Theoretical Studies on the Reaction of Solvated Methyllithium Open Dimer with Aldehyde

Masaharu Nakamura and Eiichi Nakamura*

Department of Chemistry Tokyo Institute of Technology Meguro, Tokyo 152, Japan

Nobuaki Koga^{1a} and Keiji Morokuma^{*,1b}

Institute for Molecular Science Myodaiji, Okazaki 444, Japan

Received October 26, 1992

The importance of open dimers in organometallic reactions is rapidly gaining recognition among chemists.² The unique reactivity of the open dimers A^3 and B^4 is considered to be the key for the spectacular success of catalytic asymmetric additions of organozinc⁵ and boron⁶ reagents. A very recent crystal



structural determination of an open dimer of lithium amide⁷ led to a proposal that the coordinatively unsaturated open dimer C is a crucial intermediate in the carbonyl deprotonation.⁸ The kinetic importance of a dimeric species in the carbonyl addition of BuLi has been experimentally demonstrated,⁹ and there has been made frequent allusion to a six-centered transition state such as \mathbf{D}^{10} in which an open dimer can be readily recognized. These experimental implications notwithstanding, there has been little theoretical information on the structure and energy of open dimers.¹¹ We report here the ab initio theoretical studies on the reaction of a solvated MeLi open dimer with aldehydes, which provides several important chemical implications on the reactivities of open dimeric species.

The reaction of (MeLi)₂ with formaldehyde and acetaldehyde with and without solvation (one water molecule) was studied with optimization at the HF/6-31+G* level,¹² and structures were characterized by frequency analysis. Electron correlation at the MP2 level was found not to affect grossly the energies of intermediates. The overall reaction pathway and the structural

(1) Current address: (a) Department of Chemistry, College of General Education, Nagoya University. (b) Department of Chemistry, Emory University.

(2) Reviews: Evans, D. A. Science (Washington, D.C.) 1988, 240, 420.
 (3) (a) Cf.: Oppolzer, W.; Radinov, R. N. Tetrahedron Lett. 1988, 29, 5645. Corey, E. J.; Hannon, F. J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1987, 28, 5237. Soai, 5027

K. Ookawa, A.; Ogawa, K. Kaba, T. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1987,

467. (b) See also: Kitamura, M.; Okada, S.; Suga, S.; Noyori, R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 4028. (4) Corey, E. J.; Bakshi, R. K.; Shibata, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109,

5551. Jones, D.K.; Liotta, D. C.; Shinkai, I.; Mathre, D. J. J. Org. Chem. 1993, 58, 799

(5) Oguni, N.; Omi, T. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 2823.

(6) Itsuno, S.; Ito, K.; Hirao, A.; Nakahama, S. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1983. 469.

(7) Williard, P. G.; Liu, Q.-Y. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 4115, 3380 and references threin.

 (8) Romesberg, F. E.; Collum, D. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1992, 114, 2112.
 (9) McGarrity, J. F.; Ogle, C. A.; Brich, Z.; Loosli, H.-R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 1810.

 (10) Cf.: Ashby, E. C.; Laemmle, J. T. J. Org. Chem. 1975, 40, 1469.
 (11) Cf.: Kaufmann, E.; Schleyer, P. v. R.; Wu, Y.-D.; Houk, K. N. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 5560. This pioneering study on the unsolvated (MeLi)₂ failed to recognize an open dimer as an intermediate. In addition, the reported C_S TSs possess several imaginary frequencies and therefore are not true TSs.

Scheme I. Intermediates in the Reaction of (MeLi)₂ with an Aldehydea



^a The energies (hartree; kcal/mol in italic) are for $R = H, S = H_2O$. The MP2/6-31+G*//HF/6-31+G* energies are in parentheses, and the $HF/6-31+G^*//HF/6-31+G^*$ in brackets.

features of intermediates were qualitatively the same for the solvated and unsolvated species, and, hence, those for the solvated dimers are described below.

The sequence of structures in the box in Scheme I (details shown in Figure 1) represents important events in the carbonyl addition. This scheme shares its salient feature with the mechanism recently proposed for the deprotonation of a carbonyl group with a dimeric lithium amide $(\mathbf{C})^7$ and is similar to those proposed for the reactions of A and B. Four-centered structures of solvated RLi dimers have recently been determined for BuLi.13

The solvated dimer G is a direct precursor to the open dimer H. Li¹ is coordinated to the oxygen lone pair of formaldehyde in the carbonyl plane (Figure 1). For G to expose a methyl group for addition to the carbonyl group, the C²-Li¹ bond must be cleaved. The cleavage (G to H) takes place with a small energy loss of 4.7 kcal/mol, accompanying rotation in the C1-Li1 axis.14 As is commonly seen in the crystal structures of ligand-free ate complexes,¹⁵ the C_s open dimer **H** is characterized by its nearly linear arrangement of C1-Li2-C2, by which electrostatic interaction is minimized.¹⁶ The structure H (in particular, the coordination environment of lithium atoms) shows striking resemblance to the crystal structure of a lithium amide open dimer.7

(12) GAUSSIAN 92 program: Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Head-Gordon, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Wong, M. W.; Foresman, J. B.; Johnson, B. G.; Schlegel, H. B.; Robb, M. A.; Repologie, E. S.; Gomperts, R.; Andreas, J. L.; Raghavacharni, K.; Binkley, J. S.; Gonzalez, C.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Defrees, J.; Baker, J.; Stewart, J. J. P.; Pople, J. A., *Gaussian 92, Revision* C; Gaussian, Inc.: Pittsburgh, PA, 1992.

(13) Nichols, M. A., Williard, P. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 1568. Kottke, T. Stalke, D. Angew Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1993, 32, 580.

(14) Without solvation, such cleavage (E to F) takes place with significant energy loss (8.9 kcal/mol, MP2/6-31+G*//HF/3-21G). This difference is likely be due to solvative stabilization of the developing positive charge on Li¹ upon conversion of E to F (natural orbital population of +0.783 in E vs +0.843 in F; HF/3-21G).

 (15) (a) Seebach, D. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1988, 27, 1624. (b)
 Hope, H. Olmstead, M. M.; Power, P. P.; Sandell, J.; Xu, X. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 4337.

(16) Further solvation of the open dimer H on Li^2 (examined with S = Me₂O, HF/3-21G) closes back the ring instead of giving K, probably because solvation bends the C¹-Li-C² bond as well as polarizes the Li²-C² bond. This suggests in turn, that desolvation of Li² is a necessary step for the open dimer formation. Parenthetically, the use of H2O in this calculation resulted in the formation of CH_4 due to deprotonation of H_2O .

© 1993 American Chemical Society



Figure 1. $HF/6-31+G^*$ -optimized structures of G, H, I, and J. Bond lengths are in angstroms, and angles are in degrees.

The open dimer H is a highly reactive species, making the potential surface around H and TS I quite flat. Thus, rotation of the formaldehyde moiety in the C-O axis (arrows for H) transforms H to the six-centered TS I (Scheme I, Figure 1) with only 0.45 kcal/mol activation energy. Whereas the carbonyl rotation disrupts the favorable Li²- lone pair interaction in H, it causes, in turn, energy gain due to the developing $C^{2}-\pi^{*}$ interactions.¹⁷ The open dimer H for acetaldehyde (R = Me, not shown) is virtualy identical with the one for formaldehyde, but the TS (I, R + Me) is more advanced and ladderlike.^{3b,18} The

oxygen lone pair in I (R = Me) is losing directionality and has started to interact with Li¹ and Li². Conversion from I to the product J takes place exothermically (66.2 kcal/mol).

These calculations provided several general implications. (1) An open dimer complex such as H must be a very reactive species, and, once formed in solution,^{3,7,8} it will readily engage in the intramolecular C-C bond formation. (2) The two lithium atoms in the dimer are nonequivalent and play different roles in the TS. Li¹ activates the carbonyl group, and Li² acts as an anchor of the methyl nucleophile. Realization of such a difference should be of great practical value in the analysis and design of new synthetic reactions, in particular, those employing bimetallic reagents.¹⁹ (3) The exact geometrical shape for the TS I may change, depending on the carbonyl substrate and likely also on the organometallic reagent.

(4) It is notable from an organic view point that (i) the TSs I(R = H, Me) are chiral despite the absence of chirality in the starting materials and (ii) the nucleophilic C² atom does not travel through the stereotypical C_S Bürgi–Dunitz trajectory²⁰ in the plane perpendicular to the plane of the carbonyl group.²¹ These are the intrinsic consequence of the fact that the oxygen lone pair is perpendicular to the π^* orbital. With these results, two inferences may be made. First, the site of metal coordination to the carbonyl gorup is important in the diastereoselective carbonyl additions, since it must influence the trajectory of the nucleophile.22 Second, the "face selection" in the carbonyl addition may be viewed theoretically as the result of the intramolecular rotation of the carbonyl group and the twisting of the entire TS. The seemingly related case of olefinic face differentiation operates in a different manner,23 proceeding via a bimolecular association/ dissociation process, while this difference has not so far been fully appreciated by experimetalists.

Acknowledgment. This research was financially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture of Japan. M.N. thanks JSPS for a predoctoral fellowship.

Supplementary Material Available: Geometries of structures shown in Figure 1 and the intermediates on the IRC (5 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

(17) Energy decomposition analysis for the acetaldehyde reaction (Kitaura, K.; Morokuma, K. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1976**, *10*, 325) indicated that the small activation energy is due to cancellation for the gains for the electrostatic and orbital interactions with loss by the exchange repulsion. sen: Details will be discussed later in a full paper.

(18) This seemingly large structural difference is a matter of the position of the TSs as seen in the intrinsic reaction coordinates (IRC) analysis in the supplementary material. This potential around H and I is very flat again, and the activation energy from H to I is 1.83 kcal/mol at the HF/6-31+G*//HF/6-31+G*/.

(19) Cf.: Christenson, B.; Olsson, T.; Ullenius, C. Teirahedron 1989, 45, 523 and references therein. Corey, E. J.; Naef, R.; Hannon, F. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1986, 108, 7714.

(20) Bürgi, H. B.; Dunitz, J. D.; Lehn, J. M.; Wipff, G. Tetrahedron 1974, 30, 1563.

(21) Clearly seen in the snapshots along the IRC in supplementary material.
(22) For a different view, see: Lodge, E. P.; Heathcock, C. H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 2819.

Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 2819. (23) Cf.: Kubota, K.; Nakamura, M.; Nakamura, E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 5867.