The Influence of Steric Factors in Diazoalkane-Pyranosid-2-ulose Reactions

By T. D. Inch,* G. J. Lewis, R. P. Peel, and (Mrs.) N. Williams (Chemical Defence Establishment, Porton Down, Salisbury, Wilts)

Summary Comparison of the products from reactions of diazomethane and diazoethane with pyranosid-2-uloses provides new information about the importance of steric factors in diazoethane—cyclic ketone interactions; the reaction of diazoethane with pyranosid-2-uloses is a potentially useful route to higher branched-chain sugars.

The importance of steric effects in product control of reactions between diazoalkanes and cyclic ketones is well illustrated by a comparison of the reactions of diazomethane and diazoethane with methyl 4,6-O-benzylidene-3-deoxy-3-C-ethyl-\alpha-D-arabino- (1) and -ribo-hexopyranosid-2-ulose (2). Addition of ethereal diazomethane to a solution of (1) in methanol afforded the spiro-epoxides (3) and (4) and the ring-expansion product (5). The configurations of the spiro-epoxides were established by lithium aluminium hydride reduction to 2-C-methyl derivatives and thence by an unequivocal method. The structure of (5) follows from analysis of its n.m.r. parameters (Table) which are consistent with the structure and conformation depicted. This result confirms previous assumptions, based on analogy with other 1,2-nucleophilic displacement reactions, that the migrating centre in diazomethane ring expansions retains its configuration.2

The reaction of diazoethane and (1), in contrast to the corresponding diazomethane reaction, afforded no spiroepoxides but only the three seven-membered-ring products (6), (7), and (8), whose structures and conformations follow from their n.m.r. parameters (Table). The following explanation for these differences is offered.3 The first stage in the reaction between diazoalkanes and cyclic ketones is usually considered to be a nucleophilic addition from the least hindered side of the molecule to form a zwitterionic intermediate. Since equatorial addition of diazomethane to (1) is clearly favoured as indicated by the preponderance of the spiro-epoxide (3) and in the absence of evidence to the contrary for diazoethane this common zwitterionic intermediate may be depicted as (10,) (11), or (12). The second stage of the reaction is the nucleophilic displacement of nitrogen by oxygen or by the electrons of a it is necessary to postulate that the transition state (11) when $R^1 = Me$, $R^2 = H$ or $R^1 = H$, $R^2 = Me$ is less favourable than the transition states (10) and (12).

When $R^1 = Me$ there is obviously a strong non-bonded

				TABLE		
	1-H	2-H	3-H	3'-H	4-H	
(5)	4.76		$2 \cdot 42$	2.73	1.35	$J_{3,4}$ 2·5, $J_{3',4}$ 11·8, $J_{4,5}$ 9, $J_{5,6}$ 9 Hz
(6)	$4 \cdot 2$	3.15		-	2.72	$J_{1,2}$ 8, $J_{4,5}$ 9.8 Hz
(7)	4.43	2.85			$2 \cdot 6$	$J_{1,2} 1.9, J_{4,5} 9 \text{ Hz}$
(8)	4.78	-	3	******	1.8	In ca. 9 Hz

N.m.r. spectra were measured at $100 \, \text{MHz}$. Coupling constants are in Hz and chemical shifts are expressed as δ values in p.p.m. Only parameters directly relevant to structural assignments are recorded. It will be noticed that 1-H in (5) and (8) where the carbonyl function is at C-2 resonates at lower field than in (6) and (7) where the C=O group is at C-3. Conversely 4-H is at lower field in (6) and (7) when immediately adjacent to the C=O group than when the C=O is at C-2.

C-C bond. Since displacement of nitrogen requires a trans-coplanar transition state, the favoured conformation for the intermediate which leads to (3) must be (11; $R^1 = R^2 = H$) and the intermediate leading to (5) must be (10; $R^1 = R^2 = H$). To explain the gross differences between the diazomethane and diazoethane reactions

interaction with the C-3 ethyl substituent but why the conformation (11) should be less favourable than (10 or (12) when $R^2 = Me$ is less clear. The formation of products (6), (7), and (8) and the absence of (9) follows from a consideration of the transition states (10) and (12). The most unfavourable intermediate is (10; $R^1 = H$, $R^2 = Me$) where

there is a strong non-bonded interaction between the methyl and the C-3 ethyl groups and it is this intermediate which would lead to (9). If the initial reaction between (1)

and diazoethane gave an axial addition product a consideration of the possible transition states suggests (7) and (8) would be favoured products and that little (6) or (9) would be formed. The presence of an appreciable quantity of (6) as a reaction product is therefore indirect evidence that equatorial addition occurs preponderantly.

Perhaps most indicative of the importance of steric factors in such reactions is the result that the preponderant products result from nucleophilic attack by the C-1-C-2 bond which carries two oxygen atoms at C-1. This bond is much less nucleophilic than the C-2-C-3 bond and previous evidence had indicated that in cyclic ketones where the 2-position carries electronegative substituents ring expansion is inhibited.4

Quite a different pattern was observed for reactions between (2) and diazoalkanes. With diazomethane, (2) afforded similar yields of the spiro-epoxides (13) and (14), and some ring expansion product (15). From the (2)-diazoethane reaction the preponderant product was the 3-Cmethyl derivative (16) ($\hat{J}_{3,4}$ 2 Hz). Also isolated were (16a) ($J_{3,4}$ 4·7 Hz) and the 2-C-methyl derivative (17) ($J_{1,2}$ 1.5 Hz). The configurations and conformations of this series of compounds are not immediately apparent from the n.m.r. parameters. Assuming both axial and equatorial addition of diazoethane to (2), it is obvious from a consideration of possible transition states that the formation of (16), (16a), (17), and the C-2 epimer of (17) may be equally favoured sterically and thus that the product ratios will probably depend on the relative nucleophilicity of the C-1-C-2 and C-2-C-3 bonds and on the initial direction of addition of diazoethane to (2).

(Received, September 22nd, 1970; Com. 1625.)

¹ T. D. Inch and G. J. Lewis, unpublished results.

² D. J. Cram in "Steric Effects in Organic Chemistry," ed. M. S. Newman, Wiley, New York, 1956, ch. 5.

3 Similar explanations of other ring expansion reactions have been published, e.g. (a) N. J. Turro and R. B. Gagosian, Chem. Comm., 1969, 949; (b) J. A. Marshall and J. J. Partridge, J. Org. Chem., 1968, 33, 4090.

4 C. D. Gutsche and D. Redmore, "Carbocyclic Ring Expansion Reactions," Academic Press, New York, 1968, p. 81; G. W. Cowell

⁴C. D. Gutsche and D. Redmore, "Carbon and A. Ledwith, Quart. Rev., 1970, 24, 119.