The Palladium-Catalyzed Aerobic Kinetic Resolution of Secondary Alcohols: Reaction Development, Scope, and Applications

David C. Ebner, **Jeffrey T. Bagdanoff**, **Eric M. Ferreira**, **Ryan M. McFadden**, **Daniel D. Caspi**, **Raissa M. Trend**, and **Brian M. Stoltz**[a]
Brian M. Stoltz: stoltz@caltech.edu

[a] The Arnold and Mabel Beckman Laboratories of Chemical Synthesis, Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, 1200 E. California Blvd., MC 164-30, Pasadena, CA 91125 (USA), Fax: (+1) 626-564-9297

Abstract

The first palladium-catalyzed enantioselective oxidation of secondary alcohols has been developed, utilizing the readily available diamine (−)-sparteine as chiral ligand and molecular oxygen as the stoichiometric oxidant. Mechanistic insights regarding the role of base and hydrogen bond donors have resulted in several improvements to the original system. Namely, addition of cesium carbonate and *tert*-butyl alcohol greatly enhances reaction rates, promoting rapid resolutions. The use of chloroform as solvent allows the use of ambient air as the terminal oxidant at 23 °C, resulting in enhanced catalyst selectivity. These improved reaction conditions have permitted the successful kinetic resolution of benzylic, allylic, and cyclopropyl secondary alcohols to high enantiomeric excess with good to excellent selectivity factors. This catalyst system has also been applied to the desymmetrization of *meso*-diols, providing high yields of enantioenriched hydroxyketones.

Keywords

alcohols; asymmetric catalysis; oxidation; palladium; synthetic methods

Introduction

The oxidation of alcohols to carbonyl compounds is one of the most fundamental reactions in organic chemistry.[1] Many different systems have been developed using a wide variety of oxidants.[2] Until recently, however, catalytic enantioselective variants have been largely unexplored.[3,4] The limited number of these alcohol oxidations is somewhat understandable, since this process is inherently complexity-minimizing.[5] While many enantioselective oxidative transformations involve the selective creation of stereogenicity from prochiral starting materials by transfer of a heteroatom to the organic substrate (e.g., epoxidation, dihydroxylation, sulfide oxidation),[6] enantioselective alcohol oxidation requires the selective destruction of a stereocenter in a stereoablative kinetic resolution process.[7,8] Kinetic resolutions have the ability to provide compounds of high enantiomeric excess for even modestly selective processes at higher levels of conversion. Furthermore, the ready availability of a wide range of racemic alcohols, the prevalence of chiral alcohols in organic synthesis, and the potential for product recycling by a simple reduction could make an oxidative kinetic

[Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under http://www.chemeurj.org/ or from the author.

resolution of alcohols a synthetically useful process for the production of enantioenriched materials.

As part of a general program directed toward enantioselective oxidation, we chose to pursue palladium(II) as a catalytic metal for this process. Not only is palladium catalysis prevalent in a variety of enantioselective transformations,[9] but a number of systems involving palladium have been applied to the aerobic oxidation of alcohols.[10,11] Particularly intriguing was a report by Uemura of racemic alcohol oxidation utilizing a palladium(II) catalyst and pyridine in toluene (Scheme 1).[12] Employing molecular oxygen as the sole stoichiometric oxidant, high yields of aldehydes and ketones were obtained for a variety of alcohols. These conditions were attractive for a number of reasons. Molecular oxygen, essential for cellular respiration in all aerobic organisms, is an inexpensive, abundant, and environmentally benign oxidant. The lack of additional co-oxidants simplified reaction complexity, producing water as the sole byproduct. Also, pyridine was found to be critical to the reaction both as ligand and base. Uemura reported no catalytic activity in the absence of pyridine, indicating a strong ligand acceleration effect. We anticipated that the use of chiral ligands in the place of pyridine could lead to significant enantiodiscrimination in the oxidation, while the ligand acceleration could minimize racemic background oxidation by other Pd(II) species that could be present in the reaction. Finally, the non-coordinating nature of toluene could limit solvent displacement of a chiral ligand from the palladium center.

The proposed mechanism for the oxidation involves alcohol substitution and deprotonation of a palladium(II) complex to generate intermediate palladium alkoxide **1** (Scheme 2). Subsequent β-hydride elimination from this complex forms the product ketone and palladium hydride **2**, which then reacts with oxygen and another equivalent of alcohol to reform **1**. Efforts by a number of researchers have further clarified this mechanism.[13–15]

Based on this previous report of alcohol oxidation, we recently developed a palladium-catalyzed oxidative kinetic resolution of secondary alcohols.[16,17] Utilizing [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (nbd = norbornadiene) and the commercially available diamine (−)-sparteine, a variety of alcohols were resolved to high enantiomeric excesses, often with good corresponding catalyst selectivity. In this article, we describe in detail the development of this catalytic enantioselective oxidation, modification of these conditions leading to dramatic improvements in reaction rate and selectivity, our extensive substrate scope investigation, and applications, including the desymmetrization of *meso*-diols.

Results and Discussion

Reaction Development

Our initial exploration of the aerobic kinetic resolution of secondary alcohols with catalytic Pd focused on substituting an appropriate chiral ligand for pyridine in the oxidation.[16] While many of the compounds evaluated as ligands led to little or no alcohol oxidation, some provided moderately reactive Pd complexes. However, (−)-sparteine rapidly emerged as a uniquely effective ligand for this transformation, providing modest levels of selectivity[18] in the oxidation of (±)-1-phenylethanol ((±)-**3**,Table 1).[19]

Reexamination of the general mechanism proposed by Uemura was critical for optimization of the reaction. Notably, an acetate is coordinated to the palladium center throughout the catalytic cycle, indicating the possible importance of the Pd(II) counterion in the resolution. Investigation of a number of palladium sources permitted counterion modification, resulting in greatly improved reactivity and selectivity in the oxidation employing palladium chloride complexes. [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] proved to be the most effective precatalyst, providing good selectivity in the oxidation of a number of benzylic alcohols (Scheme 3).

Although useful in principle, a major limitation of this resolution is the sluggish reaction rates. Usually, over 4 days are required to provide alcohols in high enantiomeric excess. The high operating temperature (80 °C) further demonstrates the low activity of the system. During the course of our studies to improve the reaction rate, we prepared the discrete complex [Pd (sparteine)Cl$_2$] (**5**). The reactivity of this complex was substantially decreased relative to the complex generated in situ with a 4:1 sparteine: Pd loading (Table 2).[17a] Interestingly, reactivity could be restored by adding 3 equivalents of sparteine relative to complex **5**. We hypothesized that the excess sparteine acts as a general base for the hydrogen chloride byproduct generated as a result of palladium alkoxide formation. Indeed, kinetic studies have confirmed the role of sparteine as base.[15a] Without this added sparteine, palladium alkoxide formation is much less favorable. Thus, it was anticipated that the addition of a stoichiometric base would promote palladium alkoxide formation, facilitating alcohol oxidation.

Early studies to supplant sparteine as a base centered on the addition of amines (Table 3). [20] Initially, triethylamine seemed promising (entry 3), but rapid catalyst deactivation was ultimately observed. Additional equivalents proved more detrimental (entries 5 and 6). The more nucleophilic base 1,4-diazobicyclo[2.2.2]octane (DABCO) was even poorer. The loss of reactivity with these bases is presumably due to competition between the amine and sparteine for coordination to the palladium center.[21] However, carbonate bases were effective at accelerating the oxidations. Cesium carbonate was found to be optimal, leading to the greatest reactivity enhancement.[22] Surprisingly, excess sparteine relative to palladium was still required.

Several observations suggest cesium carbonate is acting as a heterogeneous base. The solubility of cesium carbonate in toluene is minimal, even at elevated temperatures. Also, finely milled cesium carbonate performs much better than the granular base of lower surface area.[23] Thus, sparteine, which is much more soluble in toluene, may act as a better kinetic base than the heterogeneous cesium carbonate for neutralizing hydrogen chloride generated in the formation of the palladium alkoxide. While the pK_a values of sparteine·HCl[24] and cesium bicarbonate [25] are similar, the excess carbonate base could minimize sparteine·HCl concentration,[26] inhibiting protonation of the palladium alkoxide and accelerating the reaction (Scheme 4). [27]

Another key development arose from our early investigations of the substrate scope. Generally, viable resolution substrates featured a π-system that has the capacity to overlap with a cation at the alcohol carbon (Scheme 5).[15b] Because the transition state for β-hydride elimination involves some cationic character at this carbon, we speculated that methods of cation stabilization other than adjacent aromatic rings could lower the energy barrier for alcohol oxidation, increasing reaction rate. Based on this hypothesis, β-silyl alcohol (±)-**8** was prepared and exposed to our palladium-catalyzed oxidation conditions. This alcohol could potentially benefit from β-silicon stabilization by hyperconjugation in the transition state.[28] Indeed, (±)-**8** proved to be a moderately active substrate for oxidative kinetic resolution, providing partially resolved alcohol in 16% ee (Table 4, entry 1). However, a problematic side reaction complicated analysis of this resolution. The partially enantioenriched alcohol underwent silyl transfer from the α-silyl ketone to provide oxidation-resistant silyl ether **9** and desilylated ketone **10**. In order to suppress formation of side product **9**, a primary alcohol was added to the reaction. This unactivated alcohol would not be readily oxidized under our resolution conditions, but could act as a sacrificial alcohol to react with the silyl ketone. As seen in entries 2–4, increasing amounts of *n*-BuOH led to decreased formation of silyl ether **9**. Fortuitously, reaction rates also increased with up to 2.1 equivalents of *n*-BuOH. Rate enhancement was not limited to the oxidation of silyl alcohol (±)-**8**, as increased rates were also observed in the resolution of other activated alcohols.

Having observed a significant dependence on the rate of oxidative kinetic resolution with the inclusion of *n*-BuOH, a variety of alcohol additives were evaluated for their ability to enhance the reaction rate when coupled with cesium carbonate in the resolution of alcohol (±)-**6** (Table 5). Addition of 1 equivalent of either 1-butanol or trifluoroethanol led to enhanced reactivity (entries 2 and 5). Increasing equivalents led to decreased selectivity (entries 3 and 6). Large excess of either alcohol impeded the reaction (entries 4 and 7). This trend of initial rate acceleration followed by rate inhibition and selectivity erosion at high concentrations was observed across a wide variety of primary alcohol additives.

Interestingly, inclusion of *tert*-butyl alcohol proved to be an excellent exogenous alcohol additive, providing the highest and most reliable levels of selectivity across a wide range of concentrations (entries 8–10).[29] After optimizing exogenous base and *tert*-butyl alcohol equivalents, the dramatic effect of these additives on the resolution of (±)-1-phenyl-1-propanol ((±)-**11**) was realized (Table 6). This resolution provided highly enantioenriched (−)-**11** in only 4.5 h instead of 192 h without cesium carbonate and *tert*-butyl alcohol. Importantly, selectivity is maintained in these dramatically rate accelerated conditions. Further selectivity improvements could be obtained by decreasing the temperature to 60 °C.[30]

While the purpose of the carbonate base fit well with our mechanistic model for the oxidative kinetic resolution, the role of *tert*-butyl alcohol remained more subtle. One possibility was that the modified reaction conditions were transforming [Pd(sparteine)Cl$_2$] into a more reactive complex.[31] In order to verify this theory, **5** was exposed to 1 equivalent each of *tert*-butyl alcohol and cesium carbonate. After 4 d at 60 °C, carbonate **13** was isolated in nearly quantitative yield (Scheme 6). Surprisingly, **13** displayed neither catalytic nor even stoichiometric activity under kinetic resolution conditions. This finding suggests carbonate **13** is a catalyst deactivation product. While these additives provide dramatic rate enhancement, they could also detrimentally affect catalyst longevity.[32]

Alternatively, the observed rate enhancement could be due to the hydrogen bonding potential of *tert*-butyl alcohol. While hydrogen bonding plays an essential and well-documented role in the catalysis of a number of biological[33] and synthetic processes,[34] less is known about its role in organometallic transformations. A hydrogen-bond donor may enhance reactivity by stabilizing and solubilizing polar or charged intermediates in the nonpolar solvent toluene. In particular, cationic palladium complexes generated as the immediate products of alcohol coordination and β-hydride elimination result in the formation of chloride anions, which could be solubilized by hydrogen-bond donors.[15b,d]

Based on this hypothesis, a more rigorous solvent screen was performed with an emphasis on solvents capable of hydrogen-bond donation and solubilization of polar or charged intermediates (Table 7).[35] Surprisingly, while common polar solvents led to little oxidation (entries 12, 15, 16, 19, and 20), halogenated solvents that could act as weak hydrogen-bond donors provided rapid reactions. Oxidations conducted in the hydrogen-bond donating solvent CH$_2$Cl$_2$ were the fastest (entry 1), but catalyst selectivity in kinetic resolutions suffered.[36] Chloroform, on the other hand, emerged as an outstanding nonflammable solvent for rapid and selective oxidation, even at 23 °C (entry 2). Strikingly, chlorinated solvents lacking the ability to donate a hydrogen bond (entries 13, 14, 17, and 21), were less effective. Some other factors do not appear to explain the observed trends. Oxygen solubility is fairly similar in many of the solvents.[37] Also, there is no clear trend between reaction rate and dielectric constant, a measure of solvent polarity.[38]

Spectroscopic evidence for hydrogen-bond formation between chloroform and catalytic species is found in IR spectra of CDCl$_3$ (Table 8).[39] A significant shift in the C-D stretching frequency of CDCl$_3$ occurred in the presence of either (−)-sparteine (entry 2) or [Pd(sparteine)

Cl$_2$] (**5**) (entry 3).[40,41] The observed decrease in λ_{max} corresponds to a lower energy C-D stretching frequency due to a weaker C-D bond over free CDCl$_3$ when hydrogen-bond accepting species are present. Notably, no shift in the C-D stretch was observed with the catalytically inactive carbonate **13**, suggesting little or no hydrogen bonding occurs.

The change in solvent allows decreased amounts of (−)-sparteine and cesium carbonate to be used with little effect on rate. Performing the reactions at 23 °C also provides a dramatic increase in the catalyst selectivity. Furthermore, as little as 5% O$_2$ atmosphere is sufficient for oxidation, permitting the use of ambient air as the terminal oxidant. These developments greatly improve the safety of the oxidative kinetic resolution, avoiding the use of flammable solvents at elevated temperatures under an oxygen atmosphere.[42]

Concurrent with studies centered on the development of improved conditions for oxidation, efforts were undertaken to understand the mechanism of the reaction. We were especially interested in elucidating the steric and electronic influences of the sparteine ligand on the outcome of the kinetic resolution. To this end, a number of palladium complexes with sparteine were prepared.[15c] Subsequent X-ray analysis of these crystalline complexes, coupled with theoretical calculations,[15d] allowed us to develop a model for selectivity in the oxidation (Scheme 7). Coordination of alcohol to complex **5** leads to one of two diastereomeric alkoxides, **14** or **15**. Alkoxide **14**, formed from the fast reacting enantiomer of alcohol, proceeds through a four-membered β-hydride elimination transition state to afford product ketone. Complex **15**, on the other hand, has a higher energy barrier to β-hydride elimination due to developing unfavorable steric interactions with the departing chloride counterion. Confronted with this high-energy transition state, protonation regenerates the observed enantiomer of alcohol.

As a result of our exploration of the oxidative kinetic resolution of secondary alcohols, four distinct sets of conditions have been developed (Table 9): the original conditions (A) in toluene with no exogenous base, the rate enhanced conditions (B) that take advantage of cesium carbonate and *tert*-butyl alcohol additives, and the chloroform conditions at 23 °C under an atmosphere of either molecular oxygen (C) or ambient air (D). In general, resolutions performed without added carbonate base have slower rates but greater catalyst longevity. The rate enhanced (B) conditions are the fastest, often achieving highly enantioenriched alcohol in a small fraction of the time required for the original (A) conditions. Reactions performed in chloroform at 23 °C (C and D) are the most selective, nearly doubling the *s* factor for the resolution of some alcohols. Typically, both molecular oxygen and ambient air can be used in oxidations in chloroform with similar rates and selectivities. The development of four distinct sets of conditions provides the opportunity to resolve the widest range of alcohol substrates in order to maximize the selectivity of the process while maintaining reactivity and minimizing side reactions. The benefit of this flexibility is evident in the broad scope of this system.

Substrate Scope[43]

Our early studies focused on benzylic alcohols, as the racemates are commercially available or easily prepared. The resolution is quite general for this class of substrates, providing a wide range of 1-arylethanols in excellent enantiomeric excess (Table 10). Substitution on the aryl ring at the 3- and 4-positions (entries 1–8, 12–14) is well tolerated. Ortho-substitution leads to much slower rates of oxidation (entry 9), although reactivity improves if the substituent is constrained in a ring (entries 10 and 11). Some heteroaromatic substrates (entries 18 and 19) can also be resolved to high enantiomeric excesses.

Other structural variations are also tolerated by the catalyst system (Table 11). Cyclic benzylic alcohols are able to be resolved successfully. 1-Indanol (entries 1 and 2) is oxidized rapidly, albeit with decreased selectivity, compared to 1-tetralol (entries 3–5). Other functional groups on the alcohol substrate, including protected amines (entries 9 and 10), a tertiary alcohol (entry

11), and even aryl bromides (entries 11 and 12), are tolerated under the reaction conditions. [44]

The broad utility of chiral allylic alcohols in organic synthesis led us to investigate this important class of molecules next. Conditions in chloroform are particularly effective for these substrates, providing enhanced selectivity over the other methods (Table 12, cf. entries 11 and 12). While acyclic allylic alcohols are challenging, often leading to oxidation with low selectivity, many cyclic allylic alcohols are resolved successfully. Of particular note are vinyl bromides (entries 1, 2, and 5), which rapidly decompose with darkening of the reaction mixture at elevated temperatures, indicating the formation of aggregated Pd(0). While 2-bromocyclopent-2-enol (entry 5) oxidizes fast enough to allow moderate resolution at 60 °C with cesium carbonate and *tert*-butyl alcohol, 2-bromocyclohex-2-enol (entries 1 and 2) is cleanly resolved with no decomposition only at lower temperatures. Alkyl enol ethers are stable in the reactions and are resolved to high enantiomeric excess (entries 4, 7, and 8), providing access to enantioenriched α-hydroxyketone derivatives. The catalyst is also tolerant of a variety of alkene substitution patterns. Cyclopentenols are usually oxidized more quickly, though less selectively, than cyclohexenols (cf. entries 4 and 7).

Our success with benzylic alcohols led us to explore aryl substituents on cyclic allylic alcohols. These substrates are readily prepared via Suzuki coupling of arylboronate esters and iodoenones[45] followed by ketone reduction.[46] To our delight, subjection of these alcohols to any of our developed kinetic resolution conditions affords highly enantioenriched allylic alcohols with short reaction times (Table 13).[47] Both electron rich (entries 7–9) and electron poor (entries 13–15) 2-aryl substituents lead to excellent selectivity. The lack of an electronic influence on these resolutions suggests selectivity is primarily due to steric factors, as elucidated by our selectivity model (Scheme 7). Even heteroaromatic substitution (entries 22–24) and a larger ring size (entries 25–27) are tolerated, albeit with somewhat longer reaction times.

Substitution at the 3-position of cyclic allylic alcohols was also explored (Table 14). Again, allylic alcohols with 2-aryl substituents are oxidized rapidly, and with exceptionally high selectivity (entries 1–6). These resolutions have some of the highest selectivities seen with this catalyst system. 3-Substituted alcohols with 2-alkyl substituents are resolved to high enantiomeric excess as well (entries 7–13). Interestingly, analogous 2-alkyl allylic alcohols unsubstituted at the 3-position oxidize with poor selectivity.[48]

Other forms of activation of the racemic alcohols were also explored, such as α-cyclopropyl substituents. Several substrates were exposed to our oxidative kinetic resolution conditions (Table 15). Again, the chloroform conditions are especially effective in providing highly selective oxidation (cf. entries 1 and 2, entries 4 and 6). Even 1-cyclopropylethanol (entries 1–3), with relatively little steric differentiation between alcohol substituents, is able to be resolved to high enantiomeric excess. These resolutions also produce alcohols with three contiguous stereocenters (entries 4–11), including a quaternary stereocenter (entries 7 and 8). Furthermore, for entries 4–11, the product ketones are also enantioenriched (Figure 2). Importantly, these molecules have the opposite configuration at C(3) and C(4) relative to the resolved alcohol, opening the door to enantiodivergent opportunities in synthesis.

Though a broad range of secondary alcohols is successfully resolved with this system, limitations to the methodology exist. A number of alcohols display limited rates of oxidation, preventing their resolution (Figure 3). Benzylic alcohols with ortho-substituents (e.g. (±)-**18** and (±)-**19**) and sterically hindered alcohols such as (±)-**20** and (±)-**21** have dramatically decreased oxidation rates. The presence of vicinal heteroatoms (e.g. (±)-**22** and (±)-**23**) impedes the oxidation, presumably through catalyst coordination and deactivation.[49] Finally,

unactivated alcohols (e.g. (±)-**24** and (±)-**25**), particularly primary alcohols, are slow to oxidize under any of our developed conditions.[50]

In addition to unreactive alcohols, certain classes of alcohols are resolved with poor selectivity (Figure 4). In some cases, the steric difference between the two alcohol substituents seems too small for the catalyst to adequately distinguish between enantiomers (e.g. (±)-**26**, (±)-**27**, and (±)-**28**). Substrates with electron-poor aromatic substituents are much less selectively resolved than their electron-rich counterparts (cf. (±)-**29** and (±)-**30** with Table 10 entries 4 and 12, respectively). At least in the case of benzylic alcohols, steric effects alone do not fully account for these selectivity differences. Saturated alcohols, such as (±)-**31** also tend to display lower selectivity factors in the resolution.

Applications

The wide use of alcohols in synthesis provides numerous applications for our kinetic resolution. [51] A number of alcohols successfully resolved are intermediates in the synthesis of a variety of pharmaceuticals (Scheme 8).[44,52] Boc-protected γ-aminoalcohol (−)-**32**, resolved with good selectivity, is an intermediate in the synthesis of a number of related antidepressants, including fluoxetine·HCl (**33**). Tertiary alcohol (−)-**34** and a related ester were transformed to a known intermediate in the synthesis of the leukotriene receptor antagonist montelukast sodium (**35**). Finally, allylic alcohol (−)-**36** is an intermediate in the enantioselective synthesis of human neurokinin-1 (hNK-1) receptor antagonist **37**.

To further highlight the utility of the method, we have explored the Claisen rearrangement of resolved cyclic allylic alcohols such as (−)-**38** (Scheme 9).[47] Vinyl ether formation and treatment with DIBAL-H at low temperature induces Claisen rearrangement and subsequent reduction to form primary alcohol (+)-**39**. Importantly, because our kinetic resolution is able to produce alcohol (−)-**38** in high enantiomeric excess, the product alcohol is also highly enantioenriched. Furthermore, this alcohol can undergo a second palladium-catalyzed oxidative process developed in our laboratories[53] to form highly enantioenriched tetrahydrofuran (−)-**40** containing vicinal, fully substituted stereocenters.

In addition to kinetic resolution, our catalyst system is well suited for selective oxidation of *meso*-diols to hydroxyketones.[17a,c,d] These reactions have the potential to provide highly enantioenriched products in greater than 50% yield. One example of this process was demonstrated with our initially developed resolution conditions (Scheme 10).[16] Selective oxidation of diol **41** provides ketoalcohol (+)-**42** in 72% yield and 95% ee.

Further efforts in the area of *meso*-diol desymmetrization were inspired by the abundance of complex polyol- and polyether-containing natural products, such as polymethoxydienes **43a-e** (Figure 5).[54] We envisioned access to these molecules in enantioenriched form by late stage desymmetrization of a *meso*-diol stereochemical framework. This polyether array could be prepared via diastereoselective bidirectional chain synthesis from a simple symmetric precursor.[55,56]

To demonstrate the utility of our palladium-catalyzed oxidation system in this area, we developed a unified synthetic approach to several *meso*-diol stereochemical arrays. Synthesis of these *meso*-diols commenced from readily available alcohol **44** (Scheme 11).[57] Alcohol protection as a benzyl ether and palladium-catalyzed diene oxidation provides *anti*-tris-benzyl ether **45**.[58] Alkene dihydroxylation and oxidative cleavage with [Pb(OAc)$_4$] affords *meso*-dialdehyde **46**. No epimerization of the sensitive α-benzyloxy stereocenter is observed with this two-step procedure. Diastereoselective chelation-controlled addition of aryl Grignard reagents produces *meso*-diols **47a** and **47b**. The *syn*-ether array was generated by a similar sequence. Again starting from alcohol **44**, TBS ether formation followed by [4+2]

cycloaddition with singlet oxygen, reductive opening, and benzylation of the resulting diol affords *syn*-bis-benzylether **48**.[59] Alkene cleavage and diastereoselective addition of aryl nucleophiles produces diols **50a** and **50b**.

Having generated the desired *meso*-diol substrates, we looked to apply our enantioselective oxidation conditions. Exposure of the *meso*-diols to catalytic quantities of [Pd(sparteine)Cl$_2$] (**5**) and excess (−)-sparteine under a balloon of oxygen in chloroform provides highly enantioenriched hydroxyketones in excellent yields (Scheme 12). These reactions establish the absolute configuration of four stereocenters in a single catalytic asymmetric operation. Based on these methods, we have begun to construct even more complex polyether structural motifs toward the synthesis of a variety of natural product frameworks.

Conclusion

Enantioselective oxidation with Pd(II) catalysts is a powerful method for the preparation of enantioenriched secondary alcohols. Research in this area has led to dramatic improvements in reaction rate, selectivity, and operational simplicity. The development of a number of distinct methods has allowed the kinetic resolution of a wide range of substrates. Benzylic, allylic, and α-cyclopropyl alcohols can be resolved to high enantiomeric excesses, in many cases with excellent selectivity. A variety of applications, including the desymmetrization of *meso*-diols, have demonstrated the utility of this oxidation in synthesis. Ongoing efforts to enhance reactivity, to use other chiral ligands in place of sparteine,[60] and to apply this kinetic resolution to natural product synthesis will be reported in due course.

Experimental Section

General Oxidative Kinetic Resolution Conditions

Kinetic Resolution Conditions A—To an oven dried reaction tube with stir bar was added 3Å molecular sieves (250 mg). After cooling, [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (6.7 mg, 0.025 mmol, 0.05 equiv) followed by toluene (2.5 mL) and then (−)-sparteine (23.0 μL, 23.4 mg, 0.10 mmol, 0.20 equiv) were added. The reaction tube was then cooled to −78 °C, then vacuum evacuated and purged with O$_2$ (3x). Then, the tube was heated to 80 °C with vigorous stirring under O$_2$ atmosphere (1 atm, balloon) for 20 min. A solution of (±)-**6** (70.5 μL, 76.1 mg, 0.50 mmol, 1.0 equiv) and tridecane (36.6 μL, 27.7 mg, 0.15 mmol, 0.30 equiv) in toluene (2.5 mL) was added, and the reaction was allowed to proceed under O$_2$ atmosphere at 80°C. Aliquots were filtered through a small plug of silica gel (Et$_2$O eluent), evaporated, and analyzed by GC for conversion and chiral HPLC for alcohol ee. Purification of 4-methoxyacetophenone (**7**) and (−)-**6** was accomplished by direct chromatography of the crude reaction mixture.

Kinetic Resolution Conditions B—To an oven dried reaction tube with stir bar was added 3Å molecular sieves (500 mg). After cooling, [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (13.5 mg, 0.050 mmol, 0.05 equiv), followed by toluene (2 mL) and then (−)-sparteine (46.0 μL, 46.9 mg, 0.20 mmol, 0.20 equiv) were added. The reaction tube was cooled to −78 °C, then vacuum evacuated and purged with O$_2$ (3x). The tube was heated to 60 °C with vigorous stirring under O$_2$ atmosphere (1 atm, balloon) for 20 min. Finely powdered Cs$_2$CO$_3$ (163 mg, 0.50 mmol, 0.50 equiv) was added, followed by a solution of (±)-**6** (141 μL, 152 mg, 1.0 mmol, 1.0 equiv), anhydrous *t*-BuOH (143 μL, 111 mg, 1.5 mmol, 1.5 equiv), and tridecane (73.2 μL, 55.3 mg, 0.30 mmol, 0.30 equiv) in toluene (2 mL). The reaction was allowed to proceed under O$_2$ atmosphere at 60 °C. Aliquots were filtered through a small plug of silica gel (Et$_2$O eluent), evaporated, and analyzed by GC for conversion and chiral HPLC for alcohol ee. Purification of **7** and (−)-**6** was accomplished by direct chromatography of the crude reaction mixture.

Kinetic Resolution Conditions C—To an oven dried reaction tube with stir bar was added 3Å molecular sieves (500 mg). After cooling, [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (13.5 mg, 0.050 mmol, 0.05 equiv), followed by chloroform (2 mL, ACS reagent grade, stabilized with amylenes) and then (−)-sparteine (27.6 μL, 28.1 mg, 0.12 mmol, 0.12 equiv) were added. The reaction tube was cooled to −78 °C, then vacuum evacuated and purged with O$_2$ (3x). The reaction was allowed to warm to 23 °C and stirred vigorously under O$_2$ atmosphere (1 atm, balloon) for 15 min. Finely powdered Cs$_2$CO$_3$ (130 mg, 0.40 mmol, 0.40 equiv) was added, followed by a solution of (±)-**6** (141 μL, 152 mg, 1.0 mmol, 1.0 equiv) and tridecane (73.2 μL, 55.3 mg, 0.30 mmol, 0.30 equiv) in chloroform (2 mL). The reaction was allowed to proceed under O$_2$ atmosphere at 23 °C. Aliquots were filtered through a small plug of silica gel (Et$_2$O eluent), evaporated, and analyzed by GC for conversion and chiral HPLC for alcohol ee. Purification of **7** and (−)-**6** was accomplished by direct chromatography of the crude reaction mixture.

Kinetic Resolution Conditions D—To an oven dried reaction tube with stir bar was added 3Å molecular sieves (500 mg). After cooling, [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (13.5 mg, 0.050 mmol, 0.05 equiv), followed by chloroform (2 mL, ACS reagent grade, stabilized with amylenes) and then (−)-sparteine (27.6 μL, 28.1 mg, 0.12 mmol, 0.12 equiv) were added. A short tube containing Drierite was attached to the reaction tube. The reaction was stirred vigorously at 23°C for 15 min. Finely powdered Cs$_2$CO$_3$ (130 mg, 0.40 mmol, 0.40 equiv) was added, followed by a solution of (±)-**6** (141 μL, 152 mg, 1.0 mmol, 1.0 equiv) and tridecane (73.2 μL, 55.3 mg, 0.30 mmol, 0.30 equiv) in chloroform (2 mL). The reaction was allowed to proceed under an ambient air atmosphere at 23 °C. Aliquots were filtered through a small plug of silica gel (Et$_2$O eluent), evaporated, and analyzed by GC for conversion and chiral HPLC for alcohol ee. Purification of **7** and (−)-**6** was accomplished by direct chromatography of the crude reaction mixture.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

References

1. a) Hudlicky, M. Oxidations in Organic Chemistry, ACS Monograph Series. American Chemical Society; Washington, DC: 1990. b) Tidwell TT. Org React 1990;39:297–572.c) Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. Comprehensive Organic Synthesis. Pergamon; Oxford, U.K.: 1991. d) Luzzio FA. Org React 1998;53:1–221.

2. Larock, RC. Comprehensive Organic Transformations. Wiley & Sons; New York: 1999. p. 1234-1248.

3. a) Ohkubo K, Hirata K, Yoshinaga K, Okada M. Chem Lett 1976:183–184. b) Berti C, Perkins MJ. Angew Chem 1979;91:923–924.Angew Chem Int Ed Engl 1979;18:864–865. c) Ishii Y, Suzuki K, Ikariya T, Saburi M, Yoshikawa S. J Org Chem 1986;51:2822–2824. d) Ma Z, Huang Q, Bobbitt JM. J Org Chem 1993;58:4837–4843. e) Rychnovsky SD, McLernon TL, Rajapakse H. J Org Chem 1996;61:1194–1195. f) Kashiwagi Y, Yanagisawa Y, Kurashima F, Anzai J-i, Osa T, Bobbitt JM. Chem Commun 1996:2745–2746. g) Hashiguchi S, Fujii A, Haack KJ, Matsumura K, Ikariya T, Noyori R. Angew Chem 1997;109:300–303.Angew Chem Int Ed Engl 1997;36:288–289. h) Hamada T, Irie R, Mihara J, Hamachi K, Katsuki T. Tetrahedron 1998;54:10017–10028. i) Nishibayashi Y,

Takei I, Uemura S, Hidai M. Organometallics 1999;18:2291–2293. j) Gross Z, Ini S. Org Lett 1999;1:2077–2080. k) Kashiwagi Y, Kurashima F, Kikuchi C, Anzai J-i, Osa T, Bobbitt JM. Tetrahedron Lett 1999;40:6469–6472. l) Masutani K, Uchida T, Irie R, Katsuki T. Tetrahedron Lett 2000;41:5119–5123. m) Kuroboshi M, Yoshihisa H, Cortona MN, Kawakami Y, Gao Z, Tanaka H. Tetrahedron Lett 2000;41:8131–8135.

4. Subsequent to our initial report in this area, a number of further studies were reported, see: a) Shimizu H, Nakata K, Katsuki T. Chem Lett 2002:1080–1081. b) Sun W, Wang H, Xia C, Li J, Zhao P. Angew Chem 2003;115:1072–1074.Angew Chem Int Ed 2003;42:1042–1044. c) Nishibayashi Y, Yamauchi A, Onodera G, Uemura S. J Org Chem 2003;68:5875–5880. [PubMed: 12868920] d) Graetz B, Rychnovsky S, Leu WH, Farmer P, Lin R. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 2005;16:3584–3598. e) Radosevich AT, Musich C, Toste FD. J Am Chem Soc 2005;127:1090–1091. [PubMed: 15669834] f) Li Z, Tang ZH, Hu XX, Xia CG. Chem Eur J 2005;11:1210–1216. g) Weng SS, Shen MW, Kao JQ, Munot YS, Chen CT. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2006;103:3522–3527. [PubMed: 16501046] h) Pawar VD, Bettigeri S, Weng SS, Kao JQ, Chen CT. J Am Chem Soc 2006;128:6308–6309. [PubMed: 16683782] i) Li YY, Zhang XQ, Dong ZR, Shen WY, Chen G, Gao JX. Org Lett 2006;8:5565–5567. [PubMed: 17107073] j) Sun W, Wu X, Xia C. Helv Chim Acta 2007;90:623–626. k) Chen T, Jiang JJ, Xu Q, Shi M. Org Lett 2007;9:865–868. [PubMed: 17261005] l) Kantam ML, Ramani T, Chakrapani L, Choudary BM. J Mol Catal A: Chem 2007;274:11–15. m) Kureshy RI, Ahmad I, Pathak K, Khan N-uH, Abdi SHR, Prathap JK, Jasra RV. Chirality 2007;19:352–357. [PubMed: 17354262] n) Nakamura Y, Egami H, Matsumoto K, Uchida T, Katsuki T. Tetrahedron 2007;63:6383–6387. o) Pathak K, Ahmad I, Abdi SHR, Kureshy RI, Khan N-uH, Jasra RV. J Mol Catal A: Chem 2007;274:120–126. p) Onomura O, Arimoto H, Matsumura Y, Demizu Y. Tetrahedron Lett 2007;48:8668–8672. q) Arita S, Koike T, Kayaki Y, Ikariya T. Angew Chem 2008;120:2481–2483.Angew Chem Int Ed 2008;47:2447–2449. r) Tomizawa M, Shibuya M, Iwabuchi Y. Org Lett 2009;11:1829–1831. [PubMed: 19323487]

5. Stoltz BM. Chem Lett 2004;33:362–367.

6. a) Johnson, RA.; Sharpless, KB. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6A. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 231-280.b) Wen, X.; Ojima, I. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6A. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 281-286.c) Katsuki, T. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6B. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 287-326.d) Kagan, HB. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6C. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 327-356.e) Johnson, RA.; Sharpless, KB. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6D. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 357-398.f) Bolm, C.; Hildebrand, JP.; Muñiz, K. Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis. 2. Ojima, I., editor. Vol. Chapter 6E. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000. p. 399-428.g) Katsuki, T., editor. Practical Approach in Chemistry Series. Oxford Press; New York: 2001. Asymmetric Oxidation Reactions.

7. Mohr JT, Ebner DC, Stoltz BM. Org Biomol Chem 2007;5:3571–3576. [PubMed: 17971984]

8. For discussions on kinetic resolution, see: a) Kagan, HB.; Fiaud, JC. Topics in Stereochemistry. Eliel, EL., editor. Vol. 18. Wiley & Sons; New York: 1988. p. 249-330. b) Keith JM, Larrow JF, Jacobsen EN. Adv Synth Catal 2001;343:5–26. c) Vedejs E, Jure M. Angew Chem 2005;117:4040–4069.Angew Chem Int Ed 2005;44:3974–4001.

9. a) Trost BM, Van Vranken DL. Chem Rev 1996;96:395–422. [PubMed: 11848758] b) Sodeoka M, Shibasaki M. Pure Appl Chem 1998;70:411–414. c) Hayashi T. J Organomet Chem 1999;576:195–202. d) Helmchen G. J Organomet Chem 1999;576:203–214. e) Trost BM. Chem Pharm Bull 2002;50:1–14. [PubMed: 11824567] f) RajanBabu TV. Chem Rev 2003;103:2845–2860. [PubMed: 12914483] g) Graening T, Schmalz H-G. Angew Chem 2003;115:2684–2688.Angew Chem Int Ed 2003;42:2580–2584. h) Dounay AB, Overman LE. Chem Rev 2003;103:2945–2963. [PubMed: 12914487] i) Tietze LF, Ila H, Bell HP. Chem Rev 2004;104:3453–3516. [PubMed: 15250747] j) Trost BM. J Org Chem 2004;69:5813–5837. [PubMed: 15373468] k) Sodeoka M, Hamashima Y. Bull Chem Soc Jpn 2005;78:941–956. l) Hii KK. Pure Appl Chem 2006;78:341–349. m) Sodeoka M, Hamashima Y. Pure Appl Chem 2006;78:477–494. n) Hamashima Y, Sodeoka M. Synlett 2006:1467–1478.

10. a) Lloyd WG. J Org Chem 1967;32:2816–2819. b) Blackburn TF, Schwartz J. J Chem Soc, Chem Commun 1977:157–158. c) Gómez-Bengoa E, Noheda P, Echavarren AM. Tetrahedron Lett 1994;35:7097–7098. d) Aït-Mohand S, Hénin F, Muzart J. Tetrahedron Lett 1995;36:2473–2476. e) Peterson KP, Larock RC. J Org Chem 1998;63:3185–3189. f) ten Brink G-J, Arends IWCE, Sheldon

RA. Science 2000;287:1636–1639. [PubMed: 10698735] g) Hallman K, Moberg C. Adv Synth Catal 2001;343:260–263. h) Sheldon RA, Arends IWCE, ten Brink G-J, Dijksman A. Acc Chem Res 2002;35:774–781. [PubMed: 12234207] i) Schultz MJ, Park CC, Sigman MS. Chem Commun 2002:3034–3035. j) ten Brink G-J, Arends IWCE, Hoogenraad M, Verspui G, Sheldon RA. Adv Synth Catal 2003;345:497–505. k) Jensen DR, Schultz MJ, Mueller JA, Sigman MS. Angew Chem 2003;115:3940–3943.Angew Chem Int Ed 2003;42:3810–3813. l) ten Brink G-J, Arends IWCE, Hoogenraad M, Verspui G, Sheldon RA. Adv Synth Catal 2003;345:1341–1352. m) Paavola S, Zetterberg K, Privalov T, Csöregh I, Moberg C. Adv Synth Catal 2004;346:237–244. n) Iwasawa T, Tokunaga M, Obora Y, Tsuji Y. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:6554–6555. [PubMed: 15161274]

11. For reviews of palladium-catalyzed aerobic oxidations, see: a) Muzart J. Tetrahedron 2003;59:5789–5816. b) Stahl SS. Angew Chem 2004;116:3480–3501.Angew Chem Int Ed 2004;43:3400–3420. c) Sigman MS, Schultz MJ. Org Biomol Chem 2004;2:2551–2554. [PubMed: 15351815] d) Ref [5].

12. a) Nishimura T, Onoue T, Ohe K, Uemura S. Tetrahedron Lett 1998;39:6011–6014. b) Nishimura T, Onoue T, Ohe K, Uemura S. J Org Chem 1999;64:6750–6755. [PubMed: 11674682] c) Nishimura T, Maeda Y, Kakiuchi N, Uemura S. J Chem Soc, Perkin Trans 1 2000:4301–4305. d) Nishimura T, Uemura S. Synlett 2004:201–216.

13. a) Steinhoff BA, Stahl SS. Org Lett 2002;4:4179–4181. [PubMed: 12423116] b) Steinhoff BA, Guzei IA, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:11268–11278. [PubMed: 15355108] c) Privalov T, Linde C, Zetterberg K, Moberg C. Organometallics 2005;24:885–893. d) Schultz MJ, Adler RS, Zierkiewicz W, Privalov T, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2005;127:8499–8507. [PubMed: 15941285] e) Steinhoff BA, King AE, Stahl SS. J Org Chem 2006;71:1861–1868. [PubMed: 16496970]

14. For mechanistic studies of other non-enantioselective palladium-catalyzed alcohol oxidations, see: a) Stahl SS, Thorman JL, Nelson RC, Kozee MA. J Am Chem Soc 2001;123:7188–7189. [PubMed: 11459511] b) Steinhoff BA, Fix SR, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2002;124:766–767. [PubMed: 11817948] c) ten Brink G-J, Arends IWCE, Sheldon RA. Adv Synth Catal 2002;344:355–369. d) Mueller JA, Goller CP, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:9724–9734. [PubMed: 15291576] e) Konnick MM, Guzei IA, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:10212–10213. [PubMed: 15315411] f) Landis CR, Morales CM, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:16302–16303. [PubMed: 15600314] g) Zierkiewicz W, Privalov T. Organometallics 2005;24:6019–6028. h) Arends IWCE, ten Brink G-J, Sheldon RA. J Mol Catal A: Chem 2006;251:246–254. i) Steinhoff BA, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2006;128:4348–4355. [PubMed: 16569011] j) Nielsen RJ, Goddard WA III. J Am Chem Soc 2006;128:9651–9660. [PubMed: 16866517]

15. For enantioselective palladium-catalyzed alcohol oxidation mechanistic studies, see: a) Mueller JA, Jensen DR, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2002;124:8202–8203. [PubMed: 12105896] b) Mueller JA, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2003;125:7005–7013. [PubMed: 12783555] c) Trend RM, Stoltz BM. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:4482–4483. [PubMed: 15070342] d) Nielsen RJ, Keith JM, Stoltz BM, Goddard WA III. J Am Chem Soc 2004;126:7967–7974. [PubMed: 15212546] e) Keith JM, Nielsen RJ, Oxgaard J, Goddard WA III. J Am Chem Soc 2005;127:13172–13179. [PubMed: 16173744] f) Mueller JA, Cowell A, Chandler BD, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2005;127:14817–14824. [PubMed: 16231935] g) Popp BV, Stahl SS. J Am Chem Soc 2007;129:4410–4422. [PubMed: 17371024] h) Keith JM, Goddard WA III, Oxgaard J. J Am Chem Soc 2007;129:10361–10369. [PubMed: 17676735]

16. Ferreira EM, Stoltz BM. J Am Chem Soc 2001;123:7725–7726. [PubMed: 11481006]

17. Concurrent with our publication, a related system was reported, see: a) Jensen DR, Pugsley JS, Sigman MS. J Am Chem Soc 2001;123:7475–7476. [PubMed: 11472200] b) Jensen DR, Sigman MS. Org Lett 2003;5:63–65. [PubMed: 12509891] c) Mandal SK, Jensen DR, Pugsley JS, Sigman MS. J Org Chem 2003;68:4600–4603. [PubMed: 12762783] d) Mandal SK, Sigman MS. J Org Chem 2003;68:7535–7537. [PubMed: 12968915] e) Sigman MS, Jensen DR. Acc Chem Res 2006;39:221–229. [PubMed: 16548511]

18. The selectivity factor (*s*) was determined using the equation $s = k_{fast}/k_{slow} = \ln[(1-C)(1-ee)]/\ln[(1-C)(1+ee)]$, where C is conversion and ee is enantiomeric excess of recovered alcohol, see ref [8a].

19. Recently, a similar palladium-catalyzed system utilizing a different ligand for enantioselective alcohol oxidation has been developed, see ref [4k].

20. Bagdanoff JT, Ferreira EM, Stoltz BM. Org Lett 2003;5:835–837. [PubMed: 12633084]

21. Complexes of [PdCl$_2$] with a variety of monodentate amines do not catalyze alcohol oxidation. For details, see ref [12b] and Supporting Information.

22. The beneficial role of carbonates as exogenous bases in the kinetic resolution was subsequently reported by Sigman as well, see ref [17d].

23. A significant effect of cesium carbonate structure and particle size has been found for palladium-catalyzed aryl halide aminations in toluene, consistent with a heterogeneous process, see: Meyers C, Maes BUW, Loones KTJ, Bal G, Lemiere GLF, Dommisse RA. J Org Chem 2004;69:6010–6017. [PubMed: 15373485]

24. Crow WD. Aust J Chem 1959;12:474–482.

25. Lide, DR.; Frederikse, HPR., editors. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. 76. Chemical Rubber Company; New York: 1995. p. 43Section 8

26. Addition of sparteine HCl inhibits alcohol oxidation, see ref [15a].

27. Sigman has proposed that excess chloride ion in solution may inhibit displacement of chloride by alcohol in [Pd(sparteine)Cl$_2$]. Thus, formation of insoluble CsCl may sequester excess chloride and promote alcohol coordination. For details, see ref [15f].

28. Lambert JB, Zhao Y, Emblidge RW, Salvador LA, Liu X, So JH, Chelius EC. Acc Chem Res 1999;32:183–190.

29. *tert*-Butyl alcohol was found to be a competent solvent for this oxidation, see ref [17c].

30. Resolutions conducted under an atmosphere of air instead of O$_2$ displayed substantially lower reactivity and selectivity.

31. An alternate explanation involves the formation of trace amounts of CsO*t*-Bu in situ. However, reactions conducted with CsO*t*-Bu as base led to oxidation but no kinetic resolution, see Supporting Information for details.

32. Palladium carbonate complex **13** was also observed on prolonged exposure of **5** to cesium carbonate in chloroform at 23 °C.

33. Sinnott, M., editor. Comprehensive Biological Catalysis. Vol. 1–3. Academic Press; San Diego, CA: 1998.

34. For a recent review, see: Taylor MS, Jacobsen EN. Angew Chem 2006;118:1550–1573.Angew Chem Int Ed 2006;45:1520–1543.

35. Bagdanoff JT, Stoltz BM. Angew Chem 2004;116:357–361.Angew Chem Int Ed 2004;43:353–357.

36. Goddard has proposed that the solubilization of charged intermediates by dichloromethane may be so great as to nearly completely separate the chloride anion from the palladium complex in the β-hydride elimination transition state, improving the oxidation rate but limiting a key interaction for selectivity, see ref [15d].

37. Fischer F, Pfleiderer G. Z Anorg Allg Chem 1922;124:61–69.

38. For dielectric constant tables, see: *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 76th ed. (Eds.: D. R. Lide, H. P. R. Frederikse), Chemical Rubber Company, New York, 1995, Section 6, pp. 159–192.

39. The IR spectrum of CHCl$_3$ was also investigated. However, the C-H stretch was not well resolved. CDCl$_3$ performs identically to CHCl$_3$ as reaction solvent.

40. For a discussion of the hydrogen bonding of chloroform and its effect on IR vibrational frequencies, see: Green, RD. Hydrogen Bonding by C–H Groups. John Wiley & Sons; New York: 1974.

41. A molecule of chloroform is also within hydrogen bonding distance in the solid-state structure of **5**. CCDC 203513 for **5** contains the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif.

42. While we have never experienced an accident, reactions conducted at elevated temperatures in flammable solvents should be conducted with appropriate caution in a fume hood.

43. For a brief discussion of the substrate scope of the oxidative kinetic resolution, see: Stoltz, BM.; Ebner, DC. Handbook of C–H Transformation. 2. Dyker, G., editor. Wiley-VCH; New York: 2005. p. 393-401.

44. Caspi DD, Ebner DC, Bagdanoff JT, Stoltz BM. Adv Synth Catal 2004;346:185–189.

45. Ruel, FS.; Braun, MP.; Johnson, WS. Collect. Vol. X. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2004. Organic Syntheses; p. 467-471.

46. Luche JL, Gemal AL. J Chem Soc, Chem Commun 1978:601–602.

47. Ebner DC, Novák Z, Stoltz BM. Synlett 2006:3533–3539.

48. For example with conditions C, (±)-2-methylcyclopent-2-enol and (±)-2-methylcyclohex-2-enol ((±)-**26**) are oxidized with selectivity factors of 3.2 and 5.3, respectively.

49. Low reactivity was also observed in a related system, see: Sayyed IA, Kumar NSCR, Sudalai A. Indian J Chem, Sect B 2005;44B:1533–1535.

50. For palladium-catalyzed alcohol oxidation conditions that allow the resolution of some saturated alkyl alcohols, see ref [17c].

51. For recent applications of our kinetic resolution to natural product total synthesis, see: a) Tambar UK, Ebner DC, Stoltz BM. J Am Chem Soc 2006;128:11752–11753. [PubMed: 16953603] b) Krishnan S, Bagdanoff JT, Ebner DC, Ramtohul YK, Tambar UK, Stoltz BM. J Am Chem Soc 2008;130:13745–13754. [PubMed: 18798630]

52. Related oxidative kinetic resolutions en route to pharmaceutical agents have been reported, see: a) Ali IS, Sudalai A. Tetrahedron Lett 2002;43:5435–5436. b) Thakur VV, Sudalai A. Indian J Chem, Sect B 2005;44B:557–562.

53. a) Trend RM, Ramtohul YK, Ferreira EM, Stoltz BM. Angew Chem 2003;115:2998–3001.Angew Chem Int Ed 2003;42:2892–2895. b) Trend RM, Ramtohul YK, Stoltz BM. J Am Chem Soc 2005;127:17778–17788. [PubMed: 16351107]

54. Rao MR, Faulkner JD. J Nat Prod 2002;65:1201–1203. [PubMed: 12193033]

55. For discussions on synthetic approaches based on bidirectional chain synthesis, see: a) Poss CS, Schreiber SL. Acc Chem Res 1994;27:9–17. b) Schreiber SL, Goulet MT, Schulte G. J Am Chem Soc 1987;109:4718–4720.

56. For examples of bidirectional synthesis/terminus differentiation in natural products synthesis, see: a) Harada T, Kagamihara Y, Tanaka S, Sakamoto K, Oku A. J Org Chem 1992;57:1637–1639. b) Poss CS, Rychnovsky SD, Schreiber SL. J Am Chem Soc 1993;115:3360–3361. c) Schreiber SL, Sammakia T, Uehling DE. J Org Chem 1989;54:15–16. d) Ikemoto N, Schreiber SL. J Am Chem Soc 1990;112:9657–9659.

57. a) Reingold ID, DiNardo LJ. J Org Chem 1982;47:3544–3545. b) Reingold ID, Kwong KS, Kahr BE, Menard M, Cummings G, Kowalski JA. Synth Commun 1993;23:1463–1466.

58. Bäckvall JE, Vågberg JO. J Org Chem 1988;53:5695–5699.

59. Johnson CR, Golebiowski A, McGill TK, Steensma DH. Tetrahedron Lett 1991;32:2597–2600.

60. Ebner DC, Trend RM, Genet C, McGrath MJ, O'Brien P, Stoltz BM. Angew Chem 2008;120:6467–6470.Angew Chem Int Ed 2008;47:6367–6370.

Figure 1.
Ligands evaluated in Table 1.

(−)-16
up to 87% ee

(−)-17
up to 85% ee

(+)-16
up to 74% ee

Figure 2.
Enantioenriched ketones obtained from the kinetic resolution.

Figure 3.
Examples of alcohols displaying poor reactivity.

Figure 4.
Examples of alcohols oxidized with poor selectivity.

OMe OMe OMe [OMe] OMe OMe OMe

n = 1-5

43a-e

Figure 5.
Polyether natural products potentially accessible by *meso*-diol desymmetrization.

Scheme 1.
Uemura's oxidation of alcohols.

Scheme 2.
Proposed mechanism for the palladium-catalyzed alcohol oxidation.

Scheme 3.
Initial conditions for the Pd-catalyzed enantioselective oxidation of alcohols.

[(sparteine)PdCl$_2$]   **[(sparteine)Pd(OR)Cl]**

ROH
+
sparteine ⇌ **sparteine•HCl** $\xrightarrow{Cs_2CO_3}$ **sparteine**
+
CsHCO$_3$
+
CsCl ↓

Scheme 4.
Potential role of excess sparteine and base.

Scheme 5.
Stabilization of the β-hydride elimination transition state by resonance and a β-silicon.

Scheme 6.
Formation of inactive Pd complex **13**.

Scheme 7.
Model for kinetic resolution selectivity.

Scheme 8.
Secondary alcohols as drug intermediates.

Scheme 9.
Conversion of a resolved alcohol to a functionalized tetrahydrofuran.

Scheme 10.
Desymmetrization of diol **41**.

Scheme 11.
Preparation of *meso*-diols from a common starting material.

Scheme 12.
Oxidative desymmetrization of *meso*-diols.

Table 1

Initial ligand screen.

entry	ligand[a]	time	conversion[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	(S,S)-Ph-PYBOX	72 h	2%	–	–
2	(S)-t-Bu-BOX	24 h	3%	–	–
3	cinchonidine	72 h	2%	–	–
4	quinine	24 h	0%	–	–
5	(R,R)-Jacobsen ligand	24 h	3%	–	–
6	(−)-isopinocampheylamine	**24 h**	0%	–	–
7	(R)-BINAP	24 h	29.0%	0%	1.0
8	brucine	24 h	77.0%	0%	1.0
9	(DHQ)₂PHAL	24 h	31.6%	8.7%	1.6
10	(−)-sparteine	24 h	15.1%	13.7%	8.8

[a]See Figure 1.

[b]Measured by GC.

[c]Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 2

Effect of excess sparteine on the resolution for in situ and preformed catalysts.

entry	catalyst[a]	conversion[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	[Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$] (−)-sparteine (20 mol%)	59.9%	98.7%	23.1
2	[Pd(sparteine)Cl$_2$] (**5**)	4.6%	3.4%	6.0
3	[Pd(sparteine)Cl$_2$] (**5**) (−)-sparteine (15 mol%)	60.6%	99.2%	23.8

[a] 1 atm O$_2$, 500 mg MS3Å/mmol substrate, 0.1 M substrate in PhCH3.

[b] Measured by GC.

[c] Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 3

Added base in the kinetic resolution.

entry	additive	time	conversion[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	sparteine (0.3 equiv)	13 h	29%	34%	15
2	none	13 h	2%	<2%	- -
3	Et₃N (0.4 equiv)	13 h	26%	31%	22
4	Et₃N (0.4 equiv)	26 h	29%	33%	13
5	Et₃N (2.0 equiv)	13 h	19%	19%	11
6	Et₃N (4.0 equiv)	13 h	14%	11%	6
7	DABCO (0.4 equiv)	13 h	7%	8%	20
8	Na₂CO₃ (1.0 equiv)	13 h	27%	31%	15
9	K₂CO₃ (1.0 equiv)	13 h	56%	84%	13
10	Cs₂CO₃ (1.0 equiv)	13 h	68%	99%	13

[a]10 mol% [Pd(nbd)Cl₂], 10 mol% (−)-sparteine, 1 atm O₂, 500 mg MS3Å/mmol substrate, 0.1 M substrate in PhCH₃.

[b]Measured by ¹H NMR.

[c]Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 4

n-BuOH as additive in the kinetic resolution.

entry	*n*-BuOH equiv	% (*S*)-8[b] (ee)[c]	% 9[b]	% 10[b]
1	0.0	75 (16)	15	10
2	0.7	60 (34)	10	30
3	2.1	35 (81)	5	60
4	4.2	45 (61)	<5	50

[a]5 mol% [Pd(nbd)Cl2], 20 mol% (−)-sparteine, 1 atm O2, 500 mg MS3Å/mmol substrate, 0.25 M substrate in PhCH3.

[b]Measured by ^{1}H NMR.

[c]Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 5

Various non-oxidizing alcohols as additives.

entry	additive	time	conversion[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	none	5.5 h	31%	35%	12
2	n-BuOH (1.0 equiv)	5.5 h	66%	98%	12
3	n-BuOH (2.0 equiv)	5.5 h	67%	95%	10
4	n-BuOH (8.0 equiv)	19 h	48%	56%	7
5	CF$_3$CH$_2$OH (1.0 equiv)	5.5 h	60%	89%	11
6	CF$_3$CH$_2$OH (2.0 equiv)	5.5 h	42%	48%	8
7	CF$_3$CH$_2$OH (8.0 equiv)	19 h	19%	16%	6
8	t-BuOH (1.0 equiv)	22.5 h[d]	57%	90%	16
9	t-BuOH (4.0 equiv)	11.5 h[d]	57%	94%	20
10	t-BuOH (8.0 equiv)	19 h[e]	57%	90%	16

[a] 10 mol% [Pd(nbd)Cl$_2$], 10 mol% (−)-sparteine, 10 mol% Cs$_2$CO$_3$, 1 atm O$_2$, 500 mg MS3Å/mmol substrate, 0.1 M substrate in PhCH$_3$.

[b] Measured by ^{1}H NMR.

[c] Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

[d] Conducted at 50 °C.

[e] Conducted at 45 °C.

Table 6

Direct comparison of original and rate accelerated oxidative kinetic resolution conditions.

additives	time	conversion[a]	alcohol ee[b]	s
none	192 h	59%	93%	15
Cs₂CO₃ (1.2 equiv) t-BuOH (4.0 equiv)	4.5 h	63%	98%	16

[a]Measured by ^{1}H NMR.

[b]Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 7

Impact of solvent on reaction rate.

entry	solvent	dielectric constant	conversion[a]
1	CH_2Cl_2	8.9	83%
2	$CHCl_3$	4.8	74%
3	CH_2Br_2	7.8	73%
4	$CHCl_3$/1 equiv t-BuOH	4.8/12.5	72%
5	$CHBr_3$	4.4	68%
6	$ClCH_2CH_2Cl$	10.4	46%
7	$PhCH_3$/1 equiv t-BuOH	2.4/12.5	39%
8	$PhCH_3$/t-BuOH (1:1)	2.4/12.5	29%
9	$PhCH_3$	2.4	23%
10	pinacolone	12.7	21%
11	t-amyl alcohol	5.8	21%
12	THF	7.5	14%
13	$Cl_2C{=}CHCl$	3.4	10%
14	Cl_3CCH_3	7.2	9%
15	EtOAc	6.1	8%
16	2-propanol	20.2	7%
17	$Cl_2C{=}CCl_2$	2.3	6%
18	H_2O/2-propanol	80.1/20.2	3%
19	CH_3CN	36.6	3%
20	CH_3NO_2	37.3	2%
21	CCl_4	2.2	2%

[a]Measured by GC relative to internal standard (tridecane). See Supporting Information for details.

Table 8

C-D stretch of CDCl$_3$ in the presence of potential H-bond acceptors.

entry	concentration	CDCl$_3$ solution	λ_{max} (cm^{-1})
1		neat	2258
2	0.25 M		2175

entry	concentration	CDCl₃ solution	λ_max (cm⁻¹)
3	0.25 M		2230

entry	concentration	CDCl₃ solution	λ_max (cm⁻
4	0.10 M[a]		2258

[a]Near saturation concentration at 23 °C.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 9

Variety of conditions for the resolution of secondary alcohols.

entry	conditions	time	conversion[a]	ee[b]	s
A	[Pd(nbd)Cl₂] (5 mol%) (−)-sparteine (20 mol%) PhCH₃ (0.1 M), O₂ MS3Å, 80 °C	96 h	67%	96%	12
B	[Pd(nbd)Cl₂] (5 mol%) (−)-sparteine (20 mol%) Cs₂CO₃ (1.2 equiv) t-BuOH (4.0 equiv) PhCH₃ (0.25 M), O₂ MS3Å, 60 °C	9.5 h	67%	99%	15
C	[Pd(nbd)Cl₂] (5 mol%) (−)-sparteine (12 mol%) Cs₂CO₃ (0.4 equiv) CHCl₃ (0.25 M), O₂ MS3Å, 23 °C	48 h	63%	99%	27
D	[Pd(nbd)Cl₂] (5 mol%) (−)-sparteine (12 mol%) Cs₂CO₃ (0.4 equiv) CHCl₃ (0.25 M), Air MS3Å, 23 °C	24 h	62%	99%	25

[a] Measured by GC relative to internal standard (tridecane).

[b] Measured by chiral HPLC. See Supporting Information for details.

Table 10

Resolution of 1-arylethanols.

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	R = H	B	12.5 h	64%	99%	20
2		C	48 h	60%	99%	31
3		B	9.5 h	67%	99%	15
4		C	45 h	63%	99%	27
5		D	24 h	62%	99%	25
6		A	54 h	63%	97%	14
7	R = OMe	C	48 h	59%	98%	23
8	R = F	D	24 h	57%	93%	20

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
9		C	164 h	60%	89%	12

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
10	B	15 h	57%	99%	47
11	C[d]	12 h	55%	95%	29

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
12	A	28 h	52%	93%	44
13	C	24 h	54%	98%	47
14	D	22 h	54%	98%	54

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
15	A	112 h	55%	99%	47
16	C	48 h	60%	99%	31
17	D	24 h	56%	98%	37

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
18	A	120 h	67%	94%	8.3

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
19		A	120 h	67%	94%	8.8

NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript

[a] Conditions A: [Pd(nbd)Cl2] (5 mol%), (−)-sparteine (20 mol%), O2 (1 atm), MS3Å (500 mg/mmol substrate), PhCH3 (0.1 M substrate), 80 °C. Conditions B: [Pd(nbd)Cl2] (5 mol%), (−)-sparteine (20 mol %), O2 (1 atm), Cs2CO3 (0.5 equiv), t-BuOH (1.5 equiv), MS3Å (500 mg/mmol substrate), PhCH3 (0.25 M substrate), 60 °C. Conditions C: [Pd(nbd)Cl2] (5 mol%), (−)-sparteine (12 mol%), O2 (1 atm), Cs2CO3 (0.4 equiv), MS3Å (500 mg/mmol substrate), CHCl3 (0.25 M substrate), 23 °C. Conditions D: [Pd(nbd)Cl2] (5 mol%), (−)-sparteine (12 mol%), Cs2CO3 (0.4 equiv), MS3Å (500 mg/mmol substrate), CHCl3 (0.25 M substrate), 23 °C, open to ambient air under a short tube of Drierite.

[b] Conversion measured by GC or NMR.

[c] Measured by chiral HPLC or chiral GC. See Supporting Information for details.

[d] Conducted at 40 °C.

Table 11

Resolution of other benzylic alcohols.

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	B[d]	12 h	74%	99%	10
2	C	23 h	70%	98%	10

Chemistry. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 May 4.

$$\text{Ar}\underset{\text{OH}}{\overset{}{\wedge}}\text{R} \xrightarrow{\text{Conditions}} \text{Ar}\underset{\text{OH}}{\overset{}{\wedge}}\text{R} + \text{Ar}\underset{\text{O}}{\overset{}{\wedge}}\text{R}$$

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
3		B[d]	12 h	62%	99%	21
4		C	24 h	58%	98%	28
5		D	16 h	60%	99%	28
6		B[e]	4.5 h	63%	98%	16
7		C	72 h	63%	98%	24
8		D	48 h	57%	95%	22
9		A	14.5 h	70%	97%	9.0
10		A	24 h	58%	93%	18
11		B	4.5 h	71%	99%	15
12		B	4.5 h	63%	93%	11

R = Ac
R = Boc

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
13		C	122 h	55%	75%	9.0

[a–c] See Table 10 footnotes.

[d] Conducted at 40 °C.

[e] Conducted at 80 °C.

Table 12

Resolution of allylic alcohols.

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	C	33 h	64%	96%	12
2	D	25 h	55%	86%	16
3	C	31 h	51%	74%	13
4	C	74 h	52%	86%	23

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
5		B	4 h	75%	97%	7.0
6		B	7 h	66%	93%	9.2
7		C	45 h	65%	99%	15
8		D	24 h	61%	97%	17

R = Br
R = iPr
R = OiBu

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
9	C	27 h	61%	96%	16
10	D	24 h	63%	98%	17

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
11	B	12 h	65%	88%	7.5
12	C	48 h	63%	99%	18
13	D	44 h	65%	99%	16

Chemistry. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 May 4.

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
14	C	43 h	64%	97%	13
15	D	43 h	61%	91%	12

| entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
16		C	75 h	57%	94%	19

[a–c] See Table 10 footnotes.

Table 13

Resolution of 2-aryl allylic alcohols.

entry	alcohol major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	R = H	A	7 h	57%	99%	35
2		B	1.5 h	53%	99%	89
3		D	10 h	56%	99%	47
4	R = Me	B	3.5 h	58%	99%	31
5		C	11 h	58%	99%	28
6		D	10 h	56%	99%	39
7	R = OMe	A	31 h	58%	99%	30
8		B	1.5 h	54%	97%	46
9		C	24 h	55%	92%	23
10	R = F	A	10 h	57%	99%	33
11		B	3.5 h	60%	99%	24
12		C	11 h	58%	99%	30
13	R = CF₃	A	10 h	59%	99%	26
14		C	10 h	57%	94%	21
15		D	10 h	59%	99%	26
16		A	10 h	59%	99%	28
17		B	1.5 h	53%	94%	36
18		D	10 h	56%	99%	45

entry	alcohol major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
19		A	24 h	54%	99%	59
20		C	10 h	59%	99%	25
21		D	6 h	57%	97%	27
22		B	10 h	64%	99%	19
23		C	72 h	57%	96%	23
24		D	42.5 h	57%	98%	27

| entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
25	A	17 h	52%	99%	122
26	B	3 h	57%	97%	27
27	C	24 h	55%	97%	33

[a–c]See Table 10 footnotes.

Table 14

Resolution of 3-substituted cyclic allylic alcohols.

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
1	A	4 h	53%	99%	83
2	B	1 h	53%	98%	63
3	D	6 h	55%	94%	26

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
4		A	4 h	56%	99%	50
5		B	1 h	56%	99%	51
6		C	9 h	51%	95%	83

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
7	A	8 h	73%	98%	8.6
8	B	1 h	61%	85%	9.0
9	C	10 h	78%	99%	7.5

$$R \overset{OH}{\underset{}{\diagup}} R' \xrightarrow{\text{Conditions}} R \overset{OH}{\underset{}{\diagup}} R' \quad + \quad R \overset{O}{\underset{}{\diagup}} R'$$

alcohol, major enantiomer

R = Me
R = Bn

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
10	B	8 h	65%	99%	15
11	C	27 h	58%	94%	19
12	D	43 h	64%	97%	13
13	C	72 h	61%	91%	11

[a-c]See Table 10 footnotes.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 15

Resolution of cyclopropylcarbinyl alcohols.

entry		conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
	alcohol, major enantiomer					
1		B	22 h	76%	96%	6.1
2		C	72 h	67%	99%	13
3		D	68 h	66%	96%	10

Ebner et al.

Page 71

NIH-PA Author Manuscript   NIH-PA Author Manuscript   NIH-PA Author Manuscript

$$\underset{R \quad R'}{\overset{OH}{\diagup}} \xrightarrow{\text{Conditions}} \underset{R \quad R'}{\overset{OH}{\diagup}} + \underset{R \quad R'}{\overset{O}{\diagup}}$$

entry	alcohol, major enantiomer	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
4		A	23 h	69%	99%	12
5		B	3 h	59%	91%	14
6		C	25 h	59%	99%	28
7		C	71 h	60%	99%	25
8		D	38 h	57%	89%	15

Chemistry. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 May 4.

entry	conditions[a]	time	conv.[b]	alcohol ee[c]	s
9	A	17 h	66%	99%	15
10	B	9 h	71%	99%	10
11	C	24 h	51%	76%	15

[a–c] See Table 10 footnotes.