Arabian Journal of Chemistry (2013) 6, 423–427

King Saud University

Arabian Journal of Chemistry

www.ksu.edu.sa
www.sciencedirect.com

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

An efficient and greener protocol towards synthesis of unsymmetrical *N*,*N*′-biphenyl urea

Madhav Mane [b,1], Ravi Balaskar [a], Sandip Gavade [b], Pramod Pabrekar [b], Dhananjay Mane [a,*]

[a] *PG Department of Chemistry and Research Center, Shri Chatrapati Shivaji College College, Omerga 413606, India*
[b] *V.G. Vaze College, Mulund, Mumbai 81, India*

Received 23 October 2010; accepted 26 January 2011
Available online 3 February 2011

KEYWORDS

Urea;
Isocyanate;
Thiourea;
Aqueous medium;
Carbamate

Abstract A simple and efficient route for the synthesis of Unsymmetrical *N*,*N*′-diphenyl urea have been developed in aqueous medium under base and catalyst free condition from corresponding substituted isocyanate and amines. The remarkable key feature of the reaction includes the use of water as an inexpensive and environmentally benign reaction medium, absence of base and any additional catalyst, and easy isolation of the product.

1. Introduction

Recent focus on urea stems from its wide range of application in petrochemicals, agrochemicals, and pharmaceuticals and it is also used as dyes for cellulose fibres, (Sartori, 2000) antioxidants in gasoline or as plant growth regulators, pesticides and herbicides. The unsymmetrical urea functional group is also encountered in several biologically active synthetic targets. In particular, potent urea containing HIV-1 protease inhibitors (Cassar, 1990) and p38 kinase inhibitors have recently been disclosed (Lam et al., 1994).

Substituted ureas are very important class of compounds that display a wide range of interesting applications (Li et al., 2006). They have extensively been used as agrochemicals (Hegarty and Drennan, 1995), pharmaceuticals (Greene and Wuts, 1985), intermediates in organic synthesis (Han et al., 1998), for the protection of amino groups (Regan et al., 2002) and as linkers in combinatorial chemistry (Mensal and Gutschow, 2005). These require their preparation by a convenient and safe methodology. Traditionally, their synthesis involves a reaction of amines with phosgene (Smith and March, 2001), and its derivatives (Guichard et al., 1999), carbonyl-imidazoles (Batey et al., 1998), or carbon monoxide (Mccusker et al., 2000) using various kinds of metal and non-metal catalysts.

Despite the growing number of synthetic methodologies, urea is more commonly synthesised by the reaction of an amine

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91 2475252020; mob.: +91 9423740832.
E-mail addresses: madhavmanev@gmail.com (M. Mane), Dr_dvmane@rediffmail.com (D. Mane).
[1] Tel.: +91 8097058777.

Peer review under responsibility of King Saud University.
doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2011.01.030

Production and hosting by Elsevier

with phosgene or carbamates. Use of phosgene or phosgene surrogates is still regarded as the traditional method for the formation of urea, at least in the industry. This approach is particularly efficient for symmetrical ureas. In the case of unsymmetrical ureas, the synthetic efficiency is limited by the formation of symmetrical urea side products. In the last few years, toxic and unstable reagents, such as phosgene and isolated isocyanides have been increasingly substituted for cleaner and inherently safer alternatives (Chauhan et al., 2004). These include the use of carbonates or carbonyl imidazole or taking advantage of the reactivity of carbonates' with amines to produce urea.

Unfortunately, production and use of phosgene open many worrying toxicological and environmental problems, such as the use and storage of large amounts of chlorine, production of excess aqueous waste contaminated by chlorine and chlorine bi-products, high environmental risk in storage and transportation of phosgene, use of phosgene characterised by high toxicity and volatility. Nevertheless, about 2 million tons per year of phosgene are produced and utilised worldwide (Frezza et al., 2006). Under the new environmental legalisation of the developed countries, industrial and academic research groups have performed methodologies for preparation of urea based on the use of reagents that are less toxic and less hazardous than phosgene (Mccusker et al., 2000).

Method for preparing 1,3-disubstituted urea through catalytic process by reacting a cyclic carbonic acid ester with an amine were disclosed (US Patent. 5902899, 1999). This method is too expensive to use on a large scale. The transformation of amines to disubstituted urea through catalytic carbonylation provides an alternative environmental benign method and has been investigated over many years using various kinds of metallic catalysts (Mulla et al., 1997). However, these methods failed due to the problems of regenerating the catalysts from the products. Moreover, their formation using CO_2 employed harsh reaction conditions, such as long reaction times, use of expensive strongly basic reagents, tedious work-up, and low yields (Tai et al., 2002). Consequently, there is a continued interest in developing new and convenient methods for the synthesis of substituted urea using mild reaction conditions.

2. Experimental

2.1. Reagents and analysis

All Reagents were commercial purchased from Aldrich and used without further purification. Commercial reagents were used as received. Reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography (TLC) on 0.25 mm precoated Merck Silica Gel 60 F_{254}, visualising with ultraviolet light or Ninhydrine. ^{1}H NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker DPX-400 with standard pulse sequences, operating at 300 MHz Chemical shifts were in parts per million (ppm) downfield from Tetramethylsilane (TMS), which was used as an internal standard. HPLC-MS analyses were performed with an Agilent Technologies 1100 series consisted of quaternary pump with degasser, auto sampler, column oven and DAD detector.

2.2. General procedure

General procedure: Amine (10 mmol) was dissolved in water and the mixture cooled to 5 °C. After 5 min isocyanate (10 mmol) was slowly added in the above reaction mixture in such way that the temperature of reaction mixture doesn't increase above 5 °C. As the reaction proceeds solid falls out. RM was stirred for 30 min at 5 °C & reaction was monitor by TLC. After completion of the reaction the solid was filtered out & the residue was washed with water. The solid was collected to report yield & analysis of the respective urea. The product was confirmed by melting points and spectral analysis, such as MS, NMR.

Spectral data: (Table 1, entry 1) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.60 (s, 1H), δ 8.45 (s, 1H), δ 7.45 (dd, J = 9.1, 4.9 Hz, 2H), δ 7.35 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 2H), δ 7.10 (t, J = 8.9 Hz, 2H), δ 6.87 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), δ 3.71 (s, 3H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{14}H_{13}FN_2O_2$: 260.26, Found: 261.11 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 2) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.21 (s, 1H), δ 7.38–7.46 (m, 4H), δ 7.30–7.35 (m, 2H), δ 7.21–7.28 (m, 1H), δ 7.02–7.10 (m, 2H), δ 3.26 (s, 3H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{14}H_{13}FN_2O$: 224.12, Found: 225.21 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 3) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.61 (s, 1H), δ 7.45–7.55 (m, 2H), δ 7.19 (s, 4H), δ 7.08 (t, 2H), δ 4.63 (s, 2H), δ 3.69 (t, J = 5.9 Hz, 2H), δ 2.85 (t, J = 6.0 Hz, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{16}H_{15}FN_2O$: 270.12, Found: 271.11 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 4) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.54 (s, 1H), δ 7.37 (dd, J = 9.3, 5.1 Hz, 2H), δ 7.05 (t, J = 9.1 Hz, 2H), δ 6.16 (t, J = 5.5 Hz, 1H), δ 3.32–3.40 (m, 5H), δ 3.21–3.25 (m, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{10}H_{13}FN_2O_2$: 212.22, Found: 213.23 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 5) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 10.57 (s, 1H), δ 7.48–7.56 (m, 4H), δ 7.44–7.48 (m, 3H), δ 7.12–7.19 (m, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{13}H_{10}FNOS$: 247.29, Found: 248.29 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 6) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 10.29 (br s, 1H), δ 7.51 (dd, J = 9.1, 4.9 Hz, 2H), δ 7.24–7.29 (m, 4H), δ 7.18 (t, J = 8.9 Hz, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{13}H_9F2NO2$: 249.21, Found: 250.01 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 7) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 10.20 (br s, 1H), δ 7.51 (dd, J = 9.1, 4.9 Hz, 2H), δ 7.09–7.22 (m, 4H), δ 6.95 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 2H), δ 3.76 (s, 3H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{14}H_{12}FNO_3$ 261.25, Found: 262.15 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 8) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 10.27 (br s, 1H), δ 7.52 (dd, J = 9.1, 4.9 Hz, 2H), δ 7.39–7.47 (m, 2H), δ 7.13–7.30 (m, 5H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{13}H_{10}FNO_2$: 231.22, Found: 232.54 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 9) 1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.34 (s, 1H), δ 7.15 (d, J = 2.3 Hz, 1H), δ 6.76–6.83 (m, 2H), δ 6.05–6.11 (m, 1H), δ 3.70 (s, 4H), δ 3.68 (s, 3H), δ 3.36 (s, 2H), δ 3.27 (s, 3H), δ 3.19–3.26 (m, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{12}H_{18}N_2O_4$: 254.17, Found: 255.15 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 10) ^{1}H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.40 (s, 1H), δ 7.18 (s, 5H), δ 7.00 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), δ 6.83 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), δ 4.62 (s, 2H), δ 3.70 (d, J = 4.2 Hz, 8H), δ 2.84 (t, J = 5.9 Hz, 2H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{18}H_{20}N_2O_3$: 312.26, Found: 313.32 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 12) ^{1}H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6): δ 8.30 (s, 1H), δ 7.27 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 2H), δ 6.80 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 2H), δ 6.07 (t, J = 5.5 Hz, 1H), δ 3.69 (s,3H), δ 3.35–3.41 (m, 4H), δ 3.27 (s, 3H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{11}H_{16}N_2O_3$: 224.12, Found: 225.21 [M + H]. Table 1, entry 13) 1H NMR (DMSO-d_6, 300 MHz): δ 8.53 (s, 1H), δ 8.48 (s, 1H), δ 8.17 (d, J = 2.3 Hz, 1H), δ 7.82 (d, J = 8.9, 2.8 Hz, 1H), δ 7.18 (s, 1H), δ 6.86 (s, 2H), δ 6.77 (d,J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), δ 3.81 (s, 3H), δ 3.73 (s, 3H), δ 3.70 (s, 3H); ESI (m/z) Calc. for $C_{15}H_{17}N_3O_4$: 303.12, Found: 304.26 [M + H]. (Table 1, entry 14) 1H NMR (300 MHz,