

Selective conversion of primary amides to esters promoted by KHSO₄

Narsimha Sattenapally, Jhanvi Sharma, and Yuqing Hou*

Meyers Institute for Interdisciplinary Research in Organic and Medicinal Chemistry, and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901 USA

Email: huyq@siu.edu


Received 11-13-2017

Accepted 04-15-2018

Published on line 06-17-2018

Abstract

Primary amides, either aliphatic or aromatic, are easily converted to the corresponding esters via reflux in lower primary alcohols in the presence of KHSO₄. Secondary amides lead to complicated mixtures under analogous conditions, whereas tertiary amides were inert. Use of isopropyl alcohol resulted in the formation of product at slower rate and lower yield along with side products, whereas, use of tertiary alcohols did not give successful conversion and allyl and benzyl alcohol provided complex mixtures.




Keywords: Amide, ester, alcoholysis, KHSO₄, selective conversion

Introduction

Carboxylic acids and their derivatives, such as amides and esters, play important roles in nature as well as in artificial chemicals. The interconversion of these derivatives is a frequently encountered transformation by chemists. Not surprisingly, the conversion of carboxylic acids or esters to amides proceeds usually much easier than the reverse process, due to the high stability of the amide functionality, which has been well utilized by nature to build the back bone of protein structures. The hydrolysis of amides to carboxylic acids usually requires strongly acidic or basic conditions,^{1,2} enzymatic,³ or metal catalysis,⁴ except in special cases where N-C=O conjugation is prevented because of constraint⁵ or where the nitrogen is a part of a heterocyclic structure such as imidazole.⁶ Similarly, strongly acidic conditions are usually required to effect the alcoholysis of amides to esters. Examples include the use of HCl gas,^{7,8} BF₃ gas,⁹ SOCl₂,¹⁰ Me₃SiCl,¹¹ nitrite/Me₃SiCl,¹² or TsOH.H₂O¹³ for such transformations. Additionally, TiCl₄, in combination with one equiv of aqueous HCl, was found to catalyze conversion of amides to esters.¹⁴ More recently, Zn(OTf)₂ has been reported to catalyze the esterification of a special type of amides, β -hydroxyethylamides.¹⁵ Acidic Amberlyst resins¹⁶ have been reported as milder reagents to convert amides and hydrazides to esters, which required up to 168 h of heating to achieve good yields in some instances. Truly mild reaction and selective conversion has been only achieved with enzymatic method.¹⁷ Thus, milder, economical, selective, and convenient methods to convert amides to esters are still in need.

Previously, it has been reported that carboxamides go through Hofmann rearrangement in the presence of Oxone® and catalytic amount of *o*-*t*-butyliodobenzene in refluxing methanol.¹⁸ Interestingly, when 2-phenoxyacetamide (**1a**) was treated under such conditions, methyl 2-phenoxyacetate (**2a**) was also obtained in 24% yield as a side product (Scheme 1). Further experiments showed that this was not a specific reaction that only occurred with **1a**. It also occurred with other aliphatic amides, but not with aromatic amides under analogous reaction conditions. We decided to explore the scope and limit of the reaction and wish to report the results of this study herein.



Scheme 1. Treatment of **1a** with Oxone/*o*-*t*-butyliodobenzene (cat.) in MeOH.


Results and Discussion

It was at first questioned how this reaction proceeded and the role of each reagent. Tests showed that *o*-*t*-butyliodobenzene was not needed for the esterification. Furthermore, replacing Oxone with KHSO₄ led to the formation of the product in higher yield. Thus, it was concluded that this was an acid promoted alcoholysis of the amides, which became the focus of the study. Optimization of the reaction was carried out with 2-(naphthalen-1-yl)acetamide (**1b**) and 4, 6, 8, and 10 equivalents of KHSO₄ in refluxing methanol (Table 1). The reaction was complete in 12 h when 8 equiv of KHSO₄ were used. Higher excess of KHSO₄ did not increase the yield, nor shorten the reaction time. Microwave irradiation at 90 °C did not seem to accelerate the reaction much. Remarkably, with KHSO₄, the methyl ester was the only product and the pure product can be obtained

by trituration of the semi-solid residue with a suitable organic solvent after removal of methanol in vacuo, whereas with Oxone, a few side products, although in tiny quantities, were also produced, which necessitates a column chromatography purification process to obtain the pure product.

Subsequently, the reaction of various amides with methanol was explored under optimized conditions (Table 2). Generally, the reaction went faster with aliphatic amides (Table 2, entries 1 - 4), and slower with aromatic amides (Table 2, entries 5 - 14). It should also be noted that the reaction was very sluggish with secondary amides, and did not proceed at all with the tertiary amide tested. Additionally, no reaction was observed when sulfonamide or benzonitrile was used instead of carboxamides.

Table 1. Optimization of reaction conditions with **1b** and KHSO₄ in refluxing methanol

			
	1b		2b
Entry	Equiv of KHSO ₄	Reaction time (h)	Isolated yield (%)
1	4	24	71
2	6	17	100
3	8	12	100
4	10	12	91
5 ^a	8	5	33

^aMicrowave reactor was used for this reaction at 90 °C.

Table 2. Conversion of amides to methyl esters with methanol/KHSO₄ at 65 °C




















Entry	Amide	Structure	Reaction time (h)	Yield (%)
1	1a		14	86
2	1b		12	100
3	1c		14	93
4	1d		16	93
5	1e		48	88
6	1f		24	86

Table 2. Continued

Entry	Amide	Structure	Reaction time (h)	Yield (%)
7	1g		60	78
8	1g		60	86
9	1i		36	90
10	1j		48	91
11	1k		72	89
12	1l		60	92
13	1m		72	90
14	1n		48	83
15	1o		48	Trace
16	1p		48	Trace
17	1q		48	0
18	1r		16	0
19	1s		24	0

It was then tested whether this method works with other alcohols with **1f** (Table 3). The method provided the corresponding esters in high yields for primary alcohols, and a moderate yield with isopropyl alcohol in 48 h. No product was observed with *t*-butyl alcohol, while allyl alcohol and benzyl alcohol provided complex mixture. A possible explanation for this was due to water formation from these alcohols, via either intramolecular or intermolecular dehydration (*vide infra*), in the presence of KHSO₄. Surprisingly, ethylene glycol also produced only a trace of ester. Unlike other primary alcohols, however, ethylene glycol (15 mL) dissolved all KHSO₄ (1.1 g) when heated to 85 °C, which prompted us that the reaction occurred at the surface of the solid KHSO₄, not in solution. Indeed, adding water to the reaction system significantly slowed down the reaction (entry 12, table 3 vs. entry 1, table 3). It should be noted that **1f** did not dissolve well in MeOH/H₂O (2:1). To exclude the possibility that low solubility of **1f** in MeOH/H₂O caused the low yield, we also tested **1n** with MeOH/H₂O (2:1), where all **1n** dissolved in the mixed solvent. Again, lower conversion rate was observed.

When treated with water, **1n** was hydrolyzed to the corresponding carboxylic acid only in 34% in 48 h. Similar treatment of **1a**, an aliphatic amide with good water solubility, produced the carboxylic acid in 100% yield in 48 h, confirming our observation that aliphatic amides reacted faster than aromatic amides (Table 2). These observations support the explanation that water formation from alcohols was a possible cause for the lower yield or no product formation when dehydration of alcohols is significant.

Table 3. Alcoholysis (hydrolysis) of selected amides in the presence of solid KHSO₄

$\text{RCONH}_2 \xrightarrow[\text{R'OH, heat, 48 h}]{\text{KHSO}_4} \text{RCO}_2\text{R}'$ 1 2					
Entry	Amide	Solvent	Temp.(°C)	Product 2	Yield (%)
1	1f	Methanol	65	2f , R'=Me	86
2		Ethanol	78	2fa , R'=Et	92
3		2-Chloroethanol	127	2fb , R'=2-ClEt	83
4		Isopropyl alcohol	83	2fc , R'=i-Pr	34
5		<i>t</i> -Butyl alcohol	82	0	0
6		Allyl alcohol	97		Complex mixture
7		Benzyl alcohol	85	Complex mixture	
8		<i>n</i> -Propanol	97	2fd R'=1-Pr	77
9		<i>n</i> -Butanol	118	2fe R'=1-Bu	75
10		Ethylene glycol ^a	85	trace	
11		Ethylene glycol-acetonitrile (1:5)	85	trace	
12		Methanol-Water (2:1)	65	2f 15 ^a	41^b
13	1n	Methanol-Water (2:1)	65	2n	60^b
14		Water ^b	100	2n	0^b
15	1a	Water ^b	100	2a	0^b

^aAll KHSO₄ was dissolved during the reaction. ^bThe corresponding carboxylic acids, 2-naphthoic acid, *m*-toluic acid, and phenoxyacetic acid, were obtained in 15%, 25%, 34%, and 100% respectively.

KHSO₄ is easily available, inexpensive, safe, and non-toxic reagent and has been known to catalyze organic reactions, such as acetal formation, Michael addition, heterocycle formation.²⁰ Goswami et al.²¹ also reported that KHSO₄-SiO₂-MeOH deprotects efficiently esters to alcohols, presumably through trans-esterification reaction. HSO₄⁻ has a pKa of 1.99¹⁹ and is considered as a medium-strength acid. Thus, this is a milder method to convert amides, particularly primary amides, to esters of primary alcohols, comparing to reported methods.^{7-14,16} We tested this method on some compounds with two or more amide (carbamate) functionalities (Table 4) to study the selectivity of this method. Boc and acetyl protection groups were removed under the reaction condition (entries 1, 3, 4, table 4), while most of Cbz and benzoyl protection groups remained (entries 2, 5 - 8, table 4). It is interesting to note that this method showed good selectivity towards primary amides, which is understandable since the reaction probably occurred at the surface of the solid KHSO₄ and primary amides are more accessible due to less steric hindrance. We also tested our reaction

on chiral amides. The *ee* value of **3g** (Entry 7, Table 4) was determined via optical rotation to be 86%, indicating a 7% racemization during the esterification process.

Table 4. Selectivity of solid KHSO₄ promoted amide alcoholysis in refluxing alcohol

Entry	Amide	Alcohol	Time (h)	Product code	Product structure	Yield (%)
1		MeOH	48	3a		25 ^a
2		MeOH	48	3b		0
3		MeOH	48	3c		35 ^b
4		EtOH	48	3d		93
5		MeOH	48	3e		39
6		EtOH	48	3f		55 ^c
7		MeOH	25	3g		72
8		MeOH	24	3h		43
				3ha		18

^aThe Boc protection group was lost during the reaction and the product was recovered by treating the crude residue with K₂CO₃/Boc₂O in methanol. ^bYield after recrystallization from 1:1 hexanes/ethyl acetate. ^c29% starting amide was recovered.

Conclusions

It has been demonstrated that primary amides, either aliphatic or aromatic, when treated with a primary alcohol in the presence of solid KHSO₄, are converted very easily the corresponding esters via rather simple workup. This method also selectively converts primary amides into the corresponding esters in the presence of secondary amides. Solid KHSO₄ promotes the reaction faster than dissolved KHSO₄. The observed selectivity

is possibly due to steric hindrance.. Only slight racemization was observed when an optically active amide was converted to the methyl ester.

Experimental Section

Typical alcoholysis procedure. A mixture of the amide (**1**, 1 mmol), alcohol (15 mL), and pulverized potassium bisulfate (1.1 g, 8 mmol) was refluxed for the specified time. The alcohol was removed in vacuo and the residue was triturated with hexanes (or other appropriate solvent such as DCM or ethyl acetate to dissolve the product). Removal of hexanes in vacuo provided the following pure products.

2a.²² ¹H NMR: δ 3.81 (s, 3 H), 4.64 (s, 2 H), 6.91 (m, 2 H), 7.00 (m, 1 H), 7.30 (m, 2 H).

2b.¹⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 3.64 (s, 2 H), 3.70 (s, 3 H), 7.30 (m, 5 H).

2c.²³ ¹H NMR: δ 3.68 (s, 3 H), 4.09 (s, 2 H), 7.42 (m, 2 H), 7.51 (m, 2 H), 7.80 (dd, *J* 2.0, 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.87 (dd, *J* 1.6, 8.0 Hz, 1 H), 7.99 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 1 H).

2d.²³ ¹H NMR: δ 3.57 (s, 2 H), 3.69 (s, 3 H), 3.79 (s, 3 H), 6.86 (d, *J* 8.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.20 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H).

2e.²⁵ ¹H NMR: δ 3.74 (s, 3 H), 5.03 (s, 1 H), 7.24-7.34 (m, 10 H).

2f.²⁵ ¹H NMR: δ 3.99 (s, 3 H), 7.57 (m, 2 H), 7.88 (d, *J* 8.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.95 (d, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 8.06 (dd, *J* 1.6, 8.8 Hz, 1 H), 8.62 (s, 1 H).

2g.²⁶ ¹H NMR: δ 3.94 (s, 3 H), 7.40 (m, 1 H), 7.47 (m, 2 H), 7.63 (m, 2 H), 7.67 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 8.11 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H).

2h.²⁷ ¹H NMR: δ 3.93 (s, 3 H), 7.31 (m, 1 H), 7.63 (ddd, *J* 2.0, 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.68 (ddd, *J* 1.6, 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.75 (dd, *J* 2.0, 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.92 (dd, *J* 1.6, 7.6 Hz, 1 H).

2i.²⁴ ¹H NMR: δ 3.96 (s, 3 H), 7.59 (m, *J* 1 H), 7.82 (m, 1 H), 8.23 (m, 1 H), 8.31 (m, 1 H).

2j.¹⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 2.41 (s, 3 H), 3.90 (s, 3 H), 7.23 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.93 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H).

2k.²⁸ ¹H NMR: δ 3.94 (s, 3 H), 7.31 (m, 1 H), 7.43 (m, 2 H), 7.82 (dd, *J* 1.6, 8.0 Hz, 1 H).

2l.¹⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 3.91 (s, 3 H), 7.41 (d, *J* 8.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.97 (d, 2 H).

2m.²⁵ ¹H NMR: δ 3.86 (s, 3 H), 3.88 (s, 3 H), 6.91 (d, *J* 9.2 Hz, 2 H), 7.99 (d, 2 H).

2n.¹⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 2.4 (s, 3 H), 3.91 (s, 3 H), 7.32 (dd, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.36 (m, 1 H), 7.84 (m, 1 H), 7.86 (m, 1 H).

2fa.²⁹ ¹H NMR: δ 1.45 (t, *J* 7.2 Hz, 3 H), 4.45 (q, *J* 7.2 Hz, 2 H), 7.57 (m, 2 H), 7.88 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.96 (d, *J* 8 Hz, 1 H), 8.07 (dd, *J* 2.0, 8.8 Hz, 1 H), 8.61 (s, 1 H).

2fb. White solid, mp: 27-29 °C. ¹H NMR: δ 3.87 (m, 2 H), 4.64 (m, 2H), 7.58 (m, 2 H), 7.89 (m, 2 H), 7.97 (d, *J* 8.0 Hz, 1 H), 8.08 (dd, *J* 1.6, 8.8 Hz, 1 H), 8.64(s, 1 H); ¹³C: δ 41.7, 64.6, 125.2, 126.7, 126.8, 127.8, 128.3, 128.4, 129.4, 131.4, 132.4, 135.7, 166.4; HRMS (EI) calcd. for C₁₃H₁₁ClO₂: 234.0448; found: 234.0445.

2fc. ¹H NMR: δ 1.43 (d, *J* 6.0 Hz, 6 H), 5.33 (hept, *J* 6.0 Hz, 2 H), 7.56 (m, 2 H), 7.87 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.96 (d, *J* 8 Hz, 1 H), 8.07 (dd, *J* 2.0, 8.4 Hz, 1 H), 8.60 (s, 1 H); ¹³C: δ 22.0, 68.5, 125.3, 126.6, 127.7, 128.0, 128.10, 128.12, 129.3, 130.9, 132.5, 135.4, 166.3.

2fd.³⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 1.08 (t, *J* 7.2 Hz, 3 H), 1.85 (m, 2 H), 4.35 (t, *J* 6.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.57 (m, 2 H), 7.88 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.96 (d, *J* 8 Hz, 1 H), 8.07 (dd, *J* 2.0, 8.8 Hz, 1 H), 8.62 (s, 1 H).

2fe.³¹ ¹H NMR: δ 1.01 (t, *J* 7.2 Hz, 3 H), 1.53 (m, 2 H), 1.81 (m, 2 H), 4.40 (t, *J* 6.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.57 (m, 2 H), 7.88 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.96 (d, *J* 8 Hz, 1 H), 8.07 (dd, *J* 1.6, 8.8 Hz, 1 H), 8.61 (s, 1 H).

Phenoxyacetic acid.³² ¹H NMR: δ 4.70 (s, 2 H), 6.93(dd, *J* 0.8, 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.03(dd, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.32(dd, *J* 7.6, 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 8.89 (br s, 1 H).

2-Naphthoic acid.³³ ¹H NMR (DMSO-d₆): δ 7.61 (m, 2 H), 7.97 (m, 3 H), 8.10 (d, *J* 8.0 Hz, 1 H), 8.59 (s, 1 H), 13.06 (br s, 1 H).

m-Toluic acid.³⁴ ¹H NMR (DMSO-d₆): δ 2.34 (s, 3 H), 7.35 (dd, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 7.41 (d, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.72 (d, *J* 7.2 Hz), 1 H), 7.75 (s, 1 H), 12.86 (s, 1 H); ¹³C: 21.3, 126.9, 128.9, 130.2, 131.1, 133.9, 138.3, 167.8.

3a.³⁵ ¹H NMR: δ 1.23 (m, 1 H), 1.44 (m, 9 H), 1.65 (m, 4 H), 2.19 (m, 1 H), 2.93 (m, 1 H), 3.71 (s, 3 H), 3.96 (m, 1 H), 4.89 (m, 1 H).

3c.³⁶ ¹H NMR: δ 3.85 (s, 3 H), 4.03 (br. s, 2 H), 6.64 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.85 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H); ¹³C: δ 51.6, 113.8, 119.7, 131.6, 150.8, 167.2

3d.³⁷ ¹H NMR: δ 1.36 (t, 3 H), 4.09 (br. s, 2 H), 4.31 (q, *J* 7.2 Hz, 2 H), 6.64 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.85 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H).

3e.³⁸ ¹H NMR: δ 8.066 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.96 (bs, 1 H), 7.88 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.74 (d, *J* 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.61-7.56 (m, 1 H), 7.53-7.49 (m, 2 H), 3.92 (s, 3 H)

¹³C NMR: δ 52.1, 119.2, 125.8, 127.1, 128.9, 130.9, 132.2, 134.5, 142.1, 165.8, 166.6

3f.³⁹ ¹H NMR: δ 1.31 (t, *J* 7.2 Hz, 3 H), 4.28 (q, *J* 7.2 Hz, 2 H), 7.54 (m, 2 H), 7.59 (m, 1 H), 7.94 (m, 6 H), 10.55 (s, 1 H); ¹³C (DMSO): 14.7, 60.9, 120.0, 125.0, 128.2, 128.9, 130.5, 132.3, 135.0, 144.1, 165.8, 166.4.

3g.⁴⁰ ¹H NMR: δ 7.78 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.51-7.47 (m, 1 H), 7.44-7.39 (m, 2 H), 6.54 (d, *J* 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 4.90-4.85 (m, 1 H), 3.77 (s, 3 H), 1.80-1.63 (m, 2 H), 0.97(t, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 6 H); ¹³C NMR: δ 22.0, 22.8, 24.9, 51.2, 52.4, 127.1, 128.6, 131.7, 133.9, 167.2, 173.8. *ee*, 85.6%.

3h.⁴¹ ¹H NMR δ 0.89 (d, *J* 5.6, 6 H), 1.61-1.48 (m, 3 H), 3.66 (s, 3H), 3.89 (m, 2 H), 4.62-4.56 (m, 1 H), 5.08 (s, 2 H), 5.90 (bs, 1 H), 6.97 (bs, 1 H), 7.26-7.31 (m, 5 H); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 21.8, 22.75, 24.76, 25.0, 41.2, 44.3, 50.7, 52.3, 67.1, 128.1, 128.3, 128.5, 136.2, 156.7, 169.3, 173.4

3ha.²⁵ ¹H NMR: δ 7.32-7.30 (m, 5 H), 5.31 (bs, 1 H), 5.13 (s, 2 H), 3.98 (d, *J* 5.6 Hz, 2 H), 3.8 (s, 3 H). ¹³C: δ 42.6, 52.3, 67.1, 128.1, 128.2, 128.5, 136.2, 156.3, 170.5.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this work was provided by Meyers Institute for Interdisciplinary Research in Organic and Medicinal Chemistry, Southern Illinois University Carbondale. We thank Dr. Duy H. Hua and Jianyu Lu at Department of Chemistry, Kansas State University for measuring the optical rotation of **3g**.

References

- O'Connor, C. *Quarterly Rev. Chem. Soc.* **1970**, *24*, 553-564.
<https://doi.org/10.1039/qr9702400553>
- Cox, R.A. *Can. J. Chem.* **2005**, *83*, 1391-1399.
<https://doi.org/10.1139/v05-142>
- Sharma, M.; Sharma, N.N.; Bhalla, T.C. *Rev. Environ. Sci. Biotechnol.* **2009**, *8*, 343-366.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-009-9175-x>
- Hegg, E.L.; Burstyn, J.N. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1998**, *173*, 133-165.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8545\(98\)00157-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8545(98)00157-X)
- Szostak, M.; Aube, J. *Chem. Rev.* **2013**, *113*, 5701-5765.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/cr4000144>
- Fife, T.H. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1993**, *26*, 326-331.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ar00030a005>
- H. A. Taylor, T. W. Davis, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1928**, *32*, 1467-1480.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/j150292a003>

8. E. Emmet Reid, *Am. Chem. J.* **1909**, *41*, 483–510.
9. Sowa, F. J., Toole, S. G. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1937**, *58*, 1971 - 1973.
10. Li, L.-C., Ren, J., Liao, T.-G., Jiang, J.-X., Zhu, H.-J. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, 1026–1030.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejoc.200600853>
11. Xue, C.; Luo, F.-T. *J. Chinese Chem. Soc.*, **2004**, *51*, 359-362
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jccs.200400055>
12. Lee, J. G., Seo, Y. S. *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *16*, 377-379.
13. Taber, D.F.; Rahimizadeh, M. *J. Org. Chem.* **1992**, *57*, 4037-4038.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/jo00040a061>
14. Fisher, L., Caroons, J. M., Satbler, R., Lundberg, R., Zaidi, S., Sorensen, C. M., Sparacino, M. L., Muchowski, J. M. *Can. J. Chem.* **1994**, *72*, 142-145.
<https://doi.org/10.1139/v94-022>
15. Kita, Y.; Nishii, Y.; Higuchi, T.; Mashima, K. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 5723–5726.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201201789>
16. Greenlee, W. J., Thorsett, E. D. *J. Org. Chem.* **1981**, *46*, 5351-5353.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/jo00339a019>
17. Meos, H., Haga, M., Tōugu, V. *Tetra. Lett.* **1995**, *36*, 2343-2346.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-4039\(95\)00251-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-4039(95)00251-7)
18. Sattenapally, N.; Potturi, H.K.; Sharma, J.; Hou, Y. Abstracts of Papers, 245th ACS National Meeting & Exposition, New Orleans, LA, United States, April 7-11, 2013 ORGN-367.
19. Smith, M.B.; March, J. *Advanced Organic Chemistry. Reactions, Mechanisms, and Structure.* Wiley 6th Ed. Wiley-Interscience; CRC: Boca Raton, FL, 1993; pp 57-67.
20. Baghernejad, B. *Eur. J. Chem.* **2012**, *3*, 125-128.
<https://doi.org/10.5155/eurjchem.3.1.125-128.182>
21. Goswami, A.; Das, R.N.; Borthakur, N. *Ind. J. Chem.* **2007**, *46B*, 1893-1895.
22. AIST: Integrated Spectral Database System of Organic Compounds. (Data were obtained from the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (Japan))
23. Huddar, S.N.; Deshmukh, S.S.; Akamanchi, K.G. *ARKIVOC* **2011**, 67-71.
24. Xu, J.; Luo, D.-F.; Xiao, B.; Liu, Z.-J.; Gong, T.-J.; Liu, L. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, 47, 4300-4302.
<https://doi.org/10.1039/c1cc10359h>
25. Heller, S.T.; Sarpong, R. *Org. Lett.* **2010**, *12*, 4572-4575.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ol1018882>
26. Ackermann, L.; Christian J. Gschrei, C.J.; Althammer, A.; Riederer, M. *Chem. Commun.* **2006**, 1419-1421.
27. Wu, X.-F.; Darcel, C. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, 1144-1147.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejoc.200801176>
28. Kaganovsky, L.; Gelman, D.; Rueck-Braun, K. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2010**, *695*, 260-266.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2009.10.001>
29. Zhao, Y.; Jin, L.; Li, P.; Lei, A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 9429-9433.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ja801116s>
30. Gowrisankar, S.; Neumann, H.; Beller, M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 5139-5143.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201008035>
31. Maki, B.E.; Chan, A.; Phillips, E.M.; Scheidt, K.A. *Org. Lett.* **2007**, *9*, 371-374.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ol062940f>

32. Jimenez, F.; Cruz, M.d.C.; Zuniga, C.; Martinez, M.A.; Chamorro, G.; Diaz, F.; Tamariz, J. *Med. Chem. Res.* **2010**, *19*, 33-57.
33. Bonvin, Y.; Callens, E.; Larrosa, I.; Henderson, D.A.; Oldham, J.; Burton, A.J.; Barrett, A.G.M. *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 4549-4552.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ol051765k>
34. Kobayashi, K.; Kondo, Y. *Org. Lett.* **2009**, *11*, 2035-2037.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ol900528h>
35. Soicke, A.; Reuter, C.; Winter, M.; Neudoerfl, J.-M.; Schloerer, N.; Kuehne, R.; Schmalz, H.-G. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, 6467-6480.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejoc.201402737>
36. Yang, H.; Li, Y.; Jiang, M.; Wang, J.; Fu, H. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2011**, *17*, 5652-5660.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.201003711>
37. Banik, B.K.; Banik, I.; Becker, F.F. *Org. Syn.* **2005**, *81*, 188-194.
<https://doi.org/10.15227/orgsyn.081.0188>
38. Yamane, M.; Ren, W. J. *J. Org. Chem.*, **2010**, *75*, 8410-8415.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/jo101611g>
39. Miura, T.; Takahashi, Y.; Murakami, M. *Chem. Commun.* **2007**, 3577-3579.
<https://doi.org/10.1039/b709203b>
40. Karnik, Anil V.; Kamath, Suchitra S. *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, *72*, 7435-7438.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/jo070962p>
41. Whitteck, J.T.; Ni, W.; Griffin, B.M.; Eliot, A.C.; Thomas, P.M.; Kelleher, N.L.; Metcalf, W.W.; van der Donk, W.A. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 9089-9092.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.200703810>