Determination of the Enantiomeric Purity of Compound Chiral by Virtue of C-13 Labelling

By William H. Pirkle* and Mark S. Pavlin

(School of Chemical Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801)

Summary Suitable chiral additives can render nonequivalent the n.m.r. spectra of the enantiomers of compounds chiral by virtue of ¹³C labelling, thereby allowing direct determination of the enantiomeric purities of these isotopic chiral compounds.

RECENTLY, the optical rotation of a sample of chiral $[^{12}CH_2]$ benzyl $[^{13}CH_2]$ benzyl sulphoxide (1) of high but unknown enantiomeric purity has been reported.¹[†] We describe a means for the direct determination of the enantiomeric purity of this sulphoxide and illustrate the method by the determination of the enantiomeric purity of dimethyl sulphoxide (DMSO), chiral by virtue of ^{13}C labelling. The method, although not necessarily the experimental details, is general in principle for compounds chiral by virtue of ^{13}C substitution.

Treatment of an unequal (21% diastereoisomeric purity) mixture of the diastereoisomeric [(R) configuration at sulphur in excess)] (-)-menthyl methanesulphinates with 45% enriched [^{13}C]methylmagnesium iodide affords (R) enriched $^{13}CH_3SOCH_3$. The ¹H n.m.r. spectrum of this material in CFCl₃ shows a sharp singlet at δ 2.60 arising from the $^{12}C^{12}C$ component. The $^{13}C^{12}C$ sulphoxide shows four quartets centred at δ 2.60 arising from short- and long-





FIGURE. Partial 100 MHz ¹H n.m.r. spectrum of (R)-enriched ¹³CH₃SOCH₃ in: (a) CFCl₃; (b) CFCl₃ with added (R)-(-)-2,2,2-trifluorophenylethanol (2).

 \uparrow An effort was made to estimate the diastereotopic purity of the sulphinate precursors of (1) since, in the event of total conversion of the sulphinates into (1), the diastereoisomeric and optical purities correspond. Since the cost of ¹³C enriched Grignard reagents may preclude their use in large excess, kinetic differences may cause the two ratios to differ (e.g. see ref. 2).

(-)-2,2,2-trifluorophenylethanol (2),² the methyl groups in the $[^{12}C, ^{12}C]$ DMSO become diastereotopic³ (δ 2.49 and 2.51) and each of the four quartets of the [$^{13}C^{12}C$] DMSO is doubled since the enantiomers now have nonidentical chemical shifts ($\Delta \delta 0.02 \text{ p.p.m.}$). While the inner quartets of the [13C12C] enantiomers partially overlap the two central ¹²C¹²C multiplets, the outer quartets of the enantiomers clearly show intensity differences which indicate the sample had an enantiomeric purity of 18%. As expected in the presence of (R)-(2), the outer resonances of the (R)-sulphoxide enantiomer occur at higher field than those of the (S)-enantiomer.⁴ The converse is true for the inner resonances. The Figure shows this spectrum under resolution conditions such that the weak proton-proton couplings are not completely resolved.

The 9-(10-methylanthryl) analogue of (2) affords larger nonequivalence magnitudes than does (2) (e.g. 0.08 p.p.m.

of the AB multiplet normally observed for the methylene protons of dibenzyl sulphoxide in CDCl₃. The presence of ¹³C in either of the now diastereotopic methylene groups would cause strong ¹³C-H splitting and, as in the case of DMSO, determination of the enantiomeric purity of isotopically chiral (1) reduces to determination of the relative intensities of the two AB patterns in either the high- or low-field set of ¹³C satellites.

for DMSO) and causes marked doubling ($\Delta \delta 0.16$ p.p.m.)

The method just described is not restricted to sulphoxides but will, in general, be applicable to any compound in which resonances of ¹³C-coupled nuclei enantiotopic⁺ by internal comparison show chemical shift nonequivalence as they become diastereotopic in the presence of a chiral additive^{3,5} or derivatizing agent.

(Received, 28th December 1973; Com. 1724.)

[‡] Enantiotopic, that is, in the absence of ¹³C labelling.

- ¹ K. K. Anderson, S. Colonna, and C. J. M. Stirling, J.C.S. Chem. Comm., 1973, 645.
 ² W. H. Pirkle, S. D. Beare, and T. G. Burlingame, J. Org. Chem., 1969, 34, 470.
 ³ M. Kainosho, K. Ajisaka, W. H. Pirkle, and S. D. Beare, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1972, 94, 5924.
 ⁴ W. H. Pirkle and S. D. Beare, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1968, 90, 6250.
 ⁵ R. R. Fraser, M. A. Pettit, and M. Miskow, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1972, 94, 3253.