<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Ponra, S., Yang, J., Kerdphon, S., Andersson, P G. (2019)
Asymmetric Synthesis of Alkyl Fluorides: Hydrogenation of Fluorinated Olefins
Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 58(27): 9282-9287
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201903954>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:su:diva-171794>

Asymmetric Synthesis of Alkyl Fluorides: Hydrogenation of Fluorinated Olefins

Sudipta Ponra,¹ Jianping Yang,¹ Sutthichat Kerdphon and Pher G. Andersson*

Department of Organic Chemistry, Stockholm University, Svante Arrhenius väg 16C, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden.

ABSTRACT: The development of new general methods for the synthesis of chiral fluorine-containing molecules is important for several scientific disciplines. By the Ir-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation of *tri*-substituted vinyl-fluorides, a straightforward preparation of chiral organofluorine molecules is disclosed. The developed method represents a catalytic asymmetric process that enables the synthesis of chiral fluorine molecules with or without carbonyl framework. Owing to the tunable steric and electronic properties of azabicyclo iridium-thiazole-phosphine catalyst, this stereoselective reaction could be optimized and found compatible with various aromatic, aliphatic and heterocyclic systems with a variety of functional groups providing the highly desirable product in excellent yield and enantioselectivities.

INTRODUCTION

Stereo-defined organofluorine compounds possess unique physical properties and are highly important in agrochemical, pharmaceutical, material sciences¹ and medicinal chemistry.² Despite its widespread use as a pharmacological modulator, asymmetric installation of fluorine onto organic molecules presents challenges. The scarce number of asymmetric fluorine molecules³ in nature makes its availability dependent on organic synthesis. Given this perspective, the development of new, simple and efficient methods to access a diverse array of novel chiral fluorinated derivatives, to expand the asymmetric fluorine chemistry toolbox, has become a highly prioritized research area.^{1b,4} Amongst the distinct approaches available for asymmetric construction of C(sp³)-F stereogenic center^{4c,e} commonly exploited technique consists of α -fluorination of enolate or enolate-equivalents,⁵ fluorination of olefins,⁶ and asymmetric addition of nucleophilic fluorides to carbon electrophiles.⁷ α -Fluorination of carbonyl derivatives is undeniably a viable strategy⁵ however it is limited to either aldehyde,^{5b,c,8} β -keto esters⁹ or cyclic ketones¹⁰ while simple acyclic ketonic substrates met with difficulties. Although a number of fluorination methods for acyclic ketonic substrates have been reported,¹¹ the asymmetric version is still very limited.^{11c-f} Most of the asymmetric methods require multi steps and have a limited substrate scope.^{11c-e} Negishi cross coupling of racemic α,α -dihaloketones has been shown to be an effective strategy but is restricted to only aromatic tertiary alkyl fluorides.^{11f} The tractability of such reported methods however, are restricted to substrates containing carbonyl groups. For substrates without a carbonyl group required other techniques for asymmetric generation of the C-F bond. Despite the availability of a variety of methods, a simple and general asymmetric protocol, irrespective of the presence of a carbonyl group, has remained comprehensively elusive for a long time. These limitations of asymmetric fluorination have prompted us to devise a new atom economical, highly enantioselective synthetic method for versatile fluorinated molecules.

Asymmetric hydrogenation of alkenes using transition metal catalysts is one of the most fundamental and atom economical processes for synthetic organic chemistry.¹² Moreover, excel-

lent chemo-, regio-, and enantioselectivity can be obtained by the appropriate choice of metal and the chiral chelating ligand. Presence of a strongly coordinating functional groups such as amides and carboxylic acids in close proximity to the double bond facilitates hydrogenation by using Rh, Ru or Ir catalysts.¹³ Olefins carrying no neighboring coordinating group or weakly coordinating group creates challenges and for these substrates Ir is the metal of choice.^{12g, 12h, 13a, 14}

Normally, for iridium catalysed hydrogenations, the smallest substituent (hydrogen in case of a trisubstituted olefin) determines which face of the olefin that coordinates to Ir, and thus also determines the enantioselectivity of the reaction. Having two small substituents (H and F) in *tri*-substituted vinyl-F presents a challenge since more than one orientation of the olefin might be possible, resulting in enantiomeric mixtures of the product. The electron withdrawing behavior of the fluorine together with frequent de-fluorination (de-F) that occurs during hydrogenation, makes *tri*-substituted vinyl-fluorides even more difficult substrates to hydrogenate.¹⁵

However, vinyl fluorides are relatively easy to prepare and the development of a suitable catalyst for the asymmetric hydrogenation of *tri*-substituted vinyl fluorides would enable generation of various chiral fluorine molecules with and without the carbonyl framework, in one simple step.¹⁶ With the above-mentioned limitations in mind, we set out to develop an atom economical protocol for asymmetric hydrogenation of *tri*-substituted vinyl fluorides (Scheme 1).

Scheme 1. Atom economical synthesis of asymmetric fluorine motifs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Recently, we were successfully developed a diastereo- and enantioselective synthesis of fluorine motifs with two contiguous stereogenic centers by highly selective and efficient hydrogenation

of *tetra*-substituted vinyl fluorides.^{16d} Motivated by this accomplishment, we selected (*Z*)-2-fluoro-1,3-diphenylpropenone **1a** as the model substrate and azabicyclo iridium oxazoline phosphine complex **A** as the catalyst for this asymmetric hydrogenation. However, applying our previously optimized catalytic method (1 mol% catalyst, CH₂Cl₂, 10 bar H₂) to substrate **1a** gave only trace amounts (6% conversion) of the desired product **2a** (Table 1). Based on our previous knowledge of N,P-iridium-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenation,^{16a,b} we started to optimize the basic skeleton of the heterocycle of the N,P-iridium complex. Imidazole **B** provided a comparable result of 23% conversion of starting material **1a** to **2a** but with poor enantioselectivity (31% ee). Encouragingly, the thiazole N,P-iridium complex dramatically increased the enantioselectivity (>99% ee). However, despite their high enantioselectivity, both catalysts **C** and **D** provided moderate conversion (32% and 27% respectively) of the desired product (entries 3 and 4). Next, the effect of the substituents at the phosphine was studied. Gratifyingly, replacing the two *ortho*-tolyl groups with suitable aliphatic substituents on the bicyclic thiazole N,P-iridium catalyst resulted in much higher conversions into the desired product **2**. Iridium complexes with cyclohexyl **E** or isopropyl **F** on the phosphorus resulted in the successful hydrogenation of **1a** in 99% conversion with excellent enantiomeric excess (>99%).

Table 1. Evaluation of N,P-iridium catalysts in the asymmetric hydrogenation of 1a^a

A Conv. 6%		B Conv. 23% 31% ee	
C Conv. 32% >99% ee			
D Conv. 27% >99% ee		E 1a: Conv. 99%, >99% ee 7a: Conv. 93%, 89% ee	
		F 1a: Conv. 99%, >99% ee 7a: Conv. 72%, 86% ee	

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of **1a**, 1 mol% catalyst, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂. The conversion was determined by ¹H-NMR. Enantiomeric excess was determined by SFC.

After successfully designing the new effective catalyst **E** and **F**, we carried out further optimization of the catalyst loading and hydrogen pressure (Table 2). A decrease in the catalyst loading for substrate **1a** from 1.0 mol % (entry 1) to 0.5 mol % (entry 2) at 10 bar of H₂ pressure did not affect the conversion and enantioselectivity (99% conversion, >99% ee). However, a further decrease in the catalyst loading to 0.3 mol % (entry 3) significantly decreased the conversion (71%). By maintaining the catalyst loading at 0.5 mol % and decreasing the reaction time to 2 hours, the product was obtained with 99% conversion and >99% ee (entry 4). Reducing the reaction time to 1 hour gave 95% conversion (entry 5) with 0.5 mol % of catalyst **F**. A gradual decrease of the H₂ pressure from 10 bar (entry 4) to 5 bar (entry 6) using 0.5 mol % of catalyst **F** in 2 hours, did not change the conversion. A further decrease in the pressure to 2 bar resulted in a lower conversion (entry 7). Remarkably, in all cases the enantioselectivity (>99%

ee) was maintained. Hence, the optimal conditions with regards to conversion and enantioselectivity for substrate **1a** are 0.5 mol % catalyst loading of catalyst **F**, 5 bar H₂ pressure for 2 hours (entry 6). It should be mentioned that no defluorinated (de-F) product was detected which is a frequent problem in hydrogenations of vinyl fluorides.^{15b}

Table 2. Optimization of hydrogenation of vinyl fluoride 1a^a

Reaction scheme showing the hydrogenation of 1a to 2a and de-F using an Ir-N,P catalyst (F) in H₂, CH₂Cl₂, at room temperature (r.t.).

1a (Ph-CH=CH-C(=O)Ph with a red F atom) reacts with Ir-N,P catalyst (F) in H₂, CH₂Cl₂, r.t., to yield 2a (Ph-CH₂-CH₂-C(=O)Ph with a red F atom and a green Ph group) and de-F (Ph-CH₂-CH₂-C(=O)Ph with a green Ph group).

Entry	H ₂ (bar)	Time (h)	Catalyst (mol%)	Conversion (%)	de-F	ee (%) ^b
-------	----------------------	----------	-----------------	----------------	------	---------------------

1.	10	24	F (1.0)	99	0	>99
----	----	----	----------------	----	---	-----

2.	10	24	F (0.5)	99	0	>99
----	----	----	----------------	----	---	-----

3.	10	24	F (0.3)	76	0	>99
----	----	----	----------------	----	---	-----

4.	10	2	F (0.5)	99	0	>99
----	----	---	----------------	----	---	-----

5.	10	1	F (0.5)	95	0	>99
----	----	---	----------------	----	---	-----

6.	5	2	F (0.5)	99	0	>99
----	---	---	----------------	----	---	-----

7.	2	2	F (0.5)	77	0	>99
----	---	---	----------------	----	---	-----

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of **1**, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂. The conversion was determined by ¹H-NMR. Enantiomeric excess was determined by SFC.

With the optimized reaction conditions established, we evaluated the hydrogenation of various (*Z*)-3-fluoropent-3-en-2-one substrates **1** (Table 3) having different substituents. A variety of phenyl ketones were successfully hydrogenated to generate the desired products **2a-2h** in excellent yield and enantioselectivities. The (*Z*)-2-fluoro-1,3-diphenylprop-2-en-1-one substrates with either electron-donating or electron-withdrawing substituents on the phenyl rings were well tolerated and provided high isolated yields and excellent enantioselectivities of the desired products. Replacing the phenyl with the heterocyclic (3-thienyl) or 2-naphthyl substituent yielded **2e** (99% yield) or **2f** (96% yield) in excellent ee (>99%). Next we examined effect of replacing the carbonyl phenyl substituent into various aliphatic sidechains. For these substrates the optimal reaction conditions were 1.0 mol % of catalyst **G**, 10 bar H₂ pressure for 24 hours. Methyl substituted substrates performed very well irrespective of the electron-donating and electron-withdrawing substituents in the aromatic ring with excellent yields and enantioselectivities. Interestingly, substrate with electron-withdrawing substituents seems advantageous for higher enantioselectivity. Various substituted (*Z*)-3-fluoro-4-(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)but-3-en-2-ones where Me was replaced with other aliphatic substituent such as Et, ⁿBu or Bn also reacted smoothly and resulted in excellent yields (97-98%) and enantiomeric excess (98->99% ee). Secondary (ⁱPr, Cy) and tertiary aliphatic groups (^tBu), all afforded the desired products **2p**, **2q** and **2r** in exceptional yields (94-97%) and ee (99->99%). Another significant aspect is that no de-F was observed in any of these examples, which underlines the usefulness of this catalytic method.

Table 3. Hydrogenation of various fluoro-phenyl-ketone^a

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of substrate, 0.5 mol% catalyst F, 5 bar H₂, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂, 2h. ^b Reaction time 6h. ^c 1.0 mol% catalyst F, 10 bar H₂, 24h. Yields are isolated hydrogenated product. Enantiomeric excess was determined by SFC or GC/MS using chiral stationary phases.

Considering that polyfluorinated compounds are very useful molecules in various scientific disciplines¹⁷ as well as the fact that de-F during hydrogenation of vinyl-fluorides presents potential challenges,¹⁵ a further study of polyfluorinated vinyl fluoride ketones was carried out (Table 4). A number of polyfluorinated substrates were evaluated under standard conditions and irrespective to the position of the fluorine or trifluoromethyl in the aromatic ring no trace of de-F products was observed. In all cases high yields (95-99%) and enantioselectivities (93->99% ee) was obtained for the polyfluorinated products.

Table 4. Hydrogenation of various polyfluorinated vinyl-fluoride ketone^a

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of substrate, 1 mol% catalyst F, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂. Enantiomeric excess was determined by GC/MS using chiral stationary phases.

The efficacy of this stereoselective hydrogenation process was further investigated by evaluating various substrates that would produce completely aliphatic chiral fluorine molecules (Table 5). It was observed that the developed protocol was not dependent on the aliphatic or aromatic nature of the substituents and gratifyingly a number of aliphatic vinyl fluorides were also efficiently hydrogenated in good to excellent yield with very high enantioselectivity. Interestingly, various acyclic or cyclic primary (6a-6g), secondary (6h-6n), and tertiary (6o) aliphatic substituents afforded excellent results. However, the conversion of the aliphatic substrates occasionally depends on the steric around the C=C double bond of the vinyl-F. These steric effects were easily overcome by using higher pressure (50 bar), which led to good yields for bulky aliphatic substituted products such as 6i, 6l, and 6n as well as the tertiary aliphatic substituted product 6o. Thus, the challenging aliphatic fluorine molecules with different types of substituents, were effectively synthesized with good to excellent yield and ee, which shows the extended scope of this hydrogenation process.

Table 5. Hydrogenation of various aliphatic vinyl-fluorides^a

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of substrate, 1 mol% catalyst **F**, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂, 10 bar H₂. ^b 50 bar H₂. Enantiomeric excess was determined by GC/MS using chiral stationary phases.

To further study the effectiveness of this developed method for the catalytic asymmetric synthesis of alkyl fluorides, various vinyl fluorides without a carbonyl functional group were also evaluated. For this class of substrates it was found that catalyst **E** is most suitable (see Supporting Information for optimization details). Employing the same conditions as used previously, catalyst **E** was found effective for a variety of un-functionalized vinyl-fluoride substrates and produced no or very small amounts of de-F product (Table 6). Electron-donating (-Me and -OMe) or electron-withdrawing (-F, -CF₃) substituents on the aromatic ring were both tolerated however; the electron-donating substituent on the benzene ring was slightly favorable both in terms of yield and enantioselectivity. Naphthyl or heterocyclic substituted vinyl-F also works very effectively. Notably, substrates having bulky secondary (ⁱPr or Cy) or tertiary (^tBu) substituents were hydrogenated in high levels of stereoselectivity. However, for substrates containing the *tert*-butyl substituent the reaction was slow under standard reaction conditions. This was easily overcome by either increasing the catalyst loading (**8k**) and/or by increasing the H₂ pressure (**8l**). The fruitful examples presented here emphasizes that this catalytic system is very general for fluoro-olefins.

Table 6. Hydrogenation of various substituted 2-fluoropropenyl benzene^a

^a Reaction conditions: 0.05 mmol of substrate, 1 mol% catalyst **E**, 20 bar H₂, 0.5 mL CH₂Cl₂. ^b 100 bar H₂. ^c 2 mol% catalyst **E**. Enantiomeric excess was determined by SFC or GC/MS using chiral stationary phases.

This Ir-catalyzed hydrogenation reaction was also found to be particularly robust for the preparative scale production of chiral fluorine molecules under mild reaction conditions. A gram-scale set-up using for 1.0 g of starting material **1a**, 0.5 mol% of catalyst **F**, 5 bar H₂ produced the desired compound **5j** in excellent 96% yield and >99% ee without any de-F products (Scheme 2).

Scheme 2. Gram-scale production of chiral fluorine molecule.

Computational^{12e, 18} and experimental studies¹⁹ suggests that the enantioselectivity of Ir-catalyzed asymmetric hydrogenations depend mainly on the steric interactions between the substrate olefin and co-ordination environment around the N,P-iridium catalyst. A quadrant model has been developed^{12e, 18} to explain the enantioselectivity. The ligand is positioned as shown in Scheme 3a, having the iridium atom in the center of the four quadrants (Scheme 3b). The olefin then coordinates vertically trans to phosphorous as shown in Scheme 3c. The phenyl on the thiazole points outward making quadrant **i** sterically hindered. One of the cyclohexyl group on the phosphorus also points slightly outwards, making quadrant **iv** a semi-hindered quadrant. Quadrant **ii** and **iii** are considered as open quadrants since there are no obstructions from the ligand here. When the tri-substituted (*Z*)-vinylfluoride olefin **7a** is placed *trans* to phosphorous, such that the smallest substituent (H) occupies the hindered quadrant **i** and the other small substituent (F) occupies the semi-hindered quadrant **iv**, this should result in a favored arrangement (Scheme 3d). Considering the similar size of H and F another sterically favorable arrangement is also possible placing fluorine in the sterically hindered quadrant **i** (Scheme 3e). The other two possible arrangements (Scheme 3f, 3g) are sterically unfavoured. Thus, based on the quadrant model, both of the sterically favored orientations of the vinylfluoride olefin **7a** re-

sults in hydrogenation from the same face of the olefin and the predicted absolute configuration of hydrogenated product **8a** is *S* which is in agreement with the experimental results (see supporting information for absolute configuration determination).²⁰

Scheme 3. Determination of absolute configuration of 2-fluoropropenyl benzene.

However, in case of the (*E*)-vinylfluoride olefin **7a'** the two sterically favored orientations (Scheme 3h and 3i) will take place from opposite faces which would result in formation of mixtures of *R* and *S* products. These predictions are in well agreement with experimental results (Scheme 4) as the (*Z*)-vinylfluoride olefin (**7a**) provides product **8a** with high enantioselectivity (89% ee) while the (*E*)-isomer gives the corresponding products in enantiomeric mixture of 55% ee.

Scheme 4. Hydrogenation of both *Z* and *E* isomer of vinylfluoride olefin **7a**.

CONCLUSION:

In summary, we have developed a new stereoconvergent azabicyclo iridium-thiazole-phosphine-complex, which is very general and efficient for the synthesis of various alkyl fluorides, thereby complementing previous catalytic asymmetric synthesis for organofluorine compounds, which usually works with either carbonyl framework or without carbonyl framework. The developed proto-

col is simple as well unique and significantly overcomes the problem of defluorination. It has been effectively used on various aromatic and aliphatic *tri*-substituted vinyl-fluorides, providing chiral fluoro-alkanes in excellent yield and enantioselectivity.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

“The Supporting Information is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.”

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*Pher.Andersson@su.se

Author Contributions

¹S.P. and J.Y. contributed equally.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Swedish Research Council (VR), Stiftelsen Olle Engkvist Byggmästare, Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation (KAW 2016.0072 and KAW 2018.0066) supported this work. We thank Dr. Thishana Singh, School of Chemistry and Physics, University of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa, for proof reading and editing the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- (a) K. L. Kirk, *Org. Process Res. Dev.* **2008**, *12*, 305. (b) S. Purser, P. R. Moore, S. Swallow, V. Gouverneur, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2008**, *37*, 320. (c) W. K. Hagmann, *J. Med. Chem.* **2008**, *51*, 887. (d) I. Ojima, *ChemBioChem* **2004**, *5*, 628. (e) P. Jeschke, *ChemBioChem* **2004**, *5*, 570.
- (a) K. Muller, C. Faeh, F. Diederich, *Science* **2007**, *317*, 1881. (b) H.-J. Böhm, D. Banner, S. Bendels, M. Kansy, B. Kuhn, K. Müller, U. Obst-Sander, M. Stahl, *ChemBioChem* **2004**, *5*, 637. (f) J. Wang, M. Sanchez-Rosello, J. L. Acena, C. del Pozo, A. E. Sorochinsky, S. Fustero, V. A. Soloshonok, H. Liu, *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 2432. (g) Y. Zhou, J. Wang, Z. Gu, S. Wang, W. Zhu, J. L. Acena, V. A. Soloshonok, K. Izawa, H. Liu, *Chem. Rev.* **2016**, *116*, 422.
- (a) G. W. Gribble, in *Progress in the Chemistry of Organic Natural Products* Vol. 68 (eds W. Herz, G. W. Kirby, R. E. Moore, W. Steglich, C. Tamm) 1-498 (Springer, **1996**). (b) G. W. Gribble, in *Progress in the Chemistry of Organic Natural Products* Vol. 91 (eds A. D. Kinghorn, H. Falk, J. Kobayashi) 1-613 (Springer, **2009**). (c) M. C. Walker, M. C. Y. Chang, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, *43*, 6527.
- For reviews: (a) T. Liang, C. N. Neumann, T. Ritter, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 8214. (b) X. Yang, T. Wu, R. J. Phipps, F. D. Toste, *Chem. Rev.* **2015**, *115*, 826. (c) M. Nonn, A. M. Remete, F. Fulop, L. Kiss, *Tetrahedron* **2017**, *73*, 5461. (d) Y. Zhu, J. Han, J. Wang, N. Shibata, M. Sodeoka, V. A. Soloshonok, J. A. S. Coelho, F. D. Toste, *Chem. Rev.* **2018**, *118*, 3887. (e) H. Park, P. Verma, K. Hong, J.-Q. Yu, *Nat. Chem.* **2018**, *10*, 755.
- (a) L. Hintermann, A. Togni, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2000**, *39*, 4359. (b) M. Marigo, D. Fielenbach, A. Brautun, A. Kjærsgaard, K. A. Jørgensen, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 3703. (c) T. D. Beeson, D. W. C. MacMillan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 8826.
- (a) V. Rauniyar, A. D. Lackner, G. L. Hamilton, F. D. Toste, *Science* **2011**, *334*, 1681. (b) E. P. A. Talbot, T. d. A. Fernandes, J. M. McKenna, F. D. Toste, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 4101. (c) N. A. Cochrane, H. Nguyen, M. R. Gagné, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 628.
- (a) J. A. Kalow, A. G. Doyle, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 3268. (b) M. H. Katcher, A. G. Doyle, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 17402.

(c) Q. Zhang, D. P. Stockdale, J. C. Mixdorf, J. J. Topczewski, H. M. Nguyen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 11912.

8. (a) M. R. Witten, E. N. Jacobsen, *Org. Lett.* **2015**, *17*, 2772. (b) K. Shibatomi, K. Kitahara, T. Okimi, Y. Abe, S. Iwasa, *Chem. Sci.* **2016**, *7*, 1388.

9. (a) Y. Hamashima, K. Yagi, H. Takano, L. Tamas, M. Sodeoka, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 14530. (b) R. Pluta, P. E. Krach, L. Cavallo, L. Falivene, M. Rueping, *ACS Catal.* **2018**, *8*, 2582. (c) B. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Jiang, M. Chu, S. Qi, W. Ju, D. Xu, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2018**, *16*, 7702. (d) H. Wang, H. Yuan, H. Lu, W.-H. Zheng, *Org. Lett.* **2018**, *20*, 2555.

10. (a) N. Shibata, E. Suzuki, Y. Takeuchi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 10728. (b) D. Enders, M. R. M. Hutt, *Synlett* **2005**, *6*, 991. (c) G. K. S. Prakash, P. Beirer, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 2172. (d) P. Kwiatkowski, T. D. Beeson, J. C. Conrad, D. W. C. MacMillan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 1738. (e) X. Yang, R. J. Phipps, F. D. Toste, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 5225. (f) S. Hajra, A. Hazra, P. Mandal, *Org. Lett.* **2018**, *20*, 6471. (g) H. Zhang, B. Cheng, Z. Lu, *Org. Lett.* **2018**, *20*, 4028.

11. (a) T. Allmendinger, C. Dandois, B. Walliser, *Tetrahedron Letters* **1991**, *32*, 2735. (b) P. Martinet, R. Sauvetre, J.-F. Normant, *J. Fluorine Chem.* **1991**, *52*, 419. (c) D. Enders, M. Potthoff, G. Raabe, J. Runsink, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **1997**, *36*, 2362. (d) D. Enders, Faure, S. Faure, M. Potthoff, J. Runsink, *Synthesis* **2001**, *15*, 2307. (e) F. A. Davis, P. V. N. Kasu, *Tetrahedron Letters* **1998**, *39*, 6135. (f) Y. Liang, G. C. Fu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 5520.

12. For selected references (a) J. A. Osborn, F. H. Jardine, J. F. Young, G. Wilkinson, *J. Chem. Soc.* **1966**, *A*, 1711. (b) B. D. Vinyard, W. S. Knowles, M. J. Sabacky, G. L. Bachman, D. J. Wein-kauff, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1977**, *99*, 5946. (c) W. S. Knowles, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 1998. (d) R. Noyori, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 2008. (e) T. L. Church, T. Rasmussen, P. G. Andersson, *Organometallics* **2010**, *29*, 6769. (f) J. A. Bull, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 8930. (g) D. H. Woodmansee, A. Pfaltz, *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 7912. (h) S. J. Roseblade, A. Pfaltz, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2007**, *40*, 1402. (i) T. L. Church, P. G. Andersson, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2008**, *252*, 513. (j) J. J. Verendel, O. Pamies, M. Dieguez, P. G. Andersson, *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 2130. (k) C. Margarita, P. G. Andersson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*, 1346.

13. (a) J.-P. Genet, In *Modern Reduction Methods*; P. G. Andersson, I. J. Munslow, Eds.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2008. (b) Y. Chi, W. Tang, X. Zhang, In *Modern Rhodium-Catalyzed Organic Reactions*; P. A. Evans, Ed.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2005. (c) M. Kitamura, R. Noyori, In *Ruthenium in Organic Synthesis*; S.-I. Murahashi, Ed.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2004.

14. (a) O. Pamies, P. G. Andersson, M. Dieguez, *Chem.-Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 14232. (b) X. Cui, K. Burgess, *Chem. Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 3272.

15. (a) M. Hudlicky, *Chemistry of Organic Fluorine Compounds*, 2nd ed., Ellis Harwood, Chichester, U.K., **1992**. (b) D. M. Sedgwick, G. B. Hammond, *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2018**, *207*, 45.

16. (a) M. Engman, J. S. Diesen, A. Paptchikhine, P. G. Andersson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 4536. (b) P. Kaukoranta, M. Engman, C. Hedberg, J. Bergquist, P. G. Andersson, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2008**, *350*, 1168. (c) A. Stumpf, M. Reynolds, D. Sutherlin, S. Babu, E. Bappert, F. Spindler, M. Welch, J. Gaudino, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2011**, *353*, 3367. (d) S. Ponra, W. Rabten, J. Yang, H. Wu, S. Kerdphon, P. G. Andersson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2018**, *140*, 13878. (e) Z. Han, Y.-Q. Guan, G. Liu, R. Wang, X. Yin, Q. Zhao, H. Cong, X.-Q. Dong, X. Zhang, *Org. Lett.* **2018**, *20*, 6349. (f) Y.-Q. Guan, Z. Han, X. Li, C. You, X. Tan, H. Lv, X. Zhang, *Chem. Sci.*, **2019**, *10*, 252.

17. (a) A. B. Lindstrom, M. J. Strynar, E. L. Libelo, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *45*, 7954. (b) S. S. White, S. E. Fenton, E. P. Hines, *J. Steroid Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **2011**, *127*, 16. (c) S. S. White, J. P. Stanko, K. Kato, A. M. Calafat, E. P. Hines, S. E. Fenton, *Environ Health Perspect* **2011**, *119*, 1070. (d) K. Hoffman, T. F. Webster, M. G. Weisskopf, J. Weinberg, V. M. Vieira, *Environ Health Perspect* **2010**, *118*, 1762. (e) P. Grandjean, E. W. Andersen, E. Budtz-Jørgensen, F. Nielsen, K. Molbak, P. Weihe, C. Heilmann, *JAMA* **2012**, *307*, 391.

18. (a) P. Brandt, C. Hedberg, P. G. Andersson, *Chem.-Eur. J.* **2003**, *9*, 339. (b) Y. Fan, X. Cui, K. Burgess, M. B. Hall, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 16688.

19. T. Ohta, H. Takaya, M. Kitamura, K. Nagai, R. Noyori, *J. Org. Chem.* **1987**, *52*, 3174.

20. L. Zhang, W. Zhang, J. Liu, J. Hu, *J. Org. Chem.* **2009**, *74*, 2850.