<u>Creanic</u> LETTERS

Efficient Copper-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation of Aromatic and Heteroaromatic lodides: The Beneficial Anchoring Effect of Borates

Zsombor Gonda,[†] Szabolcs Kovács,[†] Csaba Wéber,[‡] Tamás Gáti,[‡] Attila Mészáros,[†] András Kotschy,^{*,‡} and Zoltán Novák^{*,†}

[†]MTA-ELTE "Lendület" Catalysis and Organic Synthesis Research Group, Institute of Chemistry, Eötvös Loránd University, Pázmány Péter stny. 1/a, H-1117 Budapest, Hungary

[‡]Servier Research Institute of Medicinal Chemistry, Záhony utca 7, H-1031 Budapest, Hungary

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Efficient copper-catalyzed trifluoromethylation of aromatic iodides was achieved with $TMSCF_3$ in the presence of trimethylborate. The Lewis acid was used to anchor the in situ generated trifluoromethyl anion and



suppress its rapid decomposition. Broad applicability of the new trifluoromethylating reaction was demonstrated in the functionalization of different aromatic and heteroaromatic iodides.

ecause of their unique physical and biological properties, B compounds bearing the trifluoromethyl functional group have attracted significant attention in medicinal research, agrochemistry and materials science.¹ While the importance of this group is unquestionable, the introduction of the trifluoromethyl group into organic molecules in most cases is very challenging. The most important issues faced by trifluoromethylation reactions are the application of cheap, stable and readily available reagents, and the development of efficient, scalable, and selective processes. Trifluoromethylation has been achieved via transition metal-catalyzed oxidative couplings,² radical functionalizations,³ and in cross-coupling reactions. Besides the palladium-catalyzed directed functionalization of aryl halides,⁴ several copper-based stoichiometric⁵ and catalytic methods⁶ were developed recently for the introduction of the trifluoromethyl group onto the aromatic core. The first copper-catalyzed trifluoromethylation of iodides in the presence of a CuI/phenanthroline catalyst was reported by Amii and co-workers.^{6a} Though this catalytic reaction works efficiently, the use of expensive and relatively inaccessible TESCF₃ as the trifluoromethyl source makes this process less economic, especially for large scale syntheses. Later, Goossen utilized K[CF₃B(OMe)₃] for copper-catalyzed trifluoromethylation.^{6b} While this salt works efficiently, its sensitivity and instability limit its application.⁷

To circumvent the drawbacks of trifluoromethylborate salts and TESCF₃, we aimed to develop a new procedure in which the relatively cheap and readily available TMSCF₃ is used as the trifluoromethyl source. The major problem with the application of TMSCF₃ in combination with a fluoride source is the rapid generation of large amounts of the CF₃⁻ anion. Since the catalytic transformation is relatively slow, a significant amount of active CF₃⁻ is lost before entering the catalytic cycle. A potential solution to this problem would be the reversible quenching of the CF₃⁻ anion by the addition of a Lewis acid species, which would protect the rapidly produced trifluoromethyl anion and release it only slowly (Scheme 1).⁸ A good buffer system should be stable enough to stabilize the CF_3 ion, while still labile enough to transfer CF_3 to the copper cycle.

Scheme 1. Lewis Acid-Buffered Copper-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation



As a starting point we examined the trifluoromethylation of 1-iodonaphthalene with 3 equiv TMSCF₃ and 3 equiv KF in the presence of 20% CuI and 20% phenanthroline ligand. The Lewis acid free reaction gave only 15% conversion in 2 h (Table 1, entry 1) that remained the same after 24 h. This finding is in agreement with the rapid KF triggered formation and decomposition of the CF₃ anion.⁹ When we used 1 equiv of TMSCF₃, KF, and B(OMe)₃ the conversion increased to 36% after 2 h at 60 °C (entry 2), but the reaction stopped again. When we increased the amount of TMSCF₃ and KF to 3 equiv while maintaining B(OMe)₃ at 1 equiv (entry 3) the conversion rose to 70%, clearly demonstrating the buffering ability of the borate.

To our delight, when $TMSCF_3:KF:B(OMe)_3$ were applied in 3:3:3 equiv ratio the reaction reached 92% conversion in 2 h

Received: July 8, 2014 **Published:** July 28, 2014

	+	TMSCF ₃ + KF 2 3	+ B(OR) ₃ 4 20 mol % li solven 60 °C, 2	Cul igand t	CF ₃
entry	solvent	ligand	borate	2:3:4 ratio	cony [%] ^b
1	DMSO	Phen	_	3:3:0	15
2	DMSO	Phen	$B(OMe)_3$	1:1:1	36
3	DMSO	Phen	$B(OMe)_3$	3:3:1	70
4	DMSO	Phen	$B(OMe)_3$	3:3:3	92
5	DMSO	Me ₄ -Phen	$B(OMe)_3$	3:3:3	81
6	DMSO	8-OH- Quinoline	B(OMe) ₃	3:3:3	0
7	DMSO	sparteine	$B(OMe)_3$	3:3:3	13
8	DMSO	Phen	$B(OEt)_3$	3:3:3	85
9	DMSO	Phen	$B(OCH_2CF_3)_3$	3:3:3	2
10	DMSO	Phen	$B(OPr)_3$	3:3:3	64
11	DMSO	Phen	$B(O^{i}Pr)_{3}$	3:3:3	10
12	DMSO	Phen	$B(OBu)_3$	3:3:3	48
13	DMSO	Phen	$B(O^{t}Bu)_{3}$	3:3:3	37

^{*a*}CuI (0.07 mmol), 1,10-phenanthroline (0.07 mmol), aryl iodide (0.35 mmol) in 1 mL of anhydrous solvent at 60 °C. ^{*b*}% conversions of 1-iodonaphthalene were determined by GC–MS.

(entry 4).¹⁰ Next, we examined the effect of the ligand and the Lewis acid on the reaction. Only the phenanthroline based ligand proved to be applicable for the transformation (entries 4-7). Variation of the Lewis acid showed that the bulkier the alkyl group on the borate the less able it is to stabilize the CF₃ anion, resulting in a lower conversion. Changing the methyl group to ethyl resulted in 81% conversion (entry 8), while the use of propyl, isopropyl, butyl and tert-butyl borates led to 64, 10, 48 and 37% conversion, respectively (entries 10-13). Replacement of ethyl group with 1,1,1-trifluoroethyl group, the borate become completely ineffective in the coupling due probably to its increased electron deficiency (entry 9).¹¹ To identify the optimal conditions for the trifluoromethylation of 1-iodonaphthalene, the temperature, copper loading, fluoride source and the solvent were also varied. As a result of this multidimension parameter screening we found that the use of 20 mol % CuI as copper source, 20 mol % 1,10-phenanthroline as ligand,¹² KF as fluoride source, and anhydrous DMSO as solvent are optimal for the coupling that is best run under argon at 60 °C. With these conditions in hand we explored the scope and limitations of the Lewis-acid enabled coppercatalyzed trifluoromethylation.

The functional group tolerance of the transformation was established on a set of 21 aromatic and heteroaromatic iodides having different electronic and steric properties, as well as protecting groups. In the first round the reactions were analyzed by GC–MS.¹³ On the basis of these studies we established that the trifluoromethylation can be achieved with aryl iodides containing both electron donating and electron withdrawing groups. However, in the latter case the reactions were faster. The presence of bulky substituents in the ortho position was also tolerated. However, longer reaction times were necessary to reach complete conversion. We have also established that for the successful coupling free hydroxyl and amino groups (including indoles) should be protected.

Having established the functional group tolerance we aimed to prove the synthetic utility of the Lewis-acid enabled trifluoromethylation by preparing a diverse set of trifluoromethylated compounds, including heterocyclic derivatives (Scheme 2). To demonstrate the applicability of the method

Scheme 2. Synthesis of Trifluoromethylated Compounds in Copper-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation a



^aCuI (0.4 mmol), 1,10-phenanthroline (0.4 mmol), KF (6 mmol), aryl iodide (2.00 mmol), DMSO (anh., 4.0 mL) $B(OMe)_3$ (6 mmol), TMSCF₃ (6 mmol), Ar, 60 °C, % isolated yield.

for the trifluoromethylation of functionalized aromatic iodides we performed successfully the trifluoromethylation of a protected phenol and two protected anilines, and isolated the appropriate products **4a**, **4b**, and **4c** in 67, 68 and 35% yield, respectively. Ester and amide derivatives of aromatic carboxylic acids also proved to be excellent substrates, and their trifluoromethyl substituted derivatives (**4d**, **4e**) were obtained in moderate to good yield (34, 81%).

The application of pyridine derivatives bearing ester-, protected alcohol- and halogen functions beyond the iodo group afforded the desired products 4f, 4g and 4h in good to excellent yield (59, 92 and 71%). The reaction was also

successful with 6-iodo-4-methyl-2-(methylthio)-pyrimidine and the trifluoromethylated compound was isolated in 90% yield (4i). In the case of 1-benzyl-4-iodopyrazole and sterically hindered 1-benzyl-3,5-diphenyl-4-iodopyrazole the reactions were not complete (87 and 68% conversion) but the desired trifluoromethylated products 4j, 4k were isolated in 60 and 34% yield. Functionalization of 1-iodoisoquinoline and 6-iodoquinoline gave the desired trifluoromethylated isoquinoline (41) and quinoline (4m) in 82 and 64% yields. We also prepared the quinoline 4n bearing a bromo substituent next to the trifluoromethyl group (32%). The analogous chloro-iodoquinoline derivatives gave the appropriate trifluoromethylated products 40, 4p and 4q in good yields (95, 74 and 80%).The coupling of benzyl protected indole derivatives, 5-iodoindole, 7iodoindole and 5-methoxy-3-iodoindole afforded the appropriate products (4r, 4s, 4t) in 72, 88 and 30% isolated yields, respectively.

The reaction of N-benzyl protected derivatives of Nheterocycles such as 3-iodo-7-azaindole, 4-iodoindazole, 6chloro-7-iodo-7-deazapurine and 4-iodocarbazole provided the appropriate heterocycles 4u, 4v, 4w and 4x in good yields (94, 87, 27 and 87%). Iodo derivatives of benzofuran and dibenzofuran reacted smoothly under the optimized conditions. Trifluoromethylation of 2-methyl-5-iodobenzofuran gave the appropriate product (4y) in 62% isolated yield, while in an analogous reaction 2-(trifluoromethyl)-dibenzofuran (4z) was isolated in 86% yield. Replacement of the oxygen in the heterocyclic compound by sulfur did not cause significant changes in reactivity, and 2-ethyl-5-trifluoromethyl benzothiophene (4aa) was obtained in 69% yield. For comparison we have also performed the trifluoromethylation on the carbacyclic compound 2-iodofluorene, and we isolated the trifluoromethylated product (4ab) only in 21% yield.

Regarding the beneficial effect of trimethyl borate in the coupling reaction we monitored the reaction by in situ NMR measurements. We supposed that the liberation of trifluor-omethyl anion from TMSCF₃ takes place quickly by interaction with fluoride anion, but in the presence of borate a significant part of the formed CF₃⁻ anion is stabilized *in situ* by the borate. The formation of CF₃-borate and Cu-CF₃ complexes was identified by ¹⁹F-NMR measurements. The presence of a peak at –29.2 ppm refers to the presence of Cu-CF₃ species, while the peak at –65.5 ppm proved the presence of CF₃B(OMe)₃. These findings support our hypothesis regarding the formation of Lewis acid–base adduct of the CF₃ anion with trimethylborane.

In conclusion, we have developed a Lewis-base enabled approach for the copper-catalyzed trifluoromethylation of aromatic and heteroaromatic iodides. The transformation utilizes TMSCF₃ as a readily available CF₃ source and trialkyl borates as Lewis acid for the temporary trapping of the CF₃⁻ anion generated by KF from the trifluoromethylating agent. The transformation has good functional group tolerance, and its synthetic utility was demonstrated through the synthesis of several trifluoromethylated aromatic and heteroaromatic molecules. The advantage of the procedure is that it eliminates the use of expensive TESCF₃ and unstable trifluoromethylborate salts, previously utilized as CF₃ source in the coppercatalyzed trifluoromethylation. Moreover, the developed conditions offer an efficient synthetic tool for the introduction of trifluoromethyl group into aromatic and heteroaromatic rings, providing easy access to compounds of high added value for pharmaceutical research.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

Experimental procedures, characterization data and NMR spectra for all compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Authors

*E-mail: andras.kotschy@hu.netgrs.com.

*E-mail: novakz@elte.hu.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial support of Servier, as well as the contribution of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences ("Lendület" Research Scholarship), and OTKA-NKTH (CK 80763) is gratefully acknowledged. The authors also thank Prof. Tim Peelen (Lebanon Valley College) for the proofreading of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

 (a) Schlosser, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2006, 45, 5432.
 (b) Müller, K.; Faeh, C.; Diederich, F. Science 2007, 317, 1881.
 (c) Hagmann, W. K. J. Med. Chem. 2008, 51, 4359. (d) Kirk, K. L. Org. Process Res. Dev. 2008, 12, 305. (e) Purser, S.; Moore, P. R.; Swallow, S.; Gouverneur, V. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2008, 37, 320. (f) Grushin, V. V.; Tomashenko, O. A. Chem. Rev. 2011, 111, 4475. (g) Roy, S.; Gregg, B. T.; Gribble, G. W.; Le, V.-D.; Roy, S. Tetrahedron 2011, 67, 2161.
 (h) Barata-Vallejo, S.; Postigo, A. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2013, 257, 3051.
 (i) Chen, P.; Liu, G. Synthesis 2013, 45, 2919. (j) Ye, Y.; Sanford, M. S. Synlett 2012, 23, 2005. (k) Chu, L.; Qing, F.-L. Acc. Chem. Res. 2014, 47, 1513. (l) Wu, X.-F.; Neumann, H.; Beller, M. Chem.—Asian J. 2012, 7, 1744. (m) Liu, X.; Xu, C.; Wang, M.; Liu, Q. Chem. Rev. 2014, DOI: 10.1021/cr400473a.

(2) (a) Wang, X.; Truesdale, L.; Yu, J.-Q. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 3648. (b) Mu, X.; Chen, S.; Zhen, X.; Liu, G. Chem.-Eur. J. 2011, 17, 6039. (c) Ye, Y.; Lee, S. H.; Sanford, M. S. Org. Lett. 2011, 13, 5464. (d) Jiang, X.; Chu, L.; Qing, F.-L. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 1251. (e) Chu, L.; Qing, F.-L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 1298. (f) Senecal, T. D.; Parsons, A. T.; Buchwald, S. L. J. Org. Chem. 2011, 76, 1174. (g) Shimizu, R.; Egami, H.; Nagi, T.; Chae, J.; Hamashima, Y.; Sodeoka, M. Tetrahedron Lett. 2010, 51, 5947. (h) Xu, J.; Luo, D.-F.; Xiao, B.; Liu, Z.-J.; Gong, T.-J.; Fu, Y.; Liu, L. Chem. Commun. 2011, 47, 4300. (i) Liu, T.; Shen, Q. Org. Lett. 2011, 13, 2342. (j) Liu, T.; Shao, X.; Wu, Y.; Shen, Q. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2012, 51, 540. (3) (a) Sawada, H.; Nakayama, M. J. Fluorine Chem. 1990, 46, 423. (b) McClinton, M. A.; McClington, D. A. Tetrahedron 1992, 48, 6555. (c) Ji, Y.; Brueckl, T.; Baxter, R. D.; Fujiwara, Y.; Seiple, I. B.; Su, S.; Blackmond, D. G.; Baran, P. S. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2011, 108, 14411. (d) Studer, A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2012, 51, 8950. (e) Zheng, Y.; Ma, J.-A. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2010, 352, 2745. (f) Merino, E.; Nevado, C. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2014, DOI: 10.1039/c4cs00025k.

(4) (a) Samant, B. S.; Kabalka, G. W. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 7236. (b) Cho, E. J.; Senecal, T. D.; Kinzel, T.; Zhang, Y.; Watson, D. A.; Buchwald, S. L. *Science* **2010**, *328*, 1679.

(5) (a) Dubinina, G. G.; Furutachi, H.; Vicic, D. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc.
2008, 130, 8600. (b) Dubinina, G. G.; Ogikubo, J.; Vicic, D. A. Organometallics 2008, 27, 6233. (c) Zhang, C.-P.; Wang, Z.-L.; Chen, Q.-Y.; Zhang, C.-T.; Gu, Y.-C.; Xiao, J.-C. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 1896. (d) Morimoto, H.; Tsubogo, T.; Litvinas, N. D.; Hartwig, J. F. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 3793. (e) Tomashenko, O. A.; Escudero, E. C.; Belmonte, M. M.; Grushin, V. V. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 7655. (f) Liu, T.; Shen, Q. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 2012, 6679. (g) Kremlev, M. M.; Mushta, A. I.; Tyrra, W.; Yagupolskii, Y. L.;

Organic Letters

Naumann, D.; Moeller, A. J. Fluorine Chem. 2012, 133, 67. (h) Chen,
M.; Buchwald, S. L. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 11628. (i) Mulder,
J. A.; Frutos, R. P.; Patel, N. D.; Qu, B.; Sun, X.; Tampone, T. G.; Gao,
J.; Sarvestni, M.; Eriksson, M. C.; Haddad, N.; Shen, S.; Song, J. J.;
Senanayake, C. H. Org. Process Res. Dev. 2013, 17, 940. (j) Zanardi, A.;
Novikov, M. A.; Martin, E.; Benet-Buchholz, J.; Grushin, V. V. J. Am.
Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 20901. (k) Serizawa, H.; Aikawa, K.; Mikami, K.
Chem.—Eur. J. 2013, 19, 17692. (l) Kobayashi, Y.; Kumadaki, I.
Tetrahedron Lett. 1969, 10, 4095. (m) Urata, H.; Fuchikami, T.
Tetrahedron Lett. 1991, 32, 91. (n) Lishchynskyi, A.; Novikov, M. A.;
Martin, E.; Escuedo-Adán, E. C.; Novák, P.; Grushin, V. V. J. Org.
Chem. 2013, 78, 11126.

(6) (a) Oishi, M.; Kondo, H.; Amii, H. Chem. Commun. 2009, 1909.
(b) Knauber, T.; Arikan, F.; Roeschenthaler, G.-V.; Goossen, L. J. Chem.—Eur. J. 2011, 17, 2689. (c) Kondo, H.; Oishi, M.; Fujikawa, K.; Amii, H. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2011, 353, 1247. (d) Weng, Z.; Lee, R.; Jia, W.; Yuan, Y.; Wang, W.; Feng, X.; Huang, K.-W. Organometallics 2011, 30, 3229. (e) Li, Y.; Chen, T.; Wang, H.; Zhang, R.; Jin, K.; Wang, X.; Duan, C. Synlett 2011, 12, 1713. (f) Popov, I.; Lindeman, S.; Daugulis, O. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 9286. (g) Schareina, T.; Wu, X.-F.; Zapf, A.; Cotté, A.; Gotta, M.; Beller, M. Top. Catal. 2012, 55, 426. (h) Nakamura, Y.; Fujiu, M.; Murase, T.; Itoh, Y.; Serizawa, H.; Aikawa, K.; Mikami, K. Beilstein J. Org. Chem. 2013, 9, 2404.

(7) On the basis of our experience, the salt works only when it is freshly prepared. Upon storage, it quickly lost its activity in several days and became ineffective in trifluormethylation. For results of stability studies of trifluoromethyl borate salts, see the Supporting Information.

(8) Prakash, G. K. S.; Jog, P. V.; Batamack, P. T. D.; Olah, G. A. Science **2012**, 338, 1324.

(9) The in situ NMR studies showed the formation of CHF_3 and $\text{CDF}_3.$

(10) For time-conversion curves, see the Supporting Information.

(11) For further details, see the Supporting Information.

(12) Although the reaction of 1-iodonaphthalene reached high conversion after 24 h with 5% copper catalyst and phenanthroline ligand, for most of the substrates a higher catalyst loading (20 mol %) was necessary to obtain full conversion.

(13) Results of functional group tolerance study with GC–MS in case of 21 substrates can be found in the Supporting Information. The goal of these experiments was to establish the functional group tolerance of the transformation. We intended to identify functional groups that allow for high (or low) conversion in the coupling. To achieve this we used GC–MS analysis to predict the steric and electronic influence of functional groups on the reaction and the necessity of protecting groups. Being aware of the limitations of the applied analytical methodology, we believe that the data provided is still solid enough to make the appropriate conclusions as is exemplified in the preparation of the compounds summarized in Scheme 2, where yields of isolated products were provided.