۰/۵

The Nature of the Preferred Chain-carrying Metallacarbene Intermediate in Metathesis Reactions Involving Alk-1-enes

By Lajos Bencze,† Kenneth J $\,$ Ivin, and John J $\,$ Rooney

(Department of Chemistry, The Queen's University of Belfast BT9 5AG, N Ireland)

Product

Summary The minor products from the cross-metathesis of norbornadiene (NBD) with hex-1-ene and of cyclopentene (CP) with octa-1,7-diene (1,7-OD), respectively, show that the complexed alkylidenes, RCH=[Mt] (where [Mt] denotes the metal site with the ligands attached), are much preferred to the complexed methylene, CH_2 =[Mt], as chain carriers formed by the reactions of the terminal olefins, but CH_2 =[Mt], when formed, is highly reactive towards the latter, with the strongly electrophilic methylene ligand selectively adding to the terminal olefins at the C-1 position

DEGENERATE metathesis of linear alk-1-enes can be at least one hundred times as fast as productive metathesis, depending on the catalyst used ¹ This can be interpreted in two ways, assuming a metallacarbene chain carrier Either the main carrier is RCH=[Mt] and reaction (1) is preferred to reaction (2) or the main carrier is CH₂=[Mt] and reaction (3) is preferred to reaction (4) It is important to note that such evidence does *not* prove that *both* $k_1 \gg k_2$ and $k_3 \gg k_4$, only that at least one of these inequalities must hold

$$\begin{array}{cccc} CH_2 &- CHR & CH_2 & CHR \\ | & | & \longrightarrow & ||^2 + || & (1) \\ CH &- [Mt] & RCH & [Mt] \end{array}$$

$$RCH = [Mt] + RCH = CH_2 \qquad RCH - [Mt] \qquad RCH \qquad [Mt]$$
$$RCH = [Mt] + RCH = CH_2 \qquad R - CH - CH_2 \qquad RCH \qquad CH_2 \qquad R_1 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_1 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_1 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_1 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 + CH_2 \qquad R_2 + CH_2 +$$

$$\begin{array}{c} CH_2 - CHR \\ | & | \\ CH_2 - [Mt] \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 - [Mt] \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ | & + \\ CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \\ \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \end{array} \xrightarrow{} \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \end{array}$$

[Mt] denotes the metal site with the ligands attached

In the cross-metathesis of cyclopentene with pent-l-ene it has been shown² that the dominant products have a nonsymmetrical structure CH₂[=CH(CH₂)₃CH=]_nCHC₃H₇ In such systems the propagating species may be designated PCH=[Mt] and may be expected to show similar chemical behaviour to RCH=[Mt] There is no guarantee, however, that it will undergo transfer with pent-1-ene by reaction (1) in preference to reaction (2)Thus one cannot say, without further evidence, whether the CH2=CH- end-groups have been formed first or last in the formation of a given product molecule This important problem has never been resolved, some authors^{1,3} favour RCH=[Mt] as an electrophile, reacting with alk-1-ene according to (1), while others⁴ $\delta +$ propose $\overset{\delta-}{CH_2}\overset{\delta+}{=}[Mt]$ as a nucleophile, reacting according to (3)

TABLE 1 Structure and relative proportions of the volatile products from the cross-metathesis of NBD and hex-1-ene ^a

Structure

$$(3) CH_2 = CH_2 - CH = CH_2 0.2$$

^a In a typical experiment 75 mmol of hex-1-ene and 19 8 mmol of NBD were dissolved in benzene (20 cm³) containing 0 26 mmol of W(Ph₃AS)₂(CO)₃Cl₂ and the mixture was heated under pure argon at 80—95 °C for 15 min giving 35—40% conversion of NBD The reaction was quenched by addition of ethanol and the more volatile products isolated and analysed by gl c – m s The ¹³C n m r of the hcavier fraction confirmed that it contained equal proportions of BuCH=CH– and CH₂=CH– end groups (Bu = n-butyl)

We report here some results for the cross-metathesis of norbornadiene (NBD) with hex-l-ene (Table 1), and cyclopentene (CP) with octa-1,7-diene (1,7-OD) (Table 2) which provide further evidence relating to this problem and also shed light on the selectivities of $CH_2=[Mt]$ in metathesis reactions

As expected (Table 1) the nonsymmetrical products (4) and (7) far outweigh the symmetrical counterparts (3), (5), and (6), respectively, but although a little ethylene is formed, there is no sign of any dec-5-ene The products (3), (4), and (5) will be formed by the reactions of metallacarbenes (8) and (9) with hex-1-ene, each in one of two ways The structures of (8) and (9) are so similar at the reacting site that it may be assumed that the same pair of rate constants k_a and k_b applies in each case The relative

$$CH_{2} = CH - CH = [Mt] + BuCH = CH_{2}^{k_{0}} (3) + BuCH = [Mt] (5)$$
(8)
(6)

BuCH=CH
$$-$$
 CH=[Mt] + BuCH=CH₂
(9) CH=[Mt] + BuCH=CH₂
(5) + CH₂=[Mt] (8)

† Present address Institute of Organic Chemistry, University of Chemical Industries, Veszprem, Hungary

proportions of (3), (4), and (5) are consistent either with k_{a}/k_{b} 23, [8]/[9] 0.0035 or with k_{a}/k_{b} 0.0035, [8]/[9] 23. Assuming that the ratio [8]/[9] reflects the proportions of CH₂=[Mt] and BuCH=[Mt], this means that if the former is correct, BuCH=[Mt] and (9) would be the dominant chain carriers, while if the latter is correct CH₂=[Mt] and (8) would be dominant, with $k_b \gg k_a$. Also, if the nucleophilic proposal is correct $k_2 \gg k_1$ and $k_3 \gg k_4$. On this basis, (2) would not be expected to be absent, especially in view of significant yields of (1), which is formed by reaction (4). On the other hand, if $[9] \gg [8]$ and $k_a \gg k_b$, the main transfer reaction to hex-l-ene is (7) and the most likely source of any CH₂=[Mt] is reaction (8). It then follows that $k_1 \gg k_2$ and $k_4 \gg k_3$ and the occasional formation of (1) by the reaction (4) of $CH_2 = [Mt]$ with hex-1-ene

can be expected. The fact that the quantities of (1) and (5) are very similar may then be interpreted to mean that $CH_2=[Mt]$ is formed almost exclusively by reaction (8) and consumed largely by (4), rather than by addition to NBD, since the % of (3) is very small. The substituted metallacarbene, BuCH=[Mt], is therefore the major chain carrier.

can only be so if $CH_2=CH(CH_2)_4CH=[Mt]$ is a major carrier in the cross-metathesis. By virtue of reaction (9) the contribution of the minor carrier $CH_2=[Mt]$ should also be considerably enhanced, and, as expected, the sequence C_{7} , C₁₂, etc., is initially several times larger than the other minor symmetrical sequence C₁₄, C₁₉, etc. This is in marked contrast to the relative amounts of (3) and (5), the corresponding products in the minor sequences from the crossmetathesis of NBD and hex-1-ene (Table 1). However, the yields of the C7, C12, etc. series are still low in comparison to the yield of cyclohexene, indicating that the majority of CH₂=[Mt] intermediates again preferentially undergo reaction (4), now with 1,7-OD.

The strong electrophilicity of the methylene intermediates, now evident in metathesis, has also been inferred recently from the observation of the linear homologation of paraffins on metal films⁶ and from the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis of n-alk-1-enes on supported iron clusters.7 Thus, in all these transition-metal catalysed reactions the behaviour of CH₂=[Mt] is in marked contrast to the reactivity of the known, relatively stable $CH_2=[Mt]$ compounds^{8,9} where

TABLE 2. Some initial product ratios from the cross-metathesis of CP and 1,7-OD^a at two different starting ratios.

Reactants	Products ^b					
CP/1,7-OD	C_{13}/C_{6}	C_{18}/C_{6}	C_7/C_6	C_{12}/C_{6}	C_{14}/C_{6}	C_{19}/C_{6}
1.0	3.0	1.4	0.35	0.2	0.06	0.04
20.0	3.6	1.8	0.2	0.12	0.05	0.06

^a Experiments were carried out under pure argon at 22 °C using either W(Ph₃As)₂(CO)₃Cl₂ (5·8 × 10⁻³ mol l⁻¹) with EtAlCl₂ (2·5 × 10⁻² mol l⁻¹), or WCl₆ (1·5 × 10⁻² mol l⁻¹) with SnMe₄ (1·5 × 10⁻² mol l⁻¹) solutions in benzene as catalysts. The total olefin concentration was kept at 6·54 mol l⁻¹ with the CP/1,7-OD ratio ranging from 0 to 22·5. Samples were periodically withdrawn, quenched by addition of dry Al₂O₃ and analysed by g.l.c.-m.s. Product distributions are extrapolated to zero conversion, using at least five analyses in the first 10% conversion of 1,7-OD. Ethylene was found but not measured. ^bC₆ = cyclohexene; C₇ = hepta-1,6-diene; C₁₂ = dodeca-1,6,11-triene; C₁₃ = trideca-1,6,12-triene; C₁₄ = tetradeca-1,7,13-triene; C₁₈ = octadeca-1,6,11,17tetraene; $C_{19} = nonadeca-1,7,12,18$ -tetraene.

The data in Table 2 confirm these conclusions. Again, asymmetric cross-metathesis is dominant giving the C_{13} , C18, etc., series of products, but in this particular system the contribution of the known reaction⁵ (9) may be readily

$$CH_2 = CH[CH_2]_4 CH = [Mt] \rightarrow cyclohexene + CH_2 = [Mt]$$
(9)

assessed and thus the relative importance of the C₇metallacarbene in the overall reaction is found. Cyclohexene is a substantial initial product (Table 2) and this

methylene acts as a nucleophile towards olefins, but does not initiate metathesis.

A corollary to our conclusions is that methylene complexes are less stable than alkylidene complexes in highly active metathesis systems.

(Received, 5th June 1980; Com. 610.)

J. McGinnis, T. J. Katz, and S. Hurwitz, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 605.

 ² N. Calderon, E. A. Ofstead, and W. A. Judy, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 1976, 15, 401.
 ³ J. J. Rooney and A. Stewart in 'Catalysis' (Special Periodical Report), Vol. 1, ed. C. Kemball, The Chemical Society, London, 1977, p. 277. ⁴ P. G. Gassman and T. H. Johnson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 605, 6057, 6058.

⁵ R. H. Grubbs, D. D. Carr, C. Hoppin, and P. L. Burk, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 3478.

⁶ C. O'Donohoe, J. K. A. Clarke, and J. J. Rooney, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 1, 1980, 345.
 ⁷ F. Hugues, B. Besson, and J. M. Basset, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1980, 719.
 ⁸ R. R. Schrock and P. R. Sharp, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1978, 100, 2389.
 ⁹ F. N. Tebbe, G. W. Parshall, and G. S. Reddy, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1978, 100, 3611.