Published in final edited form as:
J Am Chem Soc. 2012 June 6; 134(22): 9034–9037. doi:10.1021/ja301553c.

Merging Visible Light Photocatalysis and Transition Metal Catalysis in the Copper-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation of Boronic Acids with CF_3I

Yingda Ye and **Melanie S. Sanford***
University of Michigan, Department of Chemistry, 930 North University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, United States

Abstract

This communication describes the development of a mild method for the cross-coupling of arylboronic acids with CF_3I via the merger of photoredox and Cu catalysis. This method has been applied to the trifluoromethylation of electronically diverse aromatic and heteroaromatic substrates and tolerates many common functional groups.

Trifluoromethyl substituents are widely prevalent in pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals.[1] As such, the development of mild and versatile synthetic methods for generating carbon–CF_3 bonds has become a field of intense research effort. Over the past 3 years, a variety of Pd[2,3] and Cu[4,5]-based cross-coupling protocols have been developed for the trifluoromethylation of aryl halides, aryl boronic acids, and aromatic carbon– hydrogen bonds. As exemplified in Scheme 1a/b for the Cu-promoted trifluoromethylation of boronic acids, these transformations typically involve "CF_3^-" [4c,4e,4l,5i] or "CF_3^+" [4f,5d,e] reagents and are believed to proceed via nucleophilic or electrophilic transfer of the CF_3 group to the Cu center, respectively. Many of these new methods represent significant progress in comparison to the traditional Swarts reaction[6] (which requires highly reactive fluorinating reagents and harsh conditions).

Despite these important advances, most current strategies for aryl–CF_3 cross-coupling suffer from one or more limitations. In some cases, temperatures greater than 100 °C[2b,3a,b,4d] and/or strong acids or bases (TFA[3a] or ^{t}BuOK[4j]) are necessary. Other methods require expensive trifluoromethylating reagents (e.g., *S*-(trifluoromethyl)thiophenium salts,[3a,4f,5d] Togni's reagent,[5b,5e,5g] or $TESCF_3$).[3b,5a] Finally, many protocols exhibit limited substrate scope/generality.[3c,5a,b]

One attractive approach to begin to address these limitations would be to access alternative and potentially complementary mechanistic manifolds. We reasoned that a radical pathway (Scheme 1c) would be particularly interesting, since CF_3• can be generated under mild, neutral conditions from commercially available and relatively inexpensive CF_3I.[7] In particular, we noted a recent report by MacMillan demonstrating the conversion of CF_3I to CF_3• at room temperature in the presence of a photocatalyst, visible light, and a reductant (Scheme 2).[8] On the basis of this work, we hypothesized that the merger of visible light photocatalysis (to generate CF_3•) with Cu catalysis (to generate reactive Cu–aryl species)

mssanfor@umich.edu.

Supporting Information Available: Experimental details and spectroscopic and analytical data for new compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

(Scheme 2) might provide a mild and general method for the trifluoromethylation of boronic acid derivatives.

Our initial investigations focused on the Cu and Ru-photocatalyzed trifluoromethylation of 1,1'-biphenyl-4-ylboronic acid with CF_3I to form 4-(trifluoromethyl)-1,1'-biphenyl (**1a**). We were delighted to find that Cu/Ru photocatalysis provided product **1a** in modest to excellent yield under a number of conditions (Table 1). A variety of different bases (to promote transmetalation) and reaction solvents were screened for this reaction (see Table S1) and the use of K_2CO_3 in DMF proved optimal. Copper(I) catalysts generally performed better than Cu^{II} salts, and the highest yield of **1a** (76%) was obtained with CuOAc. The optimal conditions were as follows: 1 equiv of boronic acid **1**, 5 equiv of CF_3I, 1 equiv of K_2CO_3, 20 mol % of CuOAc, and 1 mol % of $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2{\cdot}6H_2O$ with irradiation from two 26 W household light bulbs. The major side product was 4-iodo-1,1'-biphenyl (formed in 9% yield under the optimal conditions).

This Cu/Ru-catalyzed coupling between **1** and CF_3I is practical and easily scalable. The reaction in Table 1, entry 6 was performed on a 0.05 mmol scale and provided 76% yield as determined by ^{19}F NMR spectroscopy and GCMS. Nearly identical isolated yields were obtained on both 1 and 5 mmol scales (72% and 70% isolated yield, respectively).

A variety of control reactions were conducted to establish the role of each component of the reaction mixture. As shown in Table 1, entries 10–12, when light, CuOAc or $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2{\cdot}6H_2O$ were excluded under otherwise identical conditions, ≤3% yield of **1a** was obtained.[9] These results clearly indicate the necessity of all three components to achieve high yields under these conditions, consistent with the major pathway to **1a** proceeding via dual Ru/Cu catalysis (*vide infra*). The iodinated side product 4-iodo-1,1'-biphenyl was also subjected to the reaction conditions to establish whether it is an intermediate in the boronic acid trifluoromethylation process. Less than 2% of the aryl–CF_3 product was formed, strongly suggesting that the major pathway to **1a** does not involve an iodinated intermediate. Finally, the reactivity of boronic acid substrate **1** was investigated under conditions reported by Baran and MacMillan to promote C–H trifluoromethylation reactions via *in situ* generation of CF_3•.[10] In both cases, <2% of **1a** was observed. These results indicate that **1a** is not formed by the direct reaction of CF_3• with the boronic acid.

This transformation was next applied to a variety of different aryl- and heteroaryl boronic acid derivatives. Representative examples are shown in Scheme 3 and were selected to highlight not only the broad scope but also the limitations of this method.[11] Aromatic boronic acids bearing both electron-donating (*t*-butyl, methoxy) as well as electron-withdrawing (cyano, trifluoromethyl, fluoro, methyl ester) substituents underwent trifluoromethylation in high yield. A variety of different potentially reactive functional groups (aromatic alcohols, ketones, aldehydes, esters, and amides) were quite well-tolerated. A boronic acid embedded in the estrone framework underwent trifluoromethylation to generate **22a** in 80% isolated yield. Most remarkably, 4-iodo-phenylboronic acid underwent selective trifluoromethylation to form **7a**, leaving the aryl iodide intact for subsequent functionalization. This demonstrates the complementarity of this method to many other Cu-catalyzed trifluoromethylation protocols.[5a,5c,5f] Furthermore, it provides additional evidence against the possibility of aryl iodide intermediates in this transformation.

The use of sterically hindered substrates such as 1-naphthyl and 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl boronic acid is typically challenging for copper-mediated cross-coupling reactions.[12] As shown in Scheme 2, similar effects were seen in the current transformation, with products **9a** and **10a** being formed in modest yields (42% and 39%, respectively). In these cases,

competing protodeboronation was problematic, and the major side product was naphthalene or mesitylene, respectively.

Heteroaromatic substrates are of particular relevance to the pharmaceutical and agrochemical industries due to the prevalence of heteroarenes in biologically active compounds.[13] Boronic acids derived from pyridine, quinoline, furan and thiophene all underwent trifluoromethylation in modest to good yield.[10] In some of these cases, modification of the catalyst loading and/or reaction temperature was required to achieve optimal yield. Importantly, with all of these substrates, trifluoromethylation of the boronic acid moiety out-competed uncatalyzed C–H trifluoromethylation of the heterocycle with CF_3•. Thus, this method provides an attractive route for the site-selective installation of CF_3 substituents into these scaffolds.

Related conditions could also be applied to analogous perfluoroalkylation reactions. This is a significant advantage of the current method, since perfluoroalkyl analogues of other common trifluoromethylating reagents (*e.g.,* R_3SiCF_3, *S*-(trifluoromethyl)thiophenium salts, or Togni's reagent) are expensive and/or not commercially available. As shown in Scheme 4, perfluorobutyl and perfluorodecyl iodides reacted with **1** to afford products **1b** and **1c** in good yields under the Cu/Ru catalyzed conditions.

While a detailed mechanistic picture of this transformation remains to be elucidated, a possible set of catalytic cycles is shown in Scheme 5. In this sequence, photoexcitation of $Ru(bpy)^{32+}$ to $Ru(bpy)_3^{2+}$* is followed by $1e^-$ reduction by Cu^I to generate $Ru(bpy)_3^+$ and Cu^{II}.[14] Reduction of CF_3I by $Ru(bpy)_3^+$ then affords CF_3• and I^-. Notably, literature reduction potential data indicates that both of these reactions should be thermodynamically favorable (see Figure S1). The CF_3• could then react with Cu^{II} to generate a $Cu^{III}(CF_3)$ intermediate. Subsequent base-promoted transmetalation between Cu^{III} and the aryl boronic acid would afford $Cu^{III}(aryl)(CF_3)$, which could undergo aryl–CF_3 bond-forming reductive elimination to release the organic product and regenerate the Cu^I catalyst.[15]

In summary, this communication describes a mild and general approach for the Cu/Ru-catalyzed trifluoromethylation/perfluoroalkylation of aryl boronic acids. This method takes advantage of visible light photoredox catalysis to generate R_F• under mild conditions and merges it with copper-catalyzed aryl boronic acid functionalization. The combination has enabled a method for the trifluoromethylation of a wide variety of aromatic and heteroaromatic substrates bearing many common functional groups. This transformation demonstrates the feasibility of achieving Cu-catalyzed trifluoromethylation via a radical pathway. Furthermore, it represents a new example of combining organometallic and photoredox catalysis to achieve synthetically useful organic transformations.[16]

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the NIH NIGMS (GM073836) for financial support. We thank Dr. Rebecca Loy and Dr. Brannon Gary for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. (a) Schlosser M. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2006; 45:5432.(b) Müller K, Faeh C, Diederich F. Science. 2007; 317:1881. [PubMed: 17901324] (c) Hagmann WK. J. Med. Chem. 2008; 51:4359. [PubMed: 18570365] (d) Kirk KL. Org. Process Res. Dev. 2008; 12:305.(e) Purser S, Moore PR, Swallow S,

Gouverneur V. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2008; 37:320. [PubMed: 18197348] (f) Tomashenko OA, Grushin VV. Chem. Rev. 2011; 111:4475. [PubMed: 21456523] (g) Roy S, Gregg BT, Gribble GW, Le V-D. Tetrahedron. 2011; 67:2161.

2. (a) Grushin VV, Marshall WJ. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006; 128:4632. [PubMed: 16594700] (b) Grushin VV, Marshall WJ. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006; 128:12644. [PubMed: 17002347] (c) Grushin VV. Acc. Chem. Res. 2010; 43:160. [PubMed: 19788304] (d) Ball ND, Kampf JW, Sanford MS. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010; 132:2878. [PubMed: 20155920] (e) Ye Y, Ball ND, Kampf JW, Sanford MS. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010; 132:14682. [PubMed: 20866077] (f) Ball ND, Gary JB, Ye Y, Sanford MS. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011; 133:7577. [PubMed: 21513271]
3. (a) Wang X, Truesdale L, Yu J-Q. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010; 132:3648. [PubMed: 20184319] (b) Cho EJ, Senecal TD, Kinzel T, Zhang Y, Watson DA, Buchwald SL. Science. 2010; 328:1679. [PubMed: 20576888] (c) Mu X, Chen S, Zhen X, Liu G. Chem. Eur. J. 2011; 17:6039. [PubMed: 21506187] (d) Loy RN, Sanford MS. Org. Lett. 2011; 13:2548. [PubMed: 21513298] (e) Mu X, Wu T, Wang H-Y, Guo Y-L, Liu G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011; 134:878. [PubMed: 22191420]
4. (a) Dubinina GG, Furutachi H, Vicic DA. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008; 130:8600. [PubMed: 18543912] (b) Dubinina GG, Ogikubo J, Vicic DA. Organometallics. 2008; 27:6233.(c) Chu L, Qing FL. Org. Lett. 2010; 12:5060. [PubMed: 20923196] (d) McReynolds KA, Lewis RS, Ackerman LKG, Dubinina GG, Brennessel WW, Vicic DA. J. Fluorine Chem. 2010; 131:1108.(e) Senecal TD, Parsons AT, Buchwald SL. J. Org. Chem. 2011; 76:1174. [PubMed: 21235259] (f) Zhang CP, Wang ZL, Chen QY, Zhang CT, Gu YC, Xiao JC. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:1896.(g) Tomashenko OA, Escudero EC, Belmonte MM, Grushin VV. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:7655.(h) Morimoto H, Tsubogo T, Litvinas ND, Hartwig JF. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:3793.(i) Litvinas ND, Fier PS, Hartwig JF. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2012; 51:536.(j) Zanardi A, Novikov MA, Martin E, Benet-Buchholz J, Grushin VV. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011; 133:20901. [PubMed: 22136628] (k) Kremlev MM, Mushta AI, Tyrra W, Yagupolskii YL, Naumann D, Möller A. J. Fluorine Chem. 2012; 133:67.(l) Khan BA, Buba AE, Gooßen LJ. Chem. Eur. J. 2012; 18:1577. [PubMed: 22238176]
5. (a) Oishi M, Kondo H, Amii H. Chem. Commun. 2009:1909.(b) Shimizu R, Egami H, Nagi T, Chae J, Hamashima Y, Sodeoka M. Tetrahedron Lett. 2010; 51:5947.(c) Knauber T, Arikan F, G R, Goossen LJ. Chem. Eur. J. 2011; 17:2689. [PubMed: 21274956] (d) Xu J, Luo DF, Xiao B, Liu J, Gong TJ, Fu Y, Liu L. Chem. Commun. 2011; 47:4300.(e) Liu T, Shen Q. Org. Lett. 2011; 13:2342. [PubMed: 21473568] (f) Li YCT, Wang H, Zhang R, Jin K, Wang X, Duan C. Synlett. 2011; 12:1713.(g) Liu T, Shao X, Wu Y, Shen Q. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2012; 51:540.(h) Chu L, Qing FL. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011; 134:1298. [PubMed: 22145831] (i) Jiang X, Chu L, Qing FL. J. Org. Chem. 2012; 77:1251. [PubMed: 22251059]
6. Swarts F. Bull. Acad. R. Belg. 1892; 24:309.
7. (a) Strekowski L, Hojjat M, Patterson SE, Kiselyov AS. J. Heterocyclic Chem. 1994; 31:1413.(b) Sato K, Omote M, Ando A, Kumadaki I. Org. Lett. 2004; 6:4359. [PubMed: 15524483] (c) Mikami K, Tomita Y, Ichikawa Y, Amikura K, Itoh Y. Org. Lett. 2006; 8:4671. [PubMed: 17020274] (d) Itoh Y, Houk KN, Mikami K. J. Org. Chem. 2006; 71:8918. [PubMed: 17081023] (e) Kino T, Nagase Y, Ohtsuka Y, Yamamoto K, Uraguchi D, Tokuhisa K, Yamakawa T. J. Fluorine Chem. 2010; 131:98.(f) Ye Y, Lee SH, Sanford MS. Org. Lett. 2011; 13:5464. [PubMed: 21932827]
8. (a) Nagib DA, Scott ME, MacMillan DWC. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009; 131:10875. [PubMed: 19722670] (b) Pham PV, Nagib DA, MacMillan DWC. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011; 50:6119.
9. Reactions between some electron-deficient substrates and CF_3I showed ~20% of the trifluoromethylated products in the absence of Ru catalyst. See Supporting Information for more details.
10. (a) Ji Y, Brueckl T, Baxter RD, Fujiwara Y, Seiple IB, Su S, Blackmond DG, Baran PS. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 2011; 108:14411. [PubMed: 21844378] (b) Nagib DA, MacMillan DWC. Nature. 2011; 480:224. [PubMed: 22158245]
11. The trifluoromethylated products that are liquids were isolated via Kugelrohr distillation. This isolation procedure typically afforded ≥95% pure products (contaminated with traces of protodeboronated material). In many cases (eg, **6a**, **9a**, **18a**, **20a**), >98% pure products could be obtained via subsequent careful purification by column chromatography, albeit in reduced yields. See Supporting Information for full details.

12. Hassan J, Sévignon M, Gozzi C, Schulz E, Lemaire M. Chem. Rev. 2002; 102:1359. [PubMed: 11996540]
13. Top Pharmaceuticals Poster Njardarson Group. http://cbc.arizona.edu/njardarson/group/sites/default/files/Top 200 Brand-name Drugs by US Retail Sales in 2010sm_0.pdf.
14. The observation that Cu^{I} salts generally perform better than Cu^{II} salts in this transformation is consistent with this proposal.
15. The order of steps ii and iii in Scheme 5 could also easily be reversed. Without detailed evidence about the resting state of the Cu-catalyst, we cannot draw definitive conclusions about the species most likely to react with CF_3•.
16. Kalyani D, McMurtrey KB, Neufeldt SR, Sanford MS. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011; 133:18566. [PubMed: 22047138]



Scheme 1.
Cu-Mediated/Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation of Boronic Acids



Scheme 2.
Proposed New Pathway for Radical Trifluoromethylation of Boronic Acids via Cu/Ru Photocatalysis



Scheme 3.

Substrate Scope for Cu/Ru-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation of Boronic Acids[a]

[a] General conditions: substrate (1 equiv), CF_3I (5 equiv), [Cu] (0.2 equiv), $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2•6H_2O$ (0.01 equiv), K_2CO_3 (1 equiv), DMF (0.17 M in substrate), 60 °C, 12 h, 26 W compact fluorescent light bulb; Isolated yield (≥95% purity). [b] ^{19}F NMR yield. [c] 0.5 equiv of CuOAc. [d] Isolated as a 1:1 mixture with inseparable protodeboronated product. [e] 0.1 equiv of CuOAc. [f] Isolated as a 10:1 mixture with inseparable protodeboronated product. [g] 3 equiv of CF_3I. [h] Reaction run at 70 °C. [i] Reaction run at 40 °C. [j] 0.05 equiv of CuOAc.



Scheme 4.

Perfluoroalkylation of **1** Catalyzed by Cu/Ru[a]

[a] General conditions: substrate (1 equiv), CuOAc (0.5–1 equiv) $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2•6H_2O$ (0.01 equiv), K_2CO_3 (1 equiv), DMF (0.17 M in substrate), 60 °C, 12 h, 26 W compact fluorescent light bulb; Isolated yield. [b] 5 equiv of C_4F_9I, 0.5 equiv of CuOAc. [c] 1.2 equiv of $C_{10}F_{21}I$, 1 equiv of CuOAc.



Scheme 5.
Possible Mechanism for Cu/Ru-Catalyzed Trifluoromethylation of Boronic Acids

Table 1

Optimization of Reaction Between **1** and CF_3I[a]



Entry	[Cu]	Base	Yield
1	$Cu(OTf)_2$	K_2CO_3	14%
2	$[Cu(OTf)]_2•C_6H_6$	K_2CO_3	28%
3	CuI	K_2CO_3	34%
4	Cu	K_2CO_3	40%
5	$Cu(OAc)_2$	K_2CO_3	68%
6	CuOAC	K_2CO_3	76%
7	CuOAC	NaOAc	34%
8	CuOAC	KF	50%
9	CuOAC	none	6%
10[b]	CuOAC	K_2CO_3	1%
11[c]	none	K_2CO_3	3%
12[d]	CuOAC	K_2CO_3	3%

[a] General conditions: substrate (0.05 mmol, 1 equiv), CF_3I (5 equiv), [Cu] (0.2 equiv), $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2•6H_2O$ (0.01 equiv), base (1 equiv), DMF (0.17 M in substrate), 60 °C, 12 h, 26 W compact fluorescent light bulb. ^{19}F NMR yield.

[b] General conditions, but with no light.

[c] General conditions, but with no CuOAc.

[d] General conditions, but with no $Ru(bpy)_3Cl_2•6H_2O$.