## Paper

# Cu(OTf)<sub>2</sub>-Catalyzed Beckmann Rearrangement of Ketones Using Hydroxylamine-O-sulfonic Acid (HOSA)

Sailu Munnuri<sup>a</sup> Saumya Verma<sup>b</sup> Dinesh Chandra<sup>b</sup> Raghunath Reddy Anugu<sup>a</sup> John R. Falck<sup>a</sup> Jawahar L. Jat<sup>\* b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Division of Chemistry, Department of Biochemistry, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX 75390, USA

S. Munnuri et al.

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chemistry, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University

(A Central University), Lucknow, India

jawaharlj@bbau.ac.in jatiawahar@gmail.com

Received: 04.06.2019 Accepted after revision: 27.06.2019 Published online: 16.07.2019 DOI: 10.1055/s-0039-1690005; Art ID: ss-2019-t0314-op

**Abstract** The Beckmann rearrangement (BKR) of ketones to secondary amides often requires harsh reaction conditions that limit its practicality and scope. Herein, the Cu(OTf)<sub>2</sub>-catalyzed BKR of ketones under mild reaction conditions using hydroxylamine-O-sulfonic acid (HOSA), a commercial water soluble aminating agent, is described. This method is compatible with most functional groups and directly provides the desired amides in good to excellent yields.

**Key words** hydroxylamine-O-sulfonic acid (HOSA), ketone, Beckmann rearrangement, Cu(OTf)<sub>2</sub>, secondary amide

The Beckmann rearrangement (BKR) is a popular method for the formation of amides from ketones and aldehydes via an oxime intermediate.<sup>1</sup> The conversion of an oxime into an amide was done first by the German chemist Ernst Otto Beckmann in 1886.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the BKR enjoys a prominent industrial role including the manufacture of monomer for polymerization into nylon-6 and nylon-12.<sup>3</sup> Also, amides are common components in drugs, natural products, agrochemicals, and functional materials (Figure 1).<sup>4,5</sup>

The traditional BKR requires harsh conditions such as high reaction temperatures and strongly acidic media, thus restricting the variety of suitable substrates; often, the process requires isolation of the oxime intermediate, which can be labile and involves a cumbersome purification process (Scheme 1a,b).<sup>6</sup> More recent modifications have addressed these limitations via catalysis with transition metals,<sup>7</sup> calcium complexes,<sup>8</sup> organocatalysts,<sup>9-13</sup> inorganic Lewis acids,<sup>14</sup> and boronic acids.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, the need for a mild, inexpensive, and environmentally friendly procedure, especially for the direct conversion from ketones,<sup>16</sup> still persists.

	Cu(OTf) <sub>2</sub> , CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	0 						
R <sup>1</sup> R <sup>2</sup> + H <sub>2</sub> N O S OH	TFE/DCM (1:4) rt to 70 °C	R <sup>2</sup> N H						
R <sup>1</sup> ,R <sup>2</sup> = Aromatic or Aliphati	22 examples up to 89% yield							
<ul> <li>One pot, operationally simple</li> <li>Water-soluble by-product</li> </ul>								
Open flask     Osecondary amide directly from ketone								

• Excellent yields, broad scope • Wide functional group tolerance



Figure 1 Amide bonds in drug molecules

Hydroxylamine-O-sulfonic acid (HOSA) attracted our attention for the BKR because it is commercial, inexpensive, water soluble, and readily handled.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, it has found sporadic utility in the BKR,<sup>18</sup> but primarily with aliphatic ketones. With aromatic ketones or hindered systems, strong acid and/or high temperatures are still required.<sup>19</sup> Fortuitously, we had observed early transition metal salts, especially Cu(OTf)<sub>2</sub>, accelerated the condensation and rearrangement of aromatic ketones with HOSA.

To actualize our aim, an introductory study was done using 2-methoxyacetophenone (**1a**) as a representative substrate along with HOSA and  $Cu(OTf)_2$  at room temperature (Table 1). Our investigation to optimize the reaction parameters to obtain amide **2a** from **1a** showed that a base was needed to commence the reaction. With lithium hydroxide (LiOH), 95% of the starting material **1a** was con-

#### S. Munnuri et al.

Svn thesis



Table 1 Optimization of Reaction Conditions<sup>a</sup>

ĺ	O OMe 1a	Cu(OTf) <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub> NOSO <sub>3</sub> H base, solvent rt, 14 h	Me	YO NH ℃OMe	+	OM 3a	ОН Ле e
Entry	Base	Solvent	Yield		(%)		
				2a	3a	1a <sup>b</sup>	
1	LiOH	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	(1:4)	85	10	5	
2 <sup>c</sup>	$Na_2CO_3$	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	(1:4)	10	0	90	
3 <sup>d</sup>	$Et_3N$	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	(1:4)	60	40	0	
4 <sup>d</sup>	pyridine	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	(1:4)	60	40	0	
5 <sup>d</sup>	DMAP	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	(1:4)	40	60	0	
6	$K_2CO_3$	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub> (1:4)		NR		100	
7 <sup>d</sup>	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	TFE/CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub>	2 <b>(1:4)</b>	88	0	0	
<b>8</b> <sup>d</sup>	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	HFIP		83	0	0	
$9^{d}$	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	TFE		84	0	0	
10	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	MeOH		10	90	0	
11 <sup>h</sup>	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	EtOH		0	50	50	
12 <sup>i</sup>	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	THF		0	30	70	
13	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	$CH_2CI_2$		10	90	0	
14	CsOH·H <sub>2</sub> O	MeCN		NR		100	

<sup>a</sup> Reaction conditions:  $Cu(OTf)_2$  (0.1equiv), HOSA (2 equiv), CsOH-H<sub>2</sub>O (2 equiv), TFE/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (1:4), rt, 14 h. TFE = 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol. NR: No reaction.

<sup>b</sup> Recovered **1a**; 0% recovered = 100% consumed.

sumed and the expected amide was obtained in 85% yield along with 10% of oxime **3a** (Table 1, entry 1). The most satisfactory result was achieved with cesium hydroxide monohydrate (CsOH·H<sub>2</sub>O) in which the desired amide **2a** was obtained in 88% yield (entry 7) whereas other mild bases were not very effective (entries 2–5) or in the case of  $K_2CO_3$ proved ineffective (entry 6).

Finally, a variety of solvents were screened including hexafluoroisopropanol (HFIP), 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (TFE), methanol, ethyl alcohol, tetrahydrofuran (THF), acetonitrile, dichloromethane, and a mixture of TFE/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (1:4) (Table 1). While HFIP and TFE delivered amide **2a** in comparable yields (83% and 84%, respectively; Table 1, entries 8 and 9), a mixture of TFE/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> was best for both the yield of amide **2a** (88%, entry 7) and for solubilization of ketones. Only acetonitrile, despite its frequent use in amidation reactions, failed to support the BKRs (entry 14).

Having established the optimum reaction conditions, the scope of the methodology was evaluated with a range of representative ketones (Scheme 2). Generally, acetophenones with strong aryl electron-donating groups reacted smoothly at room temperature to deliver the derived *N*phenylacetamides in very good yields, for example, phenol **2b**, 4-methoxy **2c**, 3,4-dimethoxy **2d**, and 4-allyloxy **2e**. The latter is notable for its chemoselectivity, that is, no allylic<sup>20</sup> or CH amination<sup>21</sup> or aziridination<sup>17c</sup> under the reaction conditions. In contrast, 4-tolyl **2f**, phenyl **2g**, and naphthyl **2h** required heating for a reasonable reaction rate, although room temperature reactivity was restored in the homologous **2i**, **j**. The halogenated ketones **2l–n** were well behaved

Paper

© 2019. Thieme. All rights reserved. – *Synthesis* 2019, *51*, 3709–3714



Svn thesis



3711

Scheme 2 One-pot synthesis of secondary amides from ketones

and provided good yields of amide, except for 4'-fluoroacetophenone which was less reactive, as it delivered the corresponding amide **2k** in 25% yield only at 70 °C in 24 hours. The BKR of benzophenone and 3-acetyindole furnished **2o** and **2p**, respectively, albeit in modest yields. Lactams **2q-t** were readily obtained from the corresponding cyclic ketones in high yields. Following upon well-established migratory priorities, estrone 3-methyl ether and hex-2-one led to **2u** and **2v**, respectively.

We propose the  $Cu(OTf)_2$  has a dual role in catalyzing the BKR (Scheme 3). First, as a mild Lewis acid, it assists in the formation of the transient ketoxime intermediate **A** that could be observed in some cases. Second, by way of the five-membered transition state **B**, the copper catalyzes the migration of the R<sup>1</sup> group to the nitrogen from which the Beckmann product is finally obtained.



In conclusion, we have developed an operationally simple, one-pot BKR route to secondary amides directly from ketones using inexpensive, easily handled HOSA as aminating agent via Cu(II)-catalysis.

Reactions, unless otherwise stated, were carried out with magnetic stirring open to the atmosphere in oven-dried glassware. Reagents were used as received, unless otherwise noted. For TLC precoated plates (Merck silica gel 60,  $F_{254}$ ) were used and visualized with UV light and/or charring after dipping in PMA or KMnO<sub>4</sub> solution. The compounds were purified by triturating the crude reaction mixture under hexane or by flash column chromatography using silica gel (100–200 mesh) with EtOAc/hexane as eluent. <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra were recorded at 400 and 100 MHz, respectively, in CDCl<sub>3</sub> or DMSO-*d*<sub>6</sub> as solvent. Chemical shifts  $\delta$  are reported in parts per million (ppm) relative to residual undeuterated solvent as an internal reference (<sup>1</sup>H  $\delta$  = 7.26 and <sup>13</sup>C  $\delta$  = 77.0 for CDCl<sub>3</sub>,  $\delta$  = 2.50 and 39.52 for DMSO-*d*<sub>6</sub>, respectively). Standard abbreviations are used to indicate NMR peak multiplicities.

#### Amides from Ketones; General Procedure

To a stirred solution of Cu(OTf)<sub>2</sub> (0.05 mmol, 10 mol%) in TFE/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (1:4, 2–3 mL) were added ketone (0.5 mmol, 1.0 equiv), HOSA (2.0 equiv), and CsOH·H<sub>2</sub>O (2.0 equiv) at rt. The reaction mixture was maintained at the temperature and for the time indicated in Scheme 2. After completion, the mixture was diluted with CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (10 mL) and washed with sat. aq Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (3 × 5 mL). The combined organic layers

S. Munnuri et al.

were washed with brine (5 mL) and dried (anhyd  $Na_2SO_4$ ). The crude product obtained after removal of all volatiles in vacuo was purified by  $SiO_2$  (100–200 mesh) chromatography using EtOAc/hexane as eluent.

# *N*-(2-Methoxyphenyl)acetamide (2a)<sup>22</sup>

Yield: 73 mg (88%); white solid; mp 72-74 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 8.35 (dd, *J* = 7.9, 1.7 Hz, 1 H), 7.77 (s, 1 H), 7.03 (td, *J* = 7.8, 1.7 Hz, 1 H), 6.95 (td, *J* = 7.8, 1.5 Hz, 1 H), 6.87 (dd, *J* = 8.1, 1.5 Hz, 1 H), 3.88 (s, 3 H), 2.20 (s, 3 H).

# N-(4-Hydroxyphenyl)acetamide (2b)<sup>23</sup>

Yield: 60 mg (80%); brown solid; mp 170–171 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO- $d_6$ ):  $\delta$  = 9.64 (s, 1 H), 9.13 (s, 1 H), 7.33 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 2 H), 6.67 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 2 H), 1.98 (s, 3 H).

# *N*-(4-Methoxyphenyl)acetamide (2c)<sup>15</sup>

Yield: 82 mg (86%); white solid; mp 129–130 C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.41–7.35 (m, 2 H), 6.87–6.81 (m, 2 H), 3.78 (s, 3 H), 2.14 (s, 3 H).

# *N*-(3,4-Dimethoxyphenyl)acetamide (2d)<sup>24</sup>

Yield: 78 mg (80%); white solid; mp 126–127.7 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.30 (d, *J* = 2.3 Hz, 1 H), 6.87–6.70 (m, 2 H), 3.86 (s, 3 H), 3.85 (s, 3 H), 2.15 (s, 3 H).

# *N*-[4-(Allyloxy)phenyl]acetamide (2e)<sup>25</sup>

Yield: 82 mg (86%); white solid; mp 94–95 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.37 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2 H), 7.14 (s, 1 H), 6.87 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2 H), 6.04 (ddd, J = 21.8, 10.4, 5.2 Hz, 1 H), 5.40 (d, J = 17.3 Hz, 1 H), 5.28 (d, J = 10.5 Hz, 1 H), 4.51 (d, J = 5.1 Hz, 2 H), 2.15 (s, 3 H).

# N-(p-Tolyl)acetamide (2f)<sup>23</sup>

Yield: 63 mg (85%); white solid; mp 151–152 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.37 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 2 H), 7.25 (br s, 1 H), 7.11 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2 H), 2.31 (s, 3 H), 2.15 (s, 3 H).

# N-Phenylacetamide (2g)<sup>26</sup>

Yield: 54 mg (80%); white solid; mp 114–115 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.49 (d, *J* = 7.7 Hz, 2 H), 7.31 (t, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2 H), 7.10 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1 H), 2.17 (s, 3 H).

# N-(Naphthalen-2-yl)acetamide(2h)27

Yield: 65 mg (70%); off-white solid; mp133–135 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 8.18 (br s, 1 H), 7.80–7.77 (m, 3 H), 7.48–7.37 (m, 4 H), 2.24 (s, 3 H).

# N-Phenylpropionamide (2i)<sup>13</sup>

Yield: 63 mg (85%); white solid; mp 107–108 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 7.52 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2 H), 7.30 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2 H), 7.26 (br, 1 H), 7.10 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1 H), 2.38 (q, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 2 H), 1.24 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 3 H).

# *N*-Phenylisobutyramide (2j)<sup>9</sup>

Yield: 88 mg (81%); white solid; mp 109–111 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 7.53 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2 H), 7.31 (t, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.09 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1 H), 2.51 (sept, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1 H), 1.25 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 6 H).

Paper

# *N*-(4-Fluorophenyl)acetamide (2k)<sup>28</sup>

Yield: 19 mg (25%); white solid; mp 153–154.6  $^\circ \text{C}.$ 

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.45 (dd, J = 8.8, 4.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.31 (br s, 1 H), 7.00 (t, J = 8.6 Hz, 2 H), 2.16 (s, 3 H).

## N-(4-Bromophenyl)acetamide (21)<sup>28</sup>

Yield: 65 mg (60%); white solid; mp 167–169 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 7.47–7.36 (m, 4 H), 7.23 (br s, 1 H), 2.17 (s, 3 H).

## N-(3-Bromophenyl)acetamide (2m)<sup>29</sup>

Yield: 75 mg (70%); white solid; mp 81–83 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 7.81 (s, 1 H), 7.69 (s, 1 H), 7.45 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1 H), 7.29 (dd, *J* = 16.1, 4.4 Hz, 1 H), 7.20 (t, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1 H), 2.22 (s, 3 H).

## N-(2,4-Dichlorophenyl)acetamide (2n)<sup>30</sup>

Yield: 38 mg (70%); brown solid; mp 142–144 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 8.34 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1 H), 7.55 (s, 1 H), 7.38 (d, *J* = 1.7 Hz, 1 H), 7.28–7.22 (m, 1 H), 2.24 (s, 3 H).

## *N*-Phenylbenzamide (20)<sup>13</sup>

Yield: 49 mg (50%); white solid; mp 164-165 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 7.87 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.80 (s, 1 H), 7.64 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2 H), 7.56 (t, J = 7.0 Hz, 1 H), 7.49 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 2 H), 7.38 (t, J = 7.8 Hz, 2 H), 7.16 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 1 H).

## N-(1-Tosyl-1H-indol-3-yl)acetamide (2p)<sup>15</sup>

Yield: 82 mg (50%); white solid; mp 193–194 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 8.20 (s, 1 H), 8.07 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1 H), 7.76 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2 H), 7.41–7.32 (m, 2 H), 7.28–7.26 (m, 1 H), 7.25–7.22 (m, 1 H), 7.18 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2 H), 2.31 (s, 3 H), 2.24 (s, 3 H).

## 7-Phenylazepan-2-one (2q)<sup>31</sup>

Yield: 76 mg (80%); white solid; mp 134-136 °C.

 $^1\text{H}$  NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\_3):  $\delta$  = 7.41–7.21 (m, 5 H), 6.18 (br s, 1 H), 4.46 (d, J = 9.3 Hz, 1 H), 2.66–2.49 (m, 2 H), 2.11–1.83 (m, 4 H), 1.76–1.57 (m, 2 H).

 $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\_3):  $\delta$  = 177.93, 141.92, 129.18, 128.22, 126.24, 58.85, 36.91, 36.79, 29.78, 22.91.

## 1,3,4,5-Tetrahydro-2*H*-benzo[*b*]azepin-2-one (2r)<sup>27</sup>

Yield: 61 mg (75%); white solid; mp 137-139 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.56 (br s, 1 H), 7.25–7.20 (m, 2 H), 7.16–7.10 (m, 1 H), 6.96 (d, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1 H), 2.80 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2 H), 2.36 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2 H), 2.27–2.21 (m, 2 H).

## Azacyclotetradecan-2-one (2s)<sup>32</sup>

Yield: 96 mg (89%); white solid; mp 155–157 °C.

 $^1\text{H}$  NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\_3):  $\delta$  = 5.57 (br s, 1 H), 3.36–3.26 (m, 2 H), 2.25–2.15 (m, 2 H), 1.76–1.61 (m, 2 H), 1.54–1.44 (m, 2 H), 1.43–1.20 (m, 16 H).

Syn<mark>thesis</mark>

S. Munnuri et al.

 $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR (101 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 173.10, 38.46, 36.27, 28.31, 26.49, 25.79, 25.71, 25.63, 25.41, 25.26, 23.95, 23.70, 23.13.

#### 5-(tert-Butyl)azepan-2-one (2t)<sup>33</sup>

Yield: 73 mg (85%); semi-solid.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>OD):  $\delta$  = 3.33–3.25 (m, 2 H), 2.58–2.48 (m, 1 H), 2.16 (td, *J* = 13.4, 4.9 Hz, 1 H), 2.07–1.94 (m, 2 H), 1.84 (td, *J* = 13.9, 5.4 Hz, 1 H), 1.37–1.14 (m, 3 H), 0.90 (s, 9 H).

<sup>13</sup>C NMR (101 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>OD): δ = 167.50, 48.46, 33.23, 32.60, 28.76, 27.91, 27.64, 26.76.

#### (4aS,4bR,10bS,12aS)-8-Methoxy-12a-methyl-3,4,4a,4b,5,6,10b,11,12,12a-decahydronaphtho[2,1-*f*]quinolin-2(1*H*)-one (2u)<sup>34</sup>

Yield: 126 mg (85%); white solid; mp 220-222 °C.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 7.18 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1 H), 6.76–6.46 (m, 3 H), 3.77 (s, 3 H), 2.93–2.79 (m, 2 H), 2.56–2.34 (m, 4 H), 2.15–1.99 (m, 2 H), 1.89–1.81 (m, 1 H), 1.77–1.66 (m, 1 H), 1.58–1.25 (m, 5 H), 1.19 (s, 3 H).

 $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR (101 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  = 171.96, 157.65, 137.57, 131.79, 126.17, 113.52, 111.69, 55.21, 54.49, 46.49, 43.28, 39.85, 39.34, 30.65, 29.88, 26.67, 26.21, 22.19, 19.83.

#### N-Butylacetamide (2v)35

Yield: 82 mg (50%); clear oil.

<sup>1</sup>H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>): δ = 5.66 (s, 1 H), 3.26–3.18 (m, 2 H), 1.95 (s, 3 H), 1.52–1.41 (m, 2 H), 1.38–1.28 (m, 2 H), 0.90 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 3 H).

## **Funding Information**

J.L.J. thanks DST-SERB (YSS/2015/000838), UGC, New Delhi for UGC-BSR Grant (No.F.30-382/2017) and BBAU, Lucknow for infrastructure. J. R. F. received financial support from the Robert A. Welch Foundation (I-0011) and USPHS NIH (HL139793).

## Acknowledgment

S. V. expresses her thanks to CSIR, New Delhi, India for the research fellowship.

## **Supporting Information**

Supporting information for this article is available online at https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1690005.

#### References

 (a) Vinnik, M. I.; Zarakhani, N. G. Russ. Chem. Soc. 1967, 36, 51.
 (b) Krow, G. R. Tetrahedron 1981, 37, 1283. (c) Gawley, R. E. Org. React. 1988, 35, 1. (d) Katritzky, A. R.; Monteux, D. A.; Tymoshenko, D. O. Org. Lett. 1999, 1, 577. (e) Smith, M. B.; March, J. Advance Organic Chemistry, 5th ed; Wiley: New York, 2001, 1415; and references cited therei. (f) Chandrasekhar, S. In Comprehensive Organic Synthesis II, Vol. 7; Knochel, P.; Molander, G. A., Ed.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, 2014, 770. (g) Holth, T. A. D.; Hutt, O. E.; Georg, G. I.; Rojas, C. M. In Molecular Rearrangements in Organic Synthesis; Rojas, C. M., Ed.; Wiley: New York, **2015**, 111–150. (h) Zhang, W.; Yang, S.; Lin, Q.; Cheng, H.; Liu, J. J. Org. Chem. **2019**, 84, 851.

- (2) (a) Beckmann, E. Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges. 1886, 19, 988. (b) Blatt,
   A. H. Chem. Rev. 1933, 12, 215.
- (3) (a) Luedeke, V. D. In Encyclopedia of Chemical Processing and Design, Vol. 6; Mcketta, J. J., Ed.; Marcel Dekker: New York, **1978**, 72–95. (b) Rademacher, H. In Ullmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry, 5th ed., Vol. A8; Gerhartz, W., Ed.; Wiley: New York, **1987**, 201. (c) Weber, J. N. In Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, 4th ed., Vol. 19; Kroschwitz, J. I., Ed.; Wiley: New York, **1990**, 500. (d) Palmer, R. J. Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Technology, 4th ed; Wiley: New York, **2001**. (e) Wessermel, K.; Arpe, H.-J. Industrial Organic Chemistry, 4th ed; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, **2003**, 239. (f) Owston, N. A.; Parker, A. J.; Williams, J. M. J. Org. Lett. **2007**, 9, 3599. (g) You, K.; Mao, L.; Yin, D.; Liu, P.; Luo, H. Catal. Commun. **2008**, 9, 1521.
- (4) (a) *The Chemistry of Amides*; Zabicky, J., Ed.; Wiley-Interscience: New York, **1970**. (b) *The Amide Linkage: Structural Significance in Chemistry, Biochemistry, and Materials Science*; Greenberg, A.; Breneman, C. M.; Liebman, J. F., Ed.; Wiley: New York, **2000**. (c) Carey, J. S.; Laffan, D.; Thomson, C.; Williams, M. T. Org. *Biomol. Chem.* **2006**, *4*, 2337. (d) Cupido, T.; Tulla-Puche, J.; Spengler, J.; Albericio, F. Curr. Opin. Drug Discovery Dev. **2007**, *10*, 768. (e) Pathare, S. P.; Jain, A. K. H.; Akamanchi, K. G. RSC Adv. **2013**, *3*, 7697. (f) Rao, S. N.; Mohana, D. C.; Adimurthy, S. RSC Adv. **2015**, *5*, 95313.
- (5) (a) Humphrey, J. M.; Chamberlin, A. R. Chem. Rev. 1997, 97, 2243. (b) Larock, R. C. Comprehensive Organic Transformatins, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 1999, 1234. (c) Bode, J. W. Curr. Opin. Drug Discovery Dev. 2006, 9, 765. (d) Selvamurugan, S.; Ramachandran, R.; Prakash, G.; Viswanathamurthi, P.; Malecki, J. G.; Endo, A. J. Organomet. Chem. 2016, 803, 119.
- (6) (a) Kalia, J.; Raines, R. T. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 7523.
  (b) Jain, P. U.; Samant, S. D. ChemistrySelect 2018, 3, 1967.
  (c) See also refs. 7–15, 17–19.
- (7) (a) Ramalingan, C.; Park, Y.-T. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 4536.
  (b) Crochet, P.; Cadierno, V. Chem. Commun. 2015, 51, 2495.
  (c) Martinez-Asencio, A.; Yus, M.; Ramon, D. J. Tetrahedron 2012, 68, 3948.
- (8) Kiely-Collins, H. J.; Sechi, I.; Brennan, P. E.; McLaughlin, M. G. Chem. Commun. 2018, 54, 654.
- (9) Furuya, Y.; Ishihara, K.; Yamamoto, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 11240.
- (10) Betti, C.; Landini, D.; Maia, A.; Pasi, M. Synlett 2008, 908.
- (11) Hashimoto, M.; Obora, Y.; Sakaguchi, S.; Ishii, Y. J. Org. Chem. **2008**, 73, 2894.
- (12) Zhu, M.; Cha, C.; Deng, W.-P.; Shi, X.-X. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2006**, 47, 4861.
- (13) Pi, H.-J.; Dong, J.-D.; An, N.; Du, W.; Deng, W.-P. *Tetrahedron* **2009**, *65*, 7790.
- (14) Zicmanis, A.; Katkevica, S.; Mekss, P. Catal. Commun. 2009, 10, 614.
- (15) Mo, X.; Morgan, T. D. R.; Ang, H. T.; Hall, D. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2018**, 140, 5264.
- (16) (a) Hyodo, K.; Hasegawa, G.; Oishi, N.; Kuroda, K.; Uchida, K. J. Org. Chem. **2018**, 83, 13080. (b) Mahajan, S.; Sharma, B.; Kapoor, K. K. Tetrahedron Lett. **2015**, 56, 1915.
- (17) (a) Wallace, R. G. Aldrichimica Acta 1980, 13, 3. (b) Erdik, E.; Saczewski, J. Hydroxylamine-O-sulfonic AcideEROS Encyclopedia of Reagents for Organic Synthesis; Wiley: Hoboken, 2013, 1.

#### S. Munnuri et al.

(c) Ma, Z.; Zhou, Z.; Kürti, L. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. **2017**, 56, 9886. (d) Sabir, S.; Kumar, G.; Jat, J. L. Org. Biomol. Chem. **2018**, 16, 3314.

- (18) Olah, G. A.; Fung, A. P. Synthesis 1979, 537.
- (19) (a) Sanford, J. K.; Blair, F. T.; Arroya, J.; Sherk, K. W. J. Am. Chem.
   Soc. **1945**, 67, 1941. (b) Freeman, J. P. J. Org. Chem. **1961**, 26, 3507.
- (20) Du Bois, J. Org. Process Res. Dev. 2011, 15, 758.
- (21) Munnuri, S.; Anugu, R. R.; Falck, J. R. Org. Lett. 2019, 21, 1926.
- (22) Srivastava, V. P.; Patel, R.; Garima, ; Yadav, L. D. S. Chem. Commun. 2010, 46, 5808.
- (23) Gao, Y.; Liu, J.; Li, Z.; Guo, T.; Xu, S.; Zhu, H.; Wei, F.; Chen, S.; Gebru, H.; Guo, K. J. Org. Chem. 2018, 83, 2040.
- (24) Schulz, L.; Enders, M.; Elsler, B.; Schollmeyer, D.; Dyballa, K. M.; Franke, R.; Waldvogel, S. R. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2017**, 56, 4877.
- (25) Schmidt, B.; Wolf, F. J. Org. Chem. 2017, 82, 4386.
- (26) Stuart, D. R.; Bertrand-Laperle, M.; Burgess, K. M. N.; Fagnou, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2008**, 130, 16474.

- (27) Luca, L. D.; Giacomelli, G.; Porcheddu, A. J. Org. Chem. 2002, 67, 6272.
- (28) Mahajan, P. S.; Humne, V. T.; Tanpure, S. D.; Mhaske, S. B. Org. Lett. 2016, 18, 3450.
- (29) Pialat, A.; Liegault, B.; Taillefer, M. Org. Lett. 2013, 15, 1764.
- (30) Singh, H.; Sen, C.; Sahoo, T.; Ghosh, S. C. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2018**, 4748.
- (31) Tokuyama, H.; Itabashi, S.; Shimomura, M.; Sato, M.; Azuma, H.; Okano, K.; Sakata, J.; Hidetoshi, T. *Synlett* **2018**, *29*, 1786.
- (32) Mudiyanselage, A. Y.; Viamajala, S.; Varanasi, S.; Yamamoto, K. ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng. **2014**, *2*, 2831.
- (33) Aube, J.; Wang, Y.; Hammond, M.; Tanol, M.; Takusagawa, F.; Velde, D. V. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1990**, 112, 4879.
- (34) Liu, Z.-J.; Lu, X.; Wang, G.; Li, L.; Jiang, W.-T.; Wang, Y.-D.; Xiao, B.; Fu, Y. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2016**, 138, 9714.
- (35) Steffel, L. R.; Cashman, T. J.; Reutershan, M. H.; Linton, B. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2007**, 129, 12956.