## FREE RADICAL SUBSTITUTION REACTIONS OF

## PHENYLACETYLENE DERIVATIVES BY AN ADDITION-ELIMINATION MECHANISM<sup>1</sup>

GLEN A. RUSSELL\* and PREECHA NGOVIWATCHAI

Department of Chemistry Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50011

Summary: Phenylacetylenes (PhC=CQ with Q = PhSO<sub>2</sub>, I, SPh, Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn PhC=CHg) undergo free radical chain substitution reactions with RHgCl, R<sub>2</sub>Hg,  $(EtO)_2P(0)HgCl$ , (PhS)<sub>2</sub>Hg or (PhSO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Hg. The relative reactivities of PhC=CQ towards  $\underline{c}-c_6H_{11}^{\circ}$  are Q = PhSO<sub>2</sub> (65) > I (19) > Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn (1.0).

Several recent reports of free radical reactions of  $PhC_{\equiv}CSO_2Ph$  have appeared.<sup>2,3</sup> These complement an earlier report by Nozaki et al. that  $PhC_{\equiv}CSO_2Me$  or  $PhC_{\equiv}CSOMe$  react with alkylboranes by a radical process to form  $PhC_{\equiv}CR$ .<sup>4</sup> We have demonstrated that a variety of substituted alkenes including PhCH=CHQ and  $Ph_2C=CHQ$  with Q = HgCl, Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn, SO<sub>2</sub>Ph, SOPh, I or SPh react with alkylmercury halides by a free radical chain process to form PhCH=CHR or  $Ph_2C=CHR$ .<sup>5,6</sup> It appears that the mechanism suggested for these vinyl systems (Scheme 1) is also applicable to acetylenic systems.<sup>7</sup>

## Scheme 1

PhCH=CHQ + R•> PhĊHCH(R)(Q)	(1)
PhĊHCH(R)(Q)> PhCH=CHR + Q•	(2)
Q• + RHgC1> QHgC1 + R•	(3)
Bu <sub>3</sub> Sn• + RHgCl ───→ Bu <sub>3</sub> SnCl + Hg° + R•	(3a)
HgC1• + RHgC1> HgC1₂ + Hg° + R•	(3b)

In specific cases the combination of Reactions 1 and 2 can lead to stereospecific substitution with retention of configuration.<sup>6</sup> Evidence for Reactions 3-3b occurring in a concerted one-step process is furnished by the observations that in the reactions of PhCH=CHSO<sub>2</sub>Ph, PhCH=CHHgC1 or PhCH=CHSnBu<sub>3</sub> with excesses of 1:1 mixtures of two alkylmercury chlorides, the relative reactivities of the alkylmercury chlorides as determined from product

ratios are  $\underline{t}$ -Bu >  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub> >  $\underline{n}$ -Bu (for Q = HgCl,  $\underline{t}$ -Bu: $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>: $\underline{n}$ -Bu = 1.0:0.011:0.0001; for Q = Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn,  $\underline{t}$ -Bu: $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>: $\underline{n}$ -Bu = 1.0:0.025:0.002).

Table 1 presents the results of the photostimulated reactions of a variety of mercurials with  $PhC \equiv C-Q$  (Reaction 4) where Q =  $PhSO_2$ , I, SPh,  $PhC \equiv CHg$  or  $Bu_3Sn$ . As in the case of

$$RHgC1 + PhC_{\Xi}C-Q \xrightarrow{350nm} > PhC_{\Xi}CR + QHgC1 \text{ or } QC1 + Hg^{\circ}$$
(4)

PhCH=CHQ or  $Ph_2C=CHQ$ ,<sup>5</sup> we find that the yields in general follow the order R = <u>t</u>-Bu > 2°-alkyl > 1°-alkyl. In addition to alkylmercury halides, the substitution reaction (Q = I) also occurs with (EtO)<sub>2</sub>P(O)HgCl (Table 1), (PhS)<sub>2</sub>Hg, (PhSO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Hg or (Me<sub>3</sub>C)<sub>2</sub>Hg. Use of (Me<sub>2</sub>CHCO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Hg to supply R• in Scheme 1 by a Hunsdiecker-type process has been unsuccessful with PhC=CI although a good yield of Ph<sub>2</sub>C=CHCHMe<sub>2</sub> is obtained from Ph<sub>2</sub>C=CHI.

The relative reactivities of PhC=C-Q, PhCH=CHQ and Ph<sub>2</sub>C=CHQ towards  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>• were determined by competitive reactions of  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>HgCl with an excess of mixtures of two substrates. The results of Table 2 indicate a surprisingly high reactivity for the substrates with Q = PhSO<sub>2</sub>, particularly in the PhC=CSO<sub>2</sub>Ph system. Since there is no evidence that the addition of R• to vinyl or acetylenic substrates is reversible, the data of Table 2 are believed to present the true reactivities of these substrates towards the addition of  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>•. For PhC=CQ the relative reactivities towards  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>• increase from Q = Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn to I to PhSO<sub>2</sub>. Competitive reactions with a deficiency of Hg(SPh)<sub>2</sub> are admittedly complicated by the reversibility of the addition of PhS•. However, again a reactivity order of PhC=CSO<sub>2</sub>Ph (1.0) > PhC=CI (0.2) > PhC=CSnBu<sub>3</sub> (<0.01) is observed. Since the same reactivity order is found with both the nucleophilic  $\underline{c}$ -C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>• and the electrophilic PhS•, the relative reactivities of the alkynes.

The measured reactivities of  $Ph_2CH=CHQ$  towards  $PhS^{\circ}$  (relative to  $PhC \equiv CSO_2Ph = 1.0$ ) are  $Q = PhSO_2$  (0.3) < I (0.8) <  $Bu_3Sn$  (4.5) < HgCl (6). The high reactivity of  $PhC \equiv CSO_2Ph$  relative to  $Ph_2C=CHSO_2Ph$  (or  $PhCH=CHSO_2Ph$ ) and the low reactivity of  $PhC \equiv CSnBu_3$  relative to  $Ph_2C=CHSNBu_3$  (or  $PhCH=CHSNBu_3$ ) observed with both  $\underline{c}-C_6H_{11}^{\circ}$  and  $PhS^{\circ}$  is puzzling. Perhaps the groups  $Q = Bu_3Sn$  or HgX can stabilize the transition states leading to PhCH-CH(R)Q, but not to PhC=C(R)Q, by hyperconjugation or bridging, particularly when the attacking radical is electrophilic in nature.

The results indicate that the preferred group for free radical substitution by an addition-elimination mechanism depends on the nature of the center being attacked (sp or  $sp^2$ ) and on the nature of the attacking radical with PhSO<sub>2</sub> being the preferred group in alkynes but often Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn or HgCl in the alkenes. However, when stereospecificity is desired, the iodo substituent seems to be the preferred leaving group.<sup>6</sup>

 Q	R (equiv of RHgCl)	Conditions <sup>ª</sup>	% Yield of PhC≘CR <sup>b</sup>	
I	<u>t</u> -Bu (1.5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, dark, 7 h	0	
Ι	<u>t</u> -Bu (1.5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, SL, 7 h	100	
Ι	t-Bu (1.2)	$Me_2SO$ , SL, 45 min	25	
Ι	t-Bu (1.2)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, SL, 45 min,		
		10 mol % ( <u>t</u> -Bu) <sub>2</sub> NO•	<5	
Ι	$C-C_{6}H_{11}$ (1.5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, SL, 7 h	93	
Ι	n-Bu (1.5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, SL, 7 h	48	
I	(EtO) <sub>2</sub> PO (1.1)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, UV, 24 h	32	
PhS02	<u>i</u> -Pr (5)	PhH, UV, 24 h	44	
PhS0 <sub>2</sub>	<u>c</u> -C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> (5)	PhH, UV, 24 h	67	
PhS02	<u>t</u> -Bu (5)	PhH, UV, 24 h	55	
PhS0 <sub>2</sub>	(EtO) <sub>2</sub> PO (5)	PhH, UV, 24 h	30	
PhS	<u>i</u> -Pr (5)	PhH, UV, 24 h	37	
PhS	<u>i</u> -Pr (5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, UV 24 h	25	
PhS	 i-Pr (0.2)	$Me_2SO$ , UV 24 h	42	
PhS	$c-C_6H_{11}$ (0.2)	$Me_2SO$ , UV, 24 h	46	
PhS	<u>t</u> -Bu (0.2)	$Me_{2}SO$ , UV, 24 h	44	
PhC≘CHg	n-Bu (5)	$Me_{2}SO$ , UV, 24 h	9 <sup>C</sup>	
PhC≘CHg	$c_{-}C_{6}H_{11}$ (5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, UV, 24 h	26 <sup><u>C</u></sup>	
PhC₌CHg	t-Bu (5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, UV, 24 h	34 <sup>⊆</sup>	
PhC≘CHg	(EtO) <sub>2</sub> PO (5)	Me <sub>2</sub> SO, UV, 24 h	61 <sup><u>C</u></sup>	
Bu <sub>3</sub> Sn	<u>n</u> -Bu (5)	PhH, UV, 30 h	13	
Bu <sub>3</sub> Sn	<u>c</u> -C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> (5)	PhH, UV, 30 h	43	
Bu <sub>3</sub> Sn	<u>t</u> -Bu (5)	PhH, UV, 30 h	61	

Table 1. Photostimulated Reaction of RHgCl with PhC=C-Q to Yield PhC=CR

 $\frac{a}{2}$  Reactions performed on a 0.1 mmol scale in 5 mL of solvent at 35-40 °C with irradiation from a 275 W sunlamp (SL) or at 350 nm in a Rayonet Reactor (UV).  $\frac{b}{2}$  Yield determined by GLPC.  $\frac{c}{2}$  Based on a stoichiometry of 2 mol of PhC=CR/mol of (PhC=C)<sub>2</sub>Hg.

Q	PhC≘CQ	( <u>E</u> )-PhCH=CHQ	Ph <sub>2</sub> C=CHQ	
PhSO		3,3	6 4	
I	3.8	<u>0.7</u>	1.0	
<u>n</u> -Bu <sub>3</sub> Sn PhC≡CHg	<u>0.2</u> <u>0.2</u> <sup>b</sup>	<u>0.7</u>	0.8	
C1Hg		<u>1.5</u>	1.9	

Table 2. Relative Reactivities towards  $\underline{c}-C_6H_{11}-\underline{a}$ 

<sup><u>a</u></sup> At 35-40 °C in Me<sub>2</sub>SO or PhH for Q = <u>m</u>-Bu<sub>3</sub>Sn by a competitive reaction photostimulated by 350 nm irradiation in a Rayonet Reactor. Underlined reactivities were determined in direct competition with Ph<sub>2</sub>C=CHI. Typical procedures involved 0.1 mmol of C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>HgCl and 2.0 mmoles of a 1:1 mixture of two substrates in 10 mL of Me<sub>2</sub>SO or PhH. <sup><u>b</u></sup> Molar reactivity of (PhC≡C)<sub>2</sub>Hg.

## References:

- Electron Transfer Processes. 41. This work was supported by grant CHE-841540 from the National Science Foundation.
- (2) De Lucchi, O.; Licini, G.; Pasquato, L.; Senta, M. <u>J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.</u> 1985, 1597.
- (3) Eisch, J. J.; Behrooz, M.; Galle, J. E. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 4851.
- (4) Miyamoto, N.; Fukuoka, D.; Utimoto, K.; Nozaki, H. Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 1974, 47, 503.
- (5) Russell, G. A.; Tashtoush, H.; Ngoviwatchai, P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 4622.
- (6) Russell, G. A.; Ngoviwatchai, P. <u>Tetrahedron Lett.</u> 1985, <u>26</u>, 4975; see also Saihi, M. L.; Pereyre, M. <u>Bull. Chem. Soc. Fr.</u> 1977, 1251; Baldwin, J. E.; Kelly, D. R.; Ziegler, C. B. <u>J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.</u> 1984, 133.
- Substitution by addition-elimination in a variety of allylic, propargylic, allenic and alkenyloxy systems is also well recognized. For some recent examples of S<sub>H</sub>2' reactions see: Ueno, Y.; Chino, K.; Okawara, M. <u>Tetrahedron Lett.</u> 1982, 23, 2575; Baldwin, J. E.; Adlington, R. M.; Basak, A. <u>J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.</u> 1984, 1284; Russell, G. A.; Herold, L. L. <u>J. Org. Chem.</u> 1985, <u>50</u>, 1037; Keck, G. E.; Byers, J. H. <u>J. Org. Chem.</u> 1985, <u>50</u>, 5042.

(Received in USA 11 February 1986)