, M. Chem. - Eur. J. 2017, 23, 5410-5413. (k) Bruneau-Voisine, A.; Wang, D.; Dorcet, V.; Roisnel, T.; Darcel, C.; Sortais, J.-B. J. Catal. 2017, 347, 57-62. (1) Rösler, S.; Ertl, M.; Irrgang, T.; Kempe, R. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 15046-15050. (m) Mastalir, M.; Tomsu, G.; Pittenauer, E.; Allmaier, G.; Kirchner, K. Org. Lett. 2016, 18, 3462-3465. (n) Midya, S.; Mondal, A.; Begum, A.; Balaraman, E. A. Synthesis 2017, 49, 39573961. (o) Yan, T.; Feringa, B. L.; Barta, K. Nat. Commun. 2014, 5, 5602. (p) Yan, T.; Feringa, B. L.; Barta, K. ACS Catal. 2016, 6, 381-388. (q) Mastalir, M.; Stöger, B.; Pittenauer, E.; Puchberger, M.; Allmaier, G.; Kirchner, K. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2016, 358, 3824-3831. (r) Brown, T. J.; Cumbes, M.; Diorazio, L. J.; Clarkson, G. J.; Wills, M. J. Org. Chem. 2017, 82, 10489-10503. (s) Bala, M.; Verma, P. K.; Kumar, N.; Sharma, U.; Singh, B. Can. J. Chem. 2013, 91, 732-737. (t) Samuelsen, S.; Santilli, C.; Ahlquist, M. S. G.; Madsen, R. Chem. Sci. 2019, 10, 1150-1157. (u) Liu, Z.; Yang, Z.; Yu, X.; Zhang, H.; Yu, B.; Zhao, Y.; Liu, Z. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2017, 359, 4278-4283. (v) Das, K.; Mondal, A.; Pal, D.; Srivastava, H. K.; Srimani, D. Organometallics 2019, 38, 1815-1825. (w) Gangwar, M. K.; Dahiya, P.: Emavavaramban, B.: Sundararaiu, B. Chem. - Asian I. 2018, 13. 2445-2448. (x) Chakraborty, P.; Gangwar, M. K.; Emayavaramban, B.; Manoury, E.; Poli, R.; Sundararaju, B. ChemSusChem 2019, 12, 3463-3467. (y) Emayavaramban, B.; Chakraborty, P.; Sundararaju, B. ChemSusChem 2019, 12, 3089-3093. (z) Emayavaramban, B.; Chakraborty, P.; Manoury, E.; Polib, R.; Sundararaju, B. Org. Chem. Front. 2019, 6, 852-857.

(5) Satyanarayana, P.; Maheswaran, H.; Reddy, G. M.; Kantam, M. L. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2013**, 355, 1859–1867.

(6) For selective examples, see: (a) Fujita, K.-i.; Asai, C.; Yamaguchi, T.; Hanasaka, F.; Yamaguchi, R. Org. Lett. 2005, 7, 4017-4019.
(b) Ruiz-Botella, S.; Peris, E. Chem. - Eur. J. 2015, 21, 15263-15271.
(c) Jiménez, M. V.; Fernandez-Tornos, J.; Modrego, F. J.; Perez-Torrente, J. J.; Oro, L. A. Chem. - Eur. J. 2015, 21, 17877-17889.
(d) Wang, R.; Ma, J.; Li, F. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 80, 10769-10776.
(e) Genç, S.; Günnaz, S.; Çetinkaya, B.; Gülcemal, S.; Gülcemal, D. J. Org. Chem. 2018, 83, 2875-2881.
(f) Genç, S.; Arslan, B.; Gülcemal, S.; Günnaz, S.; Çetinkaya, B.; Gülcemal, D. J. Org. Chem. 2019, 84, 6286-6297.

(7) For selective examples, see: (a) Gnanamgari, D.; Leung, C. H.; Schley, N. D.; Hilton, S. T.; Crabtree, R. H. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2008, 6, 4442-4445. (b) Cheung, H. W.; Lee, T. Y.; Lui, H. Y.; Yeung, C. H.; Lau, C. P. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2008, 350, 2975-2983. (c) Wang, Q.; Wu, K.; Yu, Z. Organometallics 2016, 35, 1251-1256. (d) Roy, B. C.; Chakrabarti, K.; Shee, S.; Paul, S.; Kundu, S. Chem. - Eur. J. 2016, 22, 18147-18155. (e) Sahoo, A. R.; Lalitha, G.; Murugesh, V.; Bruneau, C.; Sharma, G. V. M.; Suresh, S.; Achard, M. J. Org. Chem. 2017, 82, 10727-10731. (f) Zhang, C.; Zhao, J.-P.; Hu, B.; Shi, J.; Chen, D. Organometallics 2019, 38, 654-664.

(8) (a) Muzart, J. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 5693-5707. (b) Kose, O.; Saito, S. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2010, 8, 896-900.

(9) Yang, J.; Liu, X.; Meng, D.-L.; Chen, H.-Y.; Zong, Z.-H.; Feng, T.-T.; Sun, K. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2012, 354, 328-334.

(10) Freitag, F.; Irrgang, T.; Kempe, R. Chem. - Eur. J. 2017, 23, 12110-12113.

(11) (a) Liu, T.; Wang, L.; Wu, K.; Yu, Z. ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 7201–7207. (b) El-Sepelgy, O.; Matador, E.; Brzozowska, A.; Rueping, M. ChemSusChem 2019, 12, 3099–3102. (c) Chakraborty, S.; Daw, P.; David, Y. B.; Milstein, D. ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 10300–10305. (d) Gawali, S. S.; Pandia, B. K.; Pal, S.; Gunanathan, C. ACS Omega 2019, 4, 10741–10754.

(12) (a) Tang, G.; Cheng, C.-H. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2011, 353, 1918–1922. (b) Zhang, M.-J.; Li, H.-X.; Young, D. J.; Lia, H.-Y.; Lang, J.-P. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2019, 17, 3567–3574.

(13) (a) Liao, S.; Yu, K.; Li, Q.; Tian, H.; Zhang, Z.; Yu, X.; Xu, Q. Org. Biomol. Chem. **2012**, *10*, 2973–2978. (b) Tan, D.-W.; Li, H.-X.; Zhu, D.-L.; Li, H.-Y.; Young, D. J.; Yao, J.-L.; Lang, J.-P. Org. Lett. **2018**, *20*, 608–611.

(14) (a) Xu, Q.; Chen, J.; Liu, Q. Adv. Synth. Catal. **2013**, 355, 697– 704. (b) Allen, L. J.; Crabtree, R. H. Green Chem. **2010**, 12, 1362– 1364.

(15) (a) Zhang, G.; Wu, J.; Zeng, H.; Zhang, S.; Yin, Z.; Zheng, S. Org. Lett. **2017**, *19*, 1080–1083. (b) Liu, Z.; Yang, Z.; Yu, X.; Zhang, H.; Yu, B.; Zhao, Y.; Liu, Z. Org. Lett. **2017**, *19*, 5228–5231.

(16) Xu, S.; Alhthlol, L. M.; Paudel, K.; Reinheimer, E.; Tyer, D. L.; Taylor, D. K.; Smith, A. M.; Holzmann, J.; Lozano, E.; Ding, K. *Inorg. Chem.* **2018**, *57*, 2394–2397. (17) Paudel, K.; Pandey, B.; Xu, S.; Taylor, D. K.; Tyer, D. L.; Torres, C. L.; Gallagher, S.; Kong, L.; Ding, K. *Org. Lett.* **2018**, *20*, 4478–4481.

(18) For selective examples, see: (a) Walling, C.; Bollyky, L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1964, 86, 3750-3752. (b) Berkessel, A.; Schubert, T. J. S.; Müller, T. N. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 8693-8698.
(c) Polshettiwar, V.; Varma, R. S. Green Chem. 2009, 11, 1313-1316. (d) Ouali, A.; Majoral, J.; Caminade, A.; Taillefer, M. ChemCatChem 2009, 1, 504-509. (e) Bauer, H.; Alonso, M.; Färber, C.; Elsen, H.; Pahl, J.; Causero, A.; Ballmann, G.; De Proft, F.; Harder, S. Nat. Catal. 2018, 1, 40-47.

(19) As 1 equiv of 1a depletes 2 equiv of KO^tBu in the activation process, 5 mol % of 1a/12.5 mol % of KO^tBu were employed to make the net KO^tBu amount 2.5 mol %.