

Enantioselective Synthesis of a Taxane C-Ring Component Using the Schultz Asymmetric Birch Reduction Methodology

Philip Magnus,* Francis Tavares and Nicholas Westwood

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Abstract: The asymmetric Birch reduction methodology has been used to develop two complementary routes to the taxane C-ring component in an enantioenriched form. © 1997 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

While there have been a number of strategies reported for the synthesis of the C-ring portion of the taxane diterpenes,¹ none have taken advantage of the Schultz asymmetric Birch reduction methodology which would appear to be ideally suited for the synthesis of 3 or 4, Scheme 1.2 We envisioned that 4 would serve as a convenient precursor to 3, and the construction of 1 could be brought about by the union of 2 and 3 (or equivalents to both).³



The amide 5 was reduced with K/NH₃/THF and 6 was isolated as a 4:1 mixture of diastereomers.



Treatment of 6 with *n*-BuLi at -78°C, warming to 25°C and cooling to 0°C, followed by addition of HMPA, and recooling to -78°C followed by addition of MeI gave the correct diastereomer 7 (>99:1).⁴ If the amide enolate is not brought to 25°C, then the incorrect diastereomer is the major product. After acid hydrolysis the ketone 8 was reduced with $Zn(BH_4)_2/Et_2O$, and the resulting alcohol 9 (R = H) protected as the benzyl ether 9 (R = Bn). The configuration of 9 (R = H) was determined by X-ray crystallography, and Figure 1 shows a Chem 3D representation. The reduction is highly stereoselective, only traces

(>99:1) of the other diastereomer were detected. Reduction of 8 with NaBH₄ gave a mixture (2.4:1, β : α) of both alcohols. Iodolactonization of 9 gave 10, which on treatment with LiBH₄ followed by exposure of the iodohydrin to DBU resulted in the epoxy alcohol 11.⁵ Regioselective opening of the epoxide 11 was accomplished by treatment with PhSO₂CH₂Li/THF/HMPA to give 12 (98%); the primary alcohol was selectively protected as its -TBS ether, and dehydration using the Burgess reagent resulted in 13. Deprotection

and oxidation of 13 provided 15 via 14, and standard Wittig homologation⁶ gave the desired C-ring component 16.



Conditions: a) K/NH3/t-BuOH/-78°C, 6 (99%, 4:1). b) *n*-BuLi/THF/-78°C to 0°C, HMPA, cool to -78°C add MeI, 7 (85%, >99:1). c) THF/HCl/25°C, 8 (95%). d) i. Zn(BH4)2/Et₂O, >99:1. ii. BnBr/THF/KI (cat)/KH/25°C, 9 (91%). e) I₂/THF/H₂O (1:1)/25°C, 10 (76%). f) LiBH4/THF/-5°C, followed by DBU/CH₂Cl₂/25°C, 11 (89%). g) THF/PhSO₂Me/*n*-BuLi/HMPA/-78° to 25°C, 12 (98%). h) TBSCI/DMF/Imidazole/25°C, 13 (86%). i) Burgess reagent/PhMe/110°C, 14 (56%). j) TBAF/THF/25°C, 15 (86%). k) SO₃.py/DMSO/NEt₃/CH₂Cl₂/0° to 25°C, 16 (92%). l) MeOCH₂PPh₃+Cl⁻/KN(TMS)₂/THF/-78° to 0°C (84%), followed by 2N HCl/THF, 16 (87%).

An alternative synthesis of 14 was examined to avoid the difficult dehydration of 12, and allow more flexibility in the choice of substituents at C-20. Again using the Schultz asymmetric Birch reduction methodology 17 was converted into 18. Iodolactonization of 18 proceeded cleanly to give 19, whose structure and absolute configuration was confirmed by X-ray crystallography, Figure 2 shows a Chem 3D representation from the X-ray coordinates, Scheme 3. Reduction of the lactone using LiBH4 followed by elimination of HI gave the epoxide 20. Exposure of 20 to the classical Crandall⁷ epoxide elimination conditions (LiNEt₂/Et₂O) proceeded slowly even at reflux to give a mixture of allylic alcohols 21 and 22 (1:3).⁸ Whereas, treatment of 20 with Olofson's "Harpoon" base⁹ at 25°C cleanly produced 21 and 22 (1:6) in 84% yield. It is necessary to conduct the above epoxide rearrangement on the unprotected primary alcohol 20 because the corresponding TBS derivative does not undergo any conversion into an allylic alcohol. This suggests that lithium alkoxide coordination to the adjacent epoxide oxygen atom lone pair of electrons greatly facilitates the endo- and exocyclic elimination process.

The TBS protected exocyclic allylic alcohol 23 was surprisingly reluctant to participate in [2.3]sigmatropic rearrangement chemistry. For example, treatment of 23 with PhSCl/n-BuLi/Et₂O/-78°C gave the rearranged sulfoxide in low yield, and surprisingly 22 did not react with PhSsuccinimide/PBu₃ at all. This problem was readily solved by making use of standard S_N2' chemistry. Treatment of 23 with thionyl chloride/pyridine cleanly gave the rearranged allylic chloride 24, which was converted directly into the sulfone 13 (84% from 23) by exposure to PhSO₂Na/NaI/DMF. Alternatively, treatment of 24 with PhSH/NaH/THF gave the sulfide 25, which was converted into the homologous aldehyde 26 using the same sequence of transformations as before.



Conditions: a) Same as for 9, Scheme 2 (77% over 5 steps). b) I₂/THF/H₂O (1:1)/25°C, 19 (84%). c) LiBH₄/THF/0°C, followed by DBU/CH₂Cl₂/25°C, 20 (78%). d) 2,2,6,6-Tetramethylpiperidine/*n*-BuLi/0° to 25°C, 21:22 (1:6, 84%). e) TBSCI/NEt₃/DMAP/CH₂Cl₂/25°C, 23 (95%). f) SOCl₂/py/Et₂O/0°C. g) PhSH/NaH/THF/25°C, 25 (92% from 23). h) i. TBAF/THF/25°C, (92%). ii. SO₃.py/DMSO/NEt₃/CH₂Cl₂/0° to 25°C, (86%). iii. MeOCH₂PPh₃+Cl⁻/KN(TMS)₂/THF/-78° to 0°C (69%), followed by 2N HCl/THF, 26 (97%).

The sequence of reactions outlined in Scheme 2 is the preferred route to the C-ring sulfone 16, but the alternative route in Scheme 3 to the C-ring sulfide 26 also allows access to the C-20 sulfoxide. The Schultz asymmetric Birch reduction methodolgy provides a very direct way to control the absolute stereochemistry at C-7 and C-8 in the taxol C-ring, and the compounds 16 and 26 are appropriately functionalized for attachment of the A-ring portion by the reaction processes indicated in Scheme 1 (2 + 3).

Acknowledgments. The National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Welch Foundation and Merck Frosst are thanked for their support of this research. N. W. thanks NATO for a post-doctoral fellowship.

References and Footnotes

- Nicolaou, K. C.; Dai, W.-M.; Guy, R. K. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1994, 33, 15. Nicolaou, K. C.; Liu, J.-J.; Yang, Z.; Ueno, H.; Sorensen, E. J.; Claiborne, C. F.; Guy, R. K.; Hwang, C.-K.; Nakada, M.; Nantermet, P. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1995, 117, 634. Nicolaou, K. C.; Liu, J. J.; Dai, W.-M.; Guy, R. K. J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. 1992, 1118. Magee, T. V.; Bornmann, W. G.; Isaacs, R. C. A.; Danishefsky, S. J. J. Org. Chem. 1992, 57, 3274. Swindell, C. S.; Patel, B. P.; deSolms, S. J. J. Org. Chem. 1987, 52, 2346. Bauta, W.; Booth, J.; Bos, M. E.; DeLuca, M.; Diorazio, L.; Donohoe, T.; Magnus, N.; Magnus, P.; Mendoza, J.; Pye, P.; Tarrant, J.; Thom, S.; Ujjainwalla, F. Tetrahedron Lett. 1995, 36, 5327.
- 2. Schultz, A. G.; Macielag, M.; Sundaraaman, P.; Taveras, A. G.; Welch, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 7828.
- 3. Magnus, P.; Frost, C.; Linnane, P.; Spyvee, M. Tetrahedron Lett. 1996, 37, 9139.
- 4. Professor Schultz is thanked for information concerning this procedure.
- 5. Schultz, A. G.; Holoboski, M. A.; Smyth, M. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 6210.
- 6. Wittig, G.; Boll, W.; Kruck, K-H. Chem. Ber. 1962, 95, 2514.
- 7. Crandall, J. K.; Chang, L-H. J. Org. Chem. 1967, 32, 435.
- 8. Dutcher, J. S.; MacMillan, J. G.; Heathcock, C. H. J. Org. Chem. 1976, 41, 2663.
- 9. Olofson, R. A.; Dougherty, C. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1973, 95, 583.

(Received in USA 19 November 1996; revised 13 January 1997; accepted 14 January 1997)