Mild and Diazo-Free Synthesis of Trifluoromethyl-Cyclopropanes Using Sulfonium Ylides

Patrick Cyr,*^{,†}[©] Joël Flynn-Robitaille,[†] Patrick Boissarie,[†] and Anne Marinier^{*,†,‡,§}

[†]Medicinal Chemistry, Institute of Research in Immunology and Cancer, Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada [‡]Département de chimie, Faculté des Arts et Sciences, Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada [§]Département de pharmacologie, Faculté de Médecine, Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The synthesis of several 1,1-disubstituted trifluoromethyl-cyclopropanes (TFCPs), known as *tert*-butyl bioisosteres, has been achieved from the reaction between trifluoromethylalkenes and unstabilized sulfonium ylides in yields of $\leq 97\%$. This method offers practical access to this cyclopropyl moiety of pharmacological interest, employing a commercially available reagent at low temperatures. The synthesis of cyclopropanes bearing other electron-withdrawing groups as well as trisubstituted TFCPs was also accomplished.

T he cyclopropyl moiety is widely used in drug discovery and found in numerous pharmaceutical products.¹ Within this family, the 1,1-disubstituted trifluoromethyl-cyclopropane (TFCP) motif recently emerged as a useful bioisostere of *tert*butyl substitutents, as it generally provides increased metabolic stability, leading to improved overall pharmacokinetic properties.² Such a benefit inspired the incorporation of the TFCP surrogate in many pharmaceutical lead compounds displaying biological activities in various therapeutic areas, including autoimmune diseases [I (Figure 1)],^{3a} epilepsy (II),^{3b} cancer (III),^{3c} and chronic neurodegenerative disorders (IV).^{3d} As a result of the increased use of TFCPs in biologically relevant







compounds, a need to develop a general and efficient method for their synthesis arose.

The classical way to synthesize TFCPs consists of a [3+2] cycloaddition between a trifluoromethylalkene and diazomethane, followed by nitrogen extrusion (Scheme 1a).^{2b,4}



Received: February 12, 2019

While this stepwise approach successfully produced several therapeutic leads,^{2b,3a} the synthetic community has been engaged in the development of a milder and more direct method.⁵ Another key improvement would consist of the use of a bench-stable reagent that would allow safer and easier manipulation. More precisely, Baran used a sulfinate as a radical precursor to directly generate TFCPs from heterocycles (Scheme 1b).⁶ An alternative approach was developed by Molander; he used photoredox catalysis to generate a radical that could subsequently add on a trifluoromethylalkene (Scheme 1c).⁷ These new strategies facilitated access to trifluoromethyl-cyclopropyl groups; however, the former is limited to specific heterocyclic structures, and the latter requires the use of a photochemical reactor setup and a reagent that is not commercially available.

Therefore, we sought to develop mild and robust conditions that could provide the desired TFCP substitution starting from the corresponding, easily accessible,⁸ 1,1-disubstituted trifluoromethylalkene. For that purpose, we envisioned using a Corey–Chaykovsky cyclopropanation strategy (Scheme 1d).⁹ Such a reaction was first described by scientists at Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., although no yield was reported.^{9b} On the basis of previous studies,¹⁰ this transformation requires a sufficiently nucleophilic sulfur ylide **2** to add to alkene **3** (Scheme 2). Intermediate **4** must then contain a leaving group

Scheme 2. Cyclopropanation of Trifluoromethylalkenes with Sulfonium Ylide 2



favoring an intramolecular cyclization toward TFCP **5** instead of undergoing fluoride elimination.^{9c} Hence, our efforts focused on the identification of such a reagent.

Different reagents known to be reactive in the standard Corey-Chaykovsky cyclopropanation reaction were tested on the medicinal chemistry-relevant scaffold 3a using NaHMDS as the base and THF as the solvent (Table 1, entries 1-3). Trimethylsulfoxonium iodide (Me₃SOI, 1a) gave no reaction (Table 1, entry 1), whereas the trimethylsulfonium iodide (Me₃SI, 1b) induced decomposition of the starting material while providing small quantities of TFCP 5a (Table 1, entry 2). Only methyl(diphenyl)sulfonium tetrafluoroborate $(Ph_2SMeBF_4, 1c)^{9b,d}$ furnished the desired TFCP-containing product in significant quantities (Table 1, entry 3). Cherishing the idea of developing a method using a commercially available reagent, we selected sulfonium 1c for further optimization of the reaction conditions. Other solvents for this reaction failed to provide an increase in yield compared to that found with THF (Table 1, entries 4-6). Similarly, the screening of other bases for the cyclopropanation reaction confirmed NaHMDS as being optimal (Table 1, entries 7-10). Decreasing the amount of reagent 1c and base used to 1.3 and 1.6 equiv, respectively, afforded TFCP 5a in 65% yield (Table 1, entry 11).

Once the optimized reaction conditions were established, the substrate scope of the cyclopropanation reaction was studied (Scheme 3). To our delight, the methodology appeared to be quite general to a variety of heterocycles,

Table 1. Optimization of Reaction Conditions^a

| <u>_</u> | | cyclopropanating reagent 1 (1.5 equiv) base (2.0 equiv) solvent, 0 °C to rt, 1 h | | uiv) | |
|----------|---|--|-----------------|---------|------------------------|
| "»↓ | N | | | - "N- | N N |
| • | 3a | | | | 5a |
| entry | cyclopropa | nating reagent 1 | base | solvent | yield (%) ^b |
| 1 | Me ₃ S | OI, 1a | NaHMDS | THF | 0 ^c |
| 2 | Me ₃ SI, 1b | | NaHMDS | THF | <10 ^c |
| 3 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | NaHMDS | THF | 57 ^d |
| 4 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | NaHMDS | DCM | 48 ^d |
| 5 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | NaHMDS | toluene | 54 ^d |
| 6 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | NaHMDS | DME | 42 ^d |
| 7 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | LiHMDS | THF | 52 |
| 8 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | KHMDS | THF | 19 |
| 9 | Ph ₂ SMeBF ₄ , 1c | | NaH | THF | 32 |
| 10 | Ph ₂ SI | MeBF ₄ , 1c | <i>t</i> -BuONa | THF | 51 |
| 11 | Ph ₂ SI | MeBF ₄ , 1c | NaHMDS | THF | 65 ^e |

^{*a*}Reactions were run on a 0.066 mmol scale. ^{*b*}Yields determined from analysis of the crude ¹H NMR spectrum using triphenylmethane as an internal standard. ^{*c*}With 2.0 equiv of reagent, 4.0 equiv of base, and a temperature gradient from -78 °C to rt. ^{*d*}A temperature gradient from -78 °C to rt. ^{*c*}With 1.3 equiv of reagent and 1.6 equiv of base.

affording the desired TFCP products in yields ranging from 36% to 81% (Scheme 3, products 5a-5g). This demonstrates the applicability of the method to relevant systems in medicinal chemistry. When using the more electron-rich indole 3h, no reaction occurred, most likely due to its reduced electrophilicity. To test the necessity of having a heteroatom in the ring attached to the trifluoromethylalkene, substituted phenyls were also examined, displaying moderate to good yields (Scheme 3, products 5i-5n, 50-97% yields). Gratifyingly, electron-neutral rings 3k and 3l, as well as electron-rich ring 3n, afforded their corresponding TFCP products in good yields (Scheme 3, 5k, 5I, and 5n, respectively), indicating that an electron-withdrawing group is not required for the reaction to proceed. A particularity of naphthyl product 51 is that it could not be separated from the diphenyl sulfide byproduct using flash chromatography. To facilitate its separation, we decided to methylate back the diphenyl sulfide using methyl trifluoromethanesulfonate (MeOTf) to create a salt. This successful procedure opens the possibility of recycling the cyclopropanating reagent, something that could be of interest in large scale processes.

To broaden the scope of our methodology, we investigated the applicability of the method to the synthesis of cyclopropanes presenting different substitution patterns. We began by testing the cyclopropanation reaction on alkenes bearing electron-withdrawing groups other than CF₃. As could be expected, pentafluoroethyl (7a)- and cyano (7b)-substituted cyclopropanes (Table 2, entries 1 and 2, respectively) were accessed with yields in the same range as those obtained for TFCPs. On the other hand, when nitro-substituted alkene 6c was exposed to the same reaction conditions (Table 2, entry 3), it resulted in a poor yield, probably due to the high reactivity of the substrate.^{9a} The cyclopropanation with vinylsulfone 6d appeared to be less efficient than when stabilized sulfonium ylides were employed^{10a} but still provided 37% of 7d (Table 2, entry 4), whereas this substrate was unreactive under Molander's cyclopropanation conditions (Scheme 1c).⁷ An interesting observation was also that 3nitrostyrene 6e proved to be completely unreactive to the



Scheme 3. Substrate Scope of Trifluoromethylalkenes^a

5m, 97%5n, 50% (brsm: 74%)"Reactions were run on a 0.44 mmol scale." The reaction was run on
a 1.00 mmol scale. "With 2.0 equiv of Ph2SMeBF4 and 2.3 equiv of

was removed and the resulting mixture was treated with 10 equiv of MeOTf in THF at rt for 2 days. reaction conditions (Table 2, entry 5). This result suggests the

NaHMDS. ^dFollowing the standard reaction conditions, the solvent

possibility of chemoselectively performing the reaction on a trifluoromethylalkene when using a substrate bearing several alkenes.

To investigate the synthesis of trisubstituted TFCPs, various sulfonium salts were tested. Ethyl(diphenyl)sulfonium tetrafluoroborate 1d (Table 2, entry 6) enabled the formation of 7f in good yield as a mixture of stereoisomers, with a slight selectivity toward the *syn* isomer. However, when benzyl-(diphenyl)sulfonium tetrafluoroborate 1e was employed (Table 2, entry 7), cyclopropane 7g was obtained in low yield but with complete selectivity in favor of the *syn* isomer, and most of the unreacted starting material could be cleanly recovered (98% brsm). Both of these results display the impacts of steric hindrance on the sulfonium reagent, which are to decrease the reaction rate and to affect the orientation of the sulfonium ylide during the addition.

In summary, we have developed a straightforward methodology for the formation of TFCPs from readily accessible trifluoromethylalkenes. The disclosed process allows the use of a commercially available reagent without the need for high

 Table 2. Application to Other Substitutions on Cyclopropanes^a



^{*a*}Reactions were run on a 0.44 mmol scale. ^{*b*}Following the standard reaction conditions, the solvent was removed and the resulting mixture was treated with 10 equiv of MeOTf in THF at rt for 16 h.

temperatures. Moreover, substituted cyclopropanes with a broad substitution pattern, including a variety of heterocyclic molecules, could be synthesized using the optimized reaction conditions. We anticipate that this new method of forming TFCPs will facilitate the incorporation of this key *tert*-butyl bioisostere in drug discovery campaigns.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.or-glett.9b00557.

Optimization table, experimental procedures, characterization data, and copies of NMR spectra (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Authors

*E-mail: p.cyr@umontreal.ca. *E-mail: anne.marinier@umontreal.ca. ORCID [©]

Patrick Cyr: 0000-0001-5320-3483

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Fondation Marcel et Rolande Gosselin and a Project Grant (PJT-153131) from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

REFERENCES

(1) (a) Talele, T. T. J. Med. Chem. **2016**, 59, 8712–8756. (b) Taylor, R. D.; MacCoss, M.; Lawson, A. D. G. J. Med. Chem. **2014**, 57, 5845–5859.

(2) (a) Westphal, M. V.; Wolfstädter, B. T.; Plancher, J.-M.; Gatfield, J.; Carreira, E. M. ChemMedChem 2015, 10, 461-469. (b) Barnes-Seeman, D.; Jain, M.; Bell, L.; Ferreira, S.; Cohen, S.; Chen, X.-H.; Amin, J.; Snodgrass, B.; Hatsis, P. ACS Med. Chem. Lett. 2013, 4, 514-516. (c) Sebhat, I. K.; Franklin, C.; Lo, M. M.-C.; Chen, D.; Jewell, J. P.; Miller, R.; Pang, J.; Palyha, O.; Kan, Y.; Kelly, T. M.; Guan, X.-M.; Marsh, D. J.; Kosinski, J. A.; Metzger, J. M.; Lyons, K.; Dragovic, J.; Guzzo, P. R.; Henderson, A. J.; Reitman, M. L.; Nargund, R. P.; Wyvratt, M. J.; Lin, L. S. ACS Med. Chem. Lett. 2011, 2, 43-47. (3) (a) Lapointe, B. T.; Fuller, P. H.; Gunaydin, H.; Liu, K.; Sciammetta, N.; Trotter, B. W.; Zhang, H.; Barr, K. J.; Maclean, J. K. F.; Molinari, D. F.; Simov, V. U.S. Patent Application 2018/016239, 2018. (b) Bezençon, O.; Heidmann, B.; Siegrist, R.; Stamm, S.; Richard, S.; Pozzi, D.; Corminboeuf, O.; Roch, C.; Kessler, M.; Ertel, E. A.; Reymond, I.; Pfeifer, T.; de Kanter, R.; Toeroek-Schafroth, M.; Moccia, L. G.; Mawet, J.; Moon, R.; Rey, M.; Capeleto, B.; Fournier, E. J. Med. Chem. 2017, 60, 9769-9789. (c) Liu, G.; Abraham, S.; Liu, X.; Xu, S.; Rooks, A. M.; Nepomuceno, R.; Dao, A.; Brigham, D.; Gitnick, D.; Insko, D. E.; Gardner, M. F.; Zarrinkar, P. P.; Christopher, R.; Belli, B.; Armstrong, R. C.; Holladay, M. W. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2015, 25, 3436-3441. (d) Wityak, J.; McGee, K. F.; Conlon, M. P.; Song, H. R.; Duffy, B. C.; Clayton, B.; Lynch, M.; Wang, G.; Freeman, E.; Haber, J.; Kitchen, D. B.; Manning, D. D.; Ismail, J.; Khmelnitsky, Y.; Michels, P.; Webster, J.; Irigoyen, M.; Luche, M.; Hultman, M.; Bai, M.; Kuok, I. D.; Newell, R.; Lamers, M.; Leonard, P.; Yates, D.; Matthews, K.; Ongeri, L.; Clifton, S.; Mead, T.; Deupree, S.; Wheelan, P.; Lyons, K.; Wilson, C.; Kiselyov, A.; Toledo-Sherman, L.; Beconi, M.; Muñoz-Sanjuan, I.; Bard, J.; Dominguez, C. J. Med. Chem. 2015, 58, 2967-2987.

(4) (a) Fuchikami, T.; Shibata, Y.; Suzuki, Y. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1986**, 27, 3173–3176. (b) Gröger, C.; Musso, H.; Roßnagel, I. *Chem. Ber.* **1980**, 113, 3621–3628.

(5) Alternative strategies for the formation of TFCP-containing molecules: (a) Kautzky, J. A.; Wang, T.; Evans, R. W.; MacMillan, D. W. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 6522-6526. (b) Huang, W.-S.; Schlinquer, C.; Poisson, T.; Pannecoucke, X.; Charette, A. B.; Jubault, P. Chem. - Eur. J. 2018, 24, 10339-10343. (c) Kotozaki, M.; Chanthamath, S.; Fujii, T.; Shibatomi, K.; Iwasa, S. Chem. Commun. 2018, 54, 5110-5113. (d) Duan, Y.; Lin, J.-H.; Xiao, J.-C.; Gu, Y.-C. Org. Lett. 2016, 18, 2471-2474. (e) Bos, M.; Poisson, T.; Pannecoucke, X.; Charette, A. B.; Jubault, P. Chem. - Eur. J. 2017, 23, 4950-4961. (f) Kelly, C. B.; Mercadante, M. A.; Carnaghan, E. R.; Doherty, M. J.; Fager, D. C.; Hauck, J. J.; MacInnis, A. E.; Tilley, L. J.; Leadbeater, N. E. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2015, 2015, 4071-4076. (g) Mercadante, M. A.; Kelly, C. B.; Hamlin, T. A.; Delle Chiaie, K. R.; Drago, M. D.; Duffy, K. K.; Dumas, M. T.; Fager, D. C.; Glod, B. L. C.; Hansen, K. E.; Hill, C. R.; Leising, R. M.; Lynes, C. L.; MacInnis, A. E.; McGohey, M. R.; Murray, S. A.; Piquette, M. C.; Roy, S. L.; Smith, R. M.; Sullivan, K. R.; Truong, B. H.; Vailonis, K. M.; Gorbatyuk, V.; Leadbeater, N. E.; Tilley, L. J. Chem. Sci. 2014, 5, 3983-3994. (h) Artamonov, O. S.; Slobodyanyuk, E. Y.; Volochnyuk, D. M.; Komarov, I. V.; Tolmachev, A. A.; Mykhailiuk, P. K. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2014, 2014, 3592-3598. (i) Duncton, M. A. J.; Singh, R. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 4284-4287. (j) Morandi, B.; Mariampillai, B.; Carreira, E. M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 1101-1104. (k) Morandi, B.; Carreira, E. M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2010, 49,

938–941. (l) Le Maux, P.; Juillard, S.; Simonneaux, G. Synthesis 2006, 2006, 1701–1704. (m) Denton, J. R.; Sukumaran, D.; Davies, H. M. L. Org. Lett. 2007, 9, 2625–2628.

(6) Smith, J. M.; Dixon, J. A.; deGruyter, J. N.; Baran, P. S. *J. Med. Chem.* **2018**. (b) Gianatassio, R.; Kawamura, S.; Eprile, C. L.; Foo, K.; Ge, J.; Burns, A. C.; Collins, M. R.; Baran, P. S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2014**, 53, 9851–9855.

(7) Phelan, J. P.; Lang, S. B.; Compton, J. S.; Kelly, C. B.; Dykstra, R.; Gutierrez, O.; Molander, G. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2018**, *140*, 8037–8047.

(8) (a) Phelan, J. P.; Wiles, R. J.; Lang, S. B.; Kelly, C. B.; Molander, G. A. *Chem. Sci.* **2018**, *9*, 3215–3220. (b) Fujita, T.; Konno, N.; Watabe, Y.; Ichitsuka, T.; Nagaki, A.; Yoshida, J.-I.; Ichikawa, J. J. *Fluorine Chem.* **2018**, 207, 72–76. (c) Li, Y.; Zhao, B.; Dai, K.; Tu, D.-H.; Wang, B.; Wang, Y.-Y.; Liu, Z.-T.; Liu, Z.-W.; Lu, J. *Tetrahedron* **2016**, *72*, 5684–5690. (d) Wang, X.; Xu, Y.; Deng, Y.; Zhou, Y.; Feng, J.; Ji, G.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, J. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2014**, 20, 961–965. (e) Jiménez-Aquino, A.; Vega, J. A.; Trabanco, A. A.; Valdés, C. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2014**, 356, 1079–1084. (f) Jiang, B.; Wang, Q.-F.; Yang, C.-G.; Xu, M. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2001**, *42*, 4083–4085.

(9) (a) Hock, K. J.; Hommelsheim, R.; Mertens, L.; Ho, J.; Nguyen, T. V.; Koenigs, R. M. J. Org. Chem. 2017, 82, 8220–8227. (b) Zhang, H.; Barr, K. J.; Lapointe, B. T.; Gunaydin, H.; Liu, K.; Trotter, B. W. WO Patent Application 2017/075185, 2017. (c) Duan, Y.; Zhou, B.; Lin, J.-H.; Xiao, J.-C. Chem. Commun. 2015, 51, 13127–13130. (d) García Ruano, J. L.; Fajardo, C.; Martin, M. R.; Midura, W.; Mikolajczyk, M. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 2004, 15, 2475–2482.

(10) (a) Winter, M.; Gaunersdorfer, C.; Roiser, L.; Zielke, K.; Monkowius, U.; Waser, M. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2018, 2018, 418-421.
(b) Allgäuer, D. S.; Jangra, H.; Asahara, H.; Li, Z.; Chen, Q.; Zipse, H.; Ofial, A. R.; Mayr, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2017, 139, 13318-13329.
(c) Appel, R.; Hartmann, N.; Mayr, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 17894-17900. (d) Riches, S. L.; Saha, C.; Filgueira, N. F.; Grange, E.; McGarrigle, E. M.; Aggarwal, V. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 7626-7630. (e) Janardanan, D.; Sunoj, R. B. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 331-341. (f) Li, A.-H.; Dai, L.-X.; Aggarwal, V. K. Chem. Rev. 1997, 97, 2341-2372.