Tetrahedron Letters, Vol.30, No.22, pp 2907-2910, 1989 Printed in Great Britain 0040-4039/89 \$3.00 + .00 Pergamon Press plc

## GENERATION AND SYNTHETIC USE OF ALKYL RADICALS WITH [CpFe(CO)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> AS MEDIATOR

Gebhard Thoma and Bernd Giese<sup>1)\*</sup> Institut für Organische Chemie, Technische Hochschule Petersenstraße 22, D-6100 Darmstadt, Germany

**Summary**: Irradiation of dimeric iron complex **1** in the presence of alkyl halides yields alkyl radicals that are useful in organic synthesis.

Radical reactions with organotin compounds as mediators have proved to be very useful in organic synthesis.<sup>2)</sup> The disadvantage of organotin compounds is their toxicity, so there is a need to replace tin by other elements. We have now observed that iron complex 1 can be applied to organic synthesis via alkyl radicals.



Under irradiation the dimeric iron complex 1 yields the monomeric iron radical 2 that abstracts halogen atoms from halides  $3.^{3}$ ) This leads to iron halide 4 and alkyl radical 5. Acrylonitrile can trap this radical in methanol yielding 6. In a typical procedure 1.0 mmol of cyclohexyl iodide, 1.5 mmol of iron complex 1, and 10 mmol of acrylonitrile in 30 ml of methanol are irradiated at 15°C for 3 h with a 250 W sun lamp. Evaporation, extraction of the residue with diethyl ether, and chromatography on silica gel (pentane:ether = 20:1) gives product 6 (R=C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>11</sub>) in 90% yield. Following this procedure prim., sec., and tert. iodides as well as benzyl, allyl and glucosyl bromides 3 give products 6 in 60 to 90% yields.

$R-X + H_2C=CH-CN \xrightarrow{(Fp)_2 / hv} R-CH_2-CH_2-CN$				
3	R-X (yields of <b>6</b> ):	6		
n-C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>21</sub> -I (83%)	<ul> <li>✓ OAc</li> </ul>	$C_6H_5-CH_2-Br$ (65%)		
c-C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> -I (90%)	AcO:	H <sub>2</sub> C=CH-CH <sub>2</sub> -Br (60%)		
t-C₄H <sub>9</sub> -I (70%)	AcO OAc			

Reactions with alkenes, substituted by less electron withdrawing groups, and/or in aprotic solvents not only lead to addition products **9** but also to substitution products **10**.

C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> -I	+ $H_2C=CYZ \frac{(Fp)_2}{2}$	′ <del>hν</del> C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> -C	H <sub>2</sub> -CHYZ +	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> -CH=CYZ
7	8		9	10
	Alkene 8	Solvent	Produ 9 : 10	cts 9 + 10
	H <sub>2</sub> C=CHCN	$CH_3OH$ THF $CH_2CI_2$ $C_6H_6$	>98 : 2 66 : 34 55 : 45 50 : 50	90% 65% 80% 76%
	H <sub>2</sub> C=CHCO <sub>2</sub> Me	СН <sub>3</sub> ОН	>98: 2	55%
	H <sub>2</sub> C=C(CN)OEt	CH <sub>3</sub> OH C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	88 : 12 50 : 50	77% 65%
	H <sub>2</sub> C=C(Ph) <sub>2</sub>	CH₃OH	< 2 : 98	60%

Whereas in methanol acrylonitrile yields only addition product **9**, in benzene an equal amount of substitution product **10** is formed. With phenylstyrene only the substitution product **10** is produced, even in methanol. A pair of electron withdrawing and electron donating substituents at the alkene **8** leads to a mixture of **9** and **10** in methanol as well as in benzene. The occurrence of free radicals as intermediates can be demonstrated by cyclization reactions. Thus, treatment of hexenyl radical **11** with the iron complex **1** under irradiation gives cyclization products **12** and **13** in a 98:2 ratio. This is typical for a radical cyclization reaction.<sup>4</sup>



Intermolecular trapping experiments with alkenes also demonstrate the existence of free alkyl radicals as intermediates in the CC-bond forming step. The rel. rates of addition reactions are within

experimental error independent of the precursor of the intermediates whether they are generated from cyclohexyl iodide with iron complex 1 or from cyclohexylmercuric acetate with NaBH<sub>4</sub> (Table 1). The reaction of alkylmercuric salts with NaBH<sub>4</sub> is known to give free radicals.<sup>5)</sup>

Alkene	Rela	Relative Rate		
	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> I / <b>1</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>11</sub> HgOAc / NaBH <sub>4</sub>		
H <sub>2</sub> C=C(CN)OEt	0.38	0.48		
H <sub>2</sub> C=C(Ph) <sub>2</sub>	0.58	0.51		
H <sub>2</sub> C=CHCO <sub>2</sub> Me	≡ 1.0	≡ 1.0		
H <sub>2</sub> C=CHCN	3.0	3.6		
H <sub>2</sub> C=C(CI)CN	33	31		

## Table 1. Relative rates of cyclohexyl radicals generated by different methods at 20°C.

In contrast to the radical CC-bond formation, the hydrogen abstraction step is not a radical but an anionic reaction. Thus the reaction of cyclohexyl iodide (7) and iron complex 1 with acrylonitrile in CH<sub>3</sub>OD gives the monodeuterated product 14. The same monodeuterated product 14 is formed upon irradiation of bromide 15 with the dimeric iron complex 1 in CH<sub>3</sub>OD.

$$C_{6}H_{11}-I + H_{2}C = CH-CN \xrightarrow[]{1/hv}{CH_{3}OD} C_{6}H_{11}-CH_{2}-CH-CN \xrightarrow[]{1/hv}{CH_{3}OD} C_{6}H_{11}-CH_{2}-CH-CN$$

$$7 \qquad 90\% \qquad 14 \qquad 90\% \qquad 15$$

The mechanism of this new synthetic method is therefore similar to that using alkylcobaloxime as radical precursor<sup>6</sup>). In both cases free radicals are formed that add to alkenes and give adduct radicals. The ionic hydrogen abstraction in methanol occurs presumably via a new organometal intermediate. This solvolysis competes with an elimination reaction which leads to the unsaturated product. The ratio of solvolysis versus elimination increases with increasing electron withdrawing ability of the substituents Y and Z at the alkene.

This "iron method" has the advantage that the radical is generated directly from the alkyl halide. Using the "cobalt method"  $^{6,7)}$  the organometallic compound has to be synthesized first from the alkyl halide before the radicals can be generated. Compared to the "vitamin B<sub>12</sub> method"<sup>8)</sup> the use of iron complex **1** permits a reaction under non-reducing conditions.

**Acknowledgement**: This work was supported by the VW-Stiftung and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

## References

- 1) New address: Institut für Organische Chemie, Universität Basel, St. Johanns-Ring 19, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland.
- 2) B. Giese, <u>Radicals in Organic Synthesis: Formation of Carbon-Carbon Bonds</u>, Pergamon Press, Oxford 1986; W.P. Neumann, <u>Synthesis</u> **1987**, 665.
- A. Hudson, M.F. Lappert, P.W. Lednor, B.K. Nicholson, <u>J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.</u> 1974, 966; C. Giannotti, G. Merle, <u>J. Organomet. Chem.</u> 105 (1976) 97; H.B. Abrahamson, M.S. Wrighton, <u>J. Am. Chem. Soc.</u> 99 (1977) 97; B.D. Morre, M.B. Simpson, M. Poliakoff, J.J. Turner, <u>J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.</u> 1984, 972.
- 4) A.L.J. Beckwith, C.H. Schiesser, Tetrahedron 41 (1985) 3925.
- 5) B. Giese, Angew. Chem. 95 (1983) 771; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 22 (1983) 753.
- 6) B. Giese, J. Hartung, J. He, O. Hüter, A. Koch, Angew. Chem. in press.
- 7) M. Tada, M. Okabe, <u>Chem. Lett.</u> 1980, 201; V.F. Patel, G. Pattenden, <u>J. Chem. Soc. Chem.</u> <u>Commun.</u> 1987, 871; B.P. Branchaud, M.S. Meier, Y. Choi, <u>Tetrahedron Lett.</u> 29 (1988) 167; A. Ghosez, T. Göbel, B. Giese, <u>Chem. Ber.</u> 121 (1988) 1807.
- 8) R. Scheffold, L. Walder, C. Weymuth, Pure Appl. Chem. 59 (1987) 363.

(Received in Germany 10 March 1989)