# A Multicomponent Route to Functionalized Amides and Oxazolidinones

Christopher G. McPherson, Alasdair K. Cooper, Andrius Bubliauskas, Paul Mulrainey, Craig Jamieson* and Allan J. B. Watson.

Department of Pure & Applied Chemistry, University of Strathclyde, 295 Cathedral Street, Glasgow, G1 1XL, UK.

Supporting Information Placeholder

15 examples
39 - 96%

33 examples
24 - 94%

ABSTRACT: An organobase-mediated, multicomponent reaction of unactivated esters, epoxides, and amines is reported, furnishing functionalized amide derivatives. A wide range of substrates are tolerated under the reaction conditions, including chiral epoxides, which react with no erosion of enantiopurity. Facile modification of the method, through replacing the ester derivative with dimethyl carbonate, enables access to the corresponding oxazolidinone derivatives.

The amide functional group is ubiquitous within nature and medicinal chemistry, where it is commonly encountered within peptide bonds in proteins and small-molecule drugs, respectively.[1,2] With approximately 25% of all registered drugs containing an amide bond,[3] formation of this motif is therefore one of the most widely performed reactions within the pharmaceutical industry.[4,5] As widely established methods for the synthesis of amides from carboxylic acids have significant drawbacks, particularly with regard to atom economy and sustainability, the development of mild and efficient approaches to synthesizing amide bonds is therefore a key objective in organic chemistry.[6] In recent years, several catalytic approaches have been reported seeking to address these issues, thereby minimizing the environmental impact of the process.[7-13]

Stoichiometric approaches allowing the direct conversion of esters to amides have also been developed, overcoming the use of protracted reaction times and elevated temperatures related to aminolysis.[14,15] In recent years, catalytic approaches enabling the aminolysis of esters have been reported, however drawbacks such as limited scope of the acylating species and the use of finite and toxic transition or rare earth metals have hindered their application.[16-22]

The use of multicomponent reactions (MCRs) is an attractive approach to synthesize complex and structurally diverse products rapidly from simple starting materials, with most, if not all, of the atoms retained in the final product.[23] When applied to amide bond formation, multicomponent reactions would offer an efficient and atom economical approach, mitigating the requirement for stoichiometric coupling reagents, and hence the formation of associated by-products.

Within our own laboratories a program focused on catalytic amidation has been developed, with the aim of addressing some of the outstanding issues still encountered with this important transformation.[24-29] During these studies we have recently reported an organobase-mediated process for the catalytic formation of amides from esters and amino alcohols (Scheme 1).[24,26]

**Scheme 1.** Relevant antecedence and proposed method.

This approach represented a mild, efficient and unprotracted synthesis of amides, utilizing catalytic quantities (10 mol %) of *tert*-butylimino-2-diethylamino-1,3-dimethylperhydro-1,3,2-diazaphosphorine (BEMP, **1**)[30] as a base. The reaction is proposed to proceed through an initial transesterification event mediated by BEMP, followed by a rearrangement to the thermodynamically more stable amide product.

Having successfully developed this original process, we envisaged that the utility of the reaction could be significantly extended to enable base-mediated amidation from epoxide, ester and amine inputs, thereby representing a multi-component process. Following on from our progenitor process, an amino alcohol, in this instance formed as an intermediate *via* the reaction of the epoxide and amine, would undergo a transesterification/rearrangement process to furnish the desired amide product (Scheme 1).

In the first instance, we commenced our investigation by applying the conditions used in our original process to a model reaction between glycidal phenyl ether **2**, benzylamine **3**, and methyl benzoate **4** (Table 1, entry 1). Unfortunately, this led to no observed formation of the desired amide product **5**. However, increasing the reaction temperature resulted in a consistent increase in conversion to the desired product with 71% isolated yield achieved at 100 °C (Table 1, entries 2 – 5). Decreasing the quantity of BEMP to 5 mol % had a deleterious effect on conversion with only 17% of the desired amide observed. (Table 1, entry 6) Further studies into altering the solvent and base used in the reaction were also performed, with a positive effect on reaction conversion noted.[31] Microwave heating was also examined but did not offer an advantage over thermal methods

Table 1. Reaction optimization**.**

entry	eeaction temperature (°C)	conversion (%)[a]
1	20	0
2	40	17
3	60	30
4	70	52
5	100	71[b]
6[c]	100	17

[a]Determined by HPLC using an internal calibrant. [b]Isolated yield. [c]Reaction performed with 5 mol % BEMP.

Following on from this short optimization campaign, the scope of the ester, amine and epoxide components were then investigated (Scheme 2), with each reaction carried out on a 1 mmol scale. In general, the products were formed as single regioisomer from opening of the epoxide, although in some cases exist as rotamers.

Scheme 2. Scope of amidation method.

5, R = H, 71%
6, R = 4-CF₃, 89%
7, R = 4-F, 58%
8, R = 4-Cl, 59%
9, R = 4-Br, 58%
10, R = 4-CN, 59%
11, R = 4-OMe, 38%
12, R = 3-OMe, 70%
13, R = 2-OMe, 33%
14, 94%
15, 51%
16, 59%
17, 41%
18, 52%
19, 0%
20, 54%
21, 89%
22, 93%
23, 96%
24, 96%
25, 73%
26, 0%
27, 91%
28, 35%
29, 28%
30, 29%
31, 0%
32, 54%
33, 24%
34, 41%
35, 69%
**36**, 90% ee = >99%
37, 69% ee = >99%

The incorporation of both electron-withdrawing and electron-donating substituents onto the aryl ring of the benzoate moiety is well tolerated, with the corresponding amides **6 - 13** formed in moderate to excellent yield. Homologation of the ester, affording compound **14**, leads to an improvement in yield to 94%, as expected owing to the increased electrophilicity of the carbonyl centre. Heteroaryl esters, specifically a furan **15** and thiophene **16,** were also tolerated within the reaction, furnishing the corresponding amides in moderate yield. Amino acid esters such as **17** were also compatible with the reaction manifold.

Examination of the amine component initially focused on increasing substitution at the α-position of the amine. It was found that increasing substitution at this position leads to a significant decrease in reaction efficiency with the methyl-substituted amine furnishing the corresponding amide **18** in 52% yield. Increasing the substitution further to the gem-dimethyl **19** led to no formation of the desired amide, implying that only limited substitution at this position is tolerated before the reaction is impeded as a result of increasing steric encumbrance. Substitution of the aromatic ring is also tolerated in moderate yields, furnishing amide **20**. Homologation of the amine affording amides **21** and **22** leads to excellent yields of 89 and 93%, respectively. Alkyl amines were also examined in the reaction manifold (**23 – 27**) with aminomethylcyclohexane **23**, propylamine **24**, butylamine **25** and 2-methoxyethylamine **27** found to react in good to excellent yields. However, *tert*-butylamine derivative **26** was an unsuccessful substrate, which is likely attributable to the increased steric bulk associated with the alkyl substituent.

In the last aspect of this phase of the study, the scope of the epoxide component was examined. Further examples of epoxides with aromatic components, **28** and **29**, were less efficient substrates when subjected to the optimum conditions, furnishing the corresponding amides in yields of 35 and 28%, respectively. Although these yields are comparatively lower than those reported above, it should be noted that the average yield per step (ring opening, transesterification, and amidation is still around 65%, with the reaction still maintaining the operational efficiencies associated with a mutli-component process. A range of aliphatic epoxides were then probed. Ethyl and *tert*-butyl substituents on the epoxide ring were first examined, with the ethyl substituted amide **30** formed in a moderate yield of 29%. The vinyl epoxide was found to be a competent substrate, with the resulting amide (**32**) formed in 54% yield. *tert*-Butyl glycidyl ether **33** led to amide formation in 24%. Compared to compound **31**, the *tert*-butyl group is more remote from the oxygen and nitrogen centers involved in the transesterification/rearrangement events potentially accounting for the enhancement in yield. Allyl glycidyl ether **34** was an acceptable substrate, furnishing the corresponding amide in 41%. Incorporation of a trifluoromethyl substituent directly on the epoxide ring results in the synthesis of corresponding amide **35** in a good yield of 69%. Two chiral epoxides were also subjected to the optimized conditions, (*S*)-styrene oxide **36** and (*S*)-glycidyl phenyl ether **37**, which performed with excellent and good yields, respectively, without any degradation in enantiopurity.

During optimization of the amidation process, it was noted that the use of dimethyl carbonate (DMC) as a solvent in lieu of acetonitrile only led to a 3% conversion to amide **5**.[32] However, HPLC analysis showed that full consumption of the amine, epoxide and corresponding amino alcohol had occurred forming a previously unobserved product, with little consumption of methyl benzoate detected. Upon isolation it was determined that the use of DMC in fact led to the preferential formation of an oxazolidinone moiety **38** in 95% yield (Scheme 3). Representing a second MCR utilising a similar transesterification-type/rearrangement process, and with oxazoldinone scaffolds an important class of antibiotic drug compounds,[33,34] a focused optimization undertaken was performed to further adapt the method toward the synthesis of oxazolidinones.

Scheme 3. Preferential formation of oxazolidinone **38**.

This effort resulted in the rapid identification of a set of generally applicable reaction conditions.[35] The current approach is therefore complimentary to a very recent report on organocatalyzed oxazolidinone formation,[36] however, it avoids the use of isocyanates, which are potential respiratory sensitizers.[38]

Scheme 4. Oxazolidinone substrate scope: [a] reaction performed in neat dimethyl carbonate (2 M).

With optimum conditions toward the synthesis of oxazolidinones successfully developed, the scope of this novel MCR was then examined (Scheme 4), again using a 1 mmol scale. As noted in the amide substrate scope, increasing substitution at the α-position of the amine leads to a significant decrease in the yield of the corresponding oxazolidinone products (**39** and

40). Homologation of the amine results in a decrease in yield from benzylamine **38** to 2-phenethylamine **41**, and a further reduction is observed when 3-phenylpropylamine **42** is subjected to the reaction conditions. Linear alkyl amines such as propylamine **43** are compatible with the reaction, whilst 2-methoxyethylamine undergoes near-complete conversion to the desired oxazolidinone **49**. Cyclic aliphatic amines are tolerated in moderate to excellent yield with cyclohexylamine **50** furnishing the desired oxazolidinone in 88% yield, and the tetrahydropyran derivative affording 47% of oxazolidinone **51**.

Considering the epoxide substrate scope, substitution of the phenyl (**47**) results in a comparable yield to the original substrate **38**. Shortening the epoxide component by applying styrene oxide to the optimized conditions affords oxazolidinone **48** in an excellent yield of 96%. Ether-containing epoxides are also tolerated with *tert*-butyl glycidyl ether **49** proving to be a competent substrate, and allyl glycidyl ether performs well to furnish compound **50** in excellent yield. Again, as for the amide protocol, the presence of a trifluoromethyl group directly on the epoxide ring is tolerated in the reaction, with product **51** formed in an excellent yield of 92%. Lastly, the use of (*S*)-glycidyl phenyl ether afforded the chiral epoxide **52** in a comparable yield to the racemate, with no erosion in enantiopurity observed.

In summary, through further development of our previously developed amidation method,[24-26] we have successfully crafted a multi-component approach to amide bond formation in a highly atom economical manner. Additionally, as only catalytic quantities of base are required for the reaction to proceed, this is a distinct advantage over widely employed amide bond-forming conditions where stoichiometric coupling reagents are employed. Adaptation of the optimized reaction conditions also extends the application of the method to allow the synthesis of oxazolidinone moieties, which are important scaffolds in small molecule drug discovery.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information Available

Experimental procedures and spectroscopic data for all products. This material is available free of charge *via* the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

* Craig Jamieson, craig.jamieson@strath.ac.uk

Author Contributions

All authors have given approval to the final version of the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

1. Sewald, N.; Jakubke, H. D, *Peptides: Chemistry and Biology, 2nd edition,* Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2009.
2. Birman, V.R.; Bode, J. W. *Nature*, **2011**, *480*, 471.
3. Ghose, A. K.; Viswanadhan, V. N.; Wendoloski, J. J. *J. Comb. Chem.*, **1999**, *1*, 55
4. Roughley, S. D.; Jordan, A. M. *J. Med. Chem.*, **2011**, *54*, 3451
5. Cooper, T. W. J.; Campbell, I. B.; Macdonald, S. J. F. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, **2010**, *49*, 8082
6. For reviews, see: (a) El-Faham, A.; Albericio, F. *Chem. Rev.*, **2011**, *111*, 6557; (b) Valeur, E.; Bradley, M. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2009**, *38*, 606; (c) Montalbetti, C. A. G. N.; Falque, V. *Tetrahedron*, **2005**, *61*, 10827.
7. For reviews, see: (a) Lanigan, R. M.; Sheppard, T. D. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.*, **2013**, 7453; (b) Lundberg, H.; Tinnis, F.; Selander, N.; Adolfsson, H. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2014**, *43*, 2714
8. Allen, C. L.; Chhatwal, R.; Williams, J. M. J. *Chem. Commun.,* **2012**, *48*, 666
9. Lenstra, D. C.; Rutjes, F. P. T. J.; Mecinovic, J. *Chem. Commun.*, **2014**, *50*, 5763
10. Gunanathan, C.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. *Science*, **2007**, *317*, 790
11. Seo, S.; Marks, T. J. *Org. Lett.*, **2008**, *10*, 317
12. Arnold, K.; Batsanov, A. S.; Davies, B.; Whiting, A. *Green Chem.*, **2008**, *10*, 124
13. Gernigon, N.; Al-Zoubi, R. M.; Hall, D. G. *J. Org. Chem.*, **2012**, *77*, 8386
14. Basha, A.; Lipton, M.; Weinreb, S. *Tetrahedron Lett.*, **1977**, 4171
15. Ishihara, K.; Kuroki, Y.; Hanaki, N.; Ohara, S.; Yamamoto, H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **1996**, *118*, 1569
16. Ohshima, T.; Hayashi, Y.; Agura, K.; Fujii, Y.; Yoshiyama, A.; Mashima, K. *Chem. Commun.*, **2012**, *48*, 5434.
17. Morimoto, H.; Fujiwara, R.; Shimizu, Y.; Morisaki, K.; Ohshima, T. *Org. Lett.*, **2014**, *16*, 2018
18. Price, K. E.; Larrivee-Aboussafy, C.; Lillie, B. M.; McLaughlin, R. W.; Mustakas, J.; Hettenbach, K. W.; Hawkins, J. M.; Vaidyanathan, R. *Org. Lett.*, **2009**, *11*, 2003.
19. Weiberth, F. J.; Yu, Y.; Subotkowski, W.; Pemberton, C. *Org. Process Res. Dev.*, **2012**, 16, 1697.
20. Yang, X.; Birman, V. *Org. Lett.*, **2009**, *11*, 1499.
21. Han, C.; Lee, J. P.; Lobkovsky, E.; Porco, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2005**, *127*, 10039
22. Hie, L.; Fine Nathel, N. F.; Hong, X.; Yang, Y.; Houk, K. N.; Garg, N. K. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, **2016**, *55*, 2810
23. For reviews, see: (a) Armstrong, R. W.; Combs, A. P.; Tempest, P. A.; Brown, S. D.; Keating, T. A. *Acc. Chem. Res.*, **1996**, *29*, 123; (b) Weber, L.; Illgen, K.; Almstetter, M. *Synlett*, **1999**, *3*, 366; (c) Dömling, A.; Ugi, I. *Angew. Chemie. Int. Ed.*, **2000**, *39*, 3168; (d) Dömling, A. *Chem. Rev.*, **2006**, *106*, 17
24. Caldwell, N.; Jamieson, C.; Simpson, I.; Tuttle, T. *Org. Lett.*, **2013**, *15*, 2506
25. Caldwell, N.; Jamieson, C.; Simpson I.; Watson, A. J. B. A*CS Sustain. Chem. Eng.*, **2013**, *1*, 1339
26. Caldwell, N.; Campbell, P. S.; Jamieson, C.; Potjewyd, F.; Simpson, I.; Watson, A. J. B. *J. Org. Chem.*, **2014**, *79*, 9347
27. Caldwell, N.; Jamieson, C.; Simpson, I.; Watson, A. J. B. *Chem. Commun.,* **2015**, *51*, 9495
28. McPherson, C. G.; Livingstone, K.; Jamieson, C.; Simpson, I. *Synlett*, **2016**, *27*, 88
29. McPherson, C. G.; Caldwell, N.; Jamieson, C.; Simpson, I.; Watson, A. J. B. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, **2017**, *15*, 3507
30. Schwesinger, R.; Schlemper, H. *Angew. Chemie. Int. Ed.*, **1987**, *26*, 1167
31. See Table S4, Supporting Information
32. See Table S2, Supporting Information
33. Zurenko, G. E.; Gibson, J. K.; Shinabarger, D. L.; Aristoff, P. A.; Ford, C. W.; Tarpley, W. G. *Curr. Opin. Pharmacol.*, **2001**, *1*, 470
34. Ford, C. W.; Hamel, J. C.; Stapert, D.; Moerman, J. K.; Hutchinson, D. K.; Barbachyn, M. R.; Zurenko, G. E. *Trends Microbiology*, **1997**, *5*, 196
35. See Table S5, Supporting Information
36. Toda, Y.; Gomu, S.; Tanaka, S.; Komiyama, Y.; Kikuchi, A.; Suga, H.; *Org. Lett.* **2017**, *19*, DOI: 10.1021/acs.orglett.7b02722
37. Rattray, N. J.; Botham, P. A.; Hext, P. M.; Woodcock, D. R.; Fielding, I.; Dearman, R. J.; Kimber, I.; *Toxicology*, **1994**, *88*, 15.