

## Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub>/FeCl<sub>3</sub> mediated facile conversion of alcohols, ketals and acid sensitive ethers into diphenylmethyl (DPM) ethers<sup>†</sup>

G. V. M. Sharma,\* T. Rajendra Prasad and A. K. Mahalingam

Discovery Laboratory, Organic Chemistry Division III, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Hyderabad 500 007, India

Received 11 October 2000; revised 9 November 2000; accepted 15 November 2000

**Abstract**—10 mol% Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> or FeCl<sub>3</sub> have been developed as efficient reagents for the conversion of alcohols into diphenylmethyl (DPM) ethers. Similarly, FeCl<sub>3</sub> has also been advantageously utilised to successfully convert ketals and acid sensitive ethers into DPM ethers. © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Selective and efficient protection<sup>1</sup> of functional groups play a prominent role in a multi-step synthesis. The triphenylmethyl, diphenylmethyl, benzyl and phenyl groups are frequently used for the protection of alcohol, amino and carboxylic acid functional groups. The diphenylmethyl (DPM) group was found as a part structure in a few New Chemical Entities (NCEs)<sup>2</sup> showing therapeutic activity. Conventionally DPM protection is carried out by using DPMCl or DPMBr in the presence of base,<sup>3</sup> DPM diazomethane, tri-DPM phosphate-trifluoroacetic acid<sup>4</sup> or diphenylmethanol in the presence of conc. H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>.<sup>5</sup> The disadvantages encountered with the existing methods include compatibility towards acid and base sensitive groups. Hence, there is still a need to identify new reagents and better methods for the preparation of DPM ethers. In continuation of our interest in the development of new reagents<sup>6</sup> and new methods<sup>7-10</sup> for masking and unmasking functional groups, herein, we describe our results on the use of diphenylmethanol (A) in the presence of Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> or FeCl<sub>3</sub> for the conversion of alcohols, and FeCl<sub>3</sub> mediated one-pot conversion of ketals and acid sensitive ethers, into DPM ethers (Eq. (1)).

$$ROH \xrightarrow{Ph_2CHOH (A)} RODPM \qquad (1)$$

$$\xrightarrow{Yb(OTf)_3/FeCl_3 (10 \text{ mol\%}), CH_2Cl_2} RODPM$$

Initially, alcohol **1** was subjected to reaction with A and 10 mol% Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at room temperature for 0.5 h to give **1a** in 87% yield. Similarly, FeCl<sub>3</sub> (10 mol%) also induced the formation of ether **1a** in 88%

yield in 0.5 h from 1. Having established 10 mol% Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> and FeCl<sub>3</sub> as efficient reagents for the conversion of alcohols into DPM ethers, the protocol was extended to a variety of alcohols (Table 1). Unlike the case of 1, the alcohol group in 2, containing acid sensitive acetonides, on reaction with FeCl<sub>3</sub> gave 2a in 86% yield, while Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> gave 2a in 92% yield. Likewise, the secondary alcohol group in menthol (3) gave 3a in 88 and 86% yields with FeCl<sub>3</sub> and Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub>, respectively. Alcohol 4 underwent facile protection with Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> to give the DPM ether 4a (80%) in 0.5 h, which indicates that the acid sensitive acetonide in 4 can withstand the reaction conditions. However, with FeCl<sub>3</sub> compound 4 underwent deprotection and gave a complex mixture of products.

Selective etherification of symmetrical diol 5 with FeCl<sub>3</sub> afforded the mono protected ether **5a** (60%) along with di-ether **5b** (20%). Similarly, reaction of the unsymmetrical diol in **6** with FeCl<sub>3</sub> furnished **6a** (60%) and **6b** (20%); however, a better selectivity was observed with Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> where **6a** was obtained in 78% yield with a decrease in the formation of di-ether **6b** (10%).

After establishing Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> and FeCl<sub>3</sub> as two new and better reagents for the conversion of alcohols into DPM ethers, FeCl<sub>3</sub> has been advantageously utilised for the one-pot preparation of DPM ethers from ketals and acid sensitive ethers. Accordingly, TBDPS ether 7 underwent desilylation and protection in 1 h to give 1a in 81% yield, while the THP ether 8 furnished 1a in 85% yield in 2 h. The acetonide group in ester 9 was hydrolysed and concomitantly converted into monoether 9a (52%) and di-ether 9b (14%), while the ester functionality was found to remain intact under the

 $<sup>\</sup>begin{tabular}{ll} \textit{Keywords}: & Yb(OTf)_3; & FeCl_3; & diphenylmethanol; & diphenylmethyl \\ (DPM) & ethers. \\ \end{tabular}$ 

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. E-mail: esmvee@iict.ap.nic.in

<sup>†</sup> IICT Communication No. 4657.

reaction conditions. However, the acetonide **10** underwent facile hydrolysis and resulted in the exclusive formation of mono protected ether **10a** (72%).

Thus, in conclusion, the present protocol demonstrated that: (a) 10 mol% of Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> or FeCl<sub>3</sub> are efficient reagents for the conversion of alcohols into DPM ethers; (b) secondary acetonides in compounds such as 2 and 6 and ester functionality in 9 survive the FeCl<sub>3</sub> conditions; (c) Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> is demonstrated to be the reagent of choice and has no effect on acetonides; and (d) FeCl<sub>3</sub> has been very advantageously used for the one-pot conversion of acid sensitive substrates into

DPM ethers in good yields. Thus, the present protocol, making use of diphenylmethanol instead of its derivatives, in the presence of either Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> or FeCl<sub>3</sub> should be of great use in synthetic chemistry, particularly in carbohydrate chemistry.

**Typical experimental procedure:** FeCl<sub>3</sub> method: A mixture of alcohol/ketal (1 mmol), diphenylmethanol (1 mmol) and FeCl<sub>3</sub> (0.1 mmol) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (5 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 0.5–2 h. The reaction mixture was diluted with CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (25 mL) and washed with water (2×10 mL), brine (10 mL), dried (Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>), evaporated and the residue purified by column chro-

Table 1. Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub>/FeCl<sub>3</sub> mediated conversion of alcohols, ketals and acid sensitive ethers to DPM ethers

		Yb(OTf) <sub>3</sub>		FeCl <sub>3</sub>	
Starting materials	Products	Time(h)	Yield(%)	Time(h)	'3 Yield(%)
Ph OH	Ph ODPM	0.5	87	0.5	88
HO 0 0 0	DPMO O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	0.5	92	0.5	86
ОН	ODPM	1	86	1	88
3 0 0 1 0 H	3a ODPM	0.5	80	-	-
HO OH	4a HO ODPM	-	-	0.5	60
	<b>5b</b> diether				20
HO 6	DPMO OO HO 6a	1	78	0.75	60
n.	<b>6b</b> diether		10		20
Ph OTBI	ODPS Ph ODPN	1 -	-	1	81
Ph OTH	HP Ph ODPM	-	-	2	85
$\circ$ $\sim$ $\circ$	MO HO CO <sub>2</sub> M	1e -	-	1.5	52
9	<b>9b</b> diether	-	-		14
MeO 10	DPMQ O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	<u>'</u> -	-	1.25	72

matography (silica gel, ethyl acetate: pet. ether) to afford DPM ethers in 52-88% yields.

**Yb(OTf)**<sub>3</sub> **method**: A mixture of alcohol (1 mmol), diphenylmethanol (1 mmol) and Yb(OTf)<sub>3</sub> (0.1 mmol) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (5 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 0.5–1 h. The reaction mixture was filtered, evaporated and the residue purified by column chromatography (silica gel, ethyl acetate: pet. ether) to afford DPM ethers in 78–92% yields.

Spectral data for selected compounds: <sup>1</sup>H NMR (200 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>, TMS): **1a**:  $\delta$  1.58–1.83 (m, 4H, H-2, 2', 3, 3'), 2.62 (t, 2H, J=3.2, 6.9 Hz, H-4,4'), 3.45 (t, 2H, J=2.0, 7.4 Hz, H-1,1'), 5.25 (s, 1H, Ph<sub>2</sub>CH), 7.08–7.35 (m, 15H, ArH); FABMS: m/z 315 (M<sup>+</sup>–1, 10%), 167 (100%), 91 (50%), 73 (45%); **3a**:  $\delta$  0.42 (d, 3H, J=3.2Hz), 0.8-1.0 (m, 9H), 1.18-1.40 (m, 3H), 1.54-1.68 (m, 2H), 2.08-2.22 (m, 1H), 3.12 (dt, 1H, J=3.7, 10.3 Hz), 5.50 (s, 1H, Ph<sub>2</sub>CH), 7.12–7.48 (m, 10H, ArH); FABMS: m/z 345 (M++23, 18%), 321 (M+-1, 25%), 167 (100%), 83 (18%), 69 (14%), 55 (15%); **9a**:  $\delta$  1.48– 168 (m, 2H, H-5,5'), 2.24–2.44 (m, 2H, H-4,4'), 3.25– 3.50 (m, 2H, H-7,7'), 3.70 (s, 3H, -OCH<sub>3</sub>), 3.72–3.88 (m, 1H, H-6), 5.33 (s, 1H, Ph<sub>2</sub>CH), 5.80 (d, 1H, J=16.4 Hz, H-2), 6.82-7.0 (m, 1H, H-3), 7.15-7.35 (m, 10H, ArH); FABMS: m/z 363 (M++23, 10%), 339  $(M^+-1, 12\%), 167 (100\%), 95 (25\%), 81 (32\%), 69$ (52%), 55 (75%).

## Acknowledgements

T. Rajendra Prasad and A. K. Mahalingam are thankful to CSIR, New Delhi (India), for financial support.

## References

- Greene, T. W.; Wuts, P. G. M. Protecting Groups in Organic Synthesis; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1991; 2nd ed.
- Hayashi, M.; Drug Data Report 1997, 704–705 (JP 97077745).
- Dobson, D.; Todd, A.; Gilmore, J. Synth. Commun. 1991, 21, 611–617.
- 4. Lapatsanis, L. Tetrahedron Lett. 1978, 19, 4697-4698.
- Sugasawa, S.; Fujiwara, K. Org. Synth. Coll. 1963, 4, 72–73
- Sharma, G. V. M.; Mahalingam, A. K.; Rajendra Prasad, T. Synlett. 2000, in press.
- Sharma, G. V. M.; Ilangovan, A.; Mahalingam, A. K. J. Org. Chem. 1998, 63, 9103–9104.
- 8. Sharma, G. V. M.; Ilangovan, A. Synlett. 1999, 1963–1965.
- Sharma, G. V. M.; Mahalingam, A. K. J. Org. Chem. 1999, 64, 8943–8944.
- Sharma, G. V. M.; Mahalingam, A. K.; Nagarajan, M.; Ilangovan, A.; Radha Krishna, P. Synlett 1999, 1200– 1202.