

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23282417>

Rhenium(VII) Catalysis of Prins Cyclization Reactions

ARTICLE *in* ORGANIC LETTERS · OCTOBER 2008

Impact Factor: 6.36 · DOI: 10.1021/ol8019204 · Source: PubMed

CITATIONS

45

READS

54

2 AUTHORS:



Kwanruthai Tadpetch

Prince of Songkla University

12 PUBLICATIONS 164 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Scott Rychnovsky

University of California, Irvine

188 PUBLICATIONS 5,506 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Published in final edited form as:


Org Lett. 2008 November 6; 10(21): 4839–4842. doi:10.1021/ol8019204.

Rhenium(VII) Catalysis of Prins Cyclization Reactions

Kwanruthai Tadpetch and Scott D. Rychnovsky*

Department of Chemistry, 1102 Natural Sciences II, University of California, Irvine, California, 92697-2025

Abstract



The rhenium(VII) complex O₃ReOSiPh₃ are particularly effective catalyst for Prins cyclizations using aromatic and α,β -unsaturated aldehydes. The reaction conditions are mild and the highly substituted 4-hydroxy tetrahydropyran products are formed stereoselectively. Rhenium(VII) complexes appear to spontaneously form esters with alcohols and to directly activate electron rich alcohols for solvolysis. Re₂O₇ and perrhenic acid were equally effective in catalyzing these cyclizations.

Osborn reported that the Re(VII) complex O₃ReOSiPh₃¹ was a highly effective catalyst for allylic alcohol isomerizations.² Grubbs studied Osborn's reaction and found that O₃ReOSiPh₃ isomerizes allylic alcohols stereospecifically.³ Both Osborn and Grubbs invoked a concerted [3,3] rearrangement of allylic perrhenate esters to explain this very facile and selective isomerization (Figure 1).^{2,3} An alternative mechanism was invoked to explain some of the peculiarities of the reaction. Osborn proposed an ionic mechanism to explain the kinetics for formation of Z-alkenes,^{2b} and Grubbs invoked a similar mechanism to explain the loss of optical purity with certain electron-rich allylic alcohol substrates (Figure 1).³ The proposed ionic mechanism attracted our attention because it suggested that Re(VII) complexes might activate and solvolyze electron rich alcohols. We report herein a Prins cyclization initiated by Re(VII) catalysts⁴ based on this concept that is both very mild and shows unusual selectivity.

Prins cyclization reactions between homoallylic alcohols and aldehydes are generally promoted by strong Bronsted or Lewis acids.⁵ If halide counterions are present, they are incorporated at the 4-position of the newly formed tetrahydropyran (THP) ring.⁵ Oxygen atoms can be captured at the 4-position of the THP ring,⁶ although most acids lead to esters that must be hydrolyzed to form 4-hydroxy THP products.⁷ Most Prins cyclizations use super-stoichiometric acid to promote the reaction because the acid counterion is trapped in the product, thus consuming the acid.⁵ Re(VII) complex O₃ReOSiPh₃ is proposed to catalyze the Prins cyclization as illustrated in Scheme 1. Activation is achieved by forming perrhenate ester **4** from hemiacetal **3**. Solvolysis of ester **4** generates the intermediate **5** as a contact ion pair.

Cyclization and trapping leads to perrhenate ester **6**. Ester exchange with Ph_3SiOH would regenerate the catalyst. The proposed Re(VII) initiated reaction has several potential advantages over traditional Prins cyclization reactions. It avoids the use of strong acid, and the facile transesterification of perrhenate esters with alcohols allows turnover and makes the system catalytic. Additionally, the alcohol product would be produced directly from the reaction rather than requiring a subsequent hydrolysis step. These potentially attractive features led us to explore this reaction.

Table 1 presents an initial exploration of the Re(VII) catalyzed Prins cyclization. The aldehyde and homoallylic alcohol were selected with the same substituent to avoid complications from oxonia-Cope induced side-chain exchanges.⁸ $\text{O}_3\text{ReOSiPh}_3$ catalyzed the Prins cyclization effectively in most solvents except acetonitrile. Although the reaction was effective using 1 mol % catalyst (entry 1), 5 mol % catalyst was selected to screen conditions. Methylene chloride, chloroform and hexanes all gave yields over 60% on stirring at room temperature (entries 2, 4, and 7). The reaction times varied from several hours to several days. Vanadyl esters were also investigated as catalysts,⁹ but they were less efficient. For example, 30 mol % of tri-*n*-propyl vanadate (entry 9) gave slightly more than one mole of product per mole of catalyst after several days. Phosphomolybdic acid catalysis was evaluated for comparison (entry 10) and gave a lower yield but with higher equatorial selectivity.^{6g} Two molybdenum oxo complexes were screened as catalysts but they were ineffective.¹⁰

One surprising aspect of the oxo-metal catalyzed reaction is the isolation of axial Prins product (**7ax**) as a significant component of the product. Prins reactions normally give predominantly equatorial 4-heteroatom products, and all previously reported 4-oxygen adducts showed high equatorial selectivity.^{6,7} We previously reported that the axial selectivity was a function of the lifetime and reactivity of the ion pair, with very reactive nucleophiles, such as bromide anion, leading to high axial selectivity.¹¹ Typical oxygen nucleophiles, such as CF_3CO_2^- or AcO-BF_3^- have low nucleophilicity and lead to ca. 20:1 selectivity for the equatorial product.^{8f} The Re(VII) catalyst, while still favoring the equatorial product, shows a much lower level of selectivity. The vanadate ester example (entry 9) actually favors the axial alcohol product. These experiments suggest that perrhenate and other oxo-metal counter ions are much more nucleophilic than trifluoroacetate counterion in Prins reactions and that they may show unusual patterns of reactivity and selectivity. On a practical note, the best selectivity for the equatorial product was found using $\text{O}_3\text{ReOSiPh}_3$ in hexanes (entry 6).

Prins reactions with aromatic and aliphatic aldehydes behave differently when catalyzed by $\text{O}_3\text{ReOSiPh}_3$. Scheme 2 presents the reaction between isobutyraldehyde and alcohol **1**. The expected product **8** is accompanied by side products **9** and **7** that arise from facile 2-oxonia-Cope rearrangements.⁸ The outcome with an electron rich aromatic aldehyde is very different. Side-chain exchange products are much less prevalent, and the expected Prins product was formed in 49% yield with excellent equatorial alcohol selectivity.^{12,13} We believe that the greater nucleophilicity of the perrhenate anion limits oxonia-Cope rearrangement with aromatic aldehydes.¹⁴ The excellent equatorial selectivity is consistent with previous observations, where a more stable oxocarbenium ion leads to a less reactive ion pair and better equatorial selectivity.

The reactivity with aromatic aldehydes was further investigated (Table 2). Substituted alcohol **11-R** and its enantiomer, **11-S** were used in this study.¹⁵ Both electron rich and electron poor aromatic aldehydes gave excellent yields and selectivities for the equatorial alcohol Prins product. In entries 2 and 4, the products were demonstrated to have high optical purities. Remarkably, the unprotected free phenol in entry 3 worked very well in the reaction. The very electron rich phenol in entry 7 did give some Prins product, but only very slowly. The corresponding sulfonyl-protected phenol gave an excellent yield of equatorial THP product.

The aldehydes in entries 7 and 8 were previously investigated in our approach to kendomycin,¹³ but the Re(VII) catalyzed Prins cyclization conditions appear to be both milder and more general. Electron withdrawing substituents (entry 9, 10) lead to slightly lower yields than with electron rich aldehydes.

A common problem with aliphatic aldehydes is the generation of side-chain exchange products as shown in Scheme 2. The Re(VII) conditions appear to minimize this exchange with aromatic aldehydes. An indirect solution for selective Prins cyclization of aliphatic aldehydes might be developed using unsaturated aldehydes, followed by reduction or functionalization of the alkene.¹⁶ A few representative unsaturated aldehydes were investigated and the results are shown in Scheme 3.¹⁷ All three aldehydes worked well in the reaction, although the more complex aldehyde **17**, prepared by a metathesis reaction between crotonaldehyde and the corresponding terminal alkene, was noticeably slower than the others. All of the products showed very good selectivity for the equatorial alcohol THP products. Unsaturated aldehydes will be useful for forming complex THP fragments suitable for natural product synthesis.

Several details of the catalytic cycle are not clear at this time, but a few control experiments have placed some limits on possible mechanisms. The Prins reaction in Table 1 in DCM returned only starting material when proton scavenger 2,6-*di-tert*-butyl-4-methylpyridine (2,6-DTBMP) or 4 Å sieves were added. Grubbs reported that hindered tertiary amines also halted the allylic isomerization by O₃ReOSiPh₃.³ Addition of water stopped the reaction.¹⁸ Added CSA had no effect on the reaction. The basic path of the reaction presumably follows the mechanism outlined in Scheme 1. One significant unanswered question is whether the activation of the hemiacetal **3** is due to perrhenate ester formation or simple acid-promoted solvolysis.

Because of ambiguities in the mechanism, we decided to test other Re(VII) catalysts, and the results are shown in Scheme 4. Solutions of 65–70% aqueous perrhenic acid¹⁸ are equally effective as O₃ReOSiPh₃ in the Prins cyclization of alcohol **11-R** and *p*-anisaldehyde (**19**). Re₂O₇ is also effective for catalyzing Prins reactions. In both cases, these commercially available Re(VII) compounds lead to outcomes essentially indistinguishable from O₃ReOSiPh₃. Perrhenic acid is a strong acid with a pK_a = -1.25,¹⁹ so an acid catalyzed activation of hemiacetal **3** (Scheme 1) is certainly possible. An indirect test for perrhenate ester formation was conducted by exploring the allylic alcohol rearrangement of allylic alcohol **21**.³ Both O₃ReOSiPh₃ and perrhenic acid lead to efficient rearrangement to conjugated allylic alcohol **22** under similar conditions, suggesting that 65–70% aqueous perrhenic acid is capable of forming perrhenate esters under these conditions.¹⁸ Thus perrhenic acid may be active through the same mechanism (Scheme 1) proposed for O₃ReOSiPh₃.

Re(VII) complexes are uniquely effective catalysts for the Prins cyclization. These catalysts will be useful for Prins cyclizations and will be of interest for the development of other catalytic processes.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute (CA-081635) and by a generous gift from the Schering-Plough Research Institute. KT was supported by a fellowship from the Royal Thai Government.

References

1. Schoop T, Roesky HW, Noltemeyer M, Schmidt HG. *Organometallics* 1993;12:571–574.
2. (a) Bellemin-Laponnaz S, Gisie H, Pierre Le Nye J, Osborn JA. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl* 1997;36:976–978. (b) Bellemin-Laponnaz S, Le Ny JP, Osborn JA. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2000;41:1549–1552.
3. (a) Morrill C, Grubbs RH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:2842–2843. [PubMed: 15740106] (b) Morrill C, Beutner GL, Grubbs RH. *J. Org. Chem* 2006;71:7813–7825. [PubMed: 16995691]
4. For several other related applications of high-oxidation Re catalysts in synthesis, see: (a) Ishihara K, Furuya Y, Yamamoto H. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl* 2002;41:2983–2986. [PubMed: 12203432] (b) Maeda Y, Nishimura T, Uemura S. *Chem. Lett* 2005;34:790–791. (c) Sherry BD, Radosevich AT, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2003;125:6076–6077. [PubMed: 12785836] (d) Sherry BD, Loy RN, Toste FD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:4510–4511. [PubMed: 15070356]
5. (a) Pastor IM, Yus M. *Curr. Org. Chem* 2007;11:925–957. Snider, BB. *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis*. Trost, BM.; Fleming, I.; Heathcock, CH., editors. Vol. Vol. 2. New York: Pergamon Press; 1991. p. 527–561. (c) Adams DR, Bhatnagar SP. *Synthesis* 1977:661–672. (d) Overman LE, Pennington LD. *J. Org. Chem* 2003;68:7143–7157. [PubMed: 12968864]
6. (a) Hanschke E. *Chem. Ber* 1955;88:1053–1061. (b) Zhang W-C, Viswanathan GS, Li C-J. *Chem. Commun* 1999:291–292. (c) Zhang W-C, Li C-J. *Tetrahedron* 2000;56:2403–2411. (d) Yadav JS, Reddy BVS, Kumar GM, Murthy CVSR. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2001;42:89–91. (e) Keh CCK, Namboodiri VV, Varma RS, Li C-J. *Tetrahedron Lett* 2002;43:4993–4996. (f) Hart DJ, Bennett CE. *Org. Lett* 2003;5:1499–1502. [PubMed: 12713308] (g) Yadav JS, Reddy BVS, Kumar GGKSN, Aravind S. *Synthesis* 2008:395–400.
7. (a) Kay IT, Williams EG. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1983;24:5915–5918. (b) Kay IT, Bartholomew D. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1984;25:2035–2038. (c) Jaber JJ, Mitsui K, Rychnovsky SD. *J. Org. Chem* 2001;66:4679–4686. [PubMed: 11421792] (d) Barry CSJ, Crosby SR, Harding JR, Hughes RA, King CD, Parker GD, Willis CL. *Org. Lett* 2003;5:2429–2432. [PubMed: 12841747] (e) Barry CS, Elsworth JD, Seden PT, Bushby N, Harding JR, Alder RW, Willis CL. *Org. Lett* 2006;8:3319–3322. [PubMed: 16836395]
8. (a) Lolkema LDM, Semeyn C, Ashek L, Hiemstra H, Speckamp WN. *Tetrahedron* 1994;50:7129–7140. (b) Rychnovsky SD, Marumoto S, Jaber JJ. *Org. Lett* 2001;3:3815–3818. [PubMed: 11700146] (c) Alder RW, Harvey JN, Oakley MT. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2002;124:4960–4961. [PubMed: 11982351] (d) Crosby SR, Harding JR, King CD, Parker GD, Willis CL. *Org. Lett* 2002;4:577–580. [PubMed: 11843595] (e) Barry CS, Bushby N, Harding JR, Hughes RA, Parker GD, Roe R, Willis CL. *Chem. Commun* 2005:3727–3729. (f) Jasti R, Anderson CD, Rychnovsky SD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:9939–9945. [PubMed: 15998101] (g) Jasti R, Rychnovsky SD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:13640–13648. [PubMed: 17031979]
9. Chabardes P, Kuntz E, Varagnat J. *Tetrahedron* 1977;33:1775–1783.
10. $\text{MoO}_2(\text{acac})_2$ (a) Rajan OA, Chakravorty A. *Inorg. Chem* 1981;20:660–664. $\text{MoO}_2(\text{OSiPh}_3)_2$ (b) Huang M, DeKock CW. *Inorg. Chem* 1993;32:2287–2291.
11. (a) Jasti R, Vitale J, Rychnovsky SD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:9904–9905. [PubMed: 15303848] (b) Miles RB, Davis CE, Coates RM. *J. Org. Chem* 2006;71:1493–1501. [PubMed: 16468798]
12. This result stands in contrast to our Prins reaction approach to kendomycin, where an electron rich aromatic ring led to side chain exchange products as the major component in a TFA/DCM promoted reaction (ref. 13).
13. Bahnck KB, Rychnovsky SD. *Chem. Commun* 2006:2388–2390.
14. The aliphatic aldehyde oxonia-Cope rearrangement evident in Scheme 2 should be thermoneutral, whereas the aromatic oxonia-Cope should favor the aromatic oxocarbenium ion. In theory this effect might suppress oxonia-Cope side reactions with aromatic aldehydes, but in our experience it does not, perhaps because of a slower Prins cyclization with aromatic aldehydes. See ref. ¹³ for an example.
15. (a) Nokami J, Nomiyama K, Matsuda S, Imai N, Kataoka K. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* 2003;42:1273–1276. (b) Nokami J, Ohga M, Nakamoto H, Matsubara T, Hussain I, Kataoka K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:9168–9169. [PubMed: 11552828]
16. Chan K-P, Ling YH, Loh T-P. *Chem. Commun* 2007:939–941.

17. A Prins reaction between alcohol **1** and cinnamaldehyde led to the expected product in 40% yield and the side-chain exchanged product **7** in 18% yield. Further work needs to be done to make Prins reactions with terminal alkenes practical.
18. The "wet" reaction was run in water-saturated DCM. At 27 °C, the concentration of water would be 0.137 M (0.186 wt %: Stephenson RM. J. Chem. Eng. Data 1992;37:80–95.) With a catalyst concentration of 0.005 M, the molar ratio of water/Re(VII) would be ca. 27:1. For comparison, the molar ratio of commercial 70 wt % perrhenic acid is about 6:1 water/Re(VII). Presumably the difference in the water concentration led to the difference in outcome.
19. Bailey N, Carrington A, Lott KAK, Symons MCR. J. Chem. Soc 1960:290–297.







Figure 1. Grubbs-Osborn mechanism for stereoselective isomerization of allylic alcohols and the alternative ionic mechanism that leads to loss of selectivity are presented




Scheme 1.
Proposed mechanism for activation and Prins cyclization using $\text{O}_3\text{ReOSiPh}_3$




Scheme 2.
Prins reaction with aliphatic and aromatic aldehydes




Scheme 3.
Prins reaction with unsaturated aldehydes



compare Table 2, entry 2



compare Table 1, entry 2



Scheme 4.
Comparison of different Re(VII) catalyst

Table 1
Screening Prins Cyclization Conditions with O₃ReOSiPh₃ and Other Catalysts


<p style="text-align: center;"> $\text{R} = \text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Ph}$ </p>				
entry	solvent	time (h)	yield (%)	eq/ax
1 ^a	CH ₂ Cl ₂	36	54	1.5:1
2	CH ₂ Cl ₂	3	63	1.9:1
3	CHCl ₃	48	67	2.7:1
4	EtOAc	21	33	4.5:1
5	MeNO ₂	24	40	6.0:1
6	hexanes	48	62	15:1
7	toluene	48	38	4.4:1
8	MeCN	48	0	NA
9 ^b	CH ₂ Cl ₂	72	37	1:2.4
10 ^c	CH ₂ Cl ₂	20	43	>10:1

^a Reaction was carried out with 1 mol % O₃ReOSiPh₃.

^b Reaction was carried out with 30 mol % VO(OPr^{*i*})₃ instead of O₃ReOSiPh₃ and with two equivalents of the aldehyde.

^c Reaction catalyzed with 5 mol % H₃[P(Mo₃O₁₀)₄] \cdot xH₂O.



Table 2
Prins Cyclization with Aromatic Aldehyde and O₃ReOSiPh₃




entry

aldehyde

1


2^a




entry

aldehyde



3






entry

aldehyde


4^a5^a




entry

aldehyde

6








entry

aldehyde

7

8^c

9






entry

aldehyde

10



^a Enantiomeric series (**11-S** alcohol, 99% ee).

^b 97% ee by HPLC analysis.

^c 10 mol % $\text{O}_3\text{ReOSiPh}_3$.

^d Starting material was also recovered in 11% yield.