# *B*-(3,3-Difluoroallyl)diisopinocampheylborane for the Enantioselective Fluoroallylboration of Aldehydes

P. Veeraraghavan Ramachandran,\* Agnieszka Tafelska-Kaczmarek,<sup>‡</sup> and Anamitra Chatterjee

Herbert C. Brown Center for Borane Research, Department of Chemistry, Purdue University, 560 Oval Drive, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-2084, United States

# **Supporting Information**

**ABSTRACT:** The fluoroallylboration of aldehydes with *B*-(3,3-difluoroallyl)diisopinocampheylborane, which was prepared via the hydroboration of 1,1difluoroallene, provides chiral 2,2-*gem*-difluorinated homoallylic alcohols in good yields and 91–97% ee.

**F** luorine substitution often alters the reactivity and reaction mechanism of organic molecules.<sup>1</sup> Medicinal chemists undertake this exercise to alter the biological properties of such molecules, with the aim of identifying more potent and bioavailable molecules.<sup>2</sup> Geminal difluorinated aliphatic fluoro-organic molecules are particularly attractive due to their unique pharmacological properties.<sup>3</sup> As part of our program involving fluoro-organic synthesis via boranes,<sup>4</sup> we had reported the preparation and reactions of racemic and chiral 2-benzyloxy-(3,3-difluoroallyl)boronates **1** and **2**, respectively (Figure 1), for the synthesis of 2,2-gem-difluorinated homoallyl alcohols and derivatives.<sup>5</sup>



Figure 1. (3,3-Difluoroallyl)boronates.

We had also reported a low yield ( $\leq 20\%$ ) synthesis of the parent camphanediol (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate 4<sup>5b</sup> from 2,2difluorovinyllithium<sup>6</sup> and the corresponding camphanediol iodomethylboronate.<sup>7</sup> The importance of the products 2,2difluoro-1-aryl/alkylbut-3-en-1-ols as useful building blocks for the synthesis of bioactive molecules,<sup>8</sup> led us to re-examine the synthesis of racemic and chiral (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate reagents 3 and 4. While racemic 2,2-difluoro-1-aryl/alkylbut-3-en-1-ols have been reported via the addition of gem-difluoroallylmetals (Si,<sup>9</sup> In,<sup>10</sup> Li,<sup>11</sup> Sn,<sup>12</sup> Zn<sup>13</sup>) to aldehydes and ketones, to the best of our knowledge, chiral 2,2-gemdifluorohomoallyl alcohols are accessed via a lipase-mediated enzymatic resolution of racemic alcohols.<sup>14</sup> Reported herein are the improved synthesis of asymmetric (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate, the failed asymmetric allylboration with 4, and finally, the successful preparation and reactions of difluoroallylborane-derived from  $\alpha$ -pinene.

Diisopropyl (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate (3) prepared via the homologation<sup>15</sup> of 2,2-difluorovinyllithium<sup>6</sup> with diisopropyl

iodomethylboronate<sup>16</sup> (Scheme 1) was found to be unstable for storage. Hence, the difluoroallylboration of benzaldehyde (5a)

√)2B

F 1) RCHO

Scheme 1. Preparation of (3,3-Difluoroallyl)boronates 3 and 4



was examined with in situ generated reagents, and the optimal conditions were identified (Table 1).

The allylboration of benzaldehyde (**5a**) with **3** in THF at room temperature, monitored by <sup>11</sup>B NMR spectroscopy (chemical shift change from  $\delta$  30 to 18 ppm), furnished 2,2difluoro-1-phenylbut-3-en-1-ol (**6a**) in only 15% yield. On the basis of Lewis acid catalyzed allylboration with allylboronates,<sup>17</sup> the reaction was examined in the presence of 10 mol % Sc(OTf)<sub>3</sub>, which improved the yield to 43%. Raising the temperature to reflux further improved the yield to 67%. Increasing the catalyst loading to 20 mol % and the reaction time to 48 h did not improve the yield. Changing the catalyst to In(OTf)<sub>3</sub> (10 mol %) yielded 38% of the homoallylic alcohol. The influence of the solvent was then examined. Unlike the benzyloxy reagent **1**, the parent reagent **3** was only sparingly soluble in pentane. The reaction failed in refluxing dichloromethane (48 h); refluxing in toluene decomposed the reagent.

With the standardized reaction conditions, the fluoroallylboration of additional aldehydes was carried out (Table 2).

Received: May 22, 2012 Published: September 13, 2012 Table 1. Difluoroallylboration of Benzaldehyde (5a) with 3; Optimization of Conditions<sup>a</sup>



<sup>*a*</sup>Reactions were carried out with 1.5 equiv of crude reagent. <sup>*b*</sup>10 mol % of the Lewis acid was used, unless otherwise stated. <sup>*c*</sup>Isolated yields of pure products. <sup>*d*</sup>No reaction observed. <sup>*c*</sup>Decomposition of reagent 3. <sup>*f*</sup>No reaction due to the poor solubility of the reagent.

Table 2. Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes 5 with  $3^{a}$ 

entry	RCHO (5)	R	6	time (h)	vield <sup><math>b</math></sup> (%)	
,					/	
1	5a	$C_6H_5$	6a	24	67	
2	5b	p-MeO-C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	6b	48	33	
3	5c	2-Naphthyl	6c	38	25	
4	5d	$C_6H_5(CH_2)_2$	6d	48	62	
<sup>a</sup> Reactio	ons were carrie	ed out in THF a	t reflux	with 1.5 eq	uiv of crude	

reagent and 10 mol % of Sc(OTf)<sub>3</sub>. <sup>b</sup>Isolated yields of pure products.

Surprisingly, low yields, 33% and 25%, respectively, were obtained for the allylboration of *p*-anisaldehyde (**5b**) and 2-naphthaldehyde (**5c**). Hydrocinnamaldehyde (**5d**) afforded the product in 62% isolated yield. The factors influencing the low yield are not clear at this point, although similar homoallylic alcohols have been found to undergo the elimination of fluoride under basic conditions.<sup>18</sup> It is noteworthy that diisopropyl (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate (**3**) is less reactive than the 2-benzyloxy-substituted reagent **1**. This could be due to increased electron density of the vinylic ether, a fact which should favor the allyl transfer.

We were able to significantly improve upon our previous results, <sup>Sb</sup> enhancing the yield of (1R,3S)-1,2,2-trimethylcyclopent-1,3-diyl (4R)-2-(3,3-difluoroprop-2-enyl)-4-phenyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolane (4) from  $\leq 20\%$  to 80%, simply by decreasing the reaction temperature. Unlike the achiral reagent, 4 is stable to silica gel chromatography and the yield represents isolated yield of the pure reagent and further reactions were carried out using pure reagent. The fluoroallylboration of aldehydes with 4 was also facilitated by the presence of a Lewis acid, higher reaction temperature, and longer reaction times (Scheme 2). Allylborations were carried out with 1.25 equiv of reagent 4 in the presence of 10 mol % of Sc(OTf)<sub>3</sub> at reflux in THF and

Scheme 2. Asymmetric Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes 5 with 4



were monitored by the <sup>11</sup>B NMR spectroscopy (chemical shift change from  $\delta$  33 to 22 ppm).

As in the case of the racemic fluoroallylboration (Table 1), no reaction took place in dichloromethane and decomposition was observed in toluene. Allylboration of benzaldehyde (**5a**) afforded the chiral homoallyl alcohol (*R*)-**6a** in 38% yield and surprisingly low 20% ee, as was determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of the corresponding  $\alpha$ -methoxy  $\alpha,\alpha,\alpha$ trifluoromethylphenyl acetates (Mosher esters).<sup>19</sup> The configuration of the alcohol was assigned on the basis of the sign of the optical rotation of the alcohol, as reported in the literature.<sup>14</sup>

The use of  $In(OTf)_3$  (20 mol %) decreased the ee to 12%, but with similarly poor yield (37%). Low enantioselectivity (20%) was also observed for *p*-anisaldehyde (**5b**), where the reaction required 4.5 days (<sup>11</sup>B NMR).

The disappointing results from chiral (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronates and the established success of pinane-mediated allyl-, crotyl-, and alkoxyallylborations<sup>20</sup> prompted the preparation of *B*-(3,3-difluoroallyl)diisopinocampheylborane and fluoroallylboration of aldehydes. Hydroboration of substituted allenes have been utilized for the preparation of novel achiral and chiral allylboranes.<sup>21</sup> Accordingly, we examined the hydroboration of 1,1-difluoroallene with racemic and chiral diisopinocampheylborane (Ipc<sub>2</sub>BH) (Scheme 3).

The successful, reagent-dependent, and regioselective hydroboration of a variety of fluoroolefins have been described by us earlier.<sup>22</sup> Hydroboration of fluoroalkynes have also been reported in the literature.<sup>23</sup> However, there has been no report on the hydroboration of fluoroallenes. Accordingly, freshly prepared 1,1-difluoroallene,<sup>24</sup> was added to a suspension of (–)-Ipc<sub>2</sub>BH in diethyl ether at -78 °C and was warmed to 0 °C over 3 h, whereafter the reaction medium became homogeneous. The <sup>11</sup>B NMR spectrum revealed two peaks at  $\delta$  79 and 49 ppm in a 7:3 ratio, presumably corresponding to the difluoroallylborane 7 and (2,2-difluoro-1-methylvinyl)-borane (on the basis of <sup>11</sup>B NMR of vinylboranes) (Scheme 3).

Benzaldehyde (5a) was added to the above mixture at -78°C, and the reaction, which was monitored by <sup>11</sup>B NMR spectroscopy, was complete within 4 h. The NMR spectrum revealed a broad peak at  $\delta$  50 ppm, along with a shoulder peak, presumably due to the unreacted vinylborane. Alkaline oxidative workup with hydrogen peroxide over 12 h at rt, provided the expected 2,2-difluoro-1-phenylbut-3-en-1-ol (6a) in 43% yield, based on the allylborane present in the medium. Since allylboration has been shown to be a fast reaction even at low temperatures,<sup>25</sup> the yield of **6a** is most likely limited by the formation of the allylborane from hydroboration. <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of the Mosher ester derivative of 6a revealed an enantiomeric excess of 94%, and a configurational assignment of R.<sup>14</sup> It is observed that the stereochemistry of the product of the reaction with difluoroallylborane 7 is the same as that of the nonfluorinated analogue.<sup>25</sup>

Solvents such as THF, pentane, and  $CH_2Cl_2$  decreased the yield of the reaction. Although there was no change in the enantioselectivity, lowering the allylboration temperature to -100 °C improved the yield to 72%. The use of catalytic  $Sc(OTf)_3$  did not improve the yield or enantioselectivity. Accordingly, further diffuoroallylboration of a series of aldehydes with 7 was carried out at this temperature (Table 3). *p*-Anisaldehyde (**5b**) provided (*R*)-**6b** in 71% yield and 93% ee. Similarly, high ee (94%) was obtained for 2-naphthaldehyde (**5c**) as well. While  $\alpha,\beta$ -unsaturated aldehyde, cinnamaldehyde



Table 3. Asymmetric Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes 5 with  $7^a$  in Et<sub>2</sub>O

entry	5	R	temp (°C)	(R)- 6 <sup>6</sup>	yield <sup>c</sup> (%)	$ee^d$ (%)
1	5a	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	-78	6a	43	94
2	5a	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	-100	6a	72	94
3	5b	p-MeO-C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	-100	6b	71	93
3	5c	2-Naphthyl	-100	6c	70	94
5	5d	$C_6H_5(CH_2)_2$	-100	6d	76	97
6	5e	E-C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> CH=CH	-100	6e	70	91
7	5f	2-Furyl	-100	6f	69	92

<sup>*a*</sup>Reactions were carried out with 1 equiv of crude reagent over 4 h. <sup>*b*</sup>Determined by comparison of the optical rotation with those of known compounds.<sup>14</sup> <sup>*c*</sup>Yields of pure products based on the number of equivalents of reagent in the mixture. <sup>*d*</sup>Determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher esters.

(5e) afforded the product in 91% ee, hydrocinnamaldehyde (5d) afforded the highest ee, 97%, for the homoallylic alcohol in 76% yield. A heteroaromatic aldehyde, 2-furaldehyde (5f), provided the product in 69% yield and 92% ee. It is gratifying to note that pinane-derived reagent 7 provides very high ee for the allylboration, even with the presence of the fluorine atoms. In comparison, the camphor-derived allylboronate reagent 4 provides poor ee.

In conclusion, higher yields were achieved for the synthesis of racemic and chiral (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronates, although the allylboration results in poor yields and ee of the homoallyl alcohols. The hydroboration of 1,1-difluoroallene with diisopinocampheylborane provides a 7:3 mixture of the corresponding (3,3-difluoroallyl)- and (2,2-difluoro-1-methyl-vinyl) borane. Difluoroallylboration of representative aldehydes with B-(3,3-difluoroallyl)diisopinocampheylborane provides 2,2-gem-difluorinated homoallyl alcohols in good yields and high ee.

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

**General Information.** Unless otherwise noted, all manipulations were carried out under inert atmosphere in flame-dried glassware. Tetrahydrofuran (THF) was freshly distilled before use from sodium benzophenone ketyl. All other chemicals and solvents were purchased commercially and used without further purification, unless otherwise noted.

The <sup>1</sup>H, <sup>19</sup>F, <sup>13</sup>C, and <sup>11</sup>B nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectra were plotted on 300 MHz spectrometer with Nalorac-quad probes using CDCl<sub>3</sub> as a solvent at room temperature. The NMR chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) are reported in ppm. Abbreviations for <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR: s = singlet, d = doublet, m = multiplet, b = broad, t = triplet, q = quartet. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained by electro spray impact ionization in combination with a single quadrupole mass analyzer. The reactions were monitored by TLC using silica gel F<sub>254</sub> precoated plates. Flash chromatography was performed using flash grade silica gel (particle size: 40–63  $\mu$ m, 230 × 400 mesh). Optical rotations were measured on an automatic polarimeter at the Na D line ( $\lambda$  = 589 nm) using a 1 dm cell.

Preparation of diisopropyl iodomethylboronate,<sup>16</sup> (1R,2R,3R,4S)-4iodomethyl-1,10,10-trimethyl-2-phenyl-3,5-dioxa-4-boratricyclo-[ $5.2.1.0^{0,0}$ ]decane,<sup>7</sup> 1,1-difluoropropa-1,2-diene,<sup>24</sup> (-)-diisopinocampheylborane<sup>26</sup> were achieved as reported.

1. General Procedure for the One-Pot Synthesis of Diisopropyl (3,3-Difluoroallyl)Boronate (3) and Procedure for the Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes for the Preparation of 6a-d. To a solution of 1,1-difluoroethene (1.14 mL, 10.64 mmol) in THF (10 mL) and diethyl ether (2.5 mL) at -110 °C was added dropwise s-BuLi (3.80 mL, 1.4 M in cyclohexane, 5.32 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 15 min and then diisopropyl iodomethylboronate (1.58 g, 5.85 mmol) was slowly added at -100 °C. After 40 min at this temperature, the mixture was stirred at rt for 2 h and filtered through a short bed of Celite. The solvents were removed under vacuum and the crude difluoroallylboronate 3 was then dissolved in THF (3.5 mL), aldehyde (3.52 mmol), and Sc(OTf)<sub>3</sub> (0.17 g, 0.35 mmol) were added, and the reaction mixture was refluxed for 24 h (<sup>11</sup>B NMR shift from  $\delta$  29.5 to 18 ppm). The reaction was quenched with satd aq NH<sub>4</sub>Cl solution (5 mL), and the product was extracted with diethyl ether, washed with brine, dried (anhyd MgSO<sub>4</sub>), filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1) to yield homoallyl alcohols 6a-d. The spectral data were consistent with those reported in the literature.<sup>8c,12,14,27</sup>

2. General Procedure for the Synthesis of (1R,3S)-1,2,2-Trimethylcyclopent-1,3-diyl (4R)-2-(3,3-difluoroprop-2-enyl)-4-phenyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolane (4). To a solution of 1,1-difluoroethene (0.85 mL, 7.96 mmol) in THF (7.5 mL) and diethyl ether (1.9 mL) at -110 °C was added dropwise s-BuLi (2.85 mL, 1.4 M in cyclohexane, 3.98 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 15 min, and then (1R,2R,3R,4S)-4-iodomethyl-1,10,10-trimethyl-2phenyl-3,5-dioxa-4-boratricyclo[5.2.1.0<sup>0,0</sup>]decane<sup>7</sup> (1.74 g, 4.38 mmol) was slowly added at -100 °C. After 40 min at this temperature, the mixture was stirred at rt for 2 h and filtered through a short bed of Celite. The solvents were removed and the residue was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1) to yield difluoroallylboronate 4 as a light yellow oil (1.06 g, 80%). Rr. 0.55 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz,  $CDCl_3$ ):  $\delta$  7.44– 7.29 (m, 5H), 4.75 (s, 1H), 4.19 (dtd, J = 25.5, 7.8, and 2.4 Hz, 1H), 2.16 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 1.89–1.81 (m, 1H), 1.51 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 1.22 (s, 3H), 1.20-1.15 (m, 2H), 1.10-1.00 (m, 1H), 0.97 (s, 3H), 0.94 (s, 3H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –91.73 (d, J = 50.5 Hz, 1F), -94.62 (dd, I = 50.5 and 25.4 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ 155.9 (t, J = 282.5), 141.4, 127.4, 127.2, 126.5, 95.9, 88.7, 73.3 (t, J = 23.3 Hz), 51.9, 50.1, 48.7, 29.4, 24.6, 23.4, 20.5, 9.2. <sup>11</sup>B NMR (96 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  33.2. MS EI: m/z = 332 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>19</sub>H<sub>23</sub>BF<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 332.1759, found 332.1765.

General Procedure for the Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes Using Reagent 4. To a solution of chiral (3,3-difluoroallyl)boronate 4 (1.25 mmol) in THF (1 mL) were added aldehyde 5 (1.00 mmol) and Sc(OTf)<sub>3</sub> (0.10 mmol), and the reaction mixture was refluxed for the desired time (shown in Table 3) (<sup>11</sup>B NMR shift from  $\delta$  33.2 to 22.4 ppm). The reaction was quenched with satd aq NH<sub>4</sub>Cl solution (1.5 mL), and the product was extracted with diethyl ether, washed with brine, dried (anhyd. MgSO<sub>4</sub>), filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by flash silica gel chromatography to yield homoallyl alcohol 6.

3. General Procedure for the One Pot Synthesis of B-(3,3-Difluoroallyl)Diisopinocampheylborane (7) and Representative Procedure for the Difluoroallylboration of Aldehydes for the Preparation of (R)-2,2-Difluoro-1-phenylbut-3-en-1-ol [(R)-**6a**]. To

# The Journal of Organic Chemistry

a suspension of (-)-Ipc<sub>2</sub>BH<sup>26</sup> (1.25 g, 4.38 mmol) in Et<sub>2</sub>O (10 mL) at -78 °C was added 1,1-difluoropropa-1,2-diene<sup>24</sup> (0.50 g, 6.57 mmol). After the mixture was stirred for 3 h at 0 °C, the solid dissolved completely, indicating the completion of hydroboration (<sup>11</sup>B NMR  $\delta$ 79 and 49 ppm, ratio 7:3). The reaction mixture was cooled to -100°C, and benzaldehyde (5a) (0.46 g, 4.38 mmol) was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred at this temperature for 4 h (<sup>11</sup>B NMR:  $\delta$  79 ppm to 50 ppm), oxidized with 3 M NaOH (3.2 mL) and 30% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (3.2 mL), and stirred at rt for 12 h. The product was extracted with diethyl ether, washed with brine, dried (anhyd. MgSO<sub>4</sub>), filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by flash silica gel chromatography (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1) to yield homoallyl alcohol (R)-6a as a colorless viscous liquid (0.36 g, 45%, calculated to 72% on the basis of 7:3 mixture of the reagents).  $R_f = 0.21$  (hexane/ ethyl acetate = 8:1).  $[\alpha]_{D}^{23} = -16.96$  (c 1.25, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 94% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester (lit. <sup>14</sup>  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D}$ = -14.7 (c 1.13, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 79% ee). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$ 7.42-7.35 (m, 5H), 5.86 (ddd, J = 23.1, 17.4, and 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (d, J = 17.4 Hz, 1H), 5.46 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 4.88 (t, J = 9.6 Hz, 10.1 Hz)1H), 2.81 (bs, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –109.32 (dt, J = 246.4 and 10.4 Hz, 1F), -110.99 (dt, J = 246.4 and 10.4 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  135.9, 129.2 (t, J = 25.5 Hz), 128.6, 128.1, 127.5, 121.5 (t, J = 8.7 Hz), 119.5 (t, J = 243.1 Hz), 75.7 (td, J = 29.6 and 5.8 Hz). MS EI: m/z = 184 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>10</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O 184.0700, found 184.0711.

(*R*)-2,2-Difluoro-1-(4-methoxyphenyl)but-3-en-1-ol [(*R*)-6b]. A colorless viscous liquid, 0.50 g, 44% (calculated to 71% on the basis of 7:3 mixture of the reagents).  $R_f$  0.09 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1).  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D} = -19.75$  (c 1.55, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 93% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester (lit.<sup>14</sup>  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D} = -20.2$  (c 1.01, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 94% ee). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.33 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 6.91–6.86 (m, 2H), 5.86 (ddd, J = 23.4, 17.4, and 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.59 (dtd, J = 17.4, 2.4, and 0.9 Hz, 1H), 5.46 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 4.84 (td, J = 9.6 and 3.0 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (s, 3H), 2.63 (d, J = 3.6 Hz, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –109.59 (dt, J = 245.9 and 10.4 Hz, 1F), –111.17 (dt, J = 245.9 and 10.4 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  159.7, 129.4 (t, J = 29.6 and 7.3 Hz), 55.1. MS EI: m/z = 214 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>11</sub>H<sub>12</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 214.0805, found 214.0811.

(*R*)-2,2-Difluoro-1-(naphthalen-2-yl)but-3-en-1-ol [(*R*)-6c]. A light yellow oil, 0.53 g, 48% (calculated to 70% on the basis of 7:3 mixture of the reagents).  $R_f$  0.33 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:2).  $[\alpha]^{23}_{\rm D} = -15.56$  (*c* 1.08, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 94% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.89–7.83 (m, 4H), 7.55–7.49 (m, 3H), 5.88 (ddd, *J* = 23.4, 17.4, and 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.61 (dt, *J* = 17.1 and 2.0 Hz, 1H), 5.46 (d, *J* = 10.8 Hz, 1H), 5.09 (t, *J* = 9.3 Hz, 1H), 2.62 (bs, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  -109.03 (dt, *J* = 246.7 and 10.4 Hz, 1F), -110.46 (dt, *J* = 246.7 and 10.4 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  133.3, 132.8, 129.2 (t, *J* = 25.5 Hz), 128.1, 127.8, 127.6, 127.0, 126.3, 126.2, 124.9, 121.6, 119.6 (t, *J* = 243.4 Hz), 75.9 (td, *J* = 29.7 and 6.7 Hz). MS EI: *m*/*z* = 234 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>14</sub>H<sub>12</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O 234.0856, found 234.0859.

(*R*)-4,4-Difluoro-1-phenylhex-5-en-3-ol [(*R*)-6d]. A colorless liquid, 0.64 g, yield 53% (calculated to 76% on the basis of 7:3 mixture of the reagents).  $R_f$  0.20 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1).  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D}$  = +33.82 (c 0.76, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 97% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.33–7.28 (m, 2H), 7.23–7.18 (m, 3H), 6.05–5.88 (m, 1H), 5.71 (d, *J* = 17.4 Hz, 1H), 5.54 (d, *J* = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 3.82–3.73 (m, 1H), 2.93 (ddd, *J* = 14.1, 9.3, and 4.8 Hz, 1H), 2.76–2.66 (m, 1H), 1.99 (d, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 1H), 1.96–1.87 (m, 1H), 1.84–1.71 (m, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –110.26 (dt, *J* = 248.7 and 10.1 Hz, 1F), –113.71 (dt, *J* = 248.7 and 10.4 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  141.0, 129.5 (t, *J* = 25.8 Hz), 128.4, 126.0, 121.3 (t, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 120.2 (t, *J* = 241.5 Hz), 72.5 (t, *J* = 29.0 Hz), 31.6, 31.4. MS EI: m/z = 212 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>14</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O 212.1013, found 212.1015.

(*R*,*E*)-4,4-Difluoro-1-phenylhexa-1,5-dien-3-ol [(*R*)-6e]. A colorless oil, 0.39 g, yield 48% (calculated to 70% on the basis of 7:3

mixture of the reagents).  $R_f$  0.15 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 9:1).  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D}$  = +7.22 (*c* 1.15, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 91% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.43–7.28 (m, SH), 6.78 (d, *J* = 15.6 Hz, 1H), 6.20 (dd, *J* = 15.6 and 5.7 Hz, 1H), 6.01 (ddd, *J* = 23.1, 17.4, and 11.1 Hz, 1H), 5.75 (dtd, *J* = 17.4 Hz, 2.1 and 0.9 Hz, 1H), 5.57 (d, *J* = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 4.57–4.46 (m, 1H), 2.23 (d, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –109.99 (dt, *J* = 247.8 and 10.1 Hz, 1F), –112.10 (dt, *J* = 247.8 and 10.1 Hz, 1F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  135.8, 134.5, 129.5 (t, *J* = 25.4 Hz), 128.5, 128.2, 126.6, 123.0, 121.6 (t, *J* = 9.0 Hz), 119.3 (t, *J* = 242.5 Hz), 74.4 (td, *J* = 29.8 and 4.8 Hz). MS EI: *m/z* = 210 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>12</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O 210.0856, found 210.0859.

(*R*)-2,2-Difluoro-1-(furan-2-yl)but-3-en-1-ol [(*R*)-6f]. A light yellow oil, 0.25 g, yield 42% (calculated to 69% on the basis of 7:3 mixture of the reagents).  $R_f$  0.80 (hexane/ethyl acetate = 8:1).  $[\alpha]^{23}_{D} = -1.88$  (c 1.17, CHCl<sub>3</sub>), 92% ee, determined by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>19</sup>F NMR analysis of Mosher ester. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.50 (d, J = 1.8 Hz, 1H), 6.51–6.50 (m, 1H), 6.47–6.45 (m, 1H), 6.13–5.96 (m, 1H), 5.78 (dt, J = 17.7 and 2.4 Hz, 1H), 5.60 (d, J = 11.1 Hz, 1H), 4.97 (td, J = 9.3 and 6.6 Hz, 1H), 2.86 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 1H). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  –108.90 (t, J = 10.8 Hz, 2F). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  149.4, 143.0, 129.5 (t, J = 25.2 Hz), 121.8 (t, J = 8.5 Hz), 118.7 (t, J = 240.0 Hz), 110.6, 109.6, 70.4 (t, J = 31.6 Hz). MS EI: m/z = 174 [M<sup>+</sup>]. HRMS (ESI): calcd for C<sub>8</sub>H<sub>8</sub>F<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 174.0492, found 174.0488.

# ASSOCIATED CONTENT

### **S** Supporting Information

Copies of the NMR spectra of the products. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

# AUTHOR INFORMATION

#### **Corresponding Author**

\*E-mail: chandran@purdue.edu.

#### Present Address

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Chemistry, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Gagarina 7, 87–100 Toruń, Poland.

#### Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Herbert C. Brown Center for Borane Research for financial assistance of this project.

## REFERENCES

(1) Ojima, I., Ed. Fluorine in Medicinal Chemistry and Chemical Biology; Wiley-Blackwell: West Sussex, UK, 2009.

(2) (a) Soloshonok, V. A., Ed. Enantiocontrolled synthesis of fluoroorganic compounds: stereochemical challenges and biomedical targets; Wiley: Chichester, UK, 1999. (b) O'Hagan, D. J. Fluorine Chem. 2010, 131, 1071.

(3) (a) Tozer, M. J.; Herpin, T. F. Tetrahedron 1996, 52, 8619.
(b) Xue, F.; Li, H.; Delker, S. L.; Fang, J.; Martásek, P.; Roman, L. J.; Poulos, T. L.; Silverman, R. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 14229.

(4) Ramachandran, P. V.; Parthasarathy, G.; Gagare, P. D. Org. Lett. 2010, 12, 4474.

(5) (a) Ramachandran, P. V.; Tafelska-Kaczmarek, A.; Sakavuyi, K.; Chatterjee, A. Org. Lett. 2011, 13, 1302. (b) Ramachandran, P. V.; Tafelska-Kaczmarek, A.; Sakavuyi, K. Org. Lett. 2011, 13, 4044.
(c) Ramachandran, P. V.; Chatterjee, A. J. Fluorine Chem. 2009, 130, 144. (d) Ramachandran, P. V.; Chatterjee, A. Org. Lett. 2008, 10, 1195.
(6) Sauvetre, R.; Normant, J. F. Tetrahedron Lett. 1981, 22, 957.

(7) (a) Kennedy, J. W. J.; Hall, D. G. J. Org. Chem. 2004, 69, 4412.

(b) Lira, R.; Roush, W. R. Org. Lett. 2007, 9, 4315.

(8) (a) Ramachandran, P. V., Ed. Asymmetric Fluoroorganic Chemistry; ACS Symposium Series 746; American Chemical Society: Washington,

## The Journal of Organic Chemistry

DC, 2000. (b) Qing, F.-L.; Qiu, X. L. In *Current Fluoroorganic Chemistry: New Synthetic Direction, Technologies, Materials, and Biological Application*; Soloshonok, V. A., Mikami, K., Yamazaki, T., Welch, J. T., Honek, J. F., Eds.; ACS Symposium Series 949; American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, 2007; pp 305–322. (c) Audouard, C.; Fawcett, J.; Griffiths, G. A.; Percy, J. M.; Pintat, S.; Smith, C. A. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2004, 2, 528. (d) Bogen, S.; Arasappan, A.; Pan, W.; Ruan, S.; Padilla, A.; Saksena, A. K.; Girijavallabhan, V.; Njoroge, F. G. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2008, 18, 4219.

(9) (a) Fujita, M.; Hiyama, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 4085.
(b) Fujita, M.; Obayashi, M.; Hiyama, T. Tetrahedron 1988, 44, 4135.

(10) Kirihara, M.; Takuwa, T.; Takizawa, S.; Momose, T.; Nemoto, H. Tetrahedron 2000, 56, 8275.

(11) (a) Seyferth, D.; Simon, R. M.; Sepelak, D. J.; Klein, H. A. J. Org. Chem. **1980**, 45, 2273. (b) Seyferth, D.; Simon, R. M.; Sepelak, D. J.; Klein, H. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1983**, 105, 4634.

(12) Seyferth, D.; Wursthorn, D. J. J. Organomet. Chem. 1979, 182, 455.

(13) Yang, Z.; Burton, D. J. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 1037.

(14) Kirihara, M.; Kawasaki, M.; Katsumata, H.; Kakuda, H.; Shiro, M.; Kawabata, S. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **2002**, *13*, 2283.

(15) Wuts, P. G. M.; Thompson, P. A.; Callen, G. R. J. Org. Chem. 1983, 48, 5398.

(16) Soundararajan, R.; Li, G.; Brown, H. C. J. Org. Chem. 1996, 61, 100.

(17) (a) Kennedy, J. W. J.; Hall, D. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 11586. (b) Ishiyama, T.; Ahiko, T.-a.; Miyaura, N. J. Am. Chem. Soc.

**2002**, *124*, 12414. (c) Lachance, H.; Lu, X.; Gravel, M.; Hall, D. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2003**, *125*, 10160.

(18) Yanai, H.; Okada, H.; Sato, A.; Okada, M.; Taguchi, T. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2011**, *52*, 2997.

(19) Dale, J. A.; Dull, D. L.; Mosher, H. S. J. Org. Chem. 1969, 34, 2543.

(20) Ramachandran, P. V. Aldrichimica Acta 2002, 35, 23.

(21) (a) Brown, H. C.; Jadhav, P. K. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 1215.
(b) Brown, H. C.; Narla, G. J. Org. Chem. 1995, 60, 4686. (c) Narla,

G.; Brown, H. C. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1997**, *38*, 219. (d) Flamme, E. M.; Roush, W. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2002**, *124*, 13644.

(22) (a) Ramachandran, P. V.; Madhi, S.; O'Donnell, M. J. *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2006**, 127, 1252. (b) Ramachandran, P. V.; Jennings, M. P. *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 128, 827.

(23) Konno, T.; Chae, J.; Tanaka, T.; Ishihara, T.; Yamanaka, H. Chem. Commun. 2004, 690.

(24) (a) Henne, A. L.; Nager, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1951, 73, 1042.
(b) Drakesmith, F. G.; Stewart, O. J.; Tarrant, P. J. Org. Chem. 1967, 33, 280.

(25) Racherla, U. S.; Brown, H. C. J. Org. Chem. 1991, 56, 401.

(26) Brown, H. C.; Zaidlewicz, M. Organic Syntheses via Boranes: Recent Developments; Aldrich Chemical Co.: Milwaukee, 2001; Vol. 2, p 92.

(27) Qing, F.-L.; Wan, D.-P. Tetrahedron 1998, 54, 14189.