RSC Advances

Journal Name

Dynamic Article Links ▶

ARTICLE TYPE

Aldehyde-Alkyne-Amine (A³) Coupling Catalyzed by a Highly Efficient Dicopper Complex

Hong-Bin Chen,[a*] Yan Zhao,[a] Yi Liao[b]*

A dicopper(I) complex, $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ (pip = (2-picolyliminomethyl)pyrrole anion), was utilized to catalyze A³ coupling reactions, which led to the formation of propargylamines. Aldehydes, alkynes and amines with a variety of structures have been tested. A low catalyst loading of 0.4 mol% was sufficient to give good to excellent yields. The low catalyst loading, broad scope of substrate and easy preparation make 10 this dicopper complex a useful catalyst for A³ coupling.

Introduction

Propargylamines are versatile building blocks for the synthesis of various nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compounds,[1] and important intermediates for the preparation of complex natural 15 products and biologically active molecules.[2] Further, some propargylamines have been clinically used or are currently tested for the treatment of Parkinson's disease[3] and Alzheimer's disease.[4] Classically, propargylamines are synthesized by the nucleophilic addition of a metal alkynylide to C=N electrophiles, 20 which often requires stoichiometric amount of highly active organometallic reagents such as organolithium,[5] Grignard reagents,[6] and organozinc reagents,[7] and hence is less attractive due to low tolerance of functional groups, harsh reaction conditions, and operational complexity. In the past 25 decade, transition-metal catalyzed three-component coupling of an Aldehyde, an alkyne, and an amine (generally referred as A³-coupling) has received more and more attention due to its atom economy, step efficiency, and high chemical selectivity.[8] This reaction was proposed to proceed through the addition of an *in-*30 *situ* generated metal-alkynylide to an imine (or iminium ion), which is also formed *in-situ* from a reaction between an aldehyde and an amine, and water was formed as the only side product.

Transition metal salts and complexes, especially those from coinage metals (Cu, Ag, and Au),[8] as well as Zn,[9] Ni,[10] Fe,[11] 35 In,[12] Ir,[13] Co,[14] Mn,[15] Bi,[16] Hg[17] and Cd[18] have been developed as the catalysts for A³-coupling, among which copper compounds have been studied most. Recently, Heaney and co-workers proposed that in the mechanism of copper(I)-catalyzed A³-coupling, a dimeric copper(I) acetylide **1a** (Scheme 1) forms 40 in the early stage of the catalytic cycle.[19] The intermediate **1a** then binds to the imine or iminium ion, which leads to the addition of the alkynylide to the imine or iminium ion, and yields the intermediate **1b** (Scheme 1). It is worth mentioning that this mechanism is similar to those of copper-catalyzed alkyne-azide 45 cycloaddition (CuAAC),[20] Kinugasa reaction,[21] and Glaser coupling.[22] In fact, several dicopper catalysts have been shown

to be highly efficient for CuAAC.[23] To our best knowledge, only one type of dicopper catalyst based on pybox ligands has been reported for A³ coupling.[24] The pybox catalysts were used for 50 asymmetric synthesis and a loading of 5-10% was commonly used. Based on the mechanism, the primary function of a dinuclear structure should be improving its catalytic efficiency. Therefore, exploring new dicopper catalysts is important for enhance catalytic efficiency as well as understanding the 55 mechanism of A³ coupling.

Scheme 1. Proposed catalytic intermediates in A³-coupling[19]

Previously we reported that a dinuclear copper(I) complex, $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ (pip = (2-picolyliminomethyl)pyrrole anion) (Scheme 60 2) efficiently catalyzed the alkyne-azide cycloaddition at a low loading of 0.2 mol%.[23a] The catalyst has a stable dimeric structure in solutions and is easy to prepare. Given the similarity between the proposed mechanisms of copper catalyzed A³ and alkyne-azide cycloaddition reactions, we hypothesized that this 65 catalyst could also possess a high activity for A³ reaction. Herein, we reported our study on the catalytic behaviors of this dicopper(I) compound for a series of A³ reactions with different substrates.

Scheme 2. Structure of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$

Results and discussion

A model reaction with benzaldehyde, phenylacetylene and peperidine was studied first to evaluate the catalytic activity of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ and to optimize the reaction condition. The reaction was performed in refluxing toluene for 12 hours in the presence of 1 mol% of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$. The coupling reaction proceeded well and the expected propargylamine was isolated with nearly quantitative yield (Table 1, entry 1). Other solvents were also tested for the reaction (entries 2-7). The bath temperature was set to 110 °C, and thus the reaction was either at this temperature or the boiling points of the solvents. Non-polar solvents toluene and dioxane gave much better yields than the polar solvents including DMF, DMSO, EtOH and MeCN. The moderate yield obtained by using THF (entry 3) may also be due to the its low boiling point.

The loading of the catalyst was optimized by conducting the reaction with 1-0.2 mol% of loading using toluene as the solvent (entry 1, 8-11). The results revealed that $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ is highly active for A^3-coupling. When the catalyst loading was reduced to 0.4 mol%, the reaction still gave 98% yield (entry 10). Even a loading as low as 0.2 mol% gave 90% yield (entry 11). It is worth mentioning that homogenous A^3 reaction often requires 5-10 mol% of catalyst loading.[8] Further studies showed that the reaction time can be decreased without affect the yields. As shown in entry 12 and 13 in Table 1, 98% yield was obtained after 2h and there was no significant difference between 2h and 4h reactions. The low catalyst loading and short reaction time clearly proves the high activity of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$.

The catalytic activity of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ was compared to another dicopper(I) compound $(CuOAc)_2$, which has also been reported to be a high-efficiency catalyst for CuAAC reaction.[23c] However, even when 2 mol% of $(CuOAc)_2$ was used, which was 5 times more than that of $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$, the corresponding A^3-coupling only gave 67% yield (entry 14).

Table 1. Optimization of reaction conditions of A^3 coupling[a]

Entry	solvent	Cat. (%)	t (h)	Yield (%)[b]
1	toluene	1	12	99
2	MeCN	1	12	61
3	THF	1	12	71
4	dioxane	1	12	80
5	EtOH	1	12	37
6	DMF	1	12	32
7	DMSO	1	12	25
8	toluene	0.8	12	99
9	toluene	0.6	12	99
10	toluene	0.4	12	98
11	toluene	0.2	12	90
12	toluene	0.4	4	97
13	toluene	0.4	2	98
14[c]	toluene	2	2	67

[a] Reaction conditions: benzaldehyde (1.0 mmol), piperidine (1.0 mmol), phenylacetylene (1.2 mmol), catalyst, solvent (3 mL); [b] isolated yield; [c] $(CuOAc)_2$ was used as the catalyst.

The structural effects of the aldehyde reactants were studied using the optimized reaction condition. Aromatic and aliphatic aldehydes with a variety of structures were examined using piperidine and phenylacetylene as the other reactants, and the results are summarized in Table 2. All the aromatic aldehydes tested showed high reactivity. Electron-withdrawing or electron-donating substituents at *ortho*-, *meta*-, or *para*-position showed almost no effects, and excellent yields were obtained from the corresponding aldehydes (entries 1-9). Sterically hindered aromatic aldehydes including 2,6-dichlorobenzaldehyde and 2,6-dimethoxybenzaldehyde also reacted well, and gave the corresponding products with yields of 88% and 98% respectively (entry 10, 11). Aliphatic aldehydes including pentanal, isopentanal, octanal, cyclopentanecarboxaldehyde and cyclohexanecarboxaldehyde, were also excellent substrates for this catalytic reaction. Yields above 90% were obtained for all the tested aliphatic aldehydes after the reactions proceeded 2 hours (entries 12-16). Heteroaromatic aldehydes including 2-furaldehyde and 2-thenaldehyde were also examined and afforded the corresponding products with yields of 89% and 81% respectively (entries 17-18).

Table 2. Reaction yields of different aldehydes under optimized reaction conditions[a]

Entry	R	Yield (%)[b]
1	C_6H_5	98
2	$4\text{-}FC_6H_4$	97
3	$3\text{-}FC_6H_4$	98
4	$2\text{-}FC_6H_4$	98
5	$4\text{-}MeOC_6H_4$	96
6	$3\text{-}MeOC_6H_4$	97
7	$2\text{-}MeOC_6H_4$	97
8	1-naphthyl	95
9	2-naphthyl	97
10	$2,6\text{-}Cl_2C_6H_3$	88
11	$2,6\text{-}(MeO)_2C_6H_3$	98

12	C$_4$H$_9$	99
13	Me$_2$CHCH$_2$	99
14	C$_7$H$_{15}$	97
15	*c*-pentyl	91
16	*c*-hexyl	94
17	2- furyl	89
18	2- thiophenyl	81

[a] Reaction conditions: aldehyde (1.0 mmol), piperidine (1.0 mmol) and phenylacetylene (1.2 mmol) in toulene (3 mL); [b] isolated yield.

The structural effects of alkynes were studied using benzaldehyde and piperidine as the other reactants, and the results are summarized in Table 3. Aromatic acetylenes, regardless of electron-withdrawing or electron-donating groups on the phenyl ring, reacted well and gave excellent yields (entries 1-6). Hept-1-yne, an aliphatic alkyne, also underwent the reaction well and afforded the corresponding product nearly quantitatively (entry 7). However, propargylic alcohol and 1-phenylprop-2-yn-1-ol gave complex mixtures (entries 8, 9), which were difficult to separate by column chromatography. A possible reason is that the hydroxyl group on the alpha carbon of the alkynes may participate in the formation of the catalytic intermediates and cause side reactions. A heteroaromatic alkyne, 2-ethynylthiophene, were also examined, and a yield of 85% was obtained (entry 10).

Table 3. Reaction yields of different alkynes under optimized reaction conditions[a]

Entry	R	Yield (%)[b]
1	4-MeOC$_6$H$_4$	97
2	3,4-(MeO)$_2$C$_6$H$_3$	95
3	4-MeC$_6$H$_4$	97
4	3-MeC$_6$H$_4$	98
5	4-FC$_6$H$_4$	93
6	4-BrC$_6$H$_4$	98
7	C$_5$H$_{11}$	99
8	CH$_2$OH	[c]
9	CH(OH)C$_6$H$_5$	[c]
10	2- thiophenyl	85

[a] Reaction conditions: benzaldehyde (1.0 mmol), piperidine (1.0 mmol) and alkyne (1.2 mmol) in toulene (3 mL); [b] isolated yield.

Amines with different structures were also tested using the optimized reaction condition (Table 4). Secondary amines, including morpholine, pyrrolidine and Bn$_2$NH gave the expected products with satisfied yields (entries 1-3). However, no product was detected after the reaction when aniline was used (entry 4). This result shows that the catalytic system cannot be applied to aromatic primary amine.[25]

Table 4. Effect of different amines on A^3 coupling under optimization reaction conditions[a]

Entry	R$_1$R$_2$NH	Yield (%)[b]
1	morpholine	96
2	pyrrolidine	87
3	Bn$_2$NH	97
4	PhNH$_2$	*nd*

[a] Reaction conditions: benzaldehyde (1.0 mmol), amine (1.0 mmol) and phenylacetylene (1.2 mmol) in toulene (3 mL); [b] isolated yield.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that a dicopper(I) complex Cu$^I_2$(pip)$_2$ is highly efficient for catalyzing the A^3 coupling reaction, which produces propargylamines. Aromatic and aliphatic aldehydes, alkynes and secondary amines with various structures reacted well at a catalyst loading of 0.4 mol%, and gave good to excellent yields. The broad substrate scopes, mild reaction condition and low catalyst loadings make Cu$^I_2$(pip)$_2$ a useful catalyst for the A^3 reaction.

Experimental section

General procedure for A^3-coupling: To a solution of Cu$^I_2$(pip)$_2$ (2.0 mg, 0.4% mmol) in toluene (3 mL) was added alkyne (1.2 mmol), aldehyde (1.0 mmol) and amine (1.0 mmol) under nitrogen atmosphere. The reaction mixture was heated at 110 ^{o}C for 2 hrs, cooled, and then subjected to column chromatography on silica gel (300-400 mesh) eluting with petroleum ether-ethyl acetate to give the desired propargylamine.

Notes and references

^{a} Department of Chemistry, College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Xiamen University, 361005, PR China. Tel: 86-592-2181573; E-mail: hbchan@xmu.edu.cn
^{b} Department of Chemistry, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL 32901, USA. E-mail: yliao@fit.edu

† Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: experimental details and characterization data. See DOI: 10.1039/b000000x/

RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript

1   For some recent examples, see: (a) R. K. Arigela, R. Kumar, S. Samala, S. Gupta, B. Kundu, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, 6057; (b) C. E. Meyet, C. H. Larsen, *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 9835; (c) G. Naresh, R. Kant, T. Narender, *Org. Lett.* **2014**, *16*, 4528; (d) A. Ranjan, R. Yerande, P. B. Wakchaure, S. G. Yerande, D. H. Dethe, *Org. Lett.* **2014**, *16*, 5788; (e) Y. Xia, L. Y. Chen, S. Lv, Z. Sun, B. Wang, *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 9818; (f) O. P. Pereshivko, V. A. Peshkov, J. Jacobs, L. V. Meervelt, E. V. Van der Eycken, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2013**, *355*, 781; (g) A. Monleón, G. Blay, L. R. Domingo, M. C. Muñoz, J. R. Pedro, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2013**, *19*, 14852; (h) C. Tsukano, S. Yokouchi, A. L. Girard, T. Kuribayashi, S. Sakamoto, T. Enomoto, Y. Takemoto, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2012**, *10*, 6074; (i) M. J. Gainer, N. R. Bennett, Y. Takahashi, R. E. Looper, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 684.

2   For some selected examples, see: (a) G. Huang, Z. Yin, X. Zhang, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2013**, *19*, 11992; (b) N. Mont, V. P. Mehta, P. Appukkuttan, T. Beryozkina, S. Toppet, K. Van Hecke, L. Van Meervelt, A. Voet, M. DeMaeyer, E. V. Van der Eycken, *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 7509; (c) J. J. Fleming, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 3926; (d) B. Jiang, M. Xu, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 2543; (e) M. H. Davidson, F. E. McDonald, *Org. Lett.* **2004**, *6*, 1601; (f) B. M. Trost, C. K. Chung, A. B. Pinkerton, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 4327; (g) N. Gommermann, P. Knochel, *Chem. Commun.* **2004**, 2324; (h) G. S. Kauffman, G. D. Harris, R. L. Dorow, B. R. P. Stone, R. L. Parsons Jr, J. A. Pesti, N. A. Magnus, J. M. Fortunak, P. N. Confalone, W. A. Nugent, *Org. Lett.* **2000**, *2*, 3119; (i) M. Konishi, H. Ohkuma, T. Tsuno, T. Oki, G. D. VanDuyne, J. Clardy, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, *112*, 3715.

3   (a) J. J. Chen, D. M. Swope, K. Dashtipour, *Clin. Ther.* **2007**, *29*, 1825; (b) S. Pålhagen, E. Heinonen, J. Hägglund, T. Kaugesaar, O. Mäki-Ikola, R. Palm, *Neurology* **2006**, *66*, 1200.

4   (a) I. Bolea, A. Gella, M. Unzeta, *J. Neural. Transm.* **2013**, *120*, 893; (b) O. Weinreb, T. Amit, O. Bar-Am, M. B. H. Youdim, *Curr. Drug Targets* **2012**, *13*, 483; (c) O. Bar-Am, T. Amit, O. Weinreb, M. B. H. Youdim, S. Mandel, *J. Alzheimer's Dis.* **2010**, *21*, 361.

5   (a) B. J. Wakefield, *Organolithium Methods in Organic Synthesis*, Academic Press, London, **1988**, chapter 3, pp32; (b) P. Kaur, G. Shakya, H. Sun, Y. Pan, G. Li, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2010**, *8*, 1091; (c) R. Díez, R. Badorrey, M. D. Díaz-de-Villegas, J. A. Gálvez, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 2114; (d) K. B. Aubrecht, M. D. Winemiller, D. B. Collum, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 11084.

6   (a) B. J. Wakefield, *Organomagnesium Methods in Organic Synthesis*, Academic Press, London, **1995**, chapter 3, pp46; (b) B. L. Chen, B. Wang, G. Q. Lin, *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*, 941.

7   For some examples, See: (a) L. Zani, S. Alesi, P. G. Cozzi, C. Bolm, *J. Org. Chem.* **2006**, *71*, 1558; (b) G. Huang, Z. Yin, X. Zhang, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2013**, *19*, 11992; (c) G. Blay, E. Ceballos, A. Monleón, J. R. Pedro, *Tetrahedron* **2012**, *68*, 2128; (d) W. Yan, B. Mao, S. Zhu, X. Jiang, Z. Liu, R. Wang, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, 3790.

8   For recent reviews, see: (a) N. Uhlig, W. J. Yoo, L. Zhao, C. J. Li, In *Modern Alkyne Chemistry Catalytic and Atom-Economic Transformations* (Eds.: B. M. Trost, C. J. Li), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2014**, pp. 239-268; (b) G. Abbiati, E. Rossi, *Beilstein J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *10*, 481; (c) V. A. Peshkov, O. P. Pereshivko, E. V. Van der Eycken, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 3790; (d) W. J. Yoo, L. Zhao, C. J. Li, *Aldrichim. Acta* **2011**, *44*, 43.

10 (a) Y. Qiu, Y. Qin, Z. Ma, W. Xia, *Chem. Lett.* **2014**, *43*, 1284; (b) N. P. Eagalapatia, A. Rajacka, Y. L. N. Murthy, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.* **2014**, *381*, 126; (c) K. V. V. Satyanarayana, P. A. Ramaiah, Y. L. N. Murty, M. R. Chandra, S. V. N. Pammi, *Catal. Commun.* **2012**, *25*, 50; (d) C. Mukhopadhyay, S. Rana, *Catal. Commun.* **2009**, *11*, 285; (e) E. Ramu, R. Varala, N. Sreelatha, S. R. Adapa, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2007**, *48*, 7184.

11 (a) K. Namitharan, K. Pitchumani, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, 411; (b) S. Samai, G. C. Nandi, M. S. Singh, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2010**, *51*, 5555.

12 (a) D. A. Kotadia, S. S. Soni, *Appl. Catal. A-Gen* **2014**, *488*, 231; (b) T. Zeng, W. W. Chen, C. M. Cirtiu, A. Moores, G. Song, C. J. Li, *Green Chem.* **2010**, *12*, 570; (c) B. Sreedhar, A. S. Kumar, P. S. Reddy, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2010**, *51*, 1891; (d) W. W. Chen, R. V. Nguyen, C. J. Li, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2009**, *50*, 2895; (e) P. Li, Y. Zhang, L. Wang, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 2045.

13 (a) C. Y. K. Chan, N. W. Tseng, J. W. Y. Lam, J. Liu, R. T. K. Kwok, B. Z. Tang, *Macromolecules* **2013**, *46*, 3246; (b) Y. Zhang, P. Li, M. Wang, L. Wang, *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 4364; (c) J. S. Jadav, B. V. S. Reddy, A. V. H. Gopal, K. S. Patil, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2009**, *50*, 3493.

14 (a) S. Sakaguchi, T. Mizuta, M. Furuwan, T. Kubo, Y. Ishii, *Chem. Commun.* **2004**, 1638; (b) S. Sakaguchi, T. Kubo, Y. Ishii, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 2534.

15 W. W. Chen, H. P. Bi, C. J. Li, *Synlett* **2010**, 475.

16 S. N. Afraj, C. Chen, G. H. Lee, *RSC Adv.* **2014**, *4*, 26301.

18 A. Teimouri, A. N. Chermahini, M. Narimani, *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *33*, 1556.

19 P. H. Li, L. Wang, *Chin. J. Chem.* **2005**, *23*, 1076.

20 D. S. Raghuvanshi, K. N. Singh, *Synlett* **2011**, 373.

21 B. R. Buckley, A. N. Khan, H. Heaney, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 3855.

22 (a) M. Ahlquist, V. V. Fokin, *Organometallics* **2007**, *26*, 4389; (b) B. F. Straub, *Chem. Commun.* **2007**, 3868.

23 A. Mames, S. Stecko, P. Mikozajczyk, M. Soluch, B. Furman, M. Chmielewski, *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*, 7580.

24 L. G. Fedenok, M. S. Shvartsberg, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2011**, *52*, 3776.

25 (a) H. B. Chen, N. Abeyrathna, Y. Liao, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2014**, *55*, 6575; (b) R. Berg, J. Straub, E. Schreiner, S. Mader, F. Rominger, B. F. Straub, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2012**, *354*, 3445; (c) C. Shao, G. Cheng, D. Su, J. Xu, X. Wang, Y. Hu, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2010**, *352*, 1587; (d) G. C. Kuang, P. M. Guha, W. S. Brotherton, J. T. Simmons, L. A. Stankee, B. T. Nguyen, R. J. Clark, L. Zhu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 13984; (e) B. R. Buckley, S. E. Dann, H. Heaney, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 6278; (f) K. Kamata, Y. Nakagawa, K. Yamaguchi, N. Mizuno, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 15304.

26 (a) J. Wang, Z. Shao, K. Ding, W. Y. Yu, A. S. C. Chan, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2009**, *351*, 1250; (b) M. Panera, J. Díez, I. Merino, E. Rubio, M. P. Gamasa, *Inorg. Chem.* **2009**, *48*, 11147.

27 A^3-coupling using primary amine as substrate is much more difficult and only limited examples was reported: (a) J. B. Bariwal, D. S. Ermolat'ev, E. V. Van der Eycken, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 3281; (b) N. Mont, V. P. Mehta, P. Appukkuttan, T. Beryozkina, S. Toppet, K. Van Hecke, L. Van Meervelt, A. Voet, M. Demaeyer, E. V. Van der Eycken, *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 7509; (c) J. S. Yadav, B. V. S. Reddy, V. Naveenkumar, R. S. Rao, K. Nagaiah, *New J. Chem.* **2004**, 28, 335; (d) L. Shi, Y. Q. Tu, M. Wang, F. M. Zhang, C. A. Fan, *Org. Lett.* **2004**, *6*, 1001.

RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript

A dicopper(I) complex $Cu^I_2(pip)_2$ was utilized to catalyze A^3 coupling reactions, which led to the formation of propargylamines. A low catalyst loading of 0.4 mol% was sufficient to give good to excellent yields. The low catalyst loading, broad scope of substrate and easy preparation make this dicopper complex a useful catalyst for A^3 coupling.