

If C–H Bonds Could Talk: Selective C–H Bond Oxidation

Timothy Newhouse and Phil S. Baran*

C–H activation · natural products · synthesis design · synthetic methods

C–H oxidation has a long history and an ongoing presence in research at the forefront of chemistry and interrelated fields. As such, numerous highly useful articles and reviews have been written on this subject. Logically, these are generally written from the perspective of the scope and limitations of the reagents employed. This Minireview instead attempts to emphasize chemoselectivity imposed by the nature of the substrate. Consequently, many landmark discoveries in the field of C–H oxidation are not discussed, but hopefully the perspective taken herein will allow C–H oxidation reactions to be more readily incorporated into synthetic planning.

1. Introduction

It has been a widely recognized fact that nature's use of C–H activation reactions and strategies have contributed to the "ideality" of biosynthesis.^[1] Not surprisingly, there are fundamental advantages to incorporating such logic in chemical synthesis, specifically from the vantage point of synthesis economy.^[2] To plan a retrosynthetic analysis of a complex natural product that strategically employs a C–H oxidation step,^[3] the innate reactivity of such bonds must be intimately understood. Over the past century, an enormous body of literature has provided a foundation for "peering into the eyes" of C–H bonds.^[4–8] If C–H bonds could talk, what stories would they tell? The purpose of this Minireview is to compile some of those stories inferred from the literature. From these stories, the factors that dictate the inherent preferences of C(sp²)–H and C(sp³)–H bonds in diverse settings are illuminated: inductive effects, conjugation, hyperconjugation, steric hindrance, and strain release.

2. Inductive Effects


Through-bond effects are a major factor in determining the electronic character of C–H bonds, which largely

dominates their propensity to be oxidized. Since the vast majority of nonmetal C–H activation reagents are electrophilic, the more electron rich a C–H bond is, the more easily it is oxidized. One of the most dominant factors that affects the rate of C–H bond oxidation is the presence of electron-withdrawing groups (EWGs) on a substrate. Both the extent of electron withdrawal and distance from the EWG can modulate its influence on the selectivity of an oxidation reaction.

Scheme 1 illustrates the effects of electron-donating and -withdrawing groups through a number of examples. In compound **1** it is shown that the most electron-rich position is oxidized (i.e. the tertiary position). For nonmetal insertion pathways the reactivity trend is typically: tertiary > secondary > primary and has been understood as such for some time.^[9] The effect of electron-withdrawing groups is also a well-studied phenomenon, and in the radical chlorination of **2** the effect of the ester functionality is shown.^[10] More-selective radical halogenation reactions have subsequently been developed, as is the case for the oxidation of compound **3**.^[11]

Similarly, compound **4** has three methylene units and the least electron deficient position is the one that is oxidized.^[12] While the methyl group is more distal to the EWG, it has one fewer electron-donating alkyl groups and is, therefore, left unscathed. As with compounds **5** and **6**, oxidation occurs selectively at the most distal methylene, but a decreasing sensitivity to the EWG is observed when the reactive site is four instead of three bonds away (i.e. oxidation of a δ position rather than a γ position, as in **4**). Likewise, compounds **7** and **8** each have two tertiary sites and the one that is more distal is preferentially oxidized.^[13–15] Discrimination between two

[*] T. Newhouse, Prof. Dr. P. S. Baran
Department of Chemistry, The Scripps Research Institute
10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037 (USA)
Fax: (+1) 858-784-7375
E-mail: pbaran@scripps.edu



Scheme 1. Electron-withdrawing groups influence the site of C–H activation. B_2pin_2 = bis(pinacolato)diboron, Bz = benzoyl, Cp^* = C_5Me_5 , DMDO = dimethyldioxirane, pdp = 1,1'-bis(2-pyridinylmethyl)-2,2'-bipyridine, py = pyridine, TFDO = methyl(trifluoromethyl)dioxirane; brsm = based on recovered starting material.

electronically dissimilar tertiary sites can also be seen in **9**,^[16,17] but it should be stated that the difference in steric environment may also contribute synergistically to the observed selectivity in this case.

The oxidation of alkane substrates has been well studied and here we present the specific case of *cis*-1,2-dimethylcyclohexane (**10**). Depending on the oxidation system employed, selectivity for one of the methine or one of the methylene groups can be obtained. While tertiary positions are the most electron rich, the secondary positions are less sterically hindered and the selectivity can be influenced by

reagent selection. For example, oxidation by small reagents (e.g. TFDO) occurs selectively at tertiary positions,^[18] while large reagents (e.g. a polyoxometalate) exhibit reduced rates of oxidation at tertiary sites,^[19] and selectivity for methylene groups can be obtained. Similar trends have been observed for other substrates with other reagent systems.

Certain metal-mediated C–H activation reactions (wherein the metal is bound to the substrate) show distinct reactivity from other methods such as metal-carbenoid and -nitrenoid insertions. For these mechanistic pathways, the reactivity order of oxidation is, with considerable exception, the inverse of what is seen in nonmetal-mediated oxidation reactions: primary > secondary > tertiary.^[5d] This trend is largely reflective of the dominance of steric interactions in determining C–H bond selectivity. Additionally, in some instances this trend may be the result of an increased lability of a C–H bond that has a geminal C–H bond participating in an agostic interaction—an impossible situation in methine oxidation.^[20] This is highlighted with the ruthenium-mediated oxidation of compound **11**, wherein the primary positions are the ones that are oxidized. Furthermore, it is shown that the more electron deficient site (the one closer to the heteroatom) is the one that is oxidized first.^[21]

This reactivity contrasts with metal-nitrenoid and -carbenoid insertion reactions, which proceed with the following order of reactivity: tertiary > secondary > primary. Since these reactive intermediates proceed as electrophilic reagents, the stabilization of partial positive charge in the transition state at the reacting site (by electron-donating groups) results in an increased rate of insertion. Although it should be stated that the judicious choice of ligands is of paramount importance in determining chemoselectivity, it is sometimes possible to invert selectivity trends.^[22a–d] A discrete vinylcarbene intermediate, **12**, similarly responds to electronic stimuli; the inductive effect of oxygen functionality has been uniquely demonstrated in this instance.^[22e] While geometric considerations limit the positions that can be oxidized, the electronegative oxygen functionality drives the oxidation event to the less-deactivated C–H bond. Remarkably, since the axial C–H bond vicinal to the oxygen atom is inaccessible, this highly activated position is not oxidized. The selectivity factor that activates such positions is discussed in the next section.



Phil S. Baran was born in New Jersey in 1977 and completed his degree at New York University with Professor David I. Schuster in 1997. After earning his PhD with Professor K. C. Nicolaou at The Scripps Research Institute in 2001, he pursued postdoctoral studies with Professor E. J. Corey at Harvard University until 2003, at which point he began his independent career at Scripps, rising to the rank of Professor in 2008. His research group is dedicated to the study of fundamental organic chemistry through the auspices of natural product total synthesis.




Timothy Newhouse received his BA in chemistry from Colby College (2005), conducting research under the supervision of Professor Dasan M. Thamattoor. Under the guidance of Professor Phil S. Baran, he earned his PhD in chemistry from The Scripps Research Institute (2010). He is now conducting postdoctoral studies in the laboratories of Professor E. J. Corey at Harvard University.

3. Conjugation and Hyperconjugation

Hyperconjugative effects are another form of electronic activation or deactivation of alkane oxidation. While this force has a less pronounced effect than inductive effects, hyperconjugation can impart significant biases in certain systems. For example, it has been found that cyclopropanes bias the site of oxidation to their vicinal position in a marked way.


Although most nonmetal electrophilic reagents, such as TFDO, typically prefer to oxidize tertiary sites, compound **13** (similar to other cyclopropanes) is oxidized at the position vicinal to the cyclopropane rather than on the cyclopropane itself (Scheme 2).^[23a,b] Oxidation of **14** also occurs at the position vicinal to the activating cyclopropane ring.^[23]



Scheme 2. Hyperconjugation by cyclopropanes activates neighboring C-H bonds. dmp = dimethylpyrazole.

This activating effect requires orbital overlap between the cyclopropane C-C σ bonding orbital of the cyclopropane and the neighboring C-H σ antibonding orbital.^[24] In instances wherein this geometric configuration occurs, delocalization of electron density from the bent bonds of the cyclopropane to the neighboring C-H antibonding orbital renders an oxidation event with an electrophilic reagent more facile. Cyclopropanes are well-suited to this mode of activation due to their high-lying highest occupied molecular orbital (the C-C σ bonding orbital of the cyclopropane has considerable π character and is approximately sp^5 in nature), thus rendering cyclopropanes good electron donors.^[24] These same geometric requirements also hold true for other activating groups, such as the nonbonding electrons on an ethereal oxygen atom (**21** in Scheme 3).

The strict orbital requirements of hyperconjugation are clarified by the oxidation of **15**, wherein the proper orbital overlap is lacking at the positions vicinal to the cyclopropane.^[23b] This position is now deactivated likely as a result of the steric hinderance imposed.^[25] An interesting exception to this general trend is the oxidation of Binor S (**16**) by one of the Gif systems, which occurs exclusively at one of the methylene positions in 8% yield at 10% conversion.^[26-28] A subtle example of the orbital requirements of this activating effect can be seen in **17**, wherein the oxidation of the



Scheme 3. Hyperconjugation by heteroatoms activates neighboring C-H bonds. dosp = *N*-(*p*-dodecylphenylsulfonyl)proline, Ms = mesyl, nttl = *N*-1,8-naphthoyl-*tert*-leucine, Tp^{Ms} = hydrotris(3-mesityl)pyrazolyl-borate.

cyclohexane ring is preferred relative to that of the cyclopentane. This selectivity may be the result of multiple factors; however, it is possible that the C-C σ bond of the cyclopropane is better situated to donate into the C-H σ antibonding orbital of the cyclohexane, resulting in a high degree of selectivity.^[29] The stereoselective oxidation of **18** further illustrates the stereoelectronic effect that exists for cyclopropanes to selectively activate vicinal C-H bonds. Stereoselective activation of C-H bonds vicinal to cyclopropanes can be observed in a substrate such as **18** (diastereoselectivities of 2:1 to 3:1, depending on the carbene employed)^[30] and the more complicated substrate **19** shows a similar preference for the C-H bond activated by the cyclopropane.^[31]

The degree to which hyperconjugation can influence the course of C-H oxidation depends on how electron withdrawing or electron donating a substituent is. This trend has been quantified by comparing the relative ratios of oxidation products for 1-substituted adamantanes (**20**).^[32] As a consequence of orbital considerations, the long-range hyperconjugative effects from the C-X bond are more pronounced for the C-H_E bond than for the C-H_Z bond. Thus, the electronic influence at H_E varies with the substituent, whereas H_Z remains relatively unchanged. This effect follows a linear relationship with the substituent parameters of the substituents X ($\rho = -2.3$).^[32]

Although oxygen is an electronegative atom that can exert a withdrawing inductive effect, the nonbonding electrons on the oxygen atom may also donate electron density into neighboring C-H bonds through hyperconjugation. The nonbonding electrons on the oxygen atom are highly activating to positions with the proper orbital alignment, and the overall result is the selective oxidation of these positions.

Numerous oxidation systems can effect oxidation of tetrahydrofuran or tetrahydropyran (**21**), and a few examples are shown in Scheme 3.^[23c,33,34] Selectivity for the position adjacent to the oxygen atom is easily obtained. Interestingly, carbenoid insertion from **23** onto **22** readily occurs with $[Rh_2((S)\text{-dosp})_4]$ for the position α to the oxygen atom, rather than the benzylic position of **22**.^[35] In the case of **24**, nitrenoid insertion occurs at the benzylic position, in part because of

delocalization of the oxygen atom's nonbonding electrons into the aromatic ring decreasing the ability of this lone pair of electrons to activate the vicinal C–H bond.^[36] While the oxidation of carbinols is a notoriously low-energy process, enantioselective processes remain challenging: a notable example is the oxidation of racemic **25** by palladium–sparteine or manganese–salen catalysis and can occur with high enantioselectivity.^[37] It is noteworthy that the selective oxidation of this position is also the result of prior coordination of the alcohol functional group to the transition-metal center. In a similar vein, nitrogen atom lone pairs may also influence the course of site selectivity in C–H oxidation. The oxidation of nicotine (**26**) to cotinine can be effected by a number of reagents as a result of hyperconjugation from the pyrrolidine nitrogen atom's lone pair to the neighboring C–H bond.^[38,39]

Much as cyclopropanes and heteroatoms can serve as activating groups through hyperconjugation, the oxidation of unsaturated systems typically exhibits increased rates of oxidation relative to their saturated counterparts (Scheme 4).^[40] An illustration of this point is that singlet oxygen readily oxidizes olefinic substrates by an ene process, but C(sp³)–H bonds are relatively unreactive towards singlet oxygen.^[40b] The oxidation of geranyl acetate (**27**) is selective for the more electron rich olefin in the selenium dioxide mediated oxidation.^[41] The copper-catalyzed peroxide oxidation of olefins to yield peresters is known as the Kharasch reaction, and one such example is shown with compound **28**.^[42] In this case the positional selectivity is governed by the steric bulk of the *tert*-butyldiphenylsilyl protecting group, as evidenced by the lack of selectivity for the less sterically demanding case of the corresponding *tert*-butyldimethylsilyl


β-lactam. Further examples of steric factors influencing the course of C–H oxidation will be shown in the next section. It has also been shown that palladium and rhodium catalysts may activate enones, as in **29**.^[43] A creative use of the Kharasch reaction can be seen by the opening of the cyclopropane ring in **30**. It can be imagined that after an allylic radical is formed at C11, this species isomerizes to open the vicinal cyclopropane ring and the primary radical is then trapped to give an oxidized product.^[44]

The formation of π-allylpalladium complexes from olefins has allowed for allylic amination of these substrates, such as **31** (with olefin transposition).^[45] The interception of *meso* π-allylpalladium complexes (derived from substrates such as **32**) with nitronates has allowed for the enantioselective synthesis of enones.^[46] The oxidative cyclization of **34**,^[47] is another example of allylic oxidation, here forming a C–C bond. For transition-metal-mediated formation of π-allyl complexes, the metal center first coordinates to the olefin, thereby rendering C–H insertion more facile.

The ready oxidation of benzylic systems is a well-studied phenomenon, and as a representative case, the oxidation of 8-methylquinoline (**35**) is shown. This may be effected by treatment of **35** with selenium dioxide^[48a] or by metal-mediated pathways in either a stoichiometric^[48b,c] or catalytic^[49] manifold. It is notable that the transition-metal-mediated oxidations are enabled by initial coordination to the quinoline nitrogen atom and should be considered directed oxidations (see Section 6 for additional examples).^[50] Despite the many advances in C–H activation, new systems that can oxidize substrates while avoiding hyperconjugatively activated functionalities is a remaining challenge in the field and would greatly benefit the synthesis of complex molecules.

4. Steric Factors

A reduction of the rate of C–H oxidation is commonly observed for hindered C–H bonds. An excellent example of how hindered sites are not oxidized comes from the oxidation of cedrane (**36**) with a ruthenium system (Scheme 5).^[51] While there are three tertiary sites present in this molecule, a high



Scheme 4. Oxidation of allylic and benzylic systems. Ts = 4-toluenesulfonyl, TBS = *tert*-butyldimethylsilyl, cap = caprolactamate, tfa = trifluoroacetic acid.

Scheme 5. Steric hindrance affects the rate of C–H oxidation. Boc = *tert*-butoxycarbonyl, TBDPS = *tert*-butyldiphenylsilyl, TES = triethylsilyl, TIPS = triisopropylsilyl, TMS = trimethylsilyl, TON = turnover number; for the structure of mcpp, see Ref. [55].

selectivity for only one of the sites is observed. This is attributed to the fact that the other two positions are neopentyl and bis(neopentyl). A number of other examples where steric effects play a significant role in determining selectivity can be found in the case studies in Section 8.

While steric hindrance to the approach of the reagent does exert a significant bias, other factors can overcome this influence. For example, in the intramolecular C–H oxidation of substrate **37**, C–H insertion occurs selectively at the tertiary site, rather than the benzylic position.^[52,53] Although the benzylic position is secondary and less hindered, the methine is oxidized, possibly as a result of the more electron rich nature of this position. The authors speculate that delocalization of the C–H σ bond into the aromatic system results in a reduced availability of electron density. Furthermore, it could be said that the tertiary position is more electron rich as a result of the greater ability of the two methyl groups to donate electron density relative to a hydrogen atom and an aromatic ring.^[52] Another important factor in this cyclization reaction is that a favorable Thorpe–Ingold effect may bias the C–H insertion to the tertiary position. In an intermolecular case of rhodium-catalyzed C–H insertion, the activated methyl group in **38** is oxidized in preference to the benzylic position. In this case the authors believe that the selectivity observed is primarily the result of the less-hindered environment at the methyl group.^[54]

The iron-catalyzed oxidation of the menthol derivative **39** has demonstrated the importance of steric factors in dictating positional selectivity,^[14,55] which is feasible due to a discrete number of mechanistic scenarios.^[7m] It was shown that the tertiary position on the cyclohexyl ring is oxidized in preference to the isopropyl group. The rationalization for this selectivity is that the cyclohexyl tertiary site is the less-hindered one, since both tertiary positions are in nearly identical electronic environments. It should be stated that the rigidity of the cyclohexane ring relative to the isopropyl group may also contribute in this instance. As will be seen in Section 6, such inherent selectivity can be completely reversed by using directing groups.


One of the most dramatic examples of the effect of the steric environment on the rate of oxidation comes from the $[\text{Rh}_2((R)\text{-dosp})_4]$ oxidation of **40**.^[35] A number of different silyl ethers are oxidized, and it is observed that the more hindered the C–H bond, the slower the rate of oxidation. In fact, the TMS-protected alcohol is oxidized 102 times faster than the TBDPS derivative. Clearly, sterically hindered positions are oxidized more slowly than their less-hindered counterparts. Future challenges in this area are the development of reagents and catalysts that can more generally take advantage, or perhaps override, subtle nuances in steric effects.

5. Strain Release

In the middle of the 20th century, a theory to explain the relative rates of the oxidation of axial and equatorial alcohols was put forward to understand why axial alcohols were oxidized with greater rates. Schreiber and Eschenmoser

hypothesized that the elimination of $A_{1,3}$ strain in the transition state for the case of axial alcohols results in an increased rate of oxidation.^[56] This theory of strain release has also been recently advanced to the realm of C–H activation.^[57]

This theory was supported by the relative rates of oxidation of the substrates **41** and **42** (Scheme 6). While substrate **41** has a 1,3-syn-diaxial interaction between two



Scheme 6. Strain release may be an important factor in controlling site selectivity in C–H activation reactions.


methyl groups, substrate **42** has a hydrogen atom in the place of a methyl group. Thus, the $A_{1,3}$ strain in **42** is considerably lower than that of **41**, resulting in a slower rate of oxidation of **42** (by a factor of 3 to 4). More commonly recognized factors do not account for this difference in selectivity, including inductive effects, hyperconjugation, or steric effects. This example clearly shows that the effect of strain release on the rate of oxidation and selectivities observed in other instances may also be attributed to this phenomenon.

6. Directed Oxidations

In a complex system there will likely be functionality that is prone to oxidation even though a specific C–H activation event is desired. For example, substrate **43** contains a ketal group that is prone to oxidation^[33b] as a result of hyperconjugative activation by the oxygen atoms (see Section 3 for further explanation), yet this substrate may be oxidized elsewhere, likely as a result of the intramolecular nature of this oxidation reaction.^[58]

Directed oxidations represent an excellent opportunity to functionalize a particular C–H bond in the presence of opposing steric and electronic factors. In essence, directing groups are an easy way to override inherent substrate preferences. However, these strategies often require functional group manipulations to both install and remove the directing group. In the case of **43**, a tethered electron-deficient ketone is used to direct the oxidation event away from the ketal with remarkable selectivity (Scheme 7).^[58] An in situ dioxirane formation and subsequent intramolecular oxidation results in the observed selectivity.

Another example of inverting the selectivity of a C–H activation is the use of a trifluoroethyl carbamate directing group on menthol (**44**). By employing the Hofmann–Löffler–Freitag reaction with this carbamate, the selective functionalization of the isopropyl group, rather than oxidation of the tertiary position *ipso* to the methyl group (compare with **39**, Scheme 5),^[59] can be achieved.




Scheme 7. Directed oxidations offer an opportunity to effect positional selectivity.

The concept of “designer” directing groups for C–H activation was pioneered by Breslow et al., and an early example is shown with substrate **45**.^[60] In this case, a silyl ether is used as a tether, a functional group that is convenient for removal at a later point. The positional selectivity toward the B/C ring junction is the result of geometric considerations of the tether, rather than the inherent reactivities of the C–H bonds present in the oxidized substrate. This point is corroborated by a reversal of selectivity in the oxidation of **46**, wherein a longer tether results in selective oxidation of the C/D ring junction.^[61] Breslow et al. have reported a number of other strategies to impart chemoselectivity with a wide array of directing groups.

As was shown with compound **43** (see Scheme 7), trifluoromethyl ketones may act as directing groups for intramolecular dioxirane oxidations. In the case of **47** (Scheme 8), geometric considerations result in oxidation of a methylene, rather than a methine, thereby oxidizing the electronically disfavored position.^[62]

Dioxirane-mediated C–H activations may also be directed by the force of hydrogen bonding, as illustrated by the selectivities observed for the oxidations of **49** and **51** in Scheme 8.^[63] The tetrafluoroborate salt of a protonated amine is an EWG and thus oxidation is directed away from this functionality. However, in the TFDO-mediated oxidation of substrate **49**, selectivity is not observed for the most distal methylene position. Rather, oxidation is directed five positions away, and after the intermediate ketone condenses with the pendant amine the didehydropiperidine **50** is formed. It is believed that hydrogen bonding of the dioxirane to the protonated amine results in the high degree of selectivity for a position that is otherwise not electronically or sterically favored. To support this hypothesis, oxidation of analogue **51**, which lacks the ability to donate a hydrogen bond, was performed. It was found that a mixture of oxidation products disfavoring the methylene group five positions away was obtained (the selectivity for the ζ versus the ϵ position is 1.5 to 1).



Scheme 8. A number of directing groups may be employed in C–H activation.

Carbamates may also direct oxidation by homolytic fragmentation of an intermediate nitrogen–halogen bond, as was seen in compound **44** (Scheme 7). In this case, the selectivity for a seven-, rather than an eight-membered transition state is observed, as demonstrated by the selective oxidation of **52**.^[59] Thus, site selectivity for the more electron deficient site is obtained as a result of the trifluoroethyl carbamate directing group. This was demonstrated to be a beneficial strategy in the total synthesis of the eudesmane sesquiterpenes.^[64]

The oxidation of the methyl group in substrate **53** is the result of a number of different factors. It is postulated that the most dominant factor in this oxidative cyclization concerns initial bidentate chelation of platinum to the amino acid functionality. This results in a geometrically imposed constraint on which position may be oxidized, reflected by the preferential formation of products containing five-membered rings.^[65a] The diastereoselectivity of the lactone formation (by desymmetrization of the isopropyl group) may be the result of preorganization to a lower energy transition state, which corresponds to the observed *anti* diastereoselectivity that occurs in the carboxylic acid directed C–H activation. Similar trends in five-membered-ring formation during metal-mediated carbenoid insertion events have been observed.^[65b]

While many directing groups for C–H activation suffer from less than ideal synthetic utility (because these must be installed and later removed), the employment of carboxylic acids is a rapidly developing and synthetically useful area.^[66]

An excellent example of the ability to use carboxylic acids as directing groups for aliphatic C–H bonds is demonstrated in the acid substrate **54**.^[66a] A protocol was developed to use the Heck and Suzuki coupling pathways to execute olefination and arylation reactions. The chemoselectivity of the C–H cleavage step in this case may be the result of a kinetic preference for the formation of an intermediate five-membered palladacycle. Additionally, the selectivity for a methyl group, rather than a methylene, may arise as a result of the greater steric accessibility of primary over secondary positions.

Sulfamate esters, including **55** in Scheme 8, can also direct oxidation events, likely via intermediate iminoiodinanes in the presence of a rhodium catalyst. Interestingly, sulfamate esters generally prefer the formation of six-membered-ring products, while analogous reactions to form cyclic carbamates prefer the formation of five-membered rings. The utility of these types of directing groups has been demonstrated in a number of complex settings for the purpose of total synthesis.^[67]


Another example of a directed oxidation can be found in the palladium-catalyzed iodination of **56**.^[68] In this case the directing group allows for C–H insertion under mild conditions and situations where this strategy could be used to influence site selectivity can easily be imagined. Considerable research has further advanced the utility of 2-oxazolines for directed C–H activation.^[69]

In an olefination of **57** catalyzed by palladium, selectivity is observed for the cyclopropane rather than the methyl group.^[70] This contrasts with the difference in selectivity between a methyl group and a cyclohexyl ring, as in **56**. Many other directed oxidations are known and those shown here are only a sampling of what is possible.^[71] The many challenges in this area leave much to be discovered.

7. Activation of sp^2 Centers

Although distinctly different in nature, the chemoselectivity observed in C–H activation reactions of sp^2 centers nevertheless follows similar trends as their sp^3 counterparts. The absence of three-dimensionality reduces the factors that may affect positional selectivity through steric hindrance, inductive effects, or resonance stabilization. In the case of transition-metal-mediated directed oxidations, the conformational effects resulting from the intermediate metallacycles have a critical impact on chemoselectivity.^[5] While the oxidation of benzene derivatives has a rich history dating back to early studies on electrophilic aromatic substitution and the Heck reaction,^[72] research centered on metal-mediated catalytic methods is a vibrant area of investigation.

The decomposition of **58** in the presence of $[Rh_2(pfb)_4]$ is one example of obtaining selectivity for aromatic C–H insertion (over cyclopropanation), and catalyst selection was critical in this case (Scheme 9).^[73] Positional selectivity in the aromatic ring is dictated by the tethered diazoketone. In some intermolecular cases, selectivity for the least sterically hindered position on an aromatic ring has been obtained by the use of iridium(I) catalysts. In the case of **59**, this results in *meta*



Scheme 9. C–H activation of sp^2 centers presents unique challenges. bpy = 2,2'-bipyridine, dtbpy = 4,4'-di-*tert*-butyl-2,2'-bipyridine, pfb = perfluorobutyrate.

borylation,^[74] while in the case of **60** borylation occurs selectively *ortho* to the nitrile, rather than *ortho* to the bulkier trifluoromethyl group.^[75–77]


Olefination in a *meta*-selective fashion with palladium(II) catalysts has been demonstrated through the use of 2,6-bis(2-ethylhexyl)pyridine as a ligand.^[78] The oxidation of **61** occurs with 5:1 selectivity, relative to the *para* position. There are numerous instances of the use of directing groups to oxidize the *ortho* position of substituted aromatic compounds, and only a few of these cases are highlighted below. Remarkably, palladation can be directed by secondary hydroxy groups (**62**) even though this functionality is prone to oxidation.^[79] In the oxidative annulation reaction between acetanilide **63** and 1-phenyl-1-propyne to form an indole, excellent regioselectivity is observed for C–H activation of the less-hindered C–H bond with $[Cp^*Rh(MeCN)_3][SbF_6]_2$.^[80]

The ability to select between electronically similar sites with only subtle differences in the steric environment has been achieved through palladium-catalyzed C–H activation with protected amino acids as ligands (**64**).^[81] In this instance, almost no selectivity was observed in the absence of ligands, and a preliminary mechanistic investigation and improvement of these original conditions has recently been disclosed.^[82]

Furthermore, there are also many beautiful examples of activation of the $C(sp^2)$ –H and $C(sp^3)$ –H bonds in heterocyclic substrates, and this subject has recently been reviewed.^[83]

8. Case Studies

The oxidation of bicyclic systems represents an interesting case of site selectivity in C–H activation. The well-known propensity of adamantane (**65**) to undergo oxidation is an interesting peculiarity that has made it a yard-stick for C–H activation, and numerous examples of its oxidation have been




Scheme 10. Unique geometries of bicyclic systems results in varied selectivity.

documented (Scheme 10).^[84] The ease of oxidation of the tertiary bridgehead position of this substrate has resulted in a common misperception that the oxidation of bridgehead positions (C1) in general is a relatively simple task. The reduced selectivity observed for bicyclo[2.2.2]octane (**66**)^[18] and the reversal of selectivity observed for bicyclo[3.1.1]heptane^[85] (**67**) and bicyclo[2.2.1]heptanes (not shown)^[84a] illustrates the challenges associated with oxidizing bridgehead positions. The reactivity of a number of other unique polycyclic systems has been studied and it is worth noting that these selectivities are also reagent-dependent.^[86] The oxidation of ring junctions that are not bridgehead positions does not pose the same degree of difficulty. For example, the oxidation of *cis*- or *trans*-decalin (**68**) generally proceeds at the most electron-rich tertiary position.^[18]

The selectivity observed in extremely complicated systems cannot always be rationalized, since detailed structural information about solution-state conformations is frequently unavailable. Even though some solution structural information is known for bryostatin analogue **69**,^[87,88] rationalizing the observed selectivity is difficult (Scheme 11). While it could be said that the most electron-rich pyran is oxidized at the hyperconjugatively activated axial C–H bond, other factors certainly play a role. The unusual tolerance of olefins and a primary alcohol in this transformation as well as the pronounced selectivity for the C–H bond that is oxidized likely results from steric effects imparted by the structural complexity and its global conformation.

In the case of the B-ring seco-steroidal substrate **70**, the superb selectivity observed is the result of a number of different factors. While there are 12 methine groups present in this substrate, one position is selectively oxidized.^[89] The most dominant effect in this case is the result of the inductive effect of the acetylated alcohols and the lactone. The electron-withdrawing nature of these functionalities prevents oxidation of the nearby positions, leaving only a few positions that could potentially be oxidized. Steric effects then eliminate the possibility of oxidation at C17. The difficulty associated with the oxidation of this position is well-documented, and is seen in subsequent examples in Scheme 11. Since methylene and methyl groups are not preferred sites in dioxirane-mediated oxidations, the methine at C25 is oxidized selectively.

The oxidation of **71** illustrates the propensity of equatorial C–H bonds to be activated, since the two equatorial positions



Scheme 11. Additional examples of C–H oxidation. acam = acetamide, esp = $\alpha,\alpha,\alpha,\alpha$ -tetramethyl-1,3-benzenedipropionic acid, MOM = methoxymethyl, NBS = *N*-bromosuccinimide, tmp = 5,10,15,20-tetramethylporphyrinato; SM = starting material.

are the ones oxidized, even though there are a number of axial C–H bonds that are distal to the EWGs.^[90,91] Even though C17 is extremely hindered, some oxidation of the initial product is observed at this position rather than one of the axial C–H bonds. In the case of **72**, a combination of the electron-withdrawing influence of the epoxides and the sterically hindered C17- and C20-positions results in selective oxidation at C25.^[92] In this example, there is a tertiary position which is both distal from EWGs and relatively unhindered, and consequently this position is selectively oxidized with TFDO.

The tethered oxidation of substrate **73** represents a complicated case wherein a directing group allows for the desired oxidation event.^[93] It might be predicted that the A ring would otherwise be oxidized in this substrate because of the electron-withdrawing nature of the acyl group on the C ring. Yet, a highly selective transformation occurs as a result of the geometric requirements of the intramolecular oxidation reaction.

Sclareolide (**74**) has recently become a popular substrate to probe C–H activation methods. It was observed that amination in the presence of $[\text{Rh}_2(\text{esp})_2]$ occurs with exceptional selectivity for the C2-position.^[57] This is primarily the result of the electron-withdrawing lactone functionality directing oxidation away from the B ring. Likewise, the C1-position is disfavored due to its proximity to the lactone, leaving only two more positions. A combination of the fact that C2 is less hindered than C3 and that oxidation of C2 results in the relief of two 1,3-syn-diaxial interactions (albeit between a hydrogen atom and methyl groups), results in its selective oxidation. Although a 7:1 (C2/C3) selectivity has been observed in the chlorination of **74**,^[94] a 1.4:1 selectivity was found for the hydroxylation of **74** by $[\text{Fe}(\text{pdp})]$ and hydrogen peroxide,^[23c] and TFDO oxidation afforded a ratio of 1:1.7,^[95] highlighting the present difficulties of selective C–H hydroxylation.

En route to the total synthesis of tetrodotoxin, a selective oxidation of **75** was demonstrated.^[96] In this case, a directing group allowed for the selective amination of the bridgehead position, despite the presence of a number of other tertiary and hyperconjugatively activated ethereal positions. Even though this position is deactivated by the nearby lactone functionality, an oxidation event is effected with a high degree of selectivity.

Another example of the oxidation of a steroidal substrate (**76**) by $\text{CrO}_3/\text{Bu}_4\text{NIO}_4$ illustrates that a number of factors are at play in the oxidation of complex systems.^[97] In this case, EWGs on the A and C rings direct oxidation away from these sites, while oxidation is promoted at the α positions of the tetrahydrofuran ring. Oxidation selectively occurs at the C16-position even though the other α position (C22) is more electron rich when considering inductive effects. The steric influence of the two TBDPS ethers effectively shields the C22 α positions, and this hypothesis was confirmed by the unselective oxidation of the corresponding TMS ethers (consistent with the steric effect noted in Scheme 5).

In a rare example of a dehydrogenation reaction applied to total synthesis, the stoichiometric oxidation of substrate **77** was achieved in 44 % yield over a six-step process, including

the installation and removal of a directing group to allow for complexation of a platinum reagent.^[98] An excellent example of allylic oxidation comes from the oxidative kinetic resolution of racemic **78** by the rhodium carbenoid formed from **79**. After allylic oxidation occurs, a Cope rearrangement ensues to provide the rearranged product in 41 % yield and 92 % *ee*.^[99] An example of a rhodium-mediated diazoketone decomposition and C–H insertion is shown with substrate **80**. Selective insertion occurs in this case, despite the presence of a number of other reactive sites.^[100]

A silver-mediated method of hydroxylation was recently demonstrated to be an effective means to oxidize **81** at the four α positions of the diketopiperazines.^[101] Similarly, the oxidation of diketopiperazine **82** has been accomplished using benzoyl peroxide. Notably, this oxidation occurs selectively in the presence of an olefin.^[102] Yet another example of diketopiperazine oxidation is shown with the hydroxylation of **83**,^[103] which proceeds with NBS and the radical initiator V-70.^[104] Arylation of **84** is possible by a directed palladation, and it was noted that the remainder of the mass balance was starting material.^[105] Another silver-mediated method was also used to hydroxylate **85** in the context of the total synthesis of the axinellamines.^[106] This oxidation reaction is highly selective for hemiaminal formation, rather than spiro-2-aminoimidazolinone formation. This method has also been applied to the total syntheses of the massadines and palau'-amine.^[107]

9. Conclusion

While numerous other excellent examples of selective C–H activations have been reported, it is hoped that the few examples discussed here will serve as a useful guide and a springboard for interpreting the chemical expression of C–H bonds. C–H activation is a century-old field that has seen an incredible resurgence in the past two decades as a result of the enormous benefit that such reactions can provide in synthesis. The well-known trends summarized in this Minireview serve to highlight some of the exciting challenges that remain. For example, what yet undiscovered processes will exploit the inherent reactivity of C–H bonds to reach exquisite levels of selectivity? How can this reactivity be overridden through the use of reagents and directing groups? How can organic chemists harness the selectivity factors discussed herein to complex problems in total synthesis? Through countless studies over the past century, the “thoughts” and “stories” of C–H bonds have been illuminated—giving chemists the ability to understand factors that affect positional selectivity and inherent preferences in C–H activation.

Funding for this work was provided by Bristol–Myers Squibb and the NIH/NCI (CA134785).

Received: October 11, 2010

Revised: January 10, 2011

Published online: March 16, 2011

- [1] For representative examples and the importance of C–H activation in chemical synthesis, see T. Gaich, P. S. Baran, *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*, 4657–4673.
- [2] T. Newhouse, P. S. Baran, R. W. Hoffmann, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2009**, *38*, 3010–3021.
- [3] For an overview with respect to taxol, see a) Y. Ishihara, P. S. Baran, *Synlett* **2010**, 1733–1745; for a general overview of C–H functionalization logic in total synthesis, see b) W. R. Gutekunst, P. S. Baran, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2011**, DOI: 10.1039/c0cs00182a.
- [4] For reviews on C–H oxidation, see a) D. H. R. Barton, D. Doller, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1992**, *25*, 504–512; b) D. H. R. Barton, *Tetrahedron* **1998**, *54*, 5805–5817; c) M. P. Doyle, D. C. Forbes, *Chem. Rev.* **1998**, *98*, 911–935; d) P. Müller, C. Fruit, *Chem. Rev.* **2003**, *103*, 2905–2919; e) H. M. L. Davies, R. E. J. Beckwith, *Chem. Rev.* **2003**, *103*, 2861–2904; f) T. Punniyamurthy, S. Velusamy, J. Iqbal, *Chem. Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 2329–2363; g) K. Godula, D. Sames, *Science* **2006**, *312*, 67–72; h) A. R. Dick, M. S. Sanford, *Tetrahedron* **2006**, *62*, 2439–2463; i) H. M. L. Davies, J. R. Manning, *Nature* **2008**, *451*, 417–424; j) R. Giri, B.-F. Shi, K. M. Engle, N. Maugel, J. Q. Yu, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2009**, *38*, 3242–3271; k) M. P. Doyle, R. Duffy, M. Ratnikov, L. Zhou, *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 704–724.
- [5] For reviews on C–H oxidation from an organometallic perspective, see a) B. A. Arndtsen, R. G. Bergman, T. A. Mobley, T. H. Peterson, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1995**, *28*, 154–162; b) A. E. Shilov, G. B. Shul'pin, *Chem. Rev.* **1997**, *97*, 2879–2932; c) S. S. Stahl, J. A. Labinger, J. E. Bercaw, *Angew. Chem.* **1998**, *110*, 2298–2311; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 2180–2192; d) W. D. Jones, *Top. Organomet. Chem.* **1999**, *3*, 9–46; e) R. H. Crabtree, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* **2001**, 2437; f) C. B. Pamplin, P. Legzdins, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2003**, *36*, 223–233; g) M. Lersch, M. Tilset, *Chem. Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 2471–2526; h) L.-C. Campeau, D. R. Stuart, K. Fagnou, *Aldrichimica Acta* **2007**, *40*, 35–41; i) A. A. Kulkarni, O. Daugulis, *Synthesis* **2009**, 4087–4109; j) O. Daugulis, H.-Q. Do, D. Shabashov, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2009**, *42*, 1074–1086; k) I. A. I. Mkhaliid, J. H. Barnard, T. B. Marder, J. M. Murphy, J. F. Hartwig, *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 890–931; l) G. B. Shul'pin, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2010**, *8*, 4217–4228; m) R. Jazsar, J. Hitce, A. Renaudat, J. Sofack-Kreutzer, O. Baudoin, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 2654–2672; n) T. W. Lyons, M. S. Sanford, *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 1147–1169; o) “C–H Activation”: *Topics in Current Chemistry* (Eds.: J.-Q. Yu, Z. Shi), Springer, Berlin, **2010**, 292.
- [6] For reviews on C–H oxidation from a computational perspective, see a) Z. Lin, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2007**, *251*, 2280–2291; b) Y. Boutadla, D. L. Davies, S. A. Macgregor, A. I. Poblador-Bahamonde, *Dalton Trans.* **2009**, 5820–5831; c) D. Balcells, E. Clot, O. Eisenstein, *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 749–823.
- [7] For reviews on enzymatic and biomimetic C–H oxidation, see a) R. Breslow, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **1972**, *1*, 553–580; b) R. Breslow, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1980**, *13*, 170–177; c) R. Breslow, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1990**, *62*, 1859–1866; d) R. Breslow, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1995**, *28*, 146–153; e) D. H. R. Barton, D. K. Taylor, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1996**, *68*, 497–504; f) L. Que, Jr., R. Y. N. Ho, *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2607–2624; g) S. B. Mahato, S. Garai, *Steroids* **1997**, *62*, 332–345; h) M. Costas, K. Chen, L. Que, Jr., *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2000**, *200–202*, 517–544; i) R. Breslow, *Chemtracts* **2002**, *15*, 59–68; j) B. Meunier, S. P. de Visser, S. Shaik, *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 3947–3980; k) M. Costas, M. P. Mehn, M. P. Jensen, L. Que, Jr., *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 939–986; l) S. J. Lippard, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. A* **2005**, *363*, 861–877; m) L. Que, Jr., *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2007**, *40*, 493–500.
- [8] For reviews on the factors that affect C–H activation by radical reactions, see a) J. M. Tedder, J. C. Walton, *Tetrahedron* **1980**, *36*, 701–707; b) J. M. Tedder, *Tetrahedron* **1982**, *38*, 313–329; c) J. M. Tedder, *Angew. Chem.* **1982**, *94*, 433–442; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1982**, *21*, 401–410; d) A. A. Fokin, P. R. Schreiner, *Chem. Rev.* **2002**, *102*, 1551–1593.
- [9] For example, see H. B. Hass, E. T. McBee, P. Weber, *Ind. Eng. Chem.* **1936**, *28*, 333–339.
- [10] a) H. Singh, J. M. Tedder, *J. Chem. Soc.* **1964**, 4737–4741; b) for examples of oxidations at particularly remote sites, see C. R. Eck, D. J. Hunter, T. Money, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1974**, 865–866; c) G. K. Eigendorf, C.-L. Ma, T. Money, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1976**, 561–562; d) G. K. Eigendorf, C.-L. Ma, T. Money, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 1* **1979**, 896–904.
- [11] F. Minisci, R. Galli, A. Galli, R. Bernardi, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1967**, *8*, 2207–2209.
- [12] G. Asensio, G. Castellano, R. Mello, M. E. González Núñez, *J. Org. Chem.* **1996**, *61*, 5564–5566.
- [13] B. H. Brodsky, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 15391–15393.
- [14] N. A. Vermeulen, M. S. Chen, M. C. White, *Tetrahedron* **2009**, *65*, 3078–3084.
- [15] E. McNeill, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 10202–10204.
- [16] P. Bovicelli, P. Lupattelli, E. Mincione, T. Prencipe, R. Curci, *J. Org. Chem.* **1992**, *57*, 5052–5054.
- [17] R. R. Siciński, H. F. Deluca, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **1995**, *5*, 159–162.
- [18] R. Mello, M. Fiorentino, C. Fusco, R. Curci, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, *111*, 6749–6757.
- [19] K. Kamata, K. Yonehara, Y. Nakagawa, K. Uehara, N. Mizuno, *Nat. Chem.* **2010**, *2*, 478–483, and references therein.
- [20] a) For a review on agostic interactions, see M. Brookhart, M. L. H. Green, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1983**, *250*, 395–408; see also: b) G. J. Kubas, R. R. Ryan, B. I. Swanson, P. J. Vergamini, H. J. Wasserman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, *106*, 451–452; c) R. H. Crabtree, E. M. Holt, M. Lavin, S. M. Morehouse, *Inorg. Chem.* **1985**, *24*, 1986–1992, and references therein; d) R. A. Periana, R. G. Bergman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, 7332–7346; e) D. L. Davies, S. M. A. Donald, S. A. Macgregor, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 13754–13755; f) L. J. L. Haller, M. J. Page, S. A. Macgregor, M. F. Mahon, M. K. Whittlesey, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 4604–4605; g) S. Rousseaux, M. Davi, J. Sofack-Kreutzer, C. Pierre, C. E. Kefalidis, E. Clot, K. Fagnou, O. Baudoin, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 10706–10716.
- [21] a) H. Chen, S. Schlecht, T. C. Semple, J. F. Hartwig, *Science* **2000**, *287*, 1995–1997; b) J. D. Lawrence, M. Takahashi, C. Bae, J. F. Hartwig, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 15334–15335; c) J. M. Murphy, J. D. Lawrence, K. Kawamura, C. Incarvito, J. F. Hartwig, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 13684–13685; for mechanistic studies on the origins of related transition-metal-mediated insertions, see d) S. E. Bromberg, H. Yang, M. C. Asplund, T. Lian, B. K. McNamara, K. T. Kotz, J. S. Yeston, M. Wilkens, H. Frei, R. G. Bergman, C. B. Harris, *Science* **1997**, *278*, 260–263; e) K. R. Sawyer, J. F. Cahoon, J. E. Shanoski, E. A. Glascoe, M. F. Kling, J. P. Schlegel, M. C. Zorber, M. Hapke, J. F. Hartwig, C. E. Webster, C. B. Harris, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 1848–1859; f) C. S. Wei, C. A. Jiménez-Hoyos, M. F. Videa, J. F. Hartwig, M. B. Hall, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 3078–3091.
- [22] a) M. P. Doyle, L. J. Westrum, W. N. E. Wolthuis, M. M. See, W. P. Boone, V. Bagheri, M. M. Pearson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 958–964; b) P. Wang, J. Adams, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 3296–3305; c) M. P. Doyle, A. V. Kalinin, D. G. Ene, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, *118*, 8837–8846; d) K. W. Fiori, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 562–568; e) S. Y. Yun, J.-C. Zheng, D. Lee, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 8413–8415.

- [23] a) E. Proksch, A. de Meijere, *Angew. Chem.* **1976**, *88*, 802; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1976**, *15*, 761–762; b) L. D'Accolti, A. Dinoi, C. Fusco, A. Russo, R. Curci, *J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, *68*, 7806–7810; c) M. S. Chen, M. C. White, *Science* **2010**, *327*, 566–571.
- [24] a) W. J. Hehre, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1975**, *8*, 369–376; b) A. de Meijere, *Angew. Chem.* **1979**, *91*, 867–884; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1979**, *18*, 809–826; c) G. A. Olah, V. P. Reddy, G. K. S. Prakash, *Chem. Rev.* **1992**, *92*, 69–95.
- [25] The following references suggest that cyclopropanes do not exert significant long-range hyperconjugative effects in such a setting and that the selectivity in the case of **15** is primarily the result of a steric effect: a) V. Vinkovic, K. Mlinaric-Majerski, Z. Marinic, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1992**, *33*, 7441–7444; b) O. N. Zefirova, E. V. Nurieva, N. V. Zyk, *Russ. J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *41*, 1286–1288.
- [26] D. H. R. Barton, P. E. Eaton, W.-G. Liu, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1991**, *32*, 6263–6264.
- [27] For representative examples of Gif chemistry, see a) Refs [4a,b]; b) P. Stavropoulos, R. Celenligil-Cetin, A. E. Tapper, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2001**, *34*, 745–752; c) E. About-Jaudet, D. H. R. Barton, E. Csuhai, N. Ozbalik, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1990**, *31*, 1657–1660; d) D. H. R. Barton, E. Csuhai, D. Doller, *Tetrahedron* **1992**, *48*, 9195–9206; e) D. H. R. Barton, W. Chavasiri, *Tetrahedron* **1994**, *50*, 19–30; f) D. H. R. Barton, W. Chavasiri, *Tetrahedron* **1994**, *50*, 47–60.
- [28] For oxidation of the tertiary positions, see a) K. Pramod, P. E. Eaton, R. Gilardi, J. L. Flippen-Anderson, *J. Org. Chem.* **1990**, *55*, 6105–6107; b) L. D'Accolti, C. Fusco, V. Lucchini, G. B. Carpenter, R. Curci, *J. Org. Chem.* **2001**, *66*, 9063–9066.
- [29] M. G. Banwell, N. Haddad, J. A. Huglin, M. F. MacKay, M. E. Reum, J. H. Ryan, K. A. Turner, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1993**, 954–957.
- [30] a) G.-H. Shiue, U. Misslitz, X.-t. Ding, M. Jones, Jr., A. de Meijere, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1985**, *26*, 5399–5402; b) U. H. Brinker, G. Lin, L. Xu, W. B. Smith, J.-L. Mieusset, *J. Org. Chem.* **2007**, *72*, 8434–8451.
- [31] J. L. Coudret, S. Zöllner, B. J. Ravoo, L. Malara, C. Hanisch, K. Dörre, A. de Meijere, B. Waegell, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1996**, *37*, 2425–2428.
- [32] M. E. González-Núñez, J. Royo, R. Mello, M. Baguena, J. Martínez Ferrer, C. Ramírez de Arellano, G. Asensio, G. K. S. Prakash, *J. Org. Chem.* **2005**, *70*, 7919–7924.
- [33] a) M. M. Díaz-Requejo, T. R. Belderrain, M. C. Nicasio, S. Trofimenko, P. J. Pérez, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 896–897; b) R. Curci, L. D'Accolti, M. Fiorentino, C. Fusco, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1992**, *33*, 4225–4228.
- [34] For further examples of heteroatom-directed C–H oxidation, see a) S. Yoshifuji, Y. Arakawa, Y. Nitta, *Chem. Pharm. Bull.* **1987**, *35*, 357–363; b) M. P. Doyle, A. V. Kalinin, *Synlett* **1995**, 1075–1076; c) H. M. L. Davies, T. Hansen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 9075–9076; d) H. M. L. Davies, T. Hansen, D. W. Hopper, S. A. Panaro, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 6509–6510; e) H. M. L. Davies, T. Hansen, M. R. Churchill, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 3063–3070; f) H. M. L. Davies, A. Ni, *Chem. Commun.* **2006**, 3110–3112; g) H. M. L. Davies, Q. Jin, *Org. Lett.* **2004**, *6*, 1769–1772.
- [35] H. M. L. Davies, R. E. J. Beckwith, E. G. Antoulinakis, Q. Jin, *J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, *68*, 6126–6132.
- [36] C. Liang, R.-P. Fabien, C. Fruit, P. Müller, R. H. Dodd, P. Dauban, *Angew. Chem.* **2006**, *118*, 4757–4760; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 4641–4644.
- [37] a) E. M. Ferreira, B. M. Stoltz, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 7725–7726; b) J. T. Bagdanoff, E. M. Ferreira, B. M. Stoltz, *Org. Lett.* **2003**, *5*, 835–837; c) Q. Cheng, F. Deng, C. Xia, W. Sun, *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **2008**, *19*, 2359–2362; d) M. K. Brown, M. M. Blewett, J. R. Colombe, E. J. Corey, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 11165–11170; for reviews, see e) M. S. Sigman, D. R. Jensen, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2006**, *39*, 221–229; f) D. C. Ebner, J. T. Bagdanoff, E. M. Ferreira, R. M. McFadden, D. D. Caspi, R. M. Trend, B. M. Stoltz, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 12978–12992.
- [38] D. H. R. Barton, J. Boivin, D. Gaudin, K. Jankowski, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1989**, *30*, 1381–1382.
- [39] R. M. Moriarty, R. K. Vaid, M. P. Duncan, M. Ochiai, M. Inenaga, Y. Nagao, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1988**, *29*, 6913–6916.
- [40] For reviews, see a) D. J. Rawlinson, G. Sosnovsky, *Synthesis* **1972**, 1–28; b) E. L. Clennan, *Tetrahedron* **2000**, *56*, 9151–9179; c) J. Eames, M. Watkinson, *Angew. Chem.* **2001**, *113*, 3679–3683; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 3567–3571; d) M. B. Andrus, J. C. Lashley, *Tetrahedron* **2002**, *58*, 845–866; e) I. I. Moiseev, M. N. Vargaftik, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *248*, 2381–2391.
- [41] M. A. Umbreit, K. B. Sharpless, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1977**, *99*, 5526–5528.
- [42] a) M. S. Kharasch, A. Fono, *J. Org. Chem.* **1958**, *23*, 324; b) M. S. Kharasch, A. Fono, *J. Org. Chem.* **1958**, *23*, 324–325; c) M. S. Kharasch, G. Sosnovsky, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1958**, *80*, 756; d) J. H. Bateson, A. M. Robins, R. Southgate, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. I* **1991**, 2399–2405.
- [43] a) J.-Q. Yu, E. J. Corey, *Org. Lett.* **2002**, *4*, 2727–2730; b) J.-Q. Yu, E. J. Corey, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 3232–3233; c) A. J. Catino, R. E. Forslund, M. P. Doyle, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 13622–13623; d) J.-Q. Yu, H.-C. Wu, E. J. Corey, *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 1415–1417.
- [44] E. J. Corey, J. Lee, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 8873–8874.
- [45] a) B. Åkermarck, K. Zetterberg, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1975**, *16*, 3733–3736; b) M. Rönn, J.-E. Bäckvall, P. G. Andersson, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1995**, *36*, 7749–7752; c) R. C. Larock, T. R. Hightower, L. A. Hasvold, K. P. Peterson, *J. Org. Chem.* **1996**, *61*, 3584–3585; d) J. L. Brice, J. E. Harang, V. I. Timokhin, N. R. Anastasi, S. S. Stahl, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 2868–2869; e) S. A. Reed, A. R. Mazzotti, M. C. White, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 11701–11706; f) G. Yin, Y. Wu, G. Liu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 11978–11987.
- [46] B. M. Trost, J. Richardson, K. Yong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 2540–2541.
- [47] J. Franzén, J.-E. Bäckvall, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 6056–6057.
- [48] a) M. Seyhan, W. C. Fernelius, *J. Org. Chem.* **1957**, *22*, 217–219; b) R. M. Ceder, M. Gómez, J. Sales, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1989**, *361*, 391–398; c) H. L. Holcomb, S. Nakanishi, T. C. Flood, *Organometallics* **1996**, *15*, 4228–4234.
- [49] a) A. R. Dick, K. L. Hull, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 2300–2301; b) D. Kalyani, A. R. Dick, W. Q. Anani, M. S. Sanford, *Tetrahedron* **2006**, *62*, 11483–11498; c) J. Zhang, E. Khaskin, N. P. Anderson, P. Y. Zavalij, A. N. Vedernikov, *Chem. Commun.* **2008**, 3625–3627.
- [50] For more examples of “pyridine-like” nitrogen-directed C–H oxidation reactions and related mechanistic studies, see a) A. R. Dick, J. W. Kampf, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 12790–12791; b) B. V. S. Reddy, L. R. Reddy, E. J. Corey, *Org. Lett.* **2006**, *8*, 3391–3394; c) K. L. Hull, W. Q. Ananni, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 7134–7135; d) K. L. Hull, E. L. Lanni, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 14047–14049; e) K. L. Hull, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 11904–11905; f) S. R. Whitfield, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 15142–15143; g) L. V. Desai, K. J. Stowers, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 13285–13293; h) J. M. Racowski, A. R. Dick, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 10974–10983; i) K. L. Hull, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 9651–9653; j) N. R. Deprez, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 11234–11241; k) P. L. Arnold, M. S. Sanford, S. M. Pearson, *J.*

- Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 13912–13913; l) D. C. Powers, T. Ritter, *Nat. Chem.* **2009**, *1*, 302–309; m) D. C. Powers, M. A. L. Geibel, J. E. M. N. Klein, T. Ritter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 17050–17051; n) D. C. Powers, D. Benitez, E. Tkatchouk, W. A. Goddard III, T. Ritter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 14092–14103; o) D. C. Powers, D. Y. Xiao, M. A. L. Geibel, T. Ritter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 14530–14536; p) Y. Ye, N. D. Ball, J. W. Kampf, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 14682–14687; q) D. Shabashov, O. Daugulis, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 3965–3972.
- [51] a) A. Tenaglia, E. Terranova, B. Waegell, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1989**, *30*, 5271–5274; b) A. Tenaglia, E. Terranova, B. Waegell, *J. Org. Chem.* **1992**, *57*, 5523–5524.
- [52] D. F. Taber, R. E. Ruckle, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, 7686–7693.
- [53] For further examples, see a) P. Müller, D. Fernandez, *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1995**, *78*, 947–958; b) D. F. Taber, Y. Song, *J. Org. Chem.* **1996**, *61*, 6706–6712; c) D. F. Taber, S. C. Malcom, *J. Org. Chem.* **1998**, *63*, 3717–3721; d) W. Kurosawa, T. Kan, T. Fukuyama, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 8112–8113.
- [54] H. M. L. Davies, C. Venkataramani, *Angew. Chem.* **2002**, *114*, 2301–2303; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 2197–2199.
- [55] L. Gómez, I. Garcia-Bosch, A. Company, J. Benet-Buchholz, A. Polo, X. Sala, X. Ribas, M. Costas, *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, *121*, 5830–5833; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 5720–5723.
- [56] J. Schreiber, A. Eschenmoser, *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1955**, *38*, 1529–1536.
- [57] K. Chen, A. Eschenmoser, P. S. Baran, *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, *121*, 9885–9888; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 9705–9708.
- [58] S. Kasuya, S. Kamijo, M. Inoue, *Org. Lett.* **2009**, *11*, 3630–3632.
- [59] a) K. Chen, J. M. Richter, P. S. Baran, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 7247–7249; b) A. W. Hofmann, *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges.* **1883**, *16*, 558–560; c) A. W. Hofmann, *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges.* **1885**, *18*, 5–23; d) A. W. Hofmann, *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges.* **1885**, *18*, 109–131; e) M. E. Wolff, *Chem. Rev.* **1963**, *63*, 55–64; f) P. Mackiewicz, R. Furstoss, *Tetrahedron* **1978**, *34*, 3241–3260.
- [60] a) R. Breslow, R. J. Corcoran, B. B. Snider, R. J. Doll, P. L. Khanna, R. Kaleya, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1977**, *99*, 905–915; b) R. Breslow, D. Heyer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1982**, *104*, 2045–2046.
- [61] a) R. Breslow, J. A. Dale, P. Kalicky, S. Y. Liu, W. N. Washburn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1972**, *94*, 3276–3278; b) R. Breslow, S. Baldwin, T. Flechtner, P. Kalicky, S. Liu, W. Washburn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1973**, *95*, 3251–3262.
- [62] a) M.-K. Wong, N.-W. Chung, L. He, D. Yang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 158–162; b) M.-K. Wong, N.-W. Chung, L. He, X.-C. Wang, Z. Yan, Y.-C. Tang, D. Yang, *J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, *68*, 6321–6328; c) for a unique example of an intramolecular oxidative cyclization using oxaziridines, see C. P. Allen, T. Benkovics, A. K. Turek, T. P. Yoon, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 12560–12561.
- [63] G. Asensio, M. L. González-Núñez, C. B. Bernardini, R. Mello, W. Adam, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 7250–7253.
- [64] K. Chen, P. S. Baran, *Nature* **2009**, *459*, 824–828.
- [65] a) B. D. Dangel, K. Godula, S. W. Youn, B. Sezen, D. Sames, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 11856–11857; b) for example, see D. F. Taber, E. H. Petty, *J. Org. Chem.* **1982**, *47*, 4808–4809.
- [66] a) R. Giri, N. Mangel, J.-J. Li, D.-H. Wang, S. P. Breazzano, L. B. Saunders, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 3510–3511; b) H. A. Chiong, Q.-N. Pham, O. Daugulis, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 9879–9884.
- [67] a) C. G. Espino, P. M. When, J. Chow, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 6935–6936; b) J. J. Fleming, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 3926–3927.
- [68] R. Giri, X. Chen, J.-Q. Yu, *Angew. Chem.* **2005**, *117*, 2150–2153; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 2112–2115.
- [69] a) R. Giri, J. Liang, J.-G. Lei, J.-J. Li, D.-H. Wang, X. Chen, I. C. Nagggar, C. Guo, B. M. Foxman, J.-Q. Yu, *Angew. Chem.* **2005**, *117*, 7586–7590; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 7420–7424; b) R. Giri, X. Chen, X.-S. Hao, J.-J. Li, J. Liang, Z.-P. Fan, J.-Q. Yu, *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* **2005**, *16*, 3502–3505; c) X. Chen, J.-J. Li, X.-S. Hao, C. E. Goodhue, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 78–79; d) R. Giri, M. Wasa, S. P. Breazzano, J.-Q. Yu, *Org. Lett.* **2006**, *8*, 5685–5688; e) J.-Q. Yu, R. Giri, X. Chen, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2006**, *4*, 4041–4047; f) J.-J. Li, R. Giri, J.-Q. Yu, *Tetrahedron* **2008**, *64*, 6979–6987; g) R. Giri, N. L. Mangel, B. M. Foxman, J.-Q. Yu, *Organometallics* **2008**, *27*, 1667–1670; for related palladium-mediated C–H activations with oxime directing groups, see h) K. Carr, J. K. Sutherland, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1984**, 1227; i) J. E. Baldwin, R. H. Jones, C. Najera, M. Yus, *Tetrahedron* **1985**, *41*, 699–711; j) L. V. Desai, K. L. Hull, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 9542–9543; k) S. R. Neufeldt, M. S. Sanford, *Org. Lett.* **2010**, *12*, 532–535.
- [70] a) M. Wasa, K. M. Engle, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 3680–3681; b) for similar selectivity seen in a carbonylation reaction, see E. J. Yoo, M. Wasa, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 17378–17380.
- [71] For two other notable means of effecting directed oxidations, see a) J. I. Concepción, C. G. Francisco, R. Hernández, J. A. Salazar, E. Suárez, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1984**, *25*, 1953–1956; b) B. Schönecker, C. Lange, T. Zheldakova, W. Günther, H. Görls, G. Vaughan, *Tetrahedron* **2005**, *61*, 103–114.
- [72] a) For an early review on Friedel–Crafts reactions, see N. O. Calloway, *Chem. Rev.* **1935**, *17*, 327–392; for reviews on directed metalation, see b) V. Snieckus, *Chem. Rev.* **1990**, *90*, 879–933; c) M. Schlosser, *Angew. Chem.* **2005**, *117*, 380–398; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 376–393; d) J. Epszajn, A. Józwiak, A. K. Szczesniak, *Curr. Org. Chem.* **2006**, *10*, 1817–1848; for seminal contributions to the Heck reaction, see e) R. F. Heck, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1968**, *90*, 5518–5526; f) R. F. Heck, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1969**, *91*, 6707–6714; g) T. Mizoroki, K. Mori, A. Ozaki, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1971**, *44*, 581; h) R. F. Heck, J. P. Nolley, Jr., *J. Org. Chem.* **1972**, *37*, 2320–2322.
- [73] a) A. Padwa, D. J. Austin, S. F. Hornbuckle, M. A. Semones, M. P. Doyle, M. N. Protopopova, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 1874–1876; b) A. Padwa, D. J. Austin, A. T. Price, M. A. Semones, M. P. Doyle, M. N. Protopopova, W. R. Winchester, A. Tran, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 8669–8680; see also Refs. [22a–d].
- [74] a) T. Ishiyama, J. Takagi, K. Ishida, N. Miyaoura, N. R. Anastasi, J. F. Hartwig, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 390–391; b) T. Ishiyama, J. Takagi, J. F. Hartwig, N. Miyaoura, *Angew. Chem.* **2002**, *114*, 3182–3184; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 3056–3058; c) for an example of meta arylation, see R. J. Phipps, M. J. Gaunt, *Science* **2009**, *323*, 1593–1597.
- [75] For an excellent discussion on steric effects, see G. A. Chotana, M. A. Rak, M. R. Smith III, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 10539–10544.
- [76] For an ortho-iridium-mediated C–H insertion of haloarenes, see E. Ben-Ari, M. Gandelman, H. Rozenberg, L. J. W. Shimon, D. Milstein, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 4714–4715.
- [77] a) C. N. Iverson, M. R. Smith III, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 7696–7697; b) J.-Y. Cho, C. N. Iverson, M. R. Smith III, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 12868–12869; c) J.-Y. Cho, M. K. Tse, D. Holmes, R. E. Maleczka, Jr., M. R. Smith III, *Science* **2002**, *295*, 305–308.
- [78] Y.-H. Zhang, B.-F. Shi, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 5072–5074.
- [79] a) Y. Lu, D.-H. Wang, K. M. Engle, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 5916–5921; b) X. Wang, Y. Lu, H.-X. Dai, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 12203–12205; for triflamide-directed oxidations, see c) X. Wang, T.-S. Mei, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 7520–7521; d) B. F. Shi, N. Mangel,

- Y.-H. Zhang, J.-Q. Yu, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 4960–4964; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 4882–4886.
- [80] a) D. R. Stuart, M. Bertrand-Laperle, K. M. N. Burgess, K. Fagnou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 16474–16475; b) D. R. Stuart, P. Alsabeh, M. Kuhn, K. Fagnou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 18326–18339.
- [81] D.-H. Wang, K. M. Engle, B.-F. Shi, J.-Q. Yu, *Science* **2010**, *327*, 315–319.
- [82] K. M. Engle, D.-H. Wang, J.-Q. Yu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 14137–14151.
- [83] For representative reviews, see a) D. Alberico, M. E. Scott, M. Lautens, *Chem. Rev.* **2007**, *107*, 174–238; b) K. R. Campos, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2007**, *36*, 1069–1084; c) D. A. Colby, R. G. Bergman, J. A. Ellman, *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 624–655.
- [84] a) For an excellent study and discussion, see I. R. Likhovotrik, K. Yuan, D. W. Brown, P. A. Krasutsky, N. Smyth, M. Jones, Jr., *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1992**, *33*, 911–914; for other selected adamantane oxidations, see b) Z. Cohen, E. Keinan, Y. Mazur, T. H. Varkony, *J. Org. Chem.* **1975**, *40*, 2141–2142; c) J. T. Groves, T. E. Nemo, R. S. Myers, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1979**, *101*, 1032–1033; d) D. H. R. Barton, M. J. Gastiger, W. B. Motherwell, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1983**, 41–43; e) J. Muzart, A. N. Aijou, *J. Mol. Catal.* **1993**, *84*, L15–L19; f) F. Minisci, F. Fontana, L. Zhao, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1994**, *35*, 8033–8036; g) R. W. Murray, K. Iyanar, J. Chen, J. T. Wearing, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1995**, *36*, 6415–6418; h) J. T. Groves, M. Bonchio, T. Carofiglio, K. Shalyaev, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, *118*, 8961–8962; i) P. R. Schreiner, O. Lauenstein, E. D. Butova, P. A. Gunchenko, I. V. Kolomitsin, A. Wittkopp, G. Feder, A. A. Fokin, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2001**, *7*, 4996–5003; j) C. Wang, K. V. Shalyaev, M. Bonchio, T. Carofiglio, J. T. Groves, *Inorg. Chem.* **2006**, *45*, 4769–4782; k) G. Bianchini, M. Crucianelli, C. Crestini, R. Saladino, *Top. Catal.* **2006**, *40*, 221–227; l) for an overview of reagent systems for adamantane oxidation, see Y. Ishii, S. Sakaguchi in *Modern Oxidation Methods* (Ed.: J.-E. Bäckvall), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2004**, pp. 119–163.
- [85] Y. Lin, M. Dawei, X. Lu, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1987**, *323*, 407–419.
- [86] For some interesting examples, see A. A. Fokin, B. A. Tkachenko, O. I. Korshunov, P. A. Gunchenko, P. R. Schreiner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 11248–11252.
- [87] P. A. Wender, M. K. Hilinski, A. V. W. Mayweg, *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 79–82.
- [88] For solution structures, see a) Y. Kamano, H.-p. Zhang, H. Morita, H. Itokawa, O. Shiota, G. R. Pettit, D. L. Herald, C. L. Herald, *Tetrahedron* **1996**, *52*, 2369–2376; b) P. A. Wender, J. DeBrabander, P. G. Harran, J.-M. Jimenez, M. F. T. Koehler, B. Lippa, C.-M. Park, C. Siedenbiedel, G. R. Pettit, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **1998**, *95*, 6624–6629.
- [89] a) B. Voigt, A. Porzel, D. Golsch, W. Adam, G. Adam, *Tetrahedron* **1996**, *52*, 10653–10658; b) H. Seto, S. Fujioka, H. Koshino, S. Yoshida, M. Tsubuki, T. Honda, *Tetrahedron* **1999**, *55*, 8341–8352.
- [90] a) P. Bovicelli, A. Gambacorta, P. Lupattelli, E. Mincione, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1992**, *33*, 7411–7412; b) A. Arnone, M. Cavicchioli, V. Montanari, G. Resnati, *J. Org. Chem.* **1994**, *59*, 5511–5513; c) T. Iida, T. Yamaguchi, R. Nakamori, M. Hikosaka, N. Mano, J. Goto, T. Nambara, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 1* **2001**, 2229–2236.
- [91] For an example of an enzymatic oxidation with similar preference, see R. T. Carr, S. Balasubramanian, P. C. D. Hawkins, S. J. Benkovic, *Biochemistry* **1995**, *34*, 7525–7532.
- [92] R. Curci, A. Detomaso, T. Prencipe, G. B. Carpenter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 8112–8115.
- [93] M. Kitadani, K. Ito, A. Yoshikoshi, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1971**, *44*, 3431–3434.
- [94] W. Liu, J. T. Groves, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 12847–12849.
- [95] T. Newhouse, J. W. Lockner, K. Chen, A. Eschenmoser, P. S. Baran, unpublished results.
- [96] A. Hinman, J. Du Bois, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 11510–11511.
- [97] S. Lee, P. L. Fuchs, *Org. Lett.* **2004**, *6*, 1437–1440.
- [98] a) J. A. Johnson, D. Sames, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 6321–6322; b) J. A. Johnson, N. Li, D. Sames, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 6900–6903.
- [99] H. M. L. Davies, X. Dai, M. S. Long, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 2485–2490.
- [100] J. D. White, P. Hrnčiar, F. Stappenbeck, *J. Org. Chem.* **1999**, *64*, 7871–7884.
- [101] J. Kim, J. A. Ashenhurst, M. Movassaghi, *Science* **2009**, *324*, 238–241.
- [102] a) P. S. Baran, E. J. Corey, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 7904–7905; b) A. J. Hutchison, Y. Kishi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1979**, *101*, 6786–6788.
- [103] E. Iwasa, Y. Hamashima, S. Fujishiro, E. Higuchi, A. Ito, M. Yoshida, M. Sodeoka, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 4078–4079.
- [104] Y. Kita, A. Sano, T. Yamaguchi, M. Oka, K. Gotanda, M. Matsugi, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1997**, *38*, 3549–3552.
- [105] D. Kalyani, N. R. Deprez, L. V. Desai, M. S. Sanford, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 7330–7331.
- [106] a) J. Yamaguchi, I. B. Seiple, I. S. Young, D. P. O'Malley, M. Maue, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 3634–3636; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 3578–3581; b) D. P. O'Malley, J. Yamaguchi, I. S. Young, I. B. Seiple, P. S. Baran, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 3637–3639; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 3581–3583.
- [107] a) S. Su, I. B. Seiple, I. S. Young, P. S. Baran, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 16490–16491; b) I. B. Seiple, S. Su, I. S. Young, C. A. Lewis, J. Yamaguchi, P. S. Baran, *Angew. Chem.* **2010**, *122*, 1113–1116; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 1095–1098.