Cobalt-Catalyzed Allylic Substitution Reaction of Allylic Ethers with Phenyl and Trimethylsilylmethyl Grignard Reagents

Keiya Mizutani, Hideki Yorimitsu, and Koichiro Oshima*

Department of Material Chemistry, Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto University, Kyoto-daigaku Katsura, Nishikyo-ku, Kyoto 615-8510

(Received April 6, 2004; CL-040375)

Treatment of cinnamyl methyl ether with phenylmagnesium bromide in ether in the presence of CoCl₂[1,5-bis(diphenylphosphino)pentane] affords 1,3-diphenylpropene in good yield. Similar allylic substitution reaction with trimethylsilylmethylmagnesium chloride proceeded smoothly to yield homoallylsilanes. α , β -Unsaturated aldehyde acetal also underwent allylic substitution.

Palladium-catalyzed allylic substitution is recognized as one of the most useful reactions catalyzed by transition metal complexes.¹ On the other hand, cobalt-catalyzed allylic substitutions have scarcely been studied, where enolates were employed as nucleophiles.^{2,3} We have been interested in cobalt–phosphine complexes-catalyzed reactions.⁴ During the course of our study, we felt that the combination of cobalt salts, phosphine ligands, and Grignard reagents deserves further investigation and that allylic substitution reaction is a suitable probe. Here we report the reaction of allylic ether with phenyl and trimethylsilylmethyl Grignard reagents in the presence of cobalt–phosphine complexes.

The reaction of cinnamyl methyl ether (1) with phenyl Grignard reagent was first examined (Table 1). In the previous report on the cross-coupling reaction of alkyl halide with ArMgBr, 1,2-bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane (DPPE) was the choice of the ligand.^{4a} For the allylic substitution reaction, DPPE was not suitable and linear product **2** was obtained in only 15% yield (Entry 1). A variety of ligands were surveyed and 1,5-bis-(diphenylphosphino)pentane (DPPPEN) was found to be the most effective for this reaction. 3,3-Diphenyl-1-propene was not detected in every experiment.

Table 1. Reaction of cinnamyl ether 1 with PhMgBr

1 2 Entry Ligand ^a Yield /% 1 DPPE 15 2 None 29 3 PPh ₃ (10 mol %) 30 4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		PhOMe 1	CoCl ₂ (ligand) (5 mol %) PhMgBr (2.0 equiv.)	Ph 💪 Ph	
Entry Ligand ^a Yield /% 1 DPPE 15 2 None 29 3 PPh ₃ (10 mol %) 30 4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58			ether, reflux, 16 h	2	
1 DPPE 15 2 None 29 3 PPh ₃ (10 mol %) 30 4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		Entry	Ligand ^a	Yield /%	
2 None 29 3 PPh ₃ (10 mol %) 30 4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		1	DPPE	15	
3 PPh ₃ (10 mol %) 30 4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		2	None	29	
4 DPPM 24 5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		3	PPh ₃ (10 mol %)	30	
5 DPPP 27 6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		4	DPPM	24	
6 DPPB 50 7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		5	DPPP	27	
7 DPPPEN 72 8 DPPH 58		6	DPPB	50	
8 DPPH 58		7	DPPPEN	72	
		8	DPPH	58	

^aLigands DPPM–DPPH represent $Ph_2P(CH_2)_nPPh_2$, n = 1, DPPM; n = 2, DPPE; n = 3, DPPP; n = 4, DPPB; n = 5, DPPPEN; n = 6, DPPH.

Reactions at ambient temperature decreased the yield of **2**. The choice of the solvent was essential to obtain **2** in satisfactory yield. Reaction in THF gave rise to very low conversion of **1**. It is worth noting that treatment of cinnamyl bromide under similar conditions gave a mixture of dimeric compounds such as 1,6-diphenyl-1,5-hexadiene and 3,4-diphenyl-1,5-hexadiene in addition to a trace of **2**. The formation of the dimeric products suggests that single electron transfer from a cobalt complex yields the cinnamyl radical intermediate. Starting from branched ether **3**, **2** was obtained in comparable yield (Eq 1).

Treatment of (E)-2-octenyl methyl ether (4) with phenylmagnesium bromide in the presence of CoCl₂(dpppen) afforded a mixture of the corresponding coupling products **5**, **6**, and **7** in very poor yields (Table 2, Entry 1). Under the reaction conditions, a part of **5** was transformed into **6**. Without any phosphine ligand, coupling products were obtained in moderate yield (Entry 2). Instead, triphenylphosphine proved to be the best ligand for the reaction of **4** (Entry 4). Other monodentate phosphine ligands were inferior to triphenylphosphine (Entries 5-8).

Under the reaction conditions of Entry 4 in Table 2, 8 was also converted into 5 and 7 (Eq 2). No isomerization of 5 into 6 was observed in this reaction.

$$\begin{array}{c} & \begin{array}{c} \text{CoCl}_2(\text{PPh}_3)_2 \text{ (5 mol \%)} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text{OMe} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text{PhMgBr (2.0 equiv.)} \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} \text{5} \\ \text{74\% (50/50)} \end{array}} 5 + 7 \quad (2) \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text{74\% (50/50)} \end{array}$$

Table 2. Reaction of (E)-2-octenyl ether 4 with PhMgBr

B 🖉	CoCl ₂ (ligand) (5 mol % PhMgBr (2.0 equiv.)	6) R Pl	n Ph		
··· 🗸 🗸	ether, reflux, 16 h		n _ L		
4	$R = n - C_5 H_{11}$	~ 6 6	к ~ 7		
Entry	Ligand	Yield /% ^a	5/6/7		
1	DPPPEN	12	N.D. ^b		
2	_	47	58/10/32		
3	DPPE	32	10/53/37		
4	PPh ₃ ^c	78	36/7/57		
5	$P(2-MeC_6H_4)_3^c$	39	66/<1/33		
6	$P(4-MeC_6H_4)_3^c$	49	42/6/52		
7	P[3,5-(CF ₃) ₂ C ₆ H ₃] ₃ ^c	trace	N.D. ^b		
8	$P(4-MeOC_6H_4)_3^c$	41	31/16/53		
Combined wild of 5 (and 7 Net determined					

^aCombined yield of **5**, **6**, and **7**. ^bNot determined.

^c10 mol % of monodentate phosphines were used.

Allylic substitution reaction with Me₃SiCH₂MgCl was facile. Treatment of **1** with Me₃SiCH₂MgCl in the presence of CoCl₂(dpph) for 14 h at 20 °C afforded a linear product **9** in 99% yield (Eq 3).⁵ Whereas the choice of the ligand was crucial to establish phenylation, ligandless CoCl₂ and CoCl₂(dppb) also catalyzed the trimethylsilylmethylation to afford **9** in 92 and 98% yields, respectively. Reactions of **3** with Me₃SiCH₂MgCl afforded **9** in excellent yield. On the other hand, alkyl-substituted allylic ethers **4** and **8** were converted into mixtures of regioisomers **10** and **11** (Eq 4). The reaction required a higher temperature to complete within a satisfactory reaction time. Trimethylsilylmethylation of branched ether **8** afforded higher yields of **10** and **11** than the reaction of **4**.



Treatment of acetals 12 and 14 with phenyl Grignard reagent in the presence of $CoCl_2(dpppen)$ afforded the corresponding monophenylated allylic ethers 13 and 15, respectively (Eqs 5 and 6). The dimethyl and phenyl groups would interfere with second phenylation.



In contrast to the reaction with phenyl Grignard reagent, bistrimethylsilylmethylation occurred in the reaction of 12 with three equimolar amounts of the Grignard reagent in refluxing ether (Eq 7). Interestingly, in the reaction of 14, we could control the distribution of the product by changing the amount of the Grignard reagent and reaction time (Eqs 8 and 9). Reaction with 1.5 equimolar amounts of the Grignard reagent at ambient temperature for 35 h afforded monosubstituted product 17 in 85% yield. On the other hand, use of three equimolar amounts of the Grignard reagent resulted in generation of doubly substituted product 18 in 94% yield after 48 h reaction at reflux.





In summary, we have demonstrated allylic substitution reaction of allylic ethers with Grignard reagents under cobalt catalysis. The cobalt-catalyzed reaction with phenyl Grignard reagent proved to be a function of a substrate as well as of solvent and ligand. To attain high yields in the phenylation reaction, intensive tunings of variants are essential. In contrast, introduction of a trimethylsilylmethyl group was facile and clean under cobalt catalysis.

References and Notes

- a) J. Tsuji, Acc. Chem. Res., 2, 144 (1969). b) J. Tsuji, Pure Appl. Chem., 54, 197 (1982). c) B. M. Trost and D. L. Van Vranken, Chem. Rev., 96, 395 (1996). d) J. Tsuji, J. Organomet. Chem., 300, 281 (1986).
- 2 a) B. Bhatia, M. M. Reddy, and J. Iqbal, *Tetrahedron Lett.*,
 34, 6301 (1993). b) P. A. Grieco, W. J. DuBay, and L. J. Todd, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 37, 8707 (1996).
- 3 Cobalt-mediated direct electrochemical coupling of aryl halides with allylic esters was reported. P. Gomes, C. Gosmini, and J. Périchon, J. Org. Chem., 68, 1142 (2003).
- 4 a) K. Wakabayashi, H. Yorimitsu, and K. Oshima, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 123, 5374 (2001). b) Y. Ikeda, H. Yorimitsu, and K. Oshima, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 124, 6514 (2002). c) T. Fujioka, T. Nakamura, H. Yorimitsu, and K. Oshima, Org. Lett., 4, 2257 (2002). d) T. Tsuji, H. Yorimitsu, and K. Oshima, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 41, 4137 (2002). e) K. Mizutani, H. Shinokubo, and K. Oshima, Org. Lett., 5, 3959 (2003).
- 5 Experimental Procedure: Anhydrous $CoCl_2$ (7 mg, 0.05 mmol) was placed in a 50-mL two-necked flask and heated with a hair dryer in vacuo for 3 min. DPPH (27 mg, 0.06 mmol) and ether (1 mL) were sequentially added under argon. After the mixture was stirred for 30 min to obtain blue suspension, cinnamyl methyl ether (1, 0.15 g, 1.0 mmol) and Me₃SiCH₂MgCl (1.0 M in ether, 2.0 mL, 2.0 mmol) were successively added to the reaction mixture at 0 °C. After being stirred for 14 h at 20 °C, the reaction mixture was poured into saturated NH₄Cl solution. The products were extracted with ethyl acetate (20 mL × 3) and the combined organic layer was dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated. Silica gel column purification of the crude product provided **9** (0.20 g, 0.99 mmol) in 99% yield as colorless oil.