Copper-Catalyzed Modular Amino Oxygenation of Alkenes: Access to Diverse 1,2-Amino Oxygen-Containing Skeletons

Brett N. Hemric, Andy W. Chen, and Qiu Wang*

Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708

Email: qiu.wang@duke.edu

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Table of Contents

1.1	Condition optimization	S 1
1.2	Synthetic schemes	S 5
	1.2.1 Synthesis of O-benzoylhydroxylamines	
	1.2.2 Synthesis of alcohol substrates	
	1.2.3 Synthesis of additional oxygen source substrates	
	1.2.4 Synthesis of substrates for mechanistic studies	
1.3	Amino oxygenation representative pictures	S11
1.4	Mechanism studies and characterization data	S12
1.5	¹ H and ¹³ C Spectra	S15

1.1 Condition Optimization

General Example Optimization Screening Conditions

In a 1 Dram vial, 2-(2-vinylphenyl)propan-2-ol **1a** (32.4 mg, 0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), 4-benzoyloxymorpholine **2a** (82.9 mg, 2.0 equiv), copper (II) trifluoromethanesulfonate (14.4 mg, 0.2 equiv), and pyridine *p*-toluenesulfonate (50.3 mg, 1.0 equiv) were combined and 1,2-dichloroethane (1.0 mL) was added. The vial was capped and stirred with Teflon-coated stir bar at 60 °C. The consumption of **2a** was monitored by TLC (25% EtOAc–hexanes). The reaction mixture was filtered through activated, neutral (Brockman Grade I, 58–60Å mesh powder) Al₂O₃ and concentrated *in vacuo* to yield the crude product. To determine yields by quantitative ¹H NMR spectroscopy, dibromomethane (7.0 μ L, 0.2 mmol) was added by 10- μ L microsyringe to the crude reaction mixture in CDCl₃ (0.5 mL). The resulting solution was analyzed by ¹H NMR with a 90° pulse angle and 2 second relaxation time with 12–16 scans. The resulting spectra were analyzed in MestReNova, with the dibromomethane peak set relative to 2.0. All yields were scaled relative to a normalization curve created with known amounts of the isolated product.

Table S1. Initial Copper Catalyst Loading Screen on Model System.^a



4	15	30	24
5	20	30	33
6	30	40	31
7	50	36	33
8	100	47	41

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu catalyst in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S2. Ligand Screen on Model System.^a

Me Me Ta (1 equin	e C DH + BzO N	u(OTf) ₂ (10 mol%) Ligand DCE, 80 °C	Me O N 3a
Entry	Ligand	Ligand loading (mol%)	$3a^{b}$ (%)
1	Pyridine	20	46
2	2,2'-Bipyridine	10	26
3	1,10-Penanthrolin	e 10	29
4	DMEDA	10	26
5	PPh ₃	20	23
6	XPhos	10	27
7	BINAP	10	27
8	Xantphos	10	28
9	dppe	10	40
10	dppp	10	26
11	dppb	10	24

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), $Cu(OTf)_2$ (10 mol%), Ligand, in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S3. Equivalents Screen on Model System.^a

Me Me OH 1a	+ 0 BzO ^{-N} - 2a	Cu(OTf) ₂ (10 mol%) DCE, 80 °C	Me Me o 3a
Entry	1 (equiv)	2 (equiv)	3a ^b (%)
1	3	1	43
2	2	1	35
3	1	1	30
4	1	2	36
5	1	3	36

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a**, **2a**, $Cu(OTf)_2$ (0.02 mmol, 0.1 equiv), in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S4. Additive Screen on Model System.^a



Entry	Additive	$3\mathbf{a}^{b}$ (%)
1	2,6-Lutidine	35
2	DBU	0
3	DIPEA	0
4	DABCO	0
5	DMAP	0
6	K ₂ CO ₃	37
7	Cs ₂ CO ₃	29
8	MsOH	0
9	HCO ₂ H	43
10	BzOH	41
11	PPTS	66
12	NaH ₂ PO ₄	38
13	HFIP	34

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu(OTf)₂ (10 mol%), Additive (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S5. Pyridinium *p*-toluenesulfonate (PPTS) Equivalents Screen on Model System.^a

Me	Me OH +	BzO ^{-N}	Cu(OTf) ₂ (10 mol%) PPTS DCE, 80 °C	
1a (1 e	equiv) 2	2a (2 equiv)		3a 🦳
	Entry	PF	PTS (equiv)	$3\mathbf{a}^{b}$ (%)
	1		0.1	44
	2		0.5	63
	3		1	74
	4		1.5	68
	5		2	68

^aReaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu(OTf)₂ (10 mol%), PPTS in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^bYield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S6. Catalyst Loading Screen on Model System.^a

Me	Me OH +	BzO ^N	Cu(OTf) ₂ PPTS (1.0 equiv) DCE, 80 °C	\rightarrow	
1a (1 e	quiv)	2a (2 equiv)			3a 🗌
	Entry	v Cu(OTf)2 (mol%)	3a ^b (%)
	1		0	0	
	2		5	66	i
	3		10	71	
	4		15	72	
	5		20	78	
	6		30	80)
	7		50	92	
	8		100	94	

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu(OTf)₂, PPTS (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S7. Copper Catalyst Screen on Model System.^a

N	Ne Me OH +	BZO ^{-N}	Cu catalyst (20 mol%) PPTS (1.0 equiv) DCE, 80 °C	→	Me O N	$\mathbf{\hat{b}}$
1a (′	1 equiv)	2a (2 equiv)			3a	-
-	Entry	(Cu catalyst		$3a^{b}$ (%)	
-	1		Cu(OTf) ₂		82	
	2		Cu(OAc) ₂		78	
	3		Cu(eh) ₂		72	
	4		Cu(acac) ₂		65	
	5	[Cu	(OTf) ₂ ·PhMe		82	
	6		CuOAc		75	
	7	Cu(MeCN) ₄ ·BF ₄		75	
_	8		CuI		54	

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu catalyst (20 mol%), PPTS (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at 80 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S8. Temperature Screen on Model System.^a

Me Me OH + 1a (1 equiv)	BzO ^N 2a (2 equiv)	Cu(OTf) ₂ (20 mo PPTS (1.0 equi DCE, Temp	$\xrightarrow{I\%)} \qquad \qquad N$	
Entry	Temp	(°C)	$3a^{b}$ (%)	
1	10	0	78	
2	80)	74	
3	60)	78	
4	40)	68	
5	20)	63	

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), $Cu(OTf)_2$ (20 mol%), PPTS (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at temp. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S9. Solvent Screen on Model System.^a

Me Me OH +	BzO ^{-N}	Cu(OTf) ₂ (20 mol%) PPTS (1.0 equiv) Solvent, 60 °C	→ Me Me Ne No
1a (1 equiv)	2a (2 equiv)		3a
Entry		Solvent	$3\mathbf{a}^{b}$ (%)
1		DCE	74
2		CHCl ₃	68
3		THF	66
4		DME	68
5		PhCF ₃	72
6		PhMe	53

7	PhH	73
8	EtOH	64
9	MeCN	57
10	DMF	38

^{*a*}Reaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu(OTf)₂ (20 mol%), PPTS (1.0 equiv) in solvent (1.0 mL) at 60 °C. ^{*b*}Yield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

Table S10. Pyridinium Scource Screen on Model System.^a

Me Me OH	+ BzO ^{-N}	Cu(OTf) ₂ (20 mol%) Additive (1.0 equiv) DCE, 60 °C	Me Me O N O
1a (1 equiv)	2a (2 equiv)		3a 🔛
Entry		Additive	$\mathbf{3a}^{b}$ (%)
1	Pyridini	72	
2	Pyr	66	
3	Pyri	66	
4	4-Iso	36	
5		43	

^aReaction Conditions: **1a** (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), Cu(OTf)₂ (20 mol%), Additive (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at 60 °C. ^bYield determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with dibromomethane as a quantitative standard.

1.2 Synthetic Schemes

1.2.1 Synthesis of O-Benzoylhydroxylamines

O-Benzoyl-N-methyl-N-phenethylhydroxylamine (2f)



O-Benzoyl-N,N-dicyclohexylhydroxylamine (2g)



1.2.2 Synthesis of Alcohol Substrates

2-(2-Vinylphenyl)propan-2-ol (1a).



Diphenyl(2-vinylphenyl)methanol (1b).





1-(2-Vinylphenyl)ethan-1-ol (1c).



Phenyl(2-vinylphenyl)methanol (1d).



(2-Vinylphenyl)methanol (1e).



2-(2-Allylphenyl)propan-2-ol (1f).



2-(5-Methoxy-2-vinylphenyl)propan-2-ol (1g).



N-(3-(2-Hydroxypropan-2-yl)-4-vinylphenyl)-N-methylbenzamide (1h).



2-(4-Chloro-2-vinylphenyl)propan-2-ol (1i).



2,2-Diphenylpent-4-en-1-ol (1j).



2,2-Dimethylpent-4-en-1-ol (1k).

$$Me \xrightarrow{COOH} Et_2O, 0 °C \xrightarrow{Me} OH \xrightarrow{Me} Hk$$

2-(2-(1-Phenylvinyl)phenyl)propan-2-ol (1m).



(2-(1-Phenylvinyl)phenyl)methanol (1n).



1,1,4-Triphenylpent-4-en-1-ol (1o).



2,2,4-Triphenylpent-4-en-1-ol (1p).



2,2-Dimethyl-4-phenylpent-4-en-1-ol (1q).



4-Phenylpent-4-en-1-ol (1r).



(E)-2-(2-Styrylphenyl)propan-2-ol (E-1s).



(Z)-2-(2-Styrylphenyl)propan-2-ol (Z-1s).



(E)-2-(2-(Prop-1-en-1-yl)phenyl)propan-2-ol (E-1t).



2-(1-Methylcyclopent-3-en-1-yl)propan-2-ol (1u).



1.2.3 Synthesis of Additional Oxygen Source Substrates

N-(2-Vinylphenyl)benzamide (4a).



N-(2-Vinylphenyl)benzamide (4b).



N-Phenyl-2-vinylbenzamide (4c).



2-Allyl-1,3-diphenylpropane-1,3-dione (4d).



2-(2-Methylallyl)-1,3-diphenylpropane-1,3-dione (4e).



(E)-1-phenylbut-3-en-1-one oxime (4f).



N-hydroxy-N-methyl-2-vinylbenzamide (4g).



N-hydroxy-N-phenyl-2-vinylbenzamide (4h).



N-hydroxy-N-methyl-2-(prop-1-en-2-yl)benzamide (4j).



N-hydroxy-N,2,2-trimethylpent-4-enamide (4k).



2-(Prop-1-en-2-yl)benzothioic S-acid (4i).



1.2.4 Synthesis of substrates for mechanistic studies

2-(2-(Prop-1-en-2-yl)phenyl)propan-2-ol (1v).



2-(2-(Prop-1-en-2-yl-3,3,3-d₃)phenyl)propan-2-ol (D₃-1v).



2-(2-Vinylphenyl)propan-1,1,1,3,3,3-d₆-2-ol (D₆-1a).



2-(2-Vinylphenyl)propan-1,1,1,3,3,3-*d*₆**-2-ol** (*D*₆**-1a**): 2-Bromostyrene (732.2 mg, 4.0 mmol, 1.0 equiv) was added to a reaction vessel and vacuum purged three times, backfilling with N₂. THF (12.0 mL) was added. To the solution at -78 °C, was added slowly *n*-BuLi (2.5 M in hexanes, 1.9 mL, 1.2 equiv) over 9 min. The resulting yellow solution was stirred at -78 °C for 40 min followed by slow addition of acetone-*d*₆ (0.44 mL, 1.5 equiv) over 2 min. The resulting solution was stirred at -78 °C for 5 min and then the yellow color became clear. The solution was then warmed to room temperature over 1 h. The reaction was quenched with a saturated aqueous solution of NH₄Cl (15 mL). The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc (25 mL x 3). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (30 mL), dried with Na₂SO₄, and concentrated *in vacuo* to yield the crude alcohol. Purification by flash column chromatography (5% EtOAc–hexanes to 10% EtOAc–hexanes); ¹**H NMR** (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): δ 7.64 (dd, *J* = 17.4, 10.9 Hz, 1H), 7.51–7.40 (m, 2H), 7.29–7.21 (m, 2H), 5.52 (dd, *J* = 17.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, *J* = 10.9, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 1.92 (s, 1H); ¹³**C NMR** (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 144.7, 138.1, 137.2, 128.5, 127.4, 127.3, 124.9, 115.2, 73.3, 30.3 (multiplet); **FTIR** (thin film): cm⁻¹ 3364 (broad), 2230, 1623, 1477, 1131, 1045, 1107, 911, 769, 757; **HRGCMS-ESI** (m/z) Calcd for (C₁₁H₈D₆O) ([M]⁺): 168.14158; found: 168.14147.

1.3 Amino Oxygenation Representative Pictures



The reaction generally (but not always) became red/brown as reaction progressed.

For reactions with all solid components, add all solids to vial, then add DCE. Add vial to a pre-heated hotplate.

For reactions with a liquid component, add all solids to vial, then add DCE, followed by the liquid component. Add vial to a pre-heated hotplate.



Representative TLC for the amino oxygenation reaction in 25% EtOAc/hex using vanillin stain. Starting alkene 1/4 will vary in color and R_{f} . *O*-Benzoylhydroxylamines (2) generally stain yellow/white. Shown is **2a**.

Completed reactions



Representative filtration for the amino oxygenation reaction using Al_2O_3 (Brockman grade I, 58-60Å). For best results, dampen the Al_2O_3 plug (made using 5 mL syringe with cotton on top and bottom of the Al_2O_3) with 100% EtOAc, then add the crude reaction mixture. Allow the crude to gravity filter with 100% EtOAc for ~5 mL, then 100% EtOAc can be flushed through with air/N₂ to a total filtrate volume of ~15 mL. The filtrate is generally a yellow/orange solution, while with Al_2O_3 retains the red/brown color with a blue/green band (copper) at the top (intensity of this blue/green band varies by substrate).

1.4 Mechanism studies and characterization data

1.4.1 β-Hydride Elimination Study



4-((1,3,3-Trimethyl-1,3-dihydroisobenzofuran-1-yl)methyl)morpholine (3v) and 2-(2-(3-Morpholinoprop-1-en-2-yl)phenyl)propan-2-ol (6). Run using standard conditions. Isolated by flash column chromatography (addition of 0.2 mL TFA to crude reaction mixture, 50% EtOAc–hexanes, then 50% EtOAc–hexanes with 5% NEt₃), followed by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes to 50% EtOAc–hexanes).



4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-(methyl- d_3)-1,3-dihydroisobenzofuran-1-yl)methyl)morpholine (D_3 -3v) and 2-(2-(3-Morpholinoprop-1-en-2-yl-1,1- d_2)phenyl)propan-2-ol (D_2 -6). Run using standard conditions. Isolated by flash column chromatography (addition of 0.2 mL TFA to crude reaction mixture, 50% EtOAc–hexanes, then 50% EtOAc–hexanes with 5% NEt₃), followed by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes to 50% EtOAc–hexanes)

1.4.2 Radical Trapping Study











2-(2-Methyl-3-morpholino-2-((2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidin-1-yl)oxy)propyl)-1,3-diphenylpropane-1,3-dione (11). Synthesized by standard conditions with addition of TEMPO (1.0 equiv). Isolated by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes to 75% EtOAc–hexanes) as a colorless oil (33.1 mg, 16%).



3-Phenyl-5-(((2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidin-1-yl)oxy)methyl)-4,5-dihydroisoxazole (14). Synthesized by standard condition with the following modification: with copper(II) acetate instead of copper(II) trifluoromethanesulfonate, 1,2-dimethoxyethane instead of 1,2-dichloroethane, and with addition of TEMPO (1.0 equiv). Isolated by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes to 70% EtOAc–hexanes) as a white solid (38.2 mg, 60%).

1.4.3 Study Eliminating Dehydration as an Intermediate in the Productive Reaction Pathway



4-((3,3-Bis(methyl-d₃)-1,3-dihydroisobenzofuran-1-yl)methyl)morpholine (*D*₆-**3a**). Synthesized using standard conditions. Isolated by flash column chromatography (addition of 0.2 mL TFA to crude reaction mixture, 50% EtOAc–hexanes with 5% NEt₃) as a colorless oil (77.2 mg, 76%). $\mathbf{R}_f = 0.40$ (5% MeOH–CH₂Cl₂); ¹**H NMR** (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): δ 7.28–7.19 (m, 3H), 7.09–7.05 (m, 1H), 5.32 (dd, *J* = 7.5, 4.0 Hz, 1H), 3.74 (t, *J* = 4.6 Hz, 4H), 2.70 (dd, *J* = 13.1, 4.0 Hz, 1H), 2.60 (dd, *J* = 13.1, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 2.73–2.50 (m, 4H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 147.2, 140.1, 127.7, 127.1, 121.5, 120.4, 85.0, 79.2, 66.8, 65.9, 54.4, 29.1 (multiplet), 28.0 (multiplet); FTIR (thin film): cm⁻¹ 2852, 2807, 1455, 1116, 1036, 1009, 865, 750; **HRLCMS-ESI** (m/z) Calcd for (C₁₅H₁₆D₆NO₂) ([M+H]⁺): 254.2022; found: 254.2025.

1.4.4 Study on the Reversibility of Amine Addition to the Alkene



In the study of the alkene scope, the geometric purity of starting alkene E-1s was 99.8% E, while Z-1s was 92% Z. When the alkene was recovered, it was noted that the reaction of E-1s only gave 95% E in the recovered alkene, while Z-1s only gave 76% Z in the recovered alkene. This intriguing result led us to further explore the idea of alkene reversibility.

Table S11. Loss of Stilbene Geometric Purity in Reaction Conditions.^a

Ph Ph + BzO-N Stilbene 2: (<i>E</i> or <i>Z</i>)	Stand Condi	ard tion Ph Ph Ph
Starting Alkene	2a (equiv)	Recovered Alkene ^{bc}
<i>E</i> -stilbene (99% <i>E</i>)	2	10% 83% <i>E</i>

Z-stilbene (99% Z)	2	28 %	84% Z
<i>E</i> -stilbene (99% <i>E</i>)	0	100%	99% E
<i>Z</i> -stilbene (99% <i>Z</i>)	0	99%	99% Z

Standard conditions: stilbene (0.2 mmol, 1.0 equiv), **2a** (2.0 equiv), $Cu(OTf)_2$ (0.2 equiv), PPTS (1.0 equiv) in DCE (1.0 mL) at 60 °C for 1 h. ^bIsolation yield. ^cGeometric isomer ratios determined by GCMS.

To test this idea, we subjected stilbene substrates to the reaction condition, since they had been shown to be poor substrates for the intermolecular amino oxygenation in the past. We started with isomers of 99% geometric purity for each. When subjected to the reaction conditions with the *O*-benzoylhydroxylamine, the recovered alkene showed only 83% *E* when starting with the *E*-stilbene, and 84% Z when starting with the Z-stilbene. To exclude the possibility that the copper catalyst and/or heat was producing the observed isomerization, a control was run with the *O*-benzoylhydroxylamine removed from the reaction, but all other conditions held the same. In this case, 99%+ of each alkene was recovered with retention of the 99% geometric purities.

1.5 ¹H and ¹³C Spectra







S17









S21









S25




































































S59































































































































S123















































































































































S195












































