THE EFFECT OF BASES ON <u>TRANS</u>/<u>CIS</u> RATIOS IN ELIMINATION REACTIONS OF SECONDARY ALKYL BROMIDES IN APROTIC SOLVENTS Irving N. Feit, Antonia M. Capobianco and Thomas W. Cooke Department of Chemistry, C. W. Post College Greenvale, New York 11548

(Received in USA 26 March 1973; received in UK for publication 11 June 1973)

The remarkably facile β -elimination reactions promoted by very weak bases such as Br⁻, in dipolar aprotic solvents have generated considerable interest. These reactions are designated E2C by Winstein and Parker¹ to suggest that the base interacts strongly with C_{α} at the same time it is abstracting the proton from C_{β} . Similarly, these authors¹ label as E2H elimination reactions promoted by strong bases, such as <u>t</u>-BuOK. This designation indicates that the base interacts exclusively with the proton on C_{β} as in the classical E2 mechanism. The concept of nucleophilic participation at C_{α} has been challenged, especially by Bunnett,² and is still subject to debate. Our experiments, while supporting neither side of this controversy, clear up the misconception that halide ion-promoted eliminations give unusually high <u>trans/cis</u> ratios.¹

Based largely on a higher <u>trans/cis</u> 2-butene ratio found in the elimination reaction of 2-butyl bromide with Br⁻ than with stronger bases, Winstein and Parker conclude¹ that halide ion-promoted elimination reactions generally give abnormally high <u>trans/cis</u> ratios. This trend is considered so reliable that high <u>trans/cis</u> ratios are suggested as a measure of E2C-like character.¹

We now present evidence that halide ion-promoted elimination reactions do

2799

not give high $\underline{trans/cls}$ ratios. This conclusion is based on our gas chromatographic measurements of the olefin proportions formed upon treatment of four alkyl bromides with Bu_4NBr in acetone, Et_4NF in acetone and dimethylformamide, and \underline{t} -BuOK in dimethylformamide. Table I lists the $\underline{trans/cls}$ ratios of 4-methyl-2-pentene from 4-methyl-2-pentyl and 2-methyl-3-pentyl bromides (column 4) and of 2-pentene from 2- and 3-pentyl bromides (column 7).

Table I

trans/cis Ratios from Elimination Reactions of Alkyl Bromides

Base/Solvent	Methylpentyl Isomer	Temp.	<u>trans/cis</u> 4-Methyl- 2-pentene	Pentyl Isomer	Temp.	<u>trans/cis</u> 2pentene
Bu ₄ NBr/Acetone	4-Me-2-Pe	100	11	2-Pentyl	100	4.2
Et ₄ NF/Acetone	4-Me-2-Pe	60	17	2-Pentyl	70	5.3
Et ₄ NF/DMF	4-Me-2-Pe	60	21	2-Pentyl	60	5.7
<u>t</u> -BuOK/DMF	4-Me-2-Pe	50	25	2-Pentyl	50	5.8
Bu ₄ NBr/Acetone	2-Me-3-Pe	75	24	3-Pentyl	100	5.0
Et ₄ NF/Acetone	2-Me-3-Pe	60	34	3-Pentyl	70	5.3
Et ₄ NF/DMF	2-Me-3-Pe	60	35	3-Pentyl	60	5.8
<u>t</u> -BuOK/DMF	2-Me-3-Pe	50	59	3-Pentyl	50	5.1

Changes in product proportions with changes in reaction conditions are more distinct for reactions of methylpentyl substrates than of substrates with unbranched alkyl chains.³ Thus, it is clear from Table I that an increase in the strength of the base leads to a regular increase in the ratio of <u>trans/cis</u> 4-methyl-2-pentene in elimination reactions of 4-methyl-2-pentyl bromide and 2-methyl-3-pentyl bromide. The bromide ion base gives the lowest <u>trans/cis</u> ratios while the much stronger <u>t</u>-butoxide ion base gives the highest.

The effect of base strength on <u>trans/cis</u> ratios in the reactions of the pentyl bromides are more ambiguous. Both isomers give slightly higher <u>trans/</u> <u>cis</u> 2-pentene ratios with Et_4NF than with the weaker base Bu_4NBr . The further increase in the strength of the base to <u>t</u>-BuOK, however, causes a negligible increase in the <u>trans/cis</u> 2-pentene ratio for 2-pentyl bromide and a decrease in the ratio for 3-pentyl bromide. We are currently investigating whether the reactions of 3-pentyl bromide with <u>t</u>-BuOK and of 2-butyl bromide with Et_4NBr^1 are genuine exceptions to the general rule that increasing base strength leads to increasing <u>trans/cis</u> ratios in aprotic solvents.

2800

It is necessary to show that the general trend toward high <u>trans/cis</u> ratios with increasing base strength reflects inherent transition state characteristics and is not the result of spurious changes in experimental conditions. We therefore conducted control experiments to examine the effects of temperature and ion-pairing. The bromide-promoted eliminations were conducted at a higher temperature than those of the other bases. The ratios of $\underline{trans/cis}$ 4-methyl-2-pentene from the bromide-promoted elimination reactions of 4-methyl-2-pentyl bromide at 120, 100 and 85°C are 8, 11 and 11, respectively. The same ratios from the reaction of 2-methyl-3-pentyl bromide at 120, 100, 85 and 75°C are 25, 24, 22 and 24, respectively. These ratios are not increasing rapidly enough, if at all, at lower temperatures to approach the ratios of the fluoride or <u>t</u>-butoxide-promoted reactions.

We can also show that the trend toward higher $\underline{\text{trans}}/\underline{\text{cis}}$ ratios with stronger bases is not the result of ion-pairing.^{4,5} When we varied the concentration of the base by factors of 10-45, we found no significant variation in the $\underline{\text{trans}}/\underline{\text{cis}}$ 2-pentene ratios (±0.2) in the reactions of the pentyl bromides under all four reaction conditions. Increasing $\underline{\text{trans}}/\underline{\text{cis}}$ ratios with decreasing concentrations of the base have been used as a criterion for competing reactions of ion-paired and free bases.⁵

In aprotic solvents, ion association increases with decreasing ionic size.⁶ Thus, if ion pairing is a factor in our reactions, it will be more severe for Et_4NF than for Bu_4NBr . Since base ion-pairing leads to lower <u>trans/cis</u> ratios in <u>anti</u> eliminations,^{4,5} the higher <u>trans/cis</u> ratios from reactions promoted by F than by Br cannot be explained by ion-pairing.

Parker has determined that at the concentrations used in our experiments Bu_4NC1 is 38% dissociated in acetone.⁷ Dissociation of Bu_4NBr in acetone might be expected to be even greater.⁶ Since a base is more reactive in its free than in its ion-paired state in <u>anti</u> eliminations,^{5,8} a dissociated Br^- is most likely promoting our reactions. Závada has shown that the dissociated form of <u>t</u>-BuOK in dimethylformamide promotes the elimination reactions of acyclic tosylates,⁴ and, by implication we believe, also the bromides.

Therefore, comparisons of $\underline{\text{trans}}/\underline{\text{cis}}$ ratios in the $\underline{\text{t}}-\text{BuO}$ and $\overline{\text{Br}}$ promoted elimination reactions are valid.

Less is known about ion-pairing of Et_4NF . It is possible that ion-pairing of this base is responsible for some of the exceptional <u>trans/cis</u> ratios noted above.

The discovery that bromide ion-promoted eliminations give lower $\underline{\text{trans}}/\underline{\text{cis}}$ ratios than alkoxide ion-promoted eliminations requires a reexamination of the generally accepted hypothesis that the transition states of the former reactions have greater double bond character than those of the latter.^{1,2} The present results are consistent with less double bond character in reactions with weaker bases. The smaller increase in the rates of elimination reactions promoted by weak bases than those promoted by strong bases on changing an α or β methyl group in the substrate to a phenyl group¹ supports our contention.

We thank Research Corporation and the C. W. Post College Research Committee for financial assistance.

References

- G. Biale, D. Cook, D. J. Lloyd, A. J. Parker, I. D. F. Stevens, J. Takahashi and S. Winstein, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., <u>93</u>, 4735 (1971) and other papers in this series.
- J. F. Bunnett and D. L. Eck, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., <u>95</u>, 1897, 1900 (1973).
 J. F. Bunnett and E. Baciocchi, J. Org. Chem., <u>35</u>, 76 (1970).
- 3. I. N. Feit and W. H. Saunders, Jr., Chem. Commun., 610 (1967).
- 4. J. Závada, M. Svoboda, and M. Pánková, Tetrahedron Lett., 711 (1972).
- 5. R. A. Bartsch, G. M. Pruss, R. L. Buswell, and B. A. Bushaw, <u>ibid</u>., 2621 (1972).
- 6. D. F. Evans, C. Zawoyski, and R. L. Kay, J. Phys. Chem., <u>69</u>, 3878 (1965).
- A. J. Parker, M. Ruane, D. A. Palmer, and S. Winstein, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., <u>94</u>, 2228 (1972).
- 8. D. J. McLennan, J.C.S. Perkin II, 1577 (1972).