

Pd-Catalyzed α -Arylation of Sulfones in a Three-Component Synthesis of 3-[2-(phenyl/methylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles

Daniel Sole, Ferran Pérez-Janer, Ester Zulaica, Javier F. Guastavino, and Israel Fernandez

ACS Catal., **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acscatal.6b00027 • Publication Date (Web): 01 Feb 2016

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on February 5, 2016

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Pd-Catalyzed α -Arylation of Sulfones in a Three-
8
9
10
11 Component Synthesis of 3-[2-
12
13
14
15
16 (phenyl/methylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles
17
18
19
20

21 *Daniel Solé,^{*†} Ferran Pérez-Janer,[†] Ester Zulaica,[†] Javier F. Guastavino,^{†,§} Israel Fernández^{*‡}*
22

23
24 [†]Laboratori de Química Orgànica, Facultat de Farmàcia, Universitat de Barcelona, Av. Joan
25 XXIII s/n, 08028 Barcelona, Spain
26
27

28
29
30 [‡]Departamento de Química Orgánica I, Facultad de Ciencias Químicas, Centro de Innovación en
31 Química Avanzada (ORFEO-CINQA), Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Ciudad
32 Universitaria, 28040 Madrid, Spain
33
34
35

36
37
38
39 ABSTRACT. A novel four-step domino process for the synthesis of 3-[2-
40 (aryl/alkylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles starting from readily available 2-iodoanilines is reported. The
41 domino reaction is based on the intramolecular palladium-catalyzed α -arylation of sulfones,
42 which was combined with both intermolecular aza-Michael and Michael addition reactions using
43 vinyl sulfones as the electrophile. The domino process produced good yields and tolerated the
44 presence of substituents with different electronic properties on the aniline ring. In addition,
45 Density Functional Theory (DFT) calculations were carried out to gain more insight into the
46 formation of the observed indole derivatives.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
KEYWORDS: Palladium-catalyzed, Arylation, Domino reactions, Indoles, Density functional
calculations.


8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1. INTRODUCTION

Indole is a commonly found heterocycle in biologically active natural products and unnatural pharmaceuticals.¹ For this reason, it is not surprising that since Fischer's pioneering indole synthesis in 1883,² numerous methodologies have been reported for the construction and functionalization of the indole skeleton.³ Besides the vast array of more traditional reactions, recent advances in the area of transition metal-catalyzed transformations have led to the development of several new reliable methods for the synthesis of indoles from simple starting materials.⁴ Among the variety of cross-coupling reactions, the palladium-catalyzed arylation of acidic C–H bonds⁵ is of particular interest for the synthesis of this heteroaromatic compound from non-aromatic precursors.^{6,7}

In the context of our research on palladium-based methodologies for the synthesis of nitrogen heterocycles,⁸ we have reported the palladium-catalyzed intramolecular α -arylation of β -(2-iodoanilino) esters⁹ and amides¹⁰ to give indole-3-carboxylic acid derivatives. In parallel with these studies, and in order to create more complex and diverse scaffolds from readily accessible starting materials, we have also explored the integration of the palladium-catalyzed α -arylation reaction into one-pot sequences.¹¹ This research allowed us to recently achieve an efficient synthesis of highly functionalized tetrahydroisoquinolines by a domino aza-Michael/ α -arylation/Michael addition process based on the use of sulfones either as electrophiles or nucleophiles.¹² Continuing these studies, we decided to explore the synthesis of indole derivatives by means of a multistep sequence involving the use of sulfones (Scheme 1). When

starting from 2-haloaniline **A**, the aforementioned three-step domino process could be expected to generate a 3-(sulfonyl)indoline intermediate (i. e. **D**), a type of compound known to undergo β -elimination of sulfinic acid to afford indoles.^{13,14} We postulated that this additional step would allow us to prepare 3-[2-(aryl/alkylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles in a new four-step domino process from readily available 2-haloanilines.



Scheme 1. Generic plan for the domino aza-Michael/ α -arylation/Michael addition/ β -elimination process leading to 3-[2-(aryl/alkylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles

Among the various substitution patterns of the indole nucleus, compounds bearing the (3-indolyl)ethyl moiety are particularly challenging synthetic targets due to the diversity of biologically active tryptamine analogues.^{15,16} Thus, a general approach to this type of compound using the proposed domino aza-Michael/ α -arylation/Michael addition/ β -elimination strategy would complement existing methodologies and in some instances provide a more attractive option.¹⁷

1
2
3 A successful domino process should occur under conditions that allow the desired sequence of
4 events to take precedence over any undesired competitive reactions. Thus, in our strategy, the
5 starting iodoaniline **A** would have to be consumed rapidly by the aza-Michael addition¹⁸ to avoid
6 an intramolecular Heck process proceeding as the first step.¹⁹ Similarly, the competitive Heck
7 reaction should not interfere with the palladium-catalyzed α -arylation reaction of intermediate **B**.
8 Finally, the 3-(sulfonyl)indoline intermediate **C** should be immediately trapped²⁰ to prevent a
9 premature β -elimination leading to the non-substituted indole.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The work described herein explores the viability of the proposed palladium-catalyzed α -arylation
22 of sulfones in a four-step domino process to obtain 3-[2-(phenyl/methylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles
23 from readily available starting materials. To this end, a detailed joint experimental and
24 computational study was carried out to provide insight into the formation of the target indole
25 through this multicomponent domino reaction.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33


34 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

35
36
37 During the optimization of the domino process leading to tetrahydroisoquinolines,¹² we realized
38 that the most challenging step of the sequence was the sulfone α -arylation reaction.²¹ So, before
39 embarking on the development of a domino process to access 3-substituted indoles, we first
40 examined the palladium-catalyzed α -arylation of β -(2-iodoanilino) sulfones. Sulfones **1a-c** were
41 chosen for this purpose (Table 1).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Treatment of **1a** with the Pd₂(dba)₃/xantphos couple as the precatalyst and K₃PO₄ as the base in
52 DMF, an effective combination for the domino sequence starting from closely related 2-
53 iodobenzylamines,¹² resulted in the decomposition of the starting material (entry 1, Table 1).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

When using the same combination of palladium source and ligand, with Cs₂CO₃ as the base in THF, the starting aryl iodide **1a** was recovered unchanged (entry 2, Table 1). Substituting the ligand for BINAP resulted, once again, in the formation of a complex reaction mixture (entry 3, Table 1).

Table 1. Optimization of the α -arylation conditions^a



entry	sulfone	catalyst (equiv.)	base (equiv.)	solvent	time	¹ H NMR ratio	yield (%) ^b
1	1a	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) xantphos (0.15)	K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	DMF	72 h		--- ^c
2	1a	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) xantphos (0.15)	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	72 h		1a ^d
3	1a	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.05) BINAP (0.1)	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	72 h		--- ^c
4	1a	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (2.5)	DMF	70 h		3a (44%) ^e
5	1a	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (2.5)	THF	72 h	2a:3a (1:2)	3a (73%)
6	1a	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.05)	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (2.5)	THF	72 h	2a:3a (2:1)	3a (68%)
7	1b	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	DMF	72 h		3b (65%)
8	1b	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	THF	72 h		3b (64%)
9	1b	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.05)	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (2.5)	THF	72 h		3b (52%)
10	1c	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	DMF	120 h		3b (42%) ^e
11	1c	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	THF	115 h	2c:3b (5:1) ^e	2c (40%) 3b (41%)
12	1c	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (2.5)	THF	120 h	2c:3b (5:1) ^e	2c (7%) 3b (76%)

^a The reactions were carried out in a sealed tube at 120 °C. ^b Yields refer to pure products isolated by flash chromatography. ^c Complex mixture. ^d Yield not quantified. ^e Small amounts of the hydrodehalogenation compound (≤10%) were also observed in the crude reaction mixture. Pd₂(dba)₃: Tris(dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0). Xantphos: 4,5-Bis(diphenylphosphino)-9,9-dimethylxanthene. BINAP: 2,2'-Bis(diphenylphosphino)-1,1'-binaphthalene.

1
2
3 In contrast, the reaction of **1a** with Pd(PPh₃)₄ and K₃PO₄ in DMF afforded the product **3a**
4
5 resulting from the elimination of phenylsulfonic acid from the initially formed α -arylation
6
7 compound **2a** (entry 4, Table 1). The use of THF as the solvent, maintaining the same
8
9 combination of reagents and catalyst, led to the formation of a 1:2 mixture of indoline **2a**²² and
10
11 indole **3a** (entry 5, Table 1), whereas a ratio of 2:1 was observed when the base was changed
12
13 from K₃PO₄ to Cs₂CO₃ (entry 6, Table 1). However, after column chromatography of these
14
15 reaction mixtures, only indole **3a** was isolated, as a result of the SiO₂-promoted elimination of
16
17 phenylsulfonic acid from **2a**.
18
19
20
21
22


23
24 Phenyl sulfone **1b**, which bears a methyl group at the aniline nitrogen atom, exclusively afforded
25
26 indole **3b** when submitted to the reaction conditions optimized for the α -arylation of **1a** (entries
27
28 7-9, Table 1). It should be noted that the corresponding indoline intermediate **C** was not
29
30 observed in any of the crude reaction mixtures of these runs.
31
32
33

34
35 Methyl sulfone **1c** was also efficient in the α -arylation reaction, with a similar behavior to
36
37 phenyl sulfone **1a**, although the process was slower. While indole **3b** was directly obtained when
38
39 using DMF as the solvent (entry 10, Table 1), the annulation reaction in THF afforded mixtures
40
41 of indoline **2c** and the indole **3b** (entries 11 and 12, Table 1). Interestingly, although **2c** partially
42
43 evolved to indole **3b** during the chromatographic purification, in this case the indoline was stable
44
45 enough to be isolated and characterized.
46
47
48

49
50 At this point, the best conditions for the α -arylation of β -(2-iodoanilino) sulfones involved the
51
52 use of Pd(PPh₃)₄ as the catalyst and either K₃PO₄ or Cs₂CO₃ as the base in THF. On the other
53
54 hand, the results in Table 1 show that both phenyl and methyl sulfones could *a priori* be useful to
55
56 develop the proposed reaction cascade, since the corresponding 3-sulfonyl indolines partially
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 survived under the α -arylation conditions. However, in the phenylsulfonyl series, changing the
5
6 substituent at the nitrogen atom from benzyl to methyl resulted in a fast elimination of
7
8 phenylsulfonic acid, which could hamper the use of *N*-methyl derivatives in the domino process.
9
10 With this information in hand, without any further optimization, we then focused on combining
11
12 the α -arylation reaction with the next steps of the domino process, namely the Michael addition
13
14 of the 3-sulfonyl indoline intermediate **C** and the subsequent β -elimination from the resulting
15
16 alkylated indoline **D** (Scheme 1 and Table 2).
17
18
19
20

21 **Table 2.** α -Arylation/Michael addition/ β -elimination domino process^a
22
23



entry	sulfone	Michael acceptor	base (equiv.)	solvent	yield (%) ^b
1	1a		K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	THF	--- ^c
2	1a		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4a (48%) ^d
3	1a		K ₃ PO ₄ (3)	DMF	4a (19%) ^c
4	1a		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	DMF	4a (27%) ^{c,e}
5	1a		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4d (43%) ^f
6	1b		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4b (73%) ^g
7	1b		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4c (45%) ^g
8	1c		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4c (44%) ^h
9	1c		Cs ₂ CO ₃ (3)	THF	4b (40%) ⁱ

53 ^a Reaction conditions: **1** (0.2 mmol), Pd(PPh₃)₄ (10 mol%), Michael acceptor (2 equiv.), and
54 base (3 equiv.) in the indicated solvent in a sealed tube at 120 °C for 72 h. ^b Yields refer to pure
55 products isolated by flash chromatography. ^c Complex mixture. ^d *N*-Benzyl-4-methyl-*N*-[2-
56 (phenylsulfonyl)ethyl]aniline (**5a**) was also isolated (17%). ^e Significant amounts of *N*-benzyl-*p*-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 toluidine were observed in the reaction mixture.^f **5a** (20%) was also isolated.^g Small amounts of
4 the corresponding hydrodehalogenation product (< 10%) were also observed in the crude
5 reaction mixture.^h *N*,4-Dimethyl-*N*-[2-(methylsulfonyl)ethyl]aniline (**5c**) was also isolated
6 (20%).ⁱ **5c** (26%) was also isolated.
7
8

9 Treatment of **1a** with Pd(PPh₃)₄ and K₃PO₄ in the presence of phenyl vinyl sulfone in THF
10 afforded a complex mixture in which only trace amounts of the desired indole **4a** were observed,
11 together with the reduction compound **5a** and some products arising from the Heck reaction of
12 the starting aryl iodide (entry 1, Table 2). However, to our delight, changing the base to Cs₂CO₃
13 resulted in a clean reaction mixture, from which indole **4a** (48%) and the reduction compound **5a**
14 (17%) were isolated (entry 2, Table 2). When the reactions were performed in DMF using either
15 K₃PO₄ or Cs₂CO₃ as the base, indole **4a** was also obtained, although in significantly lower yields
16 (entries 3 and 4, Table 2).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27


28 The three-step domino process of **1a** with methyl vinyl sulfone afforded indole **4d** in 43% yield
29 (entry 5, Table 2). Phenyl sulfone **1b**, which bears a methyl group at the nitrogen atom, gave
30 indoles **4b** (73%) and **4c** (45%) when submitted to the domino reaction with phenyl vinyl sulfone
31 (entry 6, Table 2) and methyl vinyl sulfone (entry 7, Table 2), respectively. This indicates that
32 the Michael addition of the 3-sulfonyl indoline intermediate to the vinyl sulfone is faster than the
33 β-elimination of sulfinic acid, even for those substrates having a methyl substituent at the
34 nitrogen atom (*vide supra*).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Finally, methyl sulfone **1c** also underwent the domino reaction, either with methyl vinyl sulfone
46 (entry 8, Table 2) or phenyl vinyl sulfone (entry 9, Table 2), to afford, respectively, indoles **4c**
47 (44%) and **4b** (40%).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The promising results obtained in these three-step domino reactions constituted a good starting
55 point to develop the initially proposed four-step domino process, which would simplify the
56
57
58
59
60

preparation of 3-[2-(sulfonyl)ethyl]indoles starting from the readily available *N*-alkyl-2-iodoanilines. *N*-Benzyl-2-iodoaniline was chosen to test our proposal (Table 3).

Table 3. Optimization of the aza-Michael/ α -arylation/Michael addition/ β -elimination domino process^a



entry	catalyst (equiv.)	Michael acceptor	solvent	yield (%) ^b
1	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (33%) ^c
2	Pd(PPh ₃) ₄ (0.1)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	DMF	6a (28%) ^d
3	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) (<i>o</i> -tolyl) ₃ P (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	SM
4	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) xantphos (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	SM
5	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) BINAP (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (54%) ^c
6	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppf (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (69%)
7	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppf (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (80%)
8	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppf (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (65%) ^g
9	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppp (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a (65%)
10	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dtpf (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	7 ^h
11	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppe (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6a/7 (1:1) ⁱ
12	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) dppf (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6b (33%) ^j
13	Pd ₂ (dba) ₃ (0.075) BINAP (0.15)	<chem>CC(=O)S</chem>	THF	6b (58%) ^k


^a Reaction conditions: *N*-Benzyl-2-iodoaniline (0.2 mmol), [Pd] and ligand (see table), Michael acceptor (2.1 equiv.), and Cs₂CO₃ (3 equiv.) in the indicated solvent in a sealed tube at 120 °C for 72 h. ^b Yields refer to pure products isolated by flash chromatography. ^c *N*-Benzylaniline (**7**) was also isolated (10%). ^d **7** was also isolated (17%). ^e Michael acceptor (2.4 equiv.). ^f The reaction was run at 80 °C. ^g *N*-Benzyl-2-iodoaniline (8%) was recovered. ^h Yield not quantified, minor amounts of **6a** (≤10%) were also observed in the reaction mixture. ⁱ ¹H NMR ratio, yields not quantified. ^j *E-N*-Benzyl-2-[2-(methylsulfonyl)ethenyl]aniline (**8**) was also isolated (14%). ^k **8** (13%) was also isolated. dppf: 1,1'-Bis(diphenylphosphino)ferrocene. dtpf: 1,1'-Bis(di-*tert*-butylphosphino)ferrocene. dppp: 1,3-Bis(diphenylphosphino)propane. dppe: 1,2-Bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane.

When *N*-benzyl-2-iodoaniline was treated with phenyl vinyl sulfone in the presence of Pd(PPh₃)₄ and Cs₂CO₃ in THF, an effective combination to promote the three-step domino process from **1a**, indole **6a** was obtained in a modest 33% yield, together with *N*-benzylaniline (**7**), which resulted from the reduction of the starting 2-iodoaniline (entry 1, Table 3). Although the use of a more polar solvent should facilitate the initial aza-Michael addition,¹⁸ the yield of indole **6a** was in fact slightly lower when the reaction was performed in DMF (entry 2, Table 3). In view of these poor results, we decided to optimize the four-step domino reaction by using different commercially available phosphines as the ligand. The use of either (*o*-tolyl)₃P or xantphos resulted in the recovery of the starting material (entries 3 and 4, Table 3). Surprisingly, although BINAP had failed to promote the α-arylation from phenyl sulfone **1a** (see Table 1), its use in the present domino process resulted in the formation of **6a** in an acceptable 54% yield (entry 5, Table 3). Using dppf allowed us to obtain indole **6a** in 69% yield (entry 6, Table 3), while in the presence of the ligand dppp, **6a** was isolated in 65% yield (entry 9, Table 3). We were also able to increase the yield of **6a** up to 80% by using dppf and a slightly higher quantity of the Michael acceptor (entry 7, Table 3). Lower reaction temperatures resulted in the recovery of small amounts of the starting material (entry 8, Table 3). Other bidentate ligands were less amenable to promoting the four-step domino process. For instance, the most hindered dtpf mainly resulted in the formation











of the hydrodehalogenation product **7** (entry 10, Table 3), whereas a 1:1 mixture of **6a** and **7** was obtained when using dppe (entry 11, Table 3).

The four-step domino process of *N*-benzyl-2-iodoaniline with methyl vinyl sulfone using dppf as the ligand afforded a complex mixture from which indole **6b** was isolated in 33% (entry 12, Table 3). Interestingly, the replacement of the ligand by BINAP allowed us to obtain **6b** in an acceptable 58% yield (entry 13, Table 3).

Table 4. Synthesis of 3-[2-(phenyl/methylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles^a




entry	Michael acceptor	ligand	product	yield (%) ^b
1		BINAP	9a , R = Me, R'' = Ph	(71%)
2		dppp	9a , R = Me, R'' = Ph	(50%)
3		BINAP	9b , R = Me, R'' = Me	(45%)
4		dppf	 10a , R = Pr, R'' = Ph	(69%)
5		dppf	10b , R = Pr, R'' = Me	(67%)
6		BINAP	10b , R = Pr, R'' = Me	(45%)
7		dppf	11a , R = Et, R'' = Ph	(89%)
8		dppf	4a , R = Bn, R' = Me, R'' = Ph	(83%)
9		dppf	4d , R = Bn, R' = Me, R'' = Me	(56%)
10		BINAP	4d , R = Bn, R' = Me, R'' = Me	(45%)
11		dppf	 12a , R = Bn, R' = MeO, R'' = Ph	(79%)
12		dppf	12b , R = Bn, R' = MeO, R'' = Me	(57%)
13		dppf	13a , R = Pr, R' = MeO, R'' = Ph	(45%)
14		dppf	14a , R = Bn, R' = Cl, R'' = Ph	(85%)
15		BINAP	14b , R = Bn, R' = Cl, R'' = Me	(70%)

16		dppf		15a , R = Bn, R' = Cl, R'' = Ph (65%)
17		BINAP		15b , R = Bn, R' = Cl, R'' = Me (40%)
18		dppf		16a , R = Bn, R' = F, R'' = Ph (75%)
19		dppf		16b , R = Bn, R' = F, R'' = Me (73%)
20		dppf		17a , R = Bn, R' = CO ₂ Me, R'' = Ph (72%)
21		BINAP		17b , R = Bn, R' = CO ₂ Me, R'' = Me (56%)
22		dppf		17b , R = Bn, R' = CO ₂ Me, R'' = Me (62%)
23		dppf		18a , R = Pr, R' = CO ₂ Me, R'' = Ph (81%)
24		dppf		18b , R = Pr, R' = CO ₂ Me, R'' = Me (60%)

^a Reaction conditions: *N*-Aryl-2-iodoaniline (0.2 mmol), Pd₂(dba)₃ (7.5 mol%), ligand (see table, 15 mol%), Michael acceptor (2.1-2.4 equiv.), and Cs₂CO₃ (3 equiv.) in THF in a sealed tube at 120 °C for 72 h. ^b Yields refer to pure products isolated by flash chromatography.

As shown in Table 4, a variety of diversely substituted 3-(sulfonyl)ethylindoles were prepared through the four-step domino process when using either phenyl vinyl sulfone or methyl vinyl sulfone as the Michael acceptor. The generality and functional group tolerance of the reaction is well illustrated by the fact that both electron-donating and electron-withdrawing groups were perfectly accommodated on the aromatic ring. Overall, the phenyl sulfone afforded better results than the methyl sulfone due to its higher electrophilicity as well as the higher acidity of its α -C-H bonds, which favors both the α -arylation and the Michael addition. In this context, it should be noted that the initial aza-Michael addition took place without any appreciable interference from the competitive Heck reaction. The same behavior was also observed in our previously developed three-step domino process leading to tetrahydroisoquinolines.¹² This absence of competition contrasts with what occurred in a related one-pot aza-Michael addition/ α -arylation process using acrylates as the Michael acceptor.²³ In this case, it was impossible to develop a real domino reaction²⁴ because, in the presence of the Pd catalyst, the Heck coupling with the acrylate took place before the aza-Michael addition.¹⁹

Some additional comments on the four-step domino reactions described above (Tables 3 and 4) are warranted. In these reactions, the expected reduction products of the initially formed intermediates **B** (Scheme 1) were never observed, yet they were a common side-product (i. e. **5a-c**) in the three-step domino processes starting from sulfones **1a-c** (see Table 2). This fact, together with the isolation of significant amounts of *N*-benzylaniline (**7**), as well as the apparently contradictory results obtained with BINAP, suggested that a sequence of events different from those depicted in Scheme 1 could be operating in the four-step domino reaction. Indeed, all these results could be easily accommodated by an alternative sequence of reactions (Scheme 2) in which the formation of indoline **C** begins with the oxidative addition of the iodoaniline to Pd(0). The resulting Pd(II) intermediate **E** would then undergo deprotonation and aza-Michael addition to the vinyl sulfone to give intermediate **F**. The latter would evolve to indoline **C** by means of coordination of the sulfone anion and subsequent reductive elimination.




Scheme 2. Alternative sequence of events for the domino process

In search of evidence for the proposed aza-Michael/ α -arylation/Michael addition/ β -elimination sequence, further experiments were performed. Treatment of indole **3b** with phenyl vinyl sulfone in the presence of Pd(PPh₃)₄ and Cs₂CO₃ in THF at 120 °C resulted in the recovery of the starting material. On the other hand, the treatment of a 8.3:1 mixture of indoline **2c** and indole **3b** with


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

methyl vinyl sulfone and Cs₂CO₃ in THF at 120 °C, both with and without Pd(PPh₃)₄, resulted in the formation of a 6.4-6.9:1 mixture of indoles **4c** and **3b** (Scheme 3). These results therefore confirm that indole **4c** was generated by the Michael addition of indoline **2c** to methyl vinyl sulfone followed by β-elimination of sulfinic acid, rather than by the metal-promoted nucleophilic addition of indole **3b** to the vinyl sulfone.²⁵



Scheme 3. Reaction of indoline **2c** with methyl vinyl sulfone

More illustratively, the reactions of *N*-benzyl-2-iodoaniline with the dideuterated phenyl vinyl sulfone **19-D₂** under optimized conditions (see for instance Table 3, entry 7) afforded indole **6a-D₃**, bearing deuterium labels at C-2 of the indole nucleus as well as at the β position of the 3-(phenylsulfonyl)ethyl chain (Scheme 4). This result provides further experimental evidence for the proposed aza-Michael/α-arylation/Michael addition/β-elimination sequence of events.



Scheme 4. Reaction of *N*-benzyl-2-iodoaniline with sulfone **19-D₂**

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations²⁶ were carried out to gain more insight into the mechanism of the sulfone α -arylation as well as the other key steps of the domino sequence described above. First, we focused on the α -arylation process involving an analogous compound of **1c** (Table 1), where the methyl group in the aromatic ring was replaced by a hydrogen atom. Our calculations started from species **INT0**, the intermediate formed upon the initial oxidative addition of the 2-iodoaniline derivative to the model Pd(PMe₃)₂ catalyst (Figure 1). In the presence of CO₃⁻² as the base, deprotonation of the slightly acidic hydrogen atom attached to a carbon atom linked to the sulfone group may occur, therefore leading to **INT1** species in a slightly exergonic process ($\Delta G_R = -4.0$ kcal/mol). This intermediate would then evolve to complex **INT2** by exergonic coordination of the carbanion to the transition metal ($\Delta G_R = -14.9$ kcal/mol) and release of a phosphine ligand. From this species, the α -arylation would take place directly via **TS1**, a transition state associated with the formation of the new C–C bond. This exergonic step ($\Delta G_R = -14.2$ kcal/mol) occurs with an activation barrier of 28.6 kcal/mol, which is fully compatible with a process occurring at 120 °C. Therefore, this reaction mechanism resembles the one we previously proposed for the α -arylation reaction involving related ketone and ester derivatives.⁸¹

Nevertheless, an alternative reaction pathway involving a key C–H activation step can be also envisaged. Thus, the initial intermediate **INT0** may be readily transformed into complex **INT3** through a highly exergonic ($\Delta G_R = -26.6$ kcal/mol) iodide and phosphine ligand replacement promoted by bidentate CO₃⁻². This complex would be then converted into complex **INT4** via **TS2** with an activation barrier of 26.1 kcal/mol in a slightly endergonic transformation ($\Delta G_R =$

1
2
3 +2.7 kcal/mol). As depicted in Figure 1, this saddle point is associated with the concerted
4 hydrogen migration from the sulfone to the carbonate ligand and Pd–C bond formation. In this
5 sense, this transformation is analogous to related concerted metallation-deprotonation (CMD) C–
6 H activations which are assisted by acetate²⁷ or carbonate.²⁸ From **INT4**, the final indoline **2M**
7 can be directly produced through **TS3** in a reductive elimination process associated with the
8 formation of the new C–C bond. Although this reaction is exergonic ($\Delta G_R = -9.2$ kcal/mol), it
9 proceeds with a relatively high activation barrier of 37.4 kcal/mol. Therefore, **INT4** may release
10 the HCO_3^- ligand first and be transformed into **INT5**, where the reductive elimination reaction
11 via **TS4** is computed to be kinetically far more favorable ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 13.9$ kcal/mol, from **INT5**).
12 Additionally, due to the excess of CO_3^{2-} in the process, **INT2** may alternatively be converted
13 into **INT6** through a carbonate/iodide ligand exchange. This transformation seems feasible in
14 view of the high exergonicity ($\Delta G_R = -18.5$ kcal/mol) computed for this ligand exchange.
15 However, the corresponding reductive elimination via **TS5** would proceed with a much higher
16 activation barrier ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 42.9$ kcal/mol) than the process involving **TS4**, which renders this
17 alternative pathway very unlikely. Therefore, based on the computed data, it can be concluded
18 that the **INT3** → **INT4** → **INT5** → **2M** pathway, which involves an initial CMD reaction
19 followed by a reductive elimination step, seems to be the most plausible reaction mechanism for
20 the palladium-catalyzed formation of indolines from β -(2-iodoanilino) sulfones.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Computed reaction profiles for the palladium catalyzed α -arylation reaction of **INT0**. Relative free energies (ΔG_{298} , at 298 K) and bond distances are given in kcal/mol and angstroms, respectively. All data were computed at the PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVP//PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP level.

1
2
3
4 As indicated in the reaction profile depicted in Figure 1, the preferred pathway involves the
5
6 formation of the coordinatively unsaturated palladium(II) complex **INT5**. We hypothesize that
7
8 the involvement of the bidentate phosphine ligands used in the experiments must occur from this
9
10 intermediate. To find computational evidence for this hypothesis, we explored the feasibility of
11
12 the final reductive elimination reaction from **INT5'**, the analogous species to **INT5** bearing an
13
14 additional phosphine ligand (i.e. a model bidentate ligand of the dppp ligand, with phenyl groups
15
16 replaced by methyl groups). As expected, our calculations (Figure 2) indicate that the
17
18 coordination of the free phosphine leading to the coordinatively saturated complex **INT7** is
19
20 highly exergonic ($\Delta G_R = -18.5$ kcal/mol). From this species, the reductive elimination reaction
21
22 occurs via **TS6**, the corresponding saddle point associated with the formation of the new C–C
23
24 bond and release of the Pd(dppp) catalyst. From the data in Figure 2, it becomes clear that the
25
26 process involving the bidentate ligand proceeds with a much higher activation barrier ($\Delta G^\ddagger =$
27
28 29.5 kcal/mol) and a lower exergonicity ($\Delta G_R = -9.7$ kcal/mol) than the analogous process
29
30 involving the monodentate ligand ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 13.9$ kcal/mol and $\Delta G_R = -19.5$ kcal/mol, see Figure
31
32 1), which nicely agrees with the experimental findings obtained during the optimization of the α -
33
34 arylation reaction (see Table 1).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. Computed reductive elimination reaction involving **INT5'**. Relative free energies (ΔG_{298} , at 298 K) and bond distances are given in kcal/mol and angstroms, respectively. All data were computed at the PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVP//PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP level.

We then focused on understanding the negligible interference from the competitive Heck coupling reaction in the four-step domino process from *N*-alkyl-2-iodoanilines (see above, Tables 3 and 4). To this end, we computed the two possible reaction pathways, namely aza-Michael reaction vs Heck reaction, starting from **INT8**, the intermediate formed upon the initial oxidative addition of the 2-iodo-*N*-methylaniline to the model $\text{Pd}(\text{PMe}_3)_2$ catalyst (Figure 3). This species, in the presence of CO_3^{2-} as the base, may deprotonate, leading to the anionic complex **INT9** in an exergonic process ($\Delta G_{\text{R}} = -9.9$ kcal/mol). Then, **INT9** would react with the corresponding vinyl sulfone to produce **INT10** through **TS7**, a saddle point associated with the

1
2
3 formation of the N–C bond ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 8.2$ kcal/mol) in an aza-Michael type process. Final
4
5 protonation of **INT10** leads to the formation of **INT0**, the common intermediate in the processes
6
7 involving both 2-iodoanilines (Tables 3 and 4) and compounds **1** (Table 1 and 2). As clearly seen
8
9 in Figure 3, the alternative Heck coupling reaction is not competitive in this transformation. This
10
11 is mainly due to the high endergonicity ($\Delta G_R = 20.2$ kcal/mol) associated with the initial
12
13 dissociation of a phosphine ligand, which is required to create a vacant coordination to allocate
14
15 the incoming vinyl sulfone ligand. In addition, the electron-withdrawing effect of the SO₂Me
16
17 group reduces the coordination ability of the attached double bond, which also renders the
18
19 coordination of the vinyl sulfone to **INT11** endergonic ($\Delta G_R = 4.8$ kcal/mol).²⁹ Although the
20
21 subsequent insertion step via **TS8** proceeds with a relatively low activation barrier ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 11.5$
22
23 kcal/mol), this highly unfavorable phosphine/vinyl sulfone ligand interchange makes the
24
25 alternative Heck reaction very unlikely, which is fully compatible with the experimental
26
27 observations.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 The beneficial effect of bidentate phosphine ligands observed during the optimization of the
36
37 four-step domino process (see for instance, Table 3) is also in nice agreement with the expected
38
39 even higher endergonicity associated with the generation of the coordinatively unsaturated
40
41 species (*i.e.* **INT 11**), which is required for the Heck coupling when using a chelating phosphine.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Computed reaction profiles for competitive aza-Michael and Heck coupling reactions from INT8. Relative free energies (ΔG_{298} , at 298 K) and bond distances are given in kcal/mol and angstroms, respectively. All data were computed at the PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVP//PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP level.

Finally, we addressed the last steps of the domino process which involve the transformation of intermediate C (Scheme 1) into the observed 3-[2-(phenyl/methylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles. Our DFT-calculations began from intermediate 2M, the indoline formed during the palladium-catalyzed α -arylation (or CMD-reductive elimination) process described above (see Figure 1). Deprotonation of the highly acidic benzylic hydrogen atom by the base would lead to the formation of carbanion 2M-an, from which a rapid ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 6.4$ kcal/mol) and exergonic ($\Delta G_R = -3.7$ kcal/mol) Michael addition would take place via TS9. Protonation of intermediate 3M-an

would then produce the 3-(sulfonyl)indoline intermediate **3M**, which would be transformed into the final indole **4M** through **TS10**.³⁰ As depicted in Figure 4, this final five-membered ring transition state is associated with a concerted β -elimination reaction of sulfinic acid. Despite the concomitant rupture of both the S–C and C–H bonds, the process was computed to be highly exergonic ($\Delta G_R = -16.5$ kcal/mol) and to proceed with a feasible activation barrier ($\Delta G^\ddagger = 18.1$ kcal/mol). This can be ascribed to the gain in aromaticity in the final indole derivative which therefore constitutes the thermodynamic driving force of the entire transformation.




Figure 4. Final transformation of indoline **2M** into indole **4M**. Relative free energies (ΔG_{298} , at 298 K) and bond distances are given in kcal/mol and angstroms, respectively. All data were computed at the PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVP//PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP level.

1
2
3 In summary, we have developed a set of reaction conditions for a new four-step domino process
4 toward 3-[2-(aryl/alkylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles from readily available 2-iodoanilines. In this three-
5 component domino process, the crucial intramolecular palladium-catalyzed α -arylation of
6 sulfones is combined with intermolecular aza-Michael and Michael additions to vinyl sulfones,
7 as well as a highly selective β -elimination of sulfinic acid, avoiding any undesired competitive
8 reactions. A series of diversely substituted 3-[2-sulfonylethyl]indoles were easily synthesized in
9 moderate-to-high yields. According to DFT calculations, after the initial oxidative addition to the
10 palladium catalyst, an aza-Michael reaction occurs without any significant interference from the
11 alternative Heck coupling reaction. The α -arylation process would then occur through a
12 CMD/reductive elimination process thus leading to indoline derivatives. The latter species are
13 finally converted into the observed 3-[2-(aryl/alkylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles through two
14 consecutive reaction steps involving an initial rapid Michael addition followed by an exergonic
15 and concerted β -elimination reaction of sulfinic acid.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 3. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

37
38
39 **Representative procedure for the domino reactions (Table 3, Entry 7).** A mixture of *N*-
40 benzyl-2-iodobenzylamine (80 mg, 0.26 mmol), Pd₂(dba)₃ (18 mg, 0.019 mmol), dppf (21 mg,
41 0.039 mmol), phenyl vinyl sulfone (104 mg, 0.62 mmol), and Cs₂CO₃ (253 mg, 0.78 mmol) in
42 THF (8 mL) was stirred at 120 °C in a sealed tube for 72 h. The reaction mixture was poured into
43 water and extracted with Et₂O. The organic extracts were washed with brine, dried, and
44 concentrated. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (SiO₂, from hexanes to hexanes-
45 EtOAc 1:4) to give sulfone **6a** (78 mg, 80%) as an amorphous brown solid.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

All the calculations reported in this paper were obtained with the GAUSSIAN 09 suite of programs.³¹ Electron correlation was partially taken into account using the hybrid functional usually denoted as B3LYP³² in conjunction with the D3 dispersion correction suggested by Grimme and co-workers³³ using the double- ζ quality plus polarization def2-SVP basis set³⁴ for all atoms. Reactants and products were characterized by frequency calculations,³⁵ and have positive definite Hessian matrices. Transition structures (TS's) show only one negative eigenvalue in their diagonalized force constant matrices, and their associated eigenvectors were confirmed to correspond to the motion along the reaction coordinate under consideration using the Intrinsic Reaction Coordinate (IRC) method.³⁶ Solvents effects were taken into account using the Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM).³⁷ Single point calculations on the PCM(THF)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP geometries were performed to estimate the change in the Gibbs energies at the B3LYP-D3 level using the triple- ζ quality plus polarization def2-TZVP basis set³⁴ for all atoms. This level is denoted PCM(THF)-B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVP//PCM(THF)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information. Detailed experimental procedures, characterization data and copies of NMR spectra for all new compounds, as well as Cartesian coordinates of all species described in the text. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail for D.S.: dsole@ub.edu

*E-mail for I.F.: israel@quim.ucm.es

Present Addresses

[§] INFIQC, Departamento de Química Orgánica, Facultad de Ciencias Químicas, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina X5000HUA.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support for this work from the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Fondos Europeos para el Desarrollo Regional (MINECO-FEDER) (grant numbers CTQ2012-31391, CTQ2013-44303-P, and Red de Excelencia Consolider CTQ2014-51912-REDC).

REFERENCES

(1) (a) Sundberg, R. J. *Indoles*; Academic Press: London, 1996; p 1-169. (b) Joule, J. A. In *Science of Synthesis*; George Thieme Verlag: Stuttgart, 2000; Vol. 10; p 526-585. (c) Bonner, S. M.; Im, G.-Y. J.; Garg, N. K. In *Heterocycles in Natural Product Synthesis*; Majundar, K. C., Chattopadhyay, S. K., Eds.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2011; p 211-225. (d) Ishikura, M.; Abe, T.; Choshi, T.; Hibino, S. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **2013**, *30*, 694-752, and previous reviews in these series.

1
2
3 (2) Fischer, E.; Jourdan, F. *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges.* **1883**, *16*, 2241-2245.
4
5

6 (3) For recent reviews, see: (a) Humphrey, G. R.; Kuethe, J. T. *Chem. Rev.* **2006**, *106*, 2875-
7 2911. (b) Vicente, R. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, **2011**, *9*, 6469-6480. (c) Taber, D. F.; Tirunahari, P.
8 K. *Tetrahedron* **2011**, *67*, 7195-7210.
9
10
11
12

13 (4) For recent reviews, see: (a) Zeni, G.; Larock, R. C. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 2285-2309. (b)
14 Cacchi, S.; Fabrizi, G. *Chem. Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 2873-2920. (c) Zeni, G.; Larock, R. C. *Chem. Rev.*
15 **2006**, *106*, 4644-4680. (d) Bellina, F.; Rossi, R. *Tetrahedron* **2009**, *65*, 10269-10310. (e) Platon,
16 M.; Amardeil, R.; Djakovitch, L.; Hierso, J.-C. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2012**, *41*, 3929-3968. (f) Guo,
17 T.; Huang, F.; Yu, L.; Yu, Z. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2015**, *56*, 296-302.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 (5) For reviews, see: (a) Culkin, D. A.; Hartwig, J. F. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2003**, *36*, 234-245. (b)
28 Bellina, F.; Rossi, R. *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 1082-1146. (c) Johansson, C. C. C.; Colacot, T. J.
29 *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 676-707. (d) Sivanandan, S. T.; Shaji, A.; Ibnusaud, I.;
30 Johansson-Seechurn, C. C. C.; Colacot, T. J. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2015**, 38-49.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 (6) Potukuchi, H.K.; Spork, A. P.; Donohoe, T. J. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, **2015**, *13*, 4367-4373.
39
40

41 (7) For recent examples, see: (a) Kale, A. P.; Kumar, G. S.; Mangadan, A. R. K.; Kapur, M. *Org.*
42 *Lett.* **2015**, *17*, 1324-1327. (b) Rotta-Loria, N. L.; Borzenko, A.; Alsabeh, P. G.; Lavery, C. B.;
43 Stradiotto, M. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2015**, *357*, 100-106. (c) Zoller, J.; Fabry, D. C.; Ronge, M. A.;
44 Rueping, M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 13264-13268.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 (8) (a) Solé, D.; Peidró, E.; Bonjoch, J. *Org. Lett.* **2000**, *2*, 2225-2228. (b) Solé, D.; Vallverdú,
52 L.; Bonjoch, J. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2001**, *343*, 439-442. (c) Solé, D.; Diaba, F.; Bonjoch, J. *J. Org.*
53 *Chem.* **2003**, *68*, 5746-5749. (d) Solé, D.; Vallverdú, L.; Solans, X.; Font-Bardia, M.; Bonjoch, J.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 1587-1594. (e) Solé, D.; Urbaneja, X.; Bonjoch, *Adv. Synth. Catal.*
4 **2004**, *346*, 1646-1650. (f) Solé, D.; Urbaneja, X.; Bonjoch, *J. Tetrahedron Lett.* **2004**, *45*, 3131-
5 3135. (g) Solé, D.; Serrano, O. *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*, 6267-6270. (h) Solé, D.; Bennasar, M.-
6 3135. (g) Solé, D.; Serrano, O. *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*, 6267-6270. (h) Solé, D.; Bennasar, M.-
7 L.; Jiménez, I. *Synlett* **2010**, 944-946. (i) Solé, D.; Bennasar, M.-L.; Jiménez, I. *Org. Biomol.*
8 *Chem.*, **2011**, *9*, 4535-4544. (j) Solé, D.; Fernández, I.; Sierra, M. A. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*,
9 6950-6958. (k) Solé, D.; Mariani, F.; Fernández, I.; Sierra, M. A. *J. Org. Chem.* **2012**, *77*,
10 10272-10284. (l) Solé, D.; Fernández, I. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2014**, *47*, 168-179.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 (9) Solé, D.; Serrano, O. *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 2476-2479.

22
23
24 (10) Solé, D.; Serrano, O. *J. Org. Chem.* **2008**, *73*, 9372-9378.

25
26
27 (11) Solé, D.; Serrano, O. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2009**, *7*, 3382-3384.

28
29
30 (12) Solé, D.; Pérez-Janer, F.; Mancuso, R. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2015**, *21*, 4580-4584.

31
32
33 (13) For the β -elimination of sulfinic acid from 3-(arylsulfonyl)indolines, see: Babu, G.; Orita,
34 A.; Otera, J. *Org. Lett.* **2005**, *7*, 4641-4643.

35
36
37 (14) Gray, V. J.; Wilden, J. D. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2012**, *53*, 41-44.

38
39
40 (15) For recent examples of pharmacologically interesting 3-(2-substituted-ethyl)indole
41 compounds, see: (a) Jiaranaikulwanitch, J.; Govitrapong, P.; Fokin, V. V.; Vajragupta, O.
42 *Molecules* **2012**, *17*, 8312-8333. (b) Palangsuntikul, R.; Berner, H.; Berger, M. L.; Wolschann,
43 P. *Molecules* **2013**, *18*, 8799-8811. (c) Vo, V. A.; Lee, J.-W.; Park, J.-H.; Kwon, J.-H.; Lee, H.
44 J.; Kim, S.-S.; Kwon, Y.-S.; Chun, W. *Biomol Ther* **2014**, *22*, 200-206. (d) Samuel, T.;
45 Yehualaeshet, T.; Serbessa, T.; Fadlalla, K. *U. S. Pat. Appl. Publ.* (2015), US 20150164860 A1
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 20150618. (e) Xie, F.; Kniess, T.; Neuber, C.; Deuther-Conrad, W.; Mamat, C.; Lieberman, B.
4
5 P.; Liu, B.; Mach, R. H.; Brust, P.; Steinbach, J.; Pietzch, J.; Jia, H. *Med. Chem. Commun.*, **2015**,
6
7 6, 1093-1103. (f) de la Fuente Revenga, M.; Fernández-Sáez, N.; Herrera-Arozamena, C.;
8
9 Morales-García, J. A.; Alonso-Gil, S.; Pérez-Castillo, A.; Caignard, D.-H.; Rivara, S.;
10
11 Rodríguez-Franco, M. I. *J. Med. Chem.* **2015**, 58, 4998-5014. (g) Itadani, S.; Yashiro, K.;
12
13 Aratani, Y.; Sekiguchi, T.; Kinoshita, A.; Moriguchi, H.; Ohta, N.; Takahashi, S.; Ishida, A.;
14
15 Tajima, Y.; Hisaichi, K.; Ima, M.; Ueda, J.; Egashira, H.; Sekioka, Y.; Kadode, M.; Yonetomi,
16
17 Y.; Nakao, T.; Inoue, A.; Nomura, H.; Kitamine, T.; Fujita, M.; Nabe, T.; Yamaura, Y.;
18
19 Matsumura, N.; Imagawa, A.; Nakayama, Y.; Takeuchi, J.; Ohmoto, K. *J. Med. Chem.* **2015**, 58,
20
21 6093-6113.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 (16) The 3-[2-(sulfonyl)ethyl]indoles have shown interesting antiinflammatory activity. See for
29
30 example: McKew, J. C.; Foley, M. A.; Thakker, P.; Behnke, M. L.; Lovering, F. E.; Sum, F.-W.;
31
32 Tam, S.; Wu, K.; Shen, M. W. H.; Zhang, W.; Gonzalez, M.; Liu, S.; Mahadevan, A.; Sard, H.;
33
34 Khor S. P.; Clark, J. D. *J. Med. Chem.* **2006**, 49, 135-158.
35
36
37

38 (17) For the synthesis of 3-[2-(phenylsulfonyl)ethyl]indoles, see: (a) Slätt, J.; Romero, I.;
39
40 Bergman, J. *Synthesis* **2004**, 2760-2765. (b) Ma, S.; Yu, S.; Peng, Z.; Guo, H. *J. Org. Chem.*
41
42 **2006**, 71, 9865-9868. (c) Bianchi, L.; Giorgi, G.; Maccagno, M.; Petrillo, G.; Scapolla, C.;
43
44 Tavani, C. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2012**, 53, 752-757. (d) Nörder, A.; Warren, S. A.; Herdtweck, E.;
45
46 Huber, S. M.; Bach, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, 134, 13524-13531. (e) Matsuzaki, K.;
47
48 Furukawa, T.; Tokunaga, E.; Matsumoto, T.; Shiro, M.; Shibata, N. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, 15, 3282-
49
50 3285.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (18) De Castries, A.; Escande, A.; Fensterbank, H.; Magnier, E.; Marrot, J.; Larpent, C.
4
5 *Tetrahedron* **2007**, *63*, 10330-10336, and references therein.
6
7

8
9 (19) For tandem Heck/aza-Michael addition processes with acrylic acid derivatives, see: (a)
10
11 Priebbenow, D. L.; Stewart, S. G.; Pfeffer, F. M. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, **2011**, *9*, 1508-1515. (b)
12
13 Priebbenow, D. L.; Pfeffer, F. M.; Stewart, S. G. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2011**, 1632-1635. (c) Chen,
14
15 K.; Pullarkat, S. A. *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, **2012**, *10*, 6600-6606. (d) Zang, Q.; Javed, S.; Porubsky,
16
17 P.; Ullah, F.; Neuenswander, B.; Lushington, G. H.; Basha, F. Z.; Organ, M. G.; Hanson, P. R.
18
19 *ACS Combi. Sci.* **2012**, *14*, 211-217.
20
21
22

23
24 (20) For the conjugate addition of carbon nucleophiles to vinyl sulfones, see: Xie, Y.-X.; Song,
25
26 R.-J.; Liu, Y.; Wang, Z.-Q.; Xiang, J.-N.; Li, J.-H. *Synthesis*, **2014**, *46*, 203-211, and references
27
28 therein.
29
30

31
32 (21) For the intermolecular α -arylation of sulfones, see: (a) Kashin, A. N.; Mitin, A. V.;
33
34 Beletskaya, I. P.; Wife, R. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2002**, *43*, 2539-2542. (b) Niwa, T.; Yorimitsu, H.;
35
36 Oshima, K. *Tetrahedron* **2009**, *65*, 1971-1976. (c) Zhou, G.; Ting, P. C.; Aslanian, R. G.
37
38 *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2010**, *51*, 939-941. (d) Zheng, B.; Jia, T.; Walsh, P. J. *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*,
39
40 1690-1693. (e) Nambo, M.; Crudden, C. M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 742-746.
41
42
43
44

45 (22) Significant signals of indoline **2a** from a crude reaction mixture containing **2a** and **3a** (2:1):
46
47 ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 300 MHz) δ 2.29 (s, 3H), 3.50 (dd, $J = 11.7$ and 9.6 Hz, 1H), 3.78-3.85 (m,
48
49 1H), 3.81 (d, $J = 15.0$ Hz, 1H), 4.12 (d, $J = 15.0$ Hz, 1H), 4.70 (dd, $J = 9.6$ and 2.1 Hz, 1H), 6.18
50
51 (d, $J = 8.4$ Hz, 1H).
52
53
54

55
56 (23) Reddy, A. G. K.; Satyanarayana, G. *Tetrahedron*, **2012**, *68*, 8003-8010.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (24) Tietze, L. F. *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 115-136.
4
5

6
7 (25) For some representative examples of metal-catalyzed additions of indoles to α,β -
8 unsaturated systems, see: (a) Evans, D. A.; Scheidt, K. A.; Fandrick, K. R.; Lam, H. W.; Wu, J.
9 *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 10780-10781. (b) Zhou, J.; Ye, M.-C.; Huang, Z.-Z.; Tang, Y. J.
10 *Org. Chem.* **2004**, *69*, 1309-1320. (c) Palomo, C.; Oiarbide, M.; Kardak, B. G.; García, J. M.;
11 Linden, A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 4154-4155. (d) Evans, D. A.; Fandrick, K. R.; Song,
12 H.-J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 8942-8943.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 (26) All calculations were performed at the PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-
23 TZVP//PCM(tetrahydrofuran)-B3LYP-D3/def2-SVP level. See Computational Details.
24
25
26
27

28 (27) (a) Balcells, D.; Clot, E.; Eisenstein, O. *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 749-823. (b) Gorelsky, S. I.
29 *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2013**, *257*, 153-164.
30
31
32

33 (28) See, for instance: (a) Chaumontet, M.; Piccardi, R.; Audic, N.; Hitce, J.; Peglion, J.-L.; Clot,
34 E.; Baudoin, O. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 15157-15166. (b) Rousseaux, S.; Davi, M.;
35 Sofack-Kreutzer, J.; Pierre, C.; Kefalidis, C. E.; Clot, E.; Fagnou, K.; Baudoin, O. *J. Am. Chem.*
36 *Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 10706-10716. (c) Ackermann, L. *Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *111*, 1315-1345. (d) Solé,
37 D.; Mariani, F.; Fernández, I. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2014**, *356*, 3237-3243.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 (29) Similar endergonicity values have been computed for related Heck couplings involving
47 methyl acrylate. See, for instance, Zhang, S.; Shi, L.; Ding, Y. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*,
48 20218-20229.
49
50
51
52

53 (30) The computed free energy difference between **TS10** and **3M-an** of 35.6 kcal/mol seems
54 unrealistic and can be ascribed to the initial protonation of **3M-an** mediated by HCO_3^- . The high
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 endergonicity computed for the latter transformation ($\Delta G = 16.7$ kcal/mol) seems unreliable and
4
5 is very likely due to the well-known difficulties associated with the calculations involving either
6
7 highly polar groups or charged species (such as HCO_3^- , CO_3^{2-} or **3M-an**) using continuum
8
9 models (such as PCM in our case). For a discussion on this issue, see (a) Harvey, J. N. *Faraday*
10
11 *Discuss.* **2010**, *145*, 487-505. (b) Cheng, G.-J.; Zhang, X.; Chung, L. W.; Xu, L.; Wu, Y.-D. *J.*
12
13 *Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 1706-1725. For a related example involving a “computationally
14
15 intractable” acid-base mechanism, see: (c) Plata, R. E.; Singleton, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**,
16
17 *137*, 3811-3826. See also, (d) Proutiere, F.; Schoenebeck, F. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*,
18
19 8192-8195.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 (31) Gaussian 09, Revision D.01, Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.;
27
28 Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A.;
29
30 Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, H. P.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.;
31
32 Sonnenberg, J. L.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.;
33
34 Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, Jr., J. A.; Peralta, J. E.;
35
36 Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Kobayashi,
37
38 R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi,
39
40 M.; Rega, N.; Millam, N. J.; Klene, M.; Knox, J. E.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.;
41
42 Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.;
43
44 Ochterski, J. W.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.;
45
46 Dannenberg, J. J.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Farkas, Ö.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.;
47
48 Cioslowski, J.; Fox, D. J. Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2009.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(32) (a) Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648-5652. (b) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. *Phys. Rev. B* **1998**, *37*, 785-789. (c) Vosko, S. H.; Wilk, L.; Nusair, M. *Can. J. Phys.* **1980**, *58*, 1200-1211.

(33) Grimme, S.; Antony, J.; Ehrlich, S.; Krieg, H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *132*, 154104-154119.

(34) Weigend, F.; Alhrichs, R. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *7*, 3297-3305.

(35) McIver, J. W.; Komornicki, A. K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1972**, *94*, 2625-2633.

(36) González, C.; Schlegel, H. B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, *94*, 5523-5527.

(37) (a) Miertuš, S.; Scrocco, E.; Tomasi, J. *Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *55*, 117-129. (b) Pascual-Ahuir, J. L.; Silla, E.; Tuñón, I. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1994**, *15*, 1127-1138. (c) Barone, V.; Cossi, M. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **1998**, *102*, 1995-2001.

Insert Table of Contents Graphic and Synopsis Here

