#### PHOTOISOMERIZATION OF AZOALKANES

### Theodore Mill and Roger S. Stringham Physical Sciences (Chemistry) Stanford Research Institute Menlo Park, California 94025 (Received in USA 3 March 1969; received in UK for publication 13 April 1969)

<u>trans</u>-Azoalkanes are commonly employed as photolytic sources of alkyl radicals and the chemistry of such processes has been studied in some detail (1). By analogy with aromatic azo compounds (2) and with olefins (3), one expects that  $\underline{trans} \rightarrow \underline{cis}$  isomerization should be an important process competing with dissociation. However, only in the irradiation of solutions of azomethane and azoisopropane have such isomerizations been unequivocally demonstrated (4).

We have irradiated solutions of azoisobutane (AIB), azobis-(isobutyronitrile), azobis(cyanocyclohexane), and azobis(2-methylpropyl acetate) in CFCl<sub>3</sub>, acetone, methanol, or pentane with light <4000 Å in Pyrex vessels at temperatures below -50 °C. After several hours, the solutions had turned intensely yellow but only trace amounts of nitrogen were evolved. On warming to  $25^{\circ}$  the color rapidly disappeared, accompanied by evolution of nitrogen.

The irradiation of AIB was studied in detail. A solution of 116 µmole AIB in ~0.3 ml CH<sub>3</sub>OD was irradiated in an nmr tube at -80° using the output of a 200W PEK point-source mercury arc filtered through a Corning 7-84 narrow-pass filter (long wavelength cutoff at 4000 Å). After 4 hrs irradiation the nmr spectrum of the solution at -70°C showed the presence of two singlets, at 78.88 from AIB (70 µmole), and at 78.55 (43 µmole) from a photoisomer. About 2-3 µmole each of isobutane and isobutylene were present. The decay of the T8.55 peak and concomitant growth of T8.31 triplet, ( $\underline{CH}_3$ )<sub>2</sub>C-CH<sub>2</sub>, and T9.11-9.13 doublet, ( $\underline{CH}_3$ )<sub>3</sub>CH, were then measured periodically. At -23°C 10 µmole photoisomer disappeared and 11 µmole each of isobutylene and isobutylene dimer were formed in one hour. At 0°, 19 µmole of photoisomer disappeared and 21 µmole each of C<sub>4</sub> product and 2 µmole of dimer were formed in four minutes.

Plots of the logs of the integrated peak areas for photoisomer versus time at  $-23^{\circ}$  and at  $0^{\circ}$  gave two first-order rate constants of 8.3 x  $10^{-6}$  sec<sup>-1</sup> and 4.0 x  $10^{-4}$  sec<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, corresponding to an activation energy of  $23\pm2$  kcal/mole with an A-factor of  $10^{15.6\pm0.5}$  sec<sup>-1</sup> for thermal decomposition of the AIB photoisomer.

In separate experiments the photoisomer was generated below  $-50^{\circ}$  from  $\sim 0.1$  <u>M</u> AIB in deuteroacetone or methanol-OD (trace of N<sub>2</sub>). The solutions were then warmed to  $25^{\circ}$  where the final nitrogen evolution was measured with a Toepler pump and gas buret. Organic products were measured by nmr. Within experimental error the thermal decomposition of the photoisomer is represented by

$$\underline{t}-BuN_2Bu-t \longrightarrow 2\underline{t}-Bu \cdot + N_2$$

$$2\underline{t}-Bu \cdot \underbrace{-}_{C_8H_{18}} + i - C_9H_{10}$$

$$C_8H_{18}$$

Qualitative experiments showed that the AIB photoisomer decomposed at the same rate in acetone, pentane, or methanol and that the only products were nitrogen and hydrocarbons expected from  $\underline{t}$ -butyl radicals (5). However, decomposition was tenfold more rapid in CFCl<sub>3</sub> or CF<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, some isomerization to AIB occurred, and small amounts of  $\underline{t}$ -butyl chloride were formed along with the hydrocarbon products.

We attribute this change in rate and products to formation of small amounts of HCl from photolysis of the solvents. The acid added to isobutylene to form <u>t</u>-butyl chloride and also rapidly isomerized the photoisomer. This explanation is consistent with the observation that in all cases the sum of <u>t</u>-butyl chloride and isobutylene equaled the isobutane, ruling out the possibility of attack by <u>t</u>-butyl radicals on the solvent (6). That HCl was responsible for the isomerization was confirmed by an experiment wherein ~0.05 <u>M</u> photoisomer was rapidly (30 min) and quantitatively isomerized to AIB at  $-80^{\circ}$  (where it is otherwise stable) in the presence of 0.005 M trifluoroacetic acid.

Thermal decomposition of the isomer in oxygen-saturated pentane at  $-20^{\circ}$  led to oxygen uptake and formation of <u>t</u>-butyl peroxide and <u>t</u>-butyl alcohol as well as hydrocarbon products, showing the decomposition produces some free <u>t</u>-butyl radicals. The uv spectrum of the photoisomer at  $-60^{\circ}$  shows an absorption maximum at 4470 Å, about 800 Å longer wavelength than AIB. When irradiated with light of >4000 Å the photoisomer rapidly isomerized to AIB with no detectable decomposition to nitrogen and <u>t</u>-butyl radical products. Neither photochemical isomerization process was affected by oxygen at pressures up to 1000 torr.

Of the two structures isomeric with AIB, cis-AIB (I) and 1,1-di-t-butyldiazene (II),



No.23

The latter structure can be excluded for two reasons. First, Lemal and coworkers have shown that the decomposition pathway for dialkyldiazenes is solvent dependent (7,8), and in no case does rearrangement give an azoalkane. Second, McBride and Kruse (9) observed that dialkyldiazenes are stabilized in acidic media as the diazenium ions which, when neutralized to the free diazenes, couple to tetrazenes.

 $\begin{array}{c} \bigoplus \\ R_2 N = NH \end{array} \xrightarrow{H^{\bigoplus}} \\ R_2 N = N \end{array} \xrightarrow{R_2 N = N} \\ R_2 N = N \xrightarrow{R_2 N = N} \\ R_2 N = N \xrightarrow{R_2 N = N - N = NR_2} \end{array}$ 

Thus, the very facile acid catalyzed isomerization of the photoisomer to <u>trans</u>-AIB indicates that it must be <u>cis</u>-AIB.

The rapid thermal decomposition of <u>cis</u>-AIB (and of other <u>cis</u>-azoalkanes examined here) below 0° is in striking contrast to the high stability of <u>trans</u>-AIB which has rate parameters (10) of  $k_1 = 10^{16.3-42,800/\theta} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  ( $\theta = 4.6T$ ) and a calculated half-life of ~10<sup>5</sup> minutes at 200°. Since the transition states for the two reactions must be very similar, the difference in activation energies for thermal decomposition of <u>trans</u>- and <u>cis</u>-AIB of about 20 kcal/mole must arise largely from the steric strain in the <u>cis</u>-isomer. The comparable model pair, <u>cis</u>- and <u>trans</u>-1,2-di-<u>t</u>-butylethylene differ by about 10 kcal/mole in their heats of hydrogenation (11) to the same 1,2-di-<u>t</u>-butylethane. However, 1,2-di-<u>t</u>-butylbenzene has a strain energy of 23 kcal/mole (12) which presumable reflects the greater rigidity of the benzene ring compared to the ethylenic double bond where some twisting may afford partial relief of strain.

We suggest that the two pair of non-bonded electrons in <u>cis</u>-AIB produce an electrostatic repulsive interaction that could account for all or part of the difference in steric strain between <u>cis</u>-AIB and <u>cis</u>-di-t-butylethylene. Since this electrostatic effect should be present in all <u>cis</u>-azoalkanes, measurement of the kinetic parameters for decomposition of <u>cis</u>-azomethane would serve to measure the importance of this effect independently of any steric effects.

Our results do not permit a distinction between a one-bond cleavage mechanism in which  $\underline{t}$ -BuN<sub>2</sub>. radical is an intermediate and a two-bond cleavage mechanism in which two  $\underline{t}$ -Bu. radicals and N<sub>2</sub> are formed in a single step. If  $\underline{t}$ -BuN<sub>2</sub>. is formed it must decompose rapidly in the solvent cage compared to its rate of isomerization and reunion with a  $\underline{t}$ -Bu. radical to form  $\underline{trans}$ -AIB.

# t-Bu· + N<sub>2</sub> fast t-Bu-N=N slow t-Bu-N=N t-Bu· trans-AIB

Since only a small fraction of <u>trans</u>- and <u>cis</u>-AIB gave <u>t</u>-butyl radicals on irradiation at low temperatures, the major pathway for formation of t-alkyl radicals at ordinary temperatures must be via the photoisomerization of the <u>trans</u>-azoalkane, followed by rapid thermolysis of the <u>cis</u>-isomer. This scheme would explain why other investigators (13) have found no differences in the ratios of recombination to disproportionation for <u>t</u>-alkyl radicals generated by photolysis and thermolysis of the corresponding azoalkanes: both processes produce ground-state (singlet) radical pairs. Our results also show that <u>trans</u>-AIB triplet (14) does not readily undergo geometric isomerization, presumably owing to an energy barrier imposed by steric interactions in the cis- form (4).

### Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge partial support of this work by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama through Contract No. NASS-21316 and by Stanford Research Institute. Mr. William Anderson and Mrs. Lynn Stietzel very capably prepared the nmr spectra.

## References

- H. Cerfontain and K. O. Kutschke, <u>Can. J. Chem. 36</u>, 344 (1958); R. E. Rebbert and P. Ausloos, <u>J. Phys. Chem. 66</u>, 2253 (1962); R. <u>K. Lyon, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 86</u>, 1907 (1964); W. E. Morganroth and J. G. Calvert, ibid. <u>88</u>, 5387 (1966).
- (2) L. B. Jones and G. S. Hammond, ibid. 87, 4220 (1964); E. Fischer, ibid. 90, 797 (1968).
- (3) N. J. Turro, Molecular Photochemistry, pp. 176-181, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York (1965).
- (4) I. I. Abram, G. S. Milne, B. S. Solomon, and C. Steel, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 91, 7221 (1969).
- (5) J. A. G. Dominguez, J. A. Kerr, and A. F. Trotman-Dickenson, J. Chem. Soc., 3357 (1962).
- (6) Abstraction of chlorine by t-butyl radical at -50° probably has a rate constant of ~10<sup>-4</sup> mole/l sec which is much too slow to compete with recombination; see D. M. Thompkinson, J. P. Galvin, and H. O. Pritchard, J. Phys. Chem. <u>68</u>, 541 (1964).
- (7) D. M. Lemal, F. Manger, and E. Coats, <u>J. Amer. Chem. Soc.</u> <u>86</u>, 2395 (1964).
- (8) D. M. Lemal and T. W. Rave, ibid. 87, 393 (1965).
- (9) W. R. McBride and H. W. Kruse, ibid. 79, 572 (1957).
- (10) J. B. Levy and B. Copeland, ibid. 82, 5314 (1960).
- (11) R. B. Turner, P. E. Nettleton, Jr., and M. Perelman, ibid. 80, 1430 (1958).
- (12) E. M. Arnett, J. C. Sanda, S. M. Bollinger, and M. Barber, ibid. 89, 5387 (1967).
- (13) G. S. Hammond and J. R. Fox, <u>ibid</u>. <u>86</u>, 1918 (1964); S. F. Nelsen and P. D. Bartlett, <u>ibid</u>. <u>88</u>, 137, 143 (1966).
- (14) P. D. Bartlett and P. S. Engel, <u>ibid</u>. <u>90</u>, 2960 (1968).