The Magnitude of Secondary β-Deuterium Isotope Effects in Cases of σ-Participation

By J. M. JERKUNICA, S. BORČIĆ, and D. E. SUNKO*

("Rudjer Bošković" Institute, Zagreb and Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Yugoslavia)

WE report additional evidence on the usefulness of the secondary β -deuterium isotope effect as a probe for neighbouring group participation.

Previous results^{1,2} demonstrated a drastically

reduced β -effect in the solvolysis of (I; X = $O \cdot SO_2 \cdot C_6 H_4 \cdot Br \cdot p$, or Br) and normal behaviour of the corresponding *endo*-norborn-2-yl derivatives (II).





^a Uncertainties are standard deviations of the mean.

^b Uncertainties are probable errors.



This work has now been extended to the substituted *exo*-norborn-2-yl derivatives (*exo*-III) and (*exo*-IV) and the corresponding 2-*endo*-epimers (*endo*-III) and (*endo*-IV). The results are given in the Table.

A comparison of these results with those for the unsubstituted norborn-2-yl derivatives shows, as could be predicted, the essentially identical magnitude of the β -effect for all *endo*-derivatives. In the *exo*-series, the rate retardations vary with the degree and site of substitution, with (I) and (*exo*-IV) at the extremes. The same degree of rate retardation observed with (*exo*-IV) as with the three other *endo*-derivatives provides strong evidence that bridging is absent in the transition state of the solvolysis of (*exo*-IV) and that the geometry at the top of the barrier approximates to that of a classical cation.

The result obtained with (*exo*-III) is highly interesting and requires a careful analysis.

In discussing the mechanism of anchimerically assisted reactions one has to consider a number of

processes which do not necessarily occur simultaneously. In other words the energy profile of such a reaction involves a number of reaction co-ordinates. There are at least three different processes which in varying degrees contribute to the phenomenon described as neighbouring group participation: (i) ionization of the C-X bond and developing of the positive charge at the reaction centre, (ii) charge delocalization, and (iii) bridging, *i.e.* bond formation between the neighbouring group and the reaction centre.

If our results are analyzed in these terms one also has to take into account the strong conformational dependence of β -isotope effects.³

Thus, the absence of a significant effect with (I) indicates that all three processes most probably occur simultaneously. The significant amount of bridging coinciding with charge delocalization reduces almost completely an effective hyperconjugative σ C–D bond overlap with the reacting centre. The normal effect with (exo-IV) shows the absence of bridging and a well localized positive charge at tertiary C-2 in the transition state. With (exo-III) the effect is about half of its maximum value, suggesting that bridging does not coincide with the weakening of the C-X bond. The transition state for ionization is reached very early with, possibly, an already significant charge delocalization, while bridging has not as yet advanced sufficiently to cause complete elimination of the β -effect. This is further supported by an α -effect of normal magnitude observed in the acetolysis of [2-2H]isobornyl toluene-p-sulphonate.4



In spite of the fact that we still do not know the exact relationship between bridging, charge delocalization, and the magnitude of the β -effect it appears that in the norbornyl system bridging is a more important factor for the diminution of the β -effect than mere charge delocalization. If this were not so, the β -effect in (exo-III) should be of about the same magnitude as with (I) or even smaller. The opposite view, *i.e.* that in the solvolysis of (I; X = Br) charge delocalization precedes bridging, has been argued.² We have strong reservations on this conclusion because it also fails to explain the observed effect with $[6-^{2}H]$ exo-norborn-2-yl p-bromobenzenesulphonates.⁵

(Received, July 22nd, 1968; Com. 991.)

¹ J. M. Jerkunica, S. Borčić, and D. E. Sunko, Chem. Comm., 1967, 1302.

² J. P. Schaefer, M. J. Dagani, and D. S. Weinberg, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1967, 89, 6938.
³ (a) V. J. Shiner, jun., J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1960, 82, 2655; (b) V. J. Shiner, jun. and J. S. Humphrey, jun., J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1963, 85, 2416.

⁴ For a discussion of the α-effects see: R. Eliason, M. Tomić, S. Borčić, and D. E. Sunko, following Communication. ⁵ (a) B. L. Murr, A. Nickon, T. D. Swartz, and N. H. Werstiuk, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1967, 89, 1730; (b) J. M. Jerkunica, S. Borčić, and D. E. Sunko, *ibid.*, 1967, 89, 1732.