J. CHEM. SOC., CHEM. COMMUN., 1990

## Unexpected Acid-catalysed Rearrangement of Certain 3-(Arylthio)indoles to 2-(2-Aminophenyl)benzothiophenes

## Pierre Hamel,\* Yves Girard, Joseph G. Atkinson, and Michael A. Bernstein

Merck Frosst Centre for Therapeutic Research, PO Box 1005, Pointe Claire-Dorval, Québec, Canada H9R 4P8

3-(Arylthio)indoles (1), in which the aryl group is an electron-rich ring system, undergo a novel structural rearrangement to 2-(2-aminophenyl)benzothiophenes (2) upon heating in polyphosphoric acid.

We have previously reported the unusual two-step intermolecular mechanism of the acid-catalysed isomerization of indol-3-yl sulphides to the corresponding indol-2-yl sulphides.<sup>1</sup> We report herein on an unexpected and completely different type of structural rearrangement of a series of 3-(arylthio)indoles (1). They have been found to undergo indole ring cleavage and benzothiophene formation, upon heating in polyphosphoric acid (PPA). The resulting isomeric compounds have been identified as 2-(2-aminophenyl)benzothiophenes (2) (Scheme 1).

Variable amounts of the corresponding 2-(arylthio)indoles (3) are also obtained under these conditions (Table 1). In contrast, compounds (3) are the sole products of the trifluoroacetic acid (TFA)-promoted rearrangement<sup>1,2</sup> of these substrates (see footnote b to Table 1). The formation of the benzothiophenes (2) is a function of the capability of the aryl group to stabilize a positively charged intermediate [*e.g.*, (4d<sub>2</sub>)], as only activated, electron-rich aryls suffer this type of rearrangement. Thus, not even the relatively neutral 3-(phenylthio)indole (1f) gives any detectable amount of the corresponding benzothiophene (2f), but yields only 2-(phenylthio)indole (3f).

As a general procedure, the substrate  $(1)^3$  is heated in 50—60 parts of commercial PPA, at 100—120 °C for 0.5—2 h. The cooled mixture is diluted and triturated with water, then

extracted with ether or ethyl acetate, affording a mixture of (2) and (3) from which the components are separated by chromatography.



Scheme 1. Rearrangement of 3-(arylthio)indoles in hot PPA.

Table 1.ª Isomerization of 3-(arylthio)indoles to 2-(2-aminophenyl)benzothiophenes and 2-(arylthio)indoles in PPA at 100 °C: (1)  $\rightarrow$  (2) + (3).

Cpd.	$\mathbf{R}^1$	Ar	R <sup>2</sup> , R <sup>3</sup> in ( <b>2</b> )	% yield ( <b>2</b> ) (m.p./°C)	% yield ( <b>3</b> ) <sup>b</sup> (m.p./°C)
а	н	2-Naphthyl	4,5-CH=CHCH=CH-	64 (144-146)	0 (117-119)
b	Me	2-Naphthyl	4,5-CH=CHCH=CH-	10 (92-94)	44 (85
с	н	1-Naphthyl	6,7-CH=CH-CH=CH-	36 (86-88)	17 (96-98)
d	н	3-MeOC <sub>6</sub> H₄	$4-MeO(\mathbf{d}_1)$	9 (111113)	8 (71-73)
			$6-MeO(\mathbf{d}_2)$	22 (123	
e	н	$2.5 \cdot Me_2C_6H_3$	4,7-Me <sub>2</sub>	14 (oil)	31 (126-128)
f	Н	Ph	Н	0	35 (72-74)

<sup>a</sup> All new compounds have been fully characterized by IR, <sup>1</sup>H NMR, and mass spectra and elemental analysis, and the data were in accord with the proposed structures. <sup>b</sup> % yields of (3) in TFA, room temp., 1---3 h: **a**, 67; **b**, 87.5; **c**, 60; **d**, 53; **e**, 64; **f**, 56.

**Table 2.** <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectral parameters for (2a) (CDCl<sub>3</sub> solution), (2d<sub>1</sub>) (CDCl<sub>3</sub> solution), and (2d<sub>2</sub>) ( $[{}^{2}H_{6}]$  acetone solution). 300 MHz spectra were recorded at 300 K and referenced to internal Me<sub>4</sub>Si.

	Ring position												
Compound	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	3'	4'	5'	6'	$\mathrm{NH}_2$	OMe
(2a)	8.08 <sup>5</sup> J 0.7°	8.31 <sup>3</sup> J 8.3 <sup>4</sup> J 1.4	7.60 <sup>3</sup> J 7.0 <sup>4</sup> J 1.5	7.52 <sup>3</sup> J 8.1	7.94 4J 1.4	7.73 <sup>3</sup> J 8.8	7.86	6.82 <sup>3</sup> J 7.4 <sup>4</sup> J 1.2	7.21 <sup>3</sup> J7.4 <sup>4</sup> J 1.6	6.87 <sup>3</sup> J7.4	7.41	_b	_
$(2d_1)$	7.58 <sup>5</sup> J 0.7 <sup>d</sup>		6.75 <sup>3</sup> J 8.0 <sup>4</sup> J 0.7	7.27 <sup>3</sup> J 8.0	7.43			6.8ª	7.16 4J 1.6	6.8ª <sup>3</sup> J 6.9	7.34	4.13	3.96
( <b>2d</b> <sub>2</sub> )	7.40 <sup>5</sup> J 0.5ª	7.70 <sup>3</sup> J 8.7	7.00 4J2.4	_	7.47			6.86 <sup>3</sup> J 8.1 4J 1.0	7.10 <sup>3</sup> <i>J</i> 7.6 <sup>4</sup> <i>J</i> 1.5	6.70 <sup>3</sup> J7.7	7.27	4.88	3.90

<sup>a</sup> Spectra complicated by second order effects. <sup>b</sup> Not observed because of D<sub>2</sub>O wash. <sup>c</sup> J (3,9). <sup>d</sup> J (3,7).



Thus, 3-(2-naphthylthio)indole (1a) afforded, as the sole rearrangement product, isolated in 64% yield, 2-(2-aminophenyl)naphtho[2,1-b]thiophene (2a). Its structure was proven by detailed high field <sup>1</sup>H NMR analysis as described below. In this experiment, no trace (<1% by TLC) of 2-(2-naphthylthio)indole (3a) was observed, whereas this compound was obtained in 67% yield on stirring (1a) in twelve parts of TFA at room temperature for 1.5 h, with no detectable amount of (2a) being formed. In the case of 3-(3-methoxyphenylthio)indole (1d), a 1:2.5 mixture of the isomeric 4- and 6-methoxy-2-(2-aminophenyl) benzothiophenes, (2d<sub>1</sub>) and (2d<sub>2</sub>), is obtained in 31% yield by ring closure *ortho* and *para* to the methoxy group.

A full structural proof by <sup>1</sup>H NMR analysis was conducted on (**2a**) and the regioisomeric (**2d**<sub>1</sub>) and (**2d**<sub>2</sub>), and the data are compiled in Table 2. In the case of the benzothiophenes, the position of the OMe was established by NOE experiments.<sup>4</sup> Homonuclear decoupling and 2D-COSY experiments were performed where appropriate. The key NOE observations affording structural information were as follows. For (**2d**<sub>1</sub>), irradiation of the OMe signal resulted in a 9.8% enhancement in the signal of a proton having the expected coupling pattern for H-5, and a 1.0% enhancement in a signal attributable to H-3. Thus, the OMe was concluded to be on C-4. For (**2d**<sub>2</sub>), irradiation of the OMe signal resulted in a 12.2% enhance-



Scheme 2. Mechanism of formation of 2-(2-aminophenyl)benzothiophene, (2), from 3-(arylthio)indoles, (1).

ment in a resonance attributable to H-7, and a 3.0% NOE to H-5; thus the OMe substituent was deduced to occupy the C-6 position. With (**2a**), the question of whether the tricyclic portion is linear or angular was at issue. The angular product was proven correct on the basis of the deshielded bay-region protons, and close proximity between H-3 and H-4 was indicated by a 2D-NOESY experiment. Finally, the linear structure would be expected to display three aromatic singlet proton resonances, while only one such resonance was observed. This is consistent with the angular product, (**2a**).

Scheme 2 presents a rationale for the formation of the benzothiophenes (2). When the aryl ring of the sulphide is sufficiently electron-rich, intramolecular nucleophilic attack can occur on the 2-position (path a) of the protonated indole moiety (1H+) giving rise to transient species such as (4) and (5); the latter then aromatizes through loss of a proton and rupture of the C-N bond, leading to benzothiophene (2). Competitive initial desulphenylation of  $(1H^+)$  leads, through a complex series of steps (path b), to 2-(arylthio)indoles (3), as we have described previously.1 The contrast in the results between PPA and TFA may be attributable to several factors. The more viscous PPA may permit the intramolecular rearrangement leading to the benzothiophenes (2), and the greater nucleophilicity of the trifluoroacetate anion would favour the process leading to formation of 2-(arylthio)indoles (3) by path b.

The work described herein represents a novel molecular rearrangement in which an indole ring is cleaved, concomitant with the formation of a benzothiophene nucleus. It also provides a synthesis of 2-(2-aminophenyl)benzothiophenes which is fundamentally different from those previously described,<sup>5</sup> and thus broadens the availability of this class of compounds.

Received, 24th April 1990; Com. 0/01817A

## References

- 1 P. Hamel, Y. Girard, and J. G. Atkinson, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1989, 63.
- 2 R. Plate and H. C. J. Ottenheijm, Tetrahedron, 1986, 42, 4511.
- 3 J. G. Atkinson, P. Hamel, and Y. Girard, Synthesis, 1988, 480.
- 4 M. A. Bernstein, H. E. Morton, and Y. Guindon, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1986, 1155, and references cited therein.
- 5 A. H. Lamberton and J. E. Thorpe, J. Chem. Soc. C, 1968, 2029;
  K. E. Chippendale, B. Iddon, and H. Suschitzky, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1972, 2023; 2030; M. Bartle, S. T. Gore, R. K. Mackie, and J. M. Tedder, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1, 1976, 1636.