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#### Abstract

Summary: Treatment of the bromobicyclo[1.1.0]butanes 4a - $\underset{\equiv}{\underline{c} \text { with LDA led to the formation of }}$ Lhe 1,2,3-butatrienes $\underline{=}$ which were isomerized by excess base to the alkynes 8 . Reaction of  an intermediate.


1-Halobicyclo[1.1.0]butanes of type 1 with a bridge between $\mathrm{C}-2$ and $\mathrm{C}-4$ eliminate hydrogen halide when treated with a strong base, affording the bicyclo[1.1.0]but-1(3)-ene derivatives $?$ as short-lived intermediates. At low temperature ( $<0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), $\underline{\underline{2}}$ could be trapped by nucleophiles (thiolates, amides, organolithium compounds) or by reactive 1,3 -dienes ${ }^{1 \text { ) }}$. Above $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, tricyclo[4.1.0.0 $0^{2,7}$ ]hept-1(7)-ene ( $2, n=3$ ) has been shown to isomerize to $1,2,3$-cycloheptatriene ( $\underline{\underline{3}}$, $\mathrm{n}=3)^{2}$ in a formally orbital symmetry "forbidden" process 3). 1-Halobicyclo[1.1.0]butanes $\underline{\underline{4}}$ without the bridge between $\mathcal{C}-2$ and $C-4$ might behave differently when exposed to a strong base. Although the formation of $\underline{\underline{5}}$ seems reasonable, the rearrangement of $\underline{\underline{5}}$ to $\underline{\underline{6}}$ is not hampered by orbital symmetry restrictions. Therefore, 5 could evade all trapping efforts by a fast isomerization to 6 .

To test this point experimentally, the 1 -bromobicyclo[1.1.0]butanes $4 \underline{\underline{a}}-\underline{\underline{c}}$ were synthesized by the elegant method of Skattebøl and Baird ${ }^{4)}$ from the dibromocyclopropanes $\underline{\underline{Z a}} \underline{\underline{\underline{c}} \underline{\underline{c}} \text { and methyllithium. }}$ The NMR data of $4 \underline{\underline{a}}-\underline{\underline{c}}$ are collected in Table 1 . When the bromides $\underline{\underline{a}} \underline{a}-\underline{\underline{c}}$ were mixed with $3-5$ equiv. of lithium diisopropylamide (LDA) in ether at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, aqueous workup after $2-5$ hours afforded in yields of $30-50 \% \underline{\underline{8}} \underline{\underline{a}}$, a $1: 6$ mixture of $\underline{\underline{8}} \underline{\underline{b}}$ and $\underline{c}$, and, respectively, $\underline{\underline{8}} \underline{\underline{d}}$. The structures of $\underline{\underline{8}} \underline{\underline{a}} \underline{\underline{d}}$ are based on their ${ }_{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra, which had been recorded previously ${ }^{5}$ ). It was easy to

demonstrate that the alkynes 8 were formed by isomerization of the butatrienes $\underline{\underline{6}}$, caused by the excess of LDA. After dropwise addition of one equiv. of a solution of LDA to a solution of $4 \underline{a}$ or of $\underline{\underline{c}} \mathrm{C}$ in ether at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the ${ }^{1} H$ NMR spectra of the solutions showed intense signals of $6 a^{6}$ ) or of $\underline{\underline{6 c}}^{7 \text { ) }}$, which disappeared quickly, when base addition was continued.
 and 1 ithium thiophenolate or 2,5 -dimethylfuran were treated with an excess of LDA at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. However, no products containing the bicyclo[1.1.0]butane structure were isolated, leaving the question on the intermediacy of 5 unanswered.

To reach a decision on this point, $\left[1-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{c}} \underline{\underline{c}}$ was synthesized from $\left[1--^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{Z}} \underline{\mathrm{c}}$. For this purpose, commercially available ${ }^{12} \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ( ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$ content $\geq 99.95 \%$ ) was converted to ${ }^{12} \mathrm{CDBr}_{3}$ by anhydrous $\mathrm{AlBr}_{3}$ in $71 \%$ yield ${ }^{8)}$. Reaction of ${ }^{12} \mathrm{CDBr}_{3}$ with 1 -chloro-3-methylbut-2-ene in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ with conc.

NaOH under phase-transfer conditions furnished a $72 \%$ yield of $\left[1-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{C}} \mathrm{C}$, from which $\left[1-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{V}} \mathrm{C}$ was obtained in $34 \%$ yield by reaction with methyllithium in ether. The ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum of $\left[1-{ }^{12} C\right] 4 \underset{=}{C}$ indicated that the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ proportion of $C^{1}$ was below ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR detection: the sing, let of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum of $4 \underset{\sim}{c}$ at $\delta 28.9$ was not observed in the spectrum of $\left[1-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{C}} \mathrm{C}$.

Mixing $\left[1-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] 4 \mathrm{c}$ with 4 equiv. of LDA at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by aqueous workup produced a sample of the alkyne $8 \equiv \underline{d}$, the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum of which gave a clear answer to the posed question: the signal of the olefinic $C^{3}$ (at $\delta 105.4$ in the ${ }^{13} C$ NMR spectrum of $8 d$ ) was completely absent in the spectrum of the sample, showing that $\left[3-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \frac{8 \mathrm{~d}}{\boldsymbol{d}}$ was the only product. This result immediately eliminated $\underset{\underline{5 c}}{\underline{c}}$ as an intermediate. In this molecule, the bicyclo[1.1.0]butane side-bonds $C^{1}-C^{2}$ and $C^{2}-C^{3}$ are equivalent, as are the bonds $C^{1}-C^{4}$ and $C^{3}-C^{4}$. Neglecting kinetic isotope effects, cleavage of opposite side bonds ( $C^{1}-C^{2} / C^{3}-C^{4}$ and, respectively, $C^{2}-C^{3} / C^{1}-C^{4}$ ) should occur with equal probability, leading to a $1: 1$ mixture of $\left[2-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{6}} \underline{\equiv}$ and $\left[3-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \underline{\underline{6}} \underline{\underline{c}}$, and, after base-induced isomerization, finally to a $1: 1$ mixture of $\left[2-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \stackrel{8 d}{\underline{d}}$ and $\left[3-{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\right] \stackrel{8 d}{\underline{d}}$.


As $\underset{\underline{5 c}}{\underline{C}}$ is not an intermediate in the hydrogen bromide elimination of $\underline{\underline{4 c}} \underline{\underline{c}}$, and as $\underline{\underline{C}} \underline{\underline{c}}$, in the absence of electrophilic catalysts, is stable at the reaction temperature, a possible candidate
 then accompanied by cleavage of the bonds $C^{2}-C^{3}$ and $C^{2}-C^{4}$ in a concerted, but not necessarily in a synchronous fashion ${ }^{9)}$. The high regioselectivity of bond breaking of the bicyclo[1.1.0]butane framework of $\underline{\underline{g}} \underline{\underline{E}}$ is, however, not fully understood. The mechanistic alternative of single
 appears to be less attractive, because no evidence of SET was obtained in previous investigations, when halides of type $\underset{\underline{1}}{ }$ were treated with LDA ${ }^{1)}$.

Table 1. NMR data of $4 \underline{\underline{a}}-\underline{\underline{c}}, 6 \underline{=}$ and $8 \underline{\underline{d}}$
$4 \mathrm{a}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CCl}_{4}\right) \delta 1.10$ (broadened $\left.\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right), 1.80(\mathrm{tt}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ and $\mathrm{J}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ 3 Hz , each line broadened by small coupling, 2 H$) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.6(\mathrm{~d}), 15.1$ ( s$), 38.7$ ( t ).
$\underline{\underline{b}}{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CCl}_{4}\right) \delta 1.05$ (broadened $\left.\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.58(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, each line broadened by small coupling, 1 H ), $1.93(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, each line broadened by small coupling, 1 H ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 12.3(\mathrm{~d}), 14.0(\mathrm{q}), 23.9(\mathrm{~s}), 36.2(\mathrm{t}), 43.8(\mathrm{~d})$.
 ( s )
$6 \mathrm{c}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR see Lit. ${ }^{7}$ ) ; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 24.5(\mathrm{q}), 85.4(\mathrm{t}), 117.8(\mathrm{~s}), 156.5(\mathrm{~s}), 166.2$ ( s$)$.
 149.6 ( s ).
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