Diels-Alder Additions to 1,3-Dimethyldibenz[e.g.]inden-2-one

By David W. Jones (Organic Chemistry Department, The University, Leeds LS2 9JT)

Summary endo-Addition of non-conjugated dienophiles is more important for 1,3-dimethyldibenz[e.g.]inden-2-one (3) than for the cyclopentadienone (1) supporting the view that steric effects associated with non-coplanar phenyl groups in (1) impede endo-addition.

2,5-DIMETHYL-3,4-DIPHENYLCYCLOPENTADIENONE (1) rereacts with cyclopentadiene to give mainly the *endo*-adduct (2) but with cyclopentene the *endo*: oxo ratio is only 1.27:1. This result was interpreted as showing the presence of secondary attractive forces in the *endo*-cyclopentadiene addition and their absence in the *endo*-cyclopentene addition.¹ Another explanation is that the *endo*-transition state is destabilised by a steric effect arising from non-coplanarity of the phenyl groups in (1);^{2,3} such destabilisation would be greater for the more bulky cyclopentene. To test this hypothesis we have generated the very similar cyclopentadienone (3) in which the aryl rings (A) must lie

in essentially the same plane as the cyclopentadienone system.

The alcohol (4)⁴ and acetyl chloride at 0° rapidly precipitate a *cis-trans* mixture (1:1) of the chlorides (5). This mixture and triethylamine in boiling benzene gave a cyclopentadienone dimer (6)† of the usual⁵ type. In boiling benzene (6) reversibly dissociates to the monomer (3) which can be intercepted with N-phenylmaleimide to give the adduct (7). In contrast to the dissociation of the related dimer of (1) no colour accompanies dissociation of (6); presumably the equilibrium (6) \rightleftharpoons (3) more strongly favours the dimeric form.

Dissociation of (6) in the presence of cyclopentadiene led to one adduct in 71% recrystallised yield. This is assigned the *endo*-configuration (8) since in the presence of $\operatorname{Eu}(\operatorname{fod})_3$ the resonance of the olefinic protons is shifted to a much smaller extent than that of the protons H_a . Moreover reduction of (8) (H_2 -Pd-C) gave a dihydro-derivative (9) in

† This dimer was not obtained by the standard acid-catalysed dehydration of the alcohol (4) (cf. ref. 5).

Ph Me
$$R^{1}$$
 R^{2} R^{3} R^{4} R^{3} R^{4} R^{2} R^{3} R^{4} R^{3} R^{4} R^{2} R^{3} R^{4} R^{4} R^{3} R^{4} R^{4}

which the methylene protons appear as two 3H multiplets at τ 9.1 and 8.3, as in similar endo-adducts; related exoadducts show one 6H multiplet at τ ca. 8.2.

N.m.r. and t.l.c. examination of the adduct fraction obtained from the addition of cyclopentene to (3) tindicated only one major product, the endo-adduct (9). It appears therefore that endo-addition of cyclopentene to (1) is indeed inhibited by non-coplanarity of the phenyl groups for when the steric effect is removed in the addition to (3) the normal⁷ strong endo-selectivity of cyclopentene returns. Similarly in the addition of cis-but-2-ene to (3) only the endo-adduct (10) is detected. The addition of (3) to cis- and trans-but-2-ene is stereospecific (n.m.r. comparison of the crude reaction products) in agreement with concerted Diels-Alder addition of (3) to these olefins.

The suggestion that non-coplanarity of the phenyl groups in (1) favours exo-addition was made to account for the exo: endo ratio of ca. 6:1 for the addition of (1) to the cyclobutene (11).2 In agreement with a reduced impediment to endo-addition in (3) we observe an exo: endo ratio of ca. 2:1 for the addition of (3) to (11). The exo-transition state for cyclobutene addition may be favoured by other steric factors; when the steric demands for exo- and endo-addition are similar, as in the reaction of (11) with (12), the endo adduct predominates (ratio 2-2.5:1) supporting an attractive diene-alkyl group interaction.6

(Received, 11th December 1974; Com. 1501.)

‡ Addition carried out over 4.5 h in xylene solution in a bomb immersed in an oil-bath at 135—140 °C; almost complete consumption of dimer occurs in 120 h in boiling benzene but the product is contaminated with the cyclopentadiene adduct (8).

¹ K. N. Houk, Tetrahedron Letters, 1970, 2621.

² C. M. Anderson, I. W. McCay, and R. N. Warrener, Tetrahedron Letters, 1970, 2735.

³ D. W. Jones and R. L. Wife, J.C.S. Chem. Comm., 1973, 421.

⁴ F. L. C. Baranyovits and J. E. Downes, B. Pat. 1,052,951 (Chem. Abs., 1967, 66, 94727e).

⁵ M. A. Ogliaruso, M. G. Romanelli, and E. I. Becker, Chem. Rev., 1965, 65, 261.

⁶ Cf. D. W. Jones and G. Kneen, J.C.S. Chem. Comm., 1973, 420. ⁷ J. G. Martin and R. K. Hill, Chem. Rev., 1961, 61, 537.