<u>Creanic</u> LETTERS

Cobalt-Catalyzed Decarboxylative Acetoxylation of Amino Acids and Arylacetic Acids

Kun Xu,*^{,†} Zhiqiang Wang,[†] Jinjin Zhang,[†] Lintao Yu,[†] and Jiajing Tan^{*,‡}

[†]College of Chemistry and Pharmaceutical Engineering, Nanyang Normal University, Nanyang, Henan 473061 P. R. China [‡]Process Chemistry, Merck Research Laboratories, P.O. Box 2000, Rahway, New Jersey 07065, United States

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The first cobalt-catalyzed decarboxylative acetoxylation reaction was accomplished. This methodology is applicable to a wide range of amino acids and arylacetic acids.



T ransition-metal-catalyzed decarboxylative couplings have emerged as a versatile approach in organic synthesis.¹ This method employs inexpensive and benchtop stable carboxylic acids as substrate, without the need for preformed organometallic reagents, thus providing an attractive alternative to traditional cross-couplings. Moreover, the decarboxylative coupling strategy is likely promising for regiospecific functionalization and only provides nontoxic carbon dioxide as a byproduct.

Until now, transition-metal-catalyzed decarboxylative couplings have relied heavily on using late and noble transition metals including palladium,² silver,³ and rhodium complexes.⁴ Although naturally abundant first-row transition metals, such as Cu⁵ and Ni,⁶ have recently witnessed considerable attention, the development of a low cost, low toxicity catalyst system for decarboxylative coupling still represents a challenging task. Whereas significant progress has been made toward the decarboxylative C-C bond formations, the decarboxylative C–O couplings are rather limited.⁷ Given the fact that C–O moieties are ubiquitous in both natural products and pharmaceuticals, developing efficient decarboxylative strategies for construction of a C–O bond is highly desired.⁸ Herein, we report our recent efforts on cobalt-catalyzed decarboxylative acetoxylation of amino acids and arylacetic acids.⁹ This method represents a new type of decarboxylative coupling reaction catalyzed by earth-abundant, inexpensive first-row transition metals.¹

Our investigation began with the reaction of phthalimide protected phenylglycine **1a** and iodosobenzene diacetate **2** in the presence of a catalytic amount of cobalt complexes (Table 1). A screen of catalysts was first conducted with 1,2dicholoroethane (DCE) as the solvent. The results showed that $Co(OAc)_2$ ·4H₂O was the most effective catalyst for this reaction, whereas $CoCl_2$ ·6H₂O, $Co(acac)_2$, and CoC_2O_4 all gave lower yields (entries 1 vs 2–4); other Lewis acids such as $FeCl_3$, $Cu(OTf)_2$, and Ag_2CO_3 gave inferior results (entries 5– 7). Control experiment revealed that the cobalt catalyst was essential for this transformation as only 13% yield was obtained without cobalt salts (entry 8). Further assessment of the solvent effect indicated that DCE was the best solvent for this reaction,

Table 1. Optimization of the Reaction Conditions

Table 1. Optimization of the Reaction Contactoris				
		nl(OAc) ₂ solver	nt,t	O
entry	M^{n+}	solvent	temp (°C)	yield ^b (%)
1	$C_0(OAc)_{2}$ ·4H ₂ O	DCE	120	86
2	CoCl. 6H2O	DCE	120	51
3	$Co(acac)_2$	DCE	120	74
4	CoC ₂ O ₄ ·2H ₂ O	DCE	120	35
5	FeCl ₂	DCE	120	14
6	Cu(OTf) ₂	DCE	120	16
7	Ag ₂ CO ₃	DCE	120	21
8	02 0	DCE	120	13
9	Co(OAc) ₂ ·4H ₂ O	CHCl ₃	120	67
10	$Co(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$	Tol	120	37
11	$Co(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$	dioxane	120	trace
12	$Co(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$	EtOH	120	23
13	Co(OAc) ₂ ·4H ₂ O	DCE	130	79
14	Co(OAc) ₂ ·4H ₂ O	DCE	100	83
^a Reaction conditions: 1a (0.5 mmol), 2 (0.75 mmol), catalyst (0.05				

mmol), solvent (2 mL), 8 h. ^bIsolated yield.

providing higher yield than other commonly used solvents (entry 1 vs 9-12). Both increasing and decreasing the temperature resulted in lower yields (entries 13 and 14).

Under the optimized conditions, the substrate scope of amino acid was investigated. As shown in Figure 1, this protocol is successful with a large variety of phthalimide-protected amino acids. The electron-withdrawn group on the aromatic ring led to a slightly lower yield (3a vs 3b-e). Compared with the substrate with *para*-substituents, those with *meta*-substituents on the aromatic ring gave better yields (3d vs 3b, 3e vs 3c). Substrates with an alkyl substituent group were

Received: July 24, 2015 Published: September 2, 2015

Organic Letters



Figure 1. Substrate scope of *N*-protected amino acids. (a) Reaction conditions: 1 (0.5 mmol), 2 (0.75 mmol), $Co(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$ (0.05 mmol), DCE (2 mL), 10 h. (b) The reaction temperature was 120 °C, 8 h.

also tolerable where the steric hindrance had a profound effect. While linear groups provided the desired products with similar level of yields, the bulky alkyl groups led to a sharp decrease of the yields (3h-j vs 3k-m). Finally, *N*-phthaloylglycine was successfully employed as the substrate, giving the corresponding acetate 3g in 72% yield.

To further establish the general utility of this transformation, we next sought to examine other types of aliphatic carboxylic acids. As shown in Figure 2, a series of primary and secondary acids were all good reaction partners with a minor modification of the standard reaction conditions. With $CoCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ as the



Figure 2. Substrate scope of other types of aliphatic carboxylic acids. (a) Reaction conditions: 4 (0.5 mmol), 2 (0.75 mmol), $CoCl_2$ ·6H₂O (0.05 mmol), DCE (2 mL), 10 h.

catalyst, diaryl-substituted acids could give excellent yields (**5a,b**); however, only moderate yield was obtained when 2-phenylbutyric acid and 1,4-benzodioxane-2-carboxylic acid were employed as the substrates (**5c**,**d**). It is noteworthy that primary carboxylic acid, such as 4-methylphenylacetic acid, was also well tolerated in this transformation, thus affording the corresponding product **5e** in 64% yield.¹¹ However, *n*-hexanoic acid, pivalic acid, and phenylpropionic acid were unreactive.

To probe the nature of this decarboxylative coupling, the radical-trapping reagent (TEMPO) was added into the reaction of 1a and 2 (Scheme 1). It was shown that the formation of product 3a was completely prohibited, suggesting a radical process was involved.¹²

Scheme 1. Control Experiment



On the basis of the control experiment, a plausible reaction mechanism was proposed as shown in Scheme 2. Initially,





amino acid **1a** coordinated with $Co(OAc)_2$ to give cobalt carboxylate **6**, which could then be oxidized by $PhI(OAc)_2$ to form radical 7 and one molecule of $Co(OAc)_3$. Next, radical 7 could be converted into intermediate **8** with the extrusion of CO_2 . Under the catalysis of $Co(OAc)_3$, radical **8** undergoes an oxidation process to give cation **9** while releasing one molecule of acetate anion. Finally, nucleophilic attack of cation **9** by acetate anion affords the desired product **3a**.

In conclusion, we have developed the first example of a cobalt-catalyzed decarboxylative C–O bond-forming reaction. The reaction is tolerable to a wide range of amino acids and arylacetic acids, giving the corresponding acetates in moderate to good yields. The ready availability and low cost of the catalyst and the mild reaction conditions render this method of practical value in the construction of C–O bonds. Efforts to expand the synthetic applications, as well as further mechanistic studies, are currently underway.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.or-glett.5b02142.

Experimental procedures, characterization data, copies of ¹H NMR and ¹³C NMR of new compounds (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Authors

*E-mail: xukun@nynu.edu.cn. *E-mail: jiajing.tan@foxmail.com.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Financial support from the Foundation of He'nan Educational Committee (15A150067) and Nanyang Normal University (ZX2015010) is greatly acknowledged.

REFERENCES

 For selected recent reviews, see: (a) Goossen, L. J.; Rodríguez, N.; Gooßen, K. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 3100. (b) Rodríguez, N.; Goossen, L. J. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2011, 40, 5030. (c) Weaver, J. D.; Recio, A.; Grenning, A. J.; Tunge, J. A. Chem. Rev. 2011, 111, 1846. (d) Shang, R.; Liu, L. Sci. China: Chem. 2011, 54, 1670. (e) Cornella, J.; Larrosa, I. Synthesis 2012, 44, 653. (f) Park, K.; Lee, S. RSC Adv. 2013, 3, 14165. (g) Shen, C.; Zhang, P.; Sun, Q.; Bai, S.; Hor, T. S. A.; Liu, X. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2015, 44, 291.

(2) For selected examples, see: (a) Myers, A. G.; Tanaka, D.; Mannion, M. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 11250. (b) Tanaka, D.; Romeril, S. P.; Myers, A. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 10323.
(c) Rayabarapu, D. K.; Tunge, J. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 13510. (d) Gooßen, L. J.; Deng, G.; Levy, L. M. Science 2006, 313, 662. (e) Waetzig, S. R.; Tunge, J. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 4138.
(f) Gooßen, L. J.; Rudolphi, F.; Oppel, C.; Rodríguez, N. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 3043. (g) Shang, R.; Fu, Y.; Li, J.-B.; Zhang, S.-L.; Guo, Q.-X.; Liu, L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 5738. (h) Wang, C. Y.; Piel, I.; Glorius, F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 4194. (i) Shang, R.; Yang, Z.-W.; Wang, Y.; Zhang, S.-L.; Liu, L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 14391. (j) Shang, R.; Ji, D.-S.; Chu, L.; Fu, Y.; Liu, L. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 4470. (k) Shang, R.; Huang, Z.; Chu, L.; Fu, Y.; Liu, L. Org. Lett. 2011, 13, 4240. (l) Xu, Z.; Wang, Q.; Zhu, J. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 3272.

(3) For selected recent examples, see: (a) Wang, Z.; Zhu, L.; Yin, F.; Su, Z.; Li, Z.; Li, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 4258. (b) Wang, P.-F.; Wang, X.-Q.; Dai, J.-J.; Feng, Y.-S.; Xu, H.-J. Org. Lett. 2014, 16, 4586. (c) Hu, F.; Shao, X.; Zhu, D.; Lu, L.; Shen, Q. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2014, 53, 6105. (d) Kan, J.; Huang, S.; Lin, J.; Zhang, M.; Su, W. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 2199.

(4) For selected recent examples, see: (a) Sun, Z.-M.; Zhao, P. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 6726. (b) Mochida, S.; Hirano, K.; Satoh, T.; Miura, M. Org. Lett. 2010, 12, 5776. (c) Pan, F.; Lei, Z.-Q.; Wang, H.; Li, H.; Sun, J.; Shi, Z.-J. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 2063. (d) Neely, J. M.; Rovis, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 2735. (e) Zhang, Y.; Zhao, H.; Zhang, M.; Su, W. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 3817.

(5) For selected recent reports, see: (a) Bi, H.-P.; Zhao, L.; Liang, Y.-M.; Li, C.-J. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 792. (b) Shang, R.; Fu, Y.; Wang, Y.; Xu, Q.; Yu, H.-Z.; Liu, L. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 9350. (c) Ranjit, S.; Duan, Z.; Zhang, P.; Liu, X. Org. Lett. 2010, 12, 4134. (d) Zhang, Y.; Patel, S.; Mainolfi, N. Chem. Sci. 2012, 3, 3196. (e) Feng, Y.-S.; Xu, Z.-Q.; Mao, L.; Zhang, F.-F.; Xu, H.-J. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 1472. (f) Feng, Q.; Song, Q. J. Org. Chem. 2014, 79, 1867. (6) For selected examples, see: (a) Yoshino, Y.; Kurahashi, T.; Matsubara, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 7494. (b) Yang, K.; Zhang, C.; Wang, P.; Zhang, Y.; Ge, H. Chem. - Eur. J. 2014, 20, 7241. (c) Noble, A.; McCarver, S. J.; MacMillan, D. W. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 624.

(7) (a) Bhadra, S.; Dzik, W. I.; Goossen, L. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 9938. (b) Kiyokawa, K.; Yahata, S.; Kojima, T.; Minakata, S. *Org. Lett.* **2014**, *16*, 4646.

(8) For selected examples of $PhI(OAc)_2$ - and I_2 -promoted decarboxylative C–O bond formation, see: (a) Francisco, C. G.; González, C. C.; Suárez, E. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1997**, 38, 4141. (b) Boto, A.; Hernández, R.; Suárez, E. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1999**, 40, 5945. (c) Boto, A.; Hernández, R.; Suárez, R.; Suárez, E. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2000**, 41, 2495. (d) Boto, A.; Hernández, R.; Suárez, R.; Suárez, E. *J. Org. Chem.* **2000**, 65, 4930.

(9) For selected examples on the decarboxylation of amino acids, see:
(a) Zheng, L.; Yang, F.; Dang, Q.; Bai, X. Org. Lett. 2008, 10, 889.
(b) Zhang, C.; Seidel, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 1798. (c) Wang, Q.; Zhang, S.; Guo, F.; Zhang, B.; Hu, P.; Wang, Z. Y. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 11161.

(10) For selected recent examples catalyzed by first-row transition metals, such as Co and Fe, see: (a) Ilies, L.; Chen, Q.; Zeng, X.; Nakamura, E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 5221. (b) Li, B.; Wu, Z.-H.; Gu, Y.-F.; Sun, C.-L.; Wang, B.-Q.; Shi, Z.-J. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 1109. (c) Ding, Z.; Yoshikai, N. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 8574. (d) Shang, R.; Ilies, L.; Matsumoto, A.; Nakamura, E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 6030. (e) Zhao, D.; Kim, J. H.; Stegemann, L.; Strassert, C. A.; Glorius, F. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 4508. (f) Hummel, J. R.; Ellman, J. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 490. (g) Shang, R.; Ilies, L.; Nakamura, E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 7660. (h) Li, J.; Ackermann, L. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 3635. (11) For the electron-withdrawing arylacetic acids, the yield decreased dramatically. For example, when nitro-substituted arylacetic acid was employed as the substrate, the decarboxylative acetoxylation reaction did not occur.

(12) For reports on decarboxylation of aliphatic carboxylic acids with radical intermediates, see: (a) Yoshimi, Y.; Itou, T.; Hatanaka, M. *Chem. Commun.* 2007, 5244. (b) Liu, X.; Wang, Z.; Cheng, X.; Li, C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2012, 134, 14330. (c) Miyake, Y.; Nakajima, K.; Nishibayashi, Y. *Chem. Commun.* 2013, 49, 7854.