## **An unusual by-product from a non-synchronous reaction between ethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3-carboxylate and an enamine**

## **John E. Macor,\****a***†‡ William Kuipers***a* **and Rene J. Lachicotte***b*

*a Department of Medicinal Chemistry, Astra Arcus USA, PO Box 20890, Rochester, NY 14602, USA*

*b Department of Chemistry, University of Rochester, Rochester NA 14627, USA*

**The main product from the reaction of ethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3-carboxylate 3 and the pyrrolidine enamine of** *N-tert***butoxycarbonylpiperidone 2 was an azabicyclo[3.2.1]octane 4 which resulted not from a Diels–Alder reaction, but from a series of non-synchronous steps, demonstrating a heretofore unknown reaction pathway for the electron-deficient diene 3 and electron-rich dienophile 2.**

Utilization of 1,2,4-triazines as electron-deficient dienes in inverse electron demand Diels–Alder reactions with enamines has found extensive use for the synthesis of substituted pyridine derivatives. The work of Boger,<sup>1</sup> Taylor,<sup>2</sup> Snyder<sup>3</sup> and others have demonstrated the generality and utility of this approach to functionalized pyridines.

In a series of studies,<sup>4</sup> Boger and Panek examined the reaction of ethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3-carboxylate **3**5 with a variety of enamines, and found those reactions to be relatively low yielding and complicated by uncharacterized side products. However, we desired the tetrahydronaphthyridine **1** (Scheme 1) for a medicinal chemistry study and believed that the inverse electron demand Diels–Alder reaction between **3**5 and the



enamine derived from *N*-*tert*-butoxycarbonyl-4-piperidone **2** would provide rapid access to the desired heterocycle **1** (Scheme 1). The necessary enamine **2** was directly available from the reaction of pyrrolidine and *N*-*tert*-butoxycarbonyl-4-piperidone in anhydrous  $Et<sub>2</sub>O$  in the presence of anhydrous MgSO4, and the 1,2,4-triazine **3** was available from previous studies.<sup>5</sup> Reaction of  $2$  and  $3$  in CHCl<sub>3</sub> at room temperature provided only a trace (8%) of the desired tetrahydronaphthyridine **1** (Scheme 1).6 The major component of the reaction mixture (26%) was an unidentified product whose preliminary spectral data suggested the incorporation of both components **2** and **3** from the reaction without the elimination of nitrogen as would be seen in a Diels–Alder adduct. Extensive NMR studies and mass spectral data suggested that the compound was a tetrahydro-1,2,4-triazine fused to an azabicyclo[3.2.1]octane core (**4**, Scheme 1).7 Crystals were prepared of this compound (ethyl acetate–benzene) of sufficient quality that X-ray diffraction studies could be performed, and this experiment confirmed the structure of the by-product as that depicted by **4** (Fig. 1).8

The azabicyclo[3.2.1]octane clearly was not the result of a Diels–Alder reaction. A likely mechanism for its formation is shown in Scheme 1. The electron-rich  $\beta$ -position on enamine 2 attacked the electron-deficient C6 position of 1,2,4-triazine **3** in a vinylogous Michael reaction fashion. The negative charge introduced into the 1,2,4-triazine ring was stabilized by the electron-delocalizing carboxylate located at C3 of the heterocycle. Probably because of this stabilized zwitterionic species **5**, the ammonium moiety that resulted from the vinylogous Michael attack of the enamine underwent a proton transfer reaction which protonated the enolate and reformed the enamine, leading to **6**. The enamine **6** then attacked the proximate imine (Scheme 1) forming intermediate ammonium species **7** which yielded **4** upon hydrolysis.

These results, coupled with evidence from the literature, 4,9,10 suggest that the presence of an electron-delocalizing substituent at C3 of the 1,2,4-triazine can shift the balance of reactivity from a concerted Diels–Alder reaction to a stepwise, nonsynchronous reaction which gives rise to the observed by-



**Scheme 1 Fig. 1** Crystal structure of 4

product **4**, especially if the C6 position is unsubstituted. The presence of the ethoxycarbonyl group provided resonance stabilization of the negative charge introduced into the 1,2,4-triazine ring from the attack of the enamine. This and possibly the steric hindrance of the ethoxycarbonyl group discouraged further reaction of C3 of the 1,2,4-triazine with the electrophilic iminium species in **5**, leading to the creation of the second enamine moiety. This newly formed enamine could then react in a relatively unhindered fashion, leading to the 7-azabicyclo[3.2.1]octane moiety found in **4**.

The result of this reaction might have general implications for the reactions of enamines (and other electron-rich dienophiles) with 1,2,4-triazines (or other electron-poor dienes) in attempted inverse electron demand Diels–Alder reactions. Previous examples of enamines reacting with azadienes with electrondelocalizing substituents on *both* carbon atoms involved with the Diels–Alder reaction (*i.e*. diethyl 1,2,4,5-tetrazine-3,6-dicarboxylate9 and triethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3,5,6-tricarboxylate4*b*) are generally high yielding, suggesting that non-synchronous side reactions are either minimal or nonexistent. For example, triethyl 1,2,4-triazine- 3,5,6-tricarboxylate reacted with the pyrrolidine enamine derived from phenyl *n*-propyl ketone to afford the expected pyridine in 73% yield, whereas ethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3-carboxylate afforded only 10% of its expected pyridine when reacted with the same enamine.<sup>4b</sup> Also, when 3-(dimethoxymethyl)-1,2,4-triazine was used in place of ethyl 1,2,4-triazine-3-carboxylate, the Diels–Alder reactions of the acetal with enamines proceeded in higher yield.4*a* Therefore, it would appear that only in those cases where a resonance delocalizing group exists on one of the carbon atoms involved with the Diels–Alder reaction and the other, *para* carbon atom on the azadiene is unsubstituted, the balance of reactivity may be sufficiently altered to allow for, or favor, non-synchronous reactions such as vinylogous Michael reactions which would limit the amount of Diels–Alder product seen from these reactions. The result of these reactions would be products analogous to **4**. We are presently attempting to examine the generality of this hypothesis, and the implications for inverse electron demand Diels–Alder reactions.

The authors wish to thank Dr Paul Rosenberg for his efforts in establishing the collaboration for X-ray diffraction experiments between Astra Arcus and the University of Rochester.

## **Notes and References**

† E-mail: macor\_john.privlms3@msmail.bms.com

‡ *Present address*: Bristol-Myers Squibb Pharmaceutical Research Institute, Mail Stop H12-02, PO Box 4000, Princeton, NJ 08543-4000.

1 D. L. Boger and M. Patel, *Prog. Heterocycl. Chem.*, 1989, **1**, 30 and references cited therein.

- 2 E. C. Taylor, *Bull. Soc. Chim. Belg.*, 1988, **97**, 599 and references cited therein.
- 3 S. C. Benson, L. Lee and J. K. Snyder, *Tetrahedron Lett*., 1996, **37**, 5061 and references cited therein; W.-H. Fan, M. Parikh and J. K. Snyder, *Tetrahedron Lett*., 1995, **36**, 6591 and references cited therein.
- 4 (*a*) D. L. Boger, J. S. Panek and M. M. Meier, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1982, **47**, 895; (*b*) D. L. Boger and J. S. Panek, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1985, **107**, 5745.
- 5 W. Paudler and K. Kraus, *Synthesis*, 1974, 351 and references cited therein.
- 6 *Selected data* for **1**:  $\delta_H(CDC1_3, 200 MHz)$  8.50 (d, *J* 4.9, 1 H), 7.19 (d, *J* 4.9, 1 H), 4.63 (s, 2 H), 4.46 (q, *J* 7.1, 2 H), 3.66 (br t, *J* 5.9, 2 H), 3.17 (br t, *J* 5.9, 2 H), 1.50 (s, 9 H), 1.44 (t, *J* 7.1, 3 H); *m*/*z* (FAB LRMS) 308 (18%), 307 ([MH]+, 96), 251 (100), 207 (8), 57 (71).
- 7 *Selected data* for **4**: white solid; mp 187.5–189.5 °C with effervescence;  $v_{\text{max}}(KBr)/cm^{-1}$  3359 (br), 1759, 1701, 1640;  $\delta_H(DMSO, 500 \text{ MHz})$ 340 K) 6.66 (br m, NH), 6.48 (d, *J* 4.0, NH), 4.27 (br dd, *J* 12.7 and 12.9, 2 H), 4.19 (q, *J* 7.0, 2 H), 3.85 (t, *J* 5.0, 1 H), 3.39 (d, *J* 5.6, 1 H), 3.28 (d, *J* 12.7, 1 H), 3.19 (d, *J* 12.9, 1 H), 2.33 (s, 1 H), 2.26 (s, 1 H), 1.43 (s, 9 H), 1.24 (t, *J* 7.0, 3 H); δ<sub>C</sub>(DMSO, 500 MHz, 340 K) 215.1, 161.3, 154.1, 137.4, 79.8, 60.7, 53.8, 53.2, 52.6, 52.4, 51.8, 50.3, 28.0, 14.0; *m*/*z* (FAB LRMS) 354 (19%), 353 ([MH]+, 100), 297 (27). Calc. for C16H24N4O5: C 54.54; H, 6.87; N, 15.90. Found: C, 54.29; H, 6.93; N, 15.73%).
- 8 Crystals of **4** were grown in a concentrated EtOAc–benzene solution, and benzene was incorporated into the crystalline lattice in a ratio of 1 : 1 with **4**. A small single crystal was mounted on glass fiber under Paratone-8277 and placed on the X-ray diffractometer in a cold  $N_2$ ogen stream supplied by a Siemens LT-2A low temperature device. The X-ray intensity data were collected on a standard Siemens SMART CCD Area Detector System equipped with a normal focus molybdenum target X-ray tube operated at  $2.0 \text{ kW}$  (50 kV, 40 mA). A quadrant of data were collected using a narrow frame method with scan widths of 0.3° in *w*, and an exposure time of 30 s per frame. Frames were integrated to 40° with the Siemens SAINT program yielding a total of 3416 reflections, of which 1832 were independent reflections  $[R(int) = 0.0700]$ . The unit cell parameters were based upon the least-squares refinement of three dimensional centroids of 857 reflections at  $-80$  °C, giving a monoclinic cell with *a* = 15.038(1), *b* = 13.967(1), *c* = 10.777(1) Å,  $\beta$  = 99.594(4)°, *V* = 2232.0(2) Å<sup>3</sup>. The space group was assigned as  $P2_1/c$  ( $Z = 4$  and  $D_c = 1.281$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>) on the basis of systematic absences using the XPREP program (Siemens, SHELXTL 5.04). The absorption coefficient was  $0.092$  mm<sup>-1</sup>. The structure was solved by direct methods and refined by full-matrix least-squares on *F*2. All nonhydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic thermal parameters, with H atoms included in idealized positions. The empirical formula is  $C_{16}H_{24}N_4O_5$ **·**C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub> giving a formula weight of 430.50 g mol<sup>-1</sup>. Final *R* indices [1143 data having  $I > 2\sigma(I)$ ];  $\bar{R}_1$  (%) = 7.90 [ $R_1$  = 0.0790; *wR*<sup>2</sup> = 0.1481]. CCDC 182/810.
- 9 D. L. Boger, R. S. Coleman, J. S. Panek and D. Yohannes, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1984, **49**, 4405.
- 10 J. E. Macor, PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 1986, pp. 21–23 and 66–68.

*Received in Corvallis, OR, USA, 16th January 1998; 8/00563J*