Stereochemistry of the Thermal and Photolytic Decomposition of *cis*- and *trans*-2,3-Dimethylcyclobutanone in the Gas Phase¹

Sir:

A comparison of the photochemical decomposition modes with the unimolecular, thermal decomposition of cyclobutanone in the gas phase has led to a mechanistic proposal that the internal conversion process $(S_1 \longrightarrow S_0)$ is surprisingly efficient.² Furthermore, the importance of the intersystem crossing process $(S_1 \dashrightarrow T_1)$ in the direct photolysis of cyclobutanone was stressed,³ on the basis of the result that the triplet benzene photosensitization of cyclobutanone gave c-C₃H₆ and CO exclusively,³ in contrast to the thermal decomposition, which gave C_2H_4 and CH_2CO , with $E_a = 52.0$ kcal/ mol.⁴ In order to obtain additional details of this model kinetic system, we have carried out the pyrolysis and photolysis of cis- and trans-2,3-dimethylcyclobutanone (DMCB),⁵ molecules which are capable of providing the crucial stereochemical information about the unimolecular decomposition processes of interest.

The noteworthy results are: (1) pyrolysis at 325° of *cis*- or *trans*-DMCB gives *cis*- or *trans*-2-butene, respectively, with retention of the stereochemical configuration (>98%) during the ring fission path b (see Scheme I); (2) likewise, direct photolysis⁶ at 313 nm

Scheme I

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} CH_3 \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} c \\ CH_3 \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_2 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_2 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_3 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_2 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_3 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH - CH_3 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} CH_2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} CH_3 - CH = CH_3 \\ \end{array} \end{array}$$

(23°) gives predominantly retention of configuration in the 2-butene products, *cis*-DMCB giving a *trans*- to *cis*-2-butene ratio of ~0.15, and *trans*-DMCB giving a ratio of ~12; (3) the decarbonylation process c is absent in pyrolysis [$c \le 0.01(a + b)$]; (4) the ring fission processes a and b are absent in the ³B_{1u} benzenesensitized decomposition of *cis*- and *trans*-DMCB [$c \ge 50(a + b)$], and the ratio of *trans*- to *cis*-1,2-dimethylcyclopropane (DMCP) produced is ~2.6; (5) the ring fission processes predominate over the decarbonylation in the direct photolysis (313 nm) [$c \approx 0.12(a + b)$]; and (6) the ratio of products a/b is ~1.1 for the pyrolysis of *trans*-DMCB and ~6 for *cis*-DMCB, while this ratio in the direct photolysis is 0.9 and 1.3, respectively.

The most significant conclusion drawn from the above results is that the stereochemistry of the ring fission

(1) This research has been supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. GP 11390.

(2) (a) N. E. Lee, H. O. Denschlag, and E. K. C. Lee, J. Chem. Phys., **48**, 3334 (1968); (b) N. E. Lee and E. K. C. Lee, *ibid.*, **50**, 2094 (1969).

(3) H. O. Denschlag and E. K. C. Lee, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 90, 3628 (1968).

(4) (a) M. N. Das, F. Kern, T. D. Coyle, and W. D. Walters, *ibid.*, **76**, **62**71 (1954); (b) A. T. Blades, *Can. J. Chem.*, **47**, 615 (1969).

(5) Our assignments of the isomeric *cis* and *trans* structures (based on nmr, ir, and order of vpc elution) are consistent with the assignments made by N. J. Turro and R. B. Gagosian, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 92, 2036 (1970), and J.-L. Ripoll and J. M. Conia, *Bull. Chim. Soc. Fr.*, 2755 (1965).

(6) *cis-trans* isomerization of the starting ketones was not detected under our photolysis conditions.

process b from the ground state is entirely consistent with that predicted for the concerted, cycloreversion process by the conservation of orbital symmetry.⁷ We believe that our pyrolysis result, together with the results obtained in the thermal addition of olefins to ketenes,⁸ illustrates nicely the reversibility of the cycloaddition-cycloreversion process.

The reason for the negligible participation of the cycloreversion processes (a and b) in the triplet-benzenesensitized decomposition ($E_{\rm T}$ = 85 kcal/mol) may lie in the fact that the production of an electronically excited ketene (or 2-butene counterpart) from the electronically excited (triplet) DMCB is slightly endothermic and could have an appreciable activation barrier; therefore, an alternative decarbonylation process (c), presumably involving a diradical intermediate, could predominate instead, since the *trans/cis* ratio of \sim 2.6 for DMCP product obtained in observation 4 is nearly equal to the ratio of 2.9 obtained in the triplet CH₂ addition to cis- and trans-2-butenes involving a diradical intermediate.9 It is also reassuring to find that observations 2 and 5 are consistent with the earlier proposed photodecomposition mechanism involving the $S_1 \longrightarrow S_0$ internal converson process.² The observation (6) that the rate of the ring fission mode a in pyrolysis is enhanced for cis-DMCB over that for trans-DMCB is familiar to the similar observation made for cis- and trans-1,2-dimethylcyclobutane.¹⁰ However, any simple analogy could be an inadequate explanation, since the cyclobutane pyrolysis involves a nonconcerted, diradical intermediate,¹¹ unlike the cyclobutanone pyrolysis. We hope that our continued efforts made in the detailed study of this system will bring about a satisfactory understanding of the factors which control the rates in various unimolecular reaction channels of the ground and excited states.

(7) See R. B. Woodward and R. Hoffmann, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 8, 781 (1969); the orbital symmetry of the reaction is of the type $[\sigma 2_s + \sigma 2_s]$, suprafacial with respect to the olefinic product and antarafacial with respect to the ketene product.

(8) (a) R. Huisgen, L. Feiler, and G. Binsch, *ibid.*, 3, 753 (1964); (b)
J. C. Martin, V. W. Goodlett, and R. D. Burpitt, J. Org. Chem., 30, 4309 (1965); (c) R. Montaigne and L. Ghosez, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 7, 221 (1968); (d) G. Binsch, L. A. Feiler, and R. Huisgen, Tetrahedron Lett., 4497 (1968).

(9) C. McKnight, P. S. T. Lee, and F. S. Rowland, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 89, 6802 (1967).

(10) H. R. Gerberich and W. D. Walters, *ibid.*, 83, 3935, 4884 (1961).

(11) (a) A. T. Cocks, H. M. Frey, and I. D. R. Stevens, *Chem. Commun.*, 458 (1969); however see (b) J. E. Baldwin and P. W. Ford, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 91, 7192 (1969).

Howard A. J. Carless, Edward K. C. Lee Department of Chemistry, University of California Irvine, California 92664 Received April 6, 1970

Carbon-13 Fourier-Transform Nuclear Magnetic Resonance. I. Comparison of a Simple Spin-Echo Procedure with Other Methods

Sir:

Interest in Fourier-transform nuclear magnetic resonance (FT nmr) as an alternative to continuous-wave high-resolution nmr (CW nmr) for nuclei with poor sensitivity and low natural abundance is due to the expectation of large improvements in signal-to-noise