

Proton-gradient-transfer acid complexes and their catalytic performance for the synthesis of geranyl acetate (



Yongle Chen, Shiya Ding, Wentao Zheng, Yiyang Zhang, Youting Wu*, Xingbang Hu

Separation Engineering Research Center, Key Laboratory of Mesoscopic Chemistry of MOE, School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, Jiangsu, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article

Article history: Received 29 August 2016 Accepted 6 October 2016 Published 5 December 2016

Keywords: Geranyl acetate Esterification Kinetics Proton gradient transfer Reaction-induced self-separation catalyst

ABSTRACT

Special proton-gradient-transfer acid complexes (PGTACs) in which the bonded protons are not equivalent and have gradients in transfer ability, acidity, and reactivity were reported. The acidity gradient of the protons gave the PGTACs excellent catalytic activity and selectivity in the esterification of terpenols. These PGTACs are "reaction-induced self-separation catalysts" and can be easily reused. The kinetics with PGTACs as catalyst in the esterification of geraniol were also studied for use in engineering design.

© 2016, Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Esters are important chemical intermediates and products in the food, cosmetic and pharmaceutical industries. Acid-catalyzed esterification reactions are the most prevailing methods to produce esters in both industry and academia [1–4]. Strong inorganic and organic acids, such as H₂SO₄ and CF₃SO₃H, are well-known catalysts for esterification. These catalysts have good catalytic activity but suffer from the problems of causing equipment corrosion, being difficult to separate from the solution, have low selectivity, give side reactions, and cause environment pollution [5]. To overcome these drawbacks, many novel homogeneous and heterogeneous acid catalysts have been developed, such as special Lewis acid catalysts [6], heteropolyacids [7,8], ionic liquid catalysts [9–15], acidic zeolites [16–18], macroporous polymeric acids [19], sulphated complexes [20–23], acidic resins [24,25], and other solid acids [26,27]. Among these catalysts, the acidic complexes formed by the neutralization reaction between Brönsted acids and bases are receiving more attention for their low cost, low corrosiveness and reasonable catalytic activity [2,9,10–12,28–30]. Protonic ionic liquids (PILs) are typical examples of such complexes [2,9–12].

Because there is a lone electron pair on the N atom of the Brönsted base, the proton of the acid transfers to the N atom with a large Gibbs free energy change [31,32] during the formation of the PILs cations. As a result, the proton bonds tightly to the Brönsted base and the acid strength is reduced compared to the free acid [33]. However, the catalytic activity of PILs is related to their acid strength [9]. Hence, compared to the free acid used to produce the PILs, the catalytic activity of these PILs in acid-catalyzed reactions are usually weaker.

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel: +86-25-89681952; Fax: +86-25-89681953; E-mail: ytwu@nju.edu.cn

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (21376115, 21576129).

DOI: 10.1016/S1872-2067(16)62577-9 | http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/18722067 | Chin. J. Catal., Vol. 37, No. 12, December 2016



Scheme 1. Structure of [Phen-H][X]···HX, [Phen-H][X] and $[Phen-2H][X]_2$. $X^- = CH_3SO_3^-(1)$, $HSO_4^-(2)$, and $CH_3PhSO_3^-(3)$.

In contrast to these widely known PILs, we reported here a new bonding mode between the Brönsted acid and base. They are called proton gradient transfer acid complexes (PGTACs). The PGTACs were generated by a reaction between phenanthroline (Phen) and acid in 1:2 mole ratio ([Phen-H][X]···HX, 1a-3a in Scheme 1). These complexes are interesting because only one proton (H_a) formed a covalent bond with the N atom of Phen, and another proton (H_b) formed a hydrogen bond with another N atom. Furthermore, Hb can transfer between the N atom and X anion with a low barrier. That is, the transfer abilities of the H_a and H_b protons are different. The PGTACs are a good compromise between the free acid (HX) and [Phen-H][X] when both catalytic activity and selectivity are taken into consideration. In particular, these PGTACs can be easily separated and reused because of the nature of the salts, so a green reaction separation integration is enabled.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

All chemicals were analytical grade and used without any purification. 1,10-Phenanthroline (Phen) was purchased from Sun Chemical Technology (Shanghai) Co. Ltd. Geraniol, acetic anhydride, methylsulfonic acid (MSA), H₂SO₄, *p*-toluenesulfonic acid (PTS), and D72 resin were obtained from Jintan Huagong Chemical Research Institute (Jiangsu, China). Lewatit® K 2620 resin was purchased from Aladdin Industrial Corporation (Shanghai, China). The other alcohols were obtained from Energy Chemical (China) Co. Ltd.

2.2. Methods

¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra were collected on an Agilent DD2 400MR equipment operating at 400 and 100 MHz, respectively. The elemental analysis (EA) was obtained using a Heraeus-CHN-O-Rapid analyzer. The ESI MS spectra were determined with a LCQ-fleet ESI Mass Spectrometer. The FTIR spectra of the samples were recorded on a PerkinElmer Spectrum 100 Series FTIR spectrometer with a universal ATR accessory. Thermogravimetry characterization for these PGTACs was carried out on a PerkinElmer Diamond TG/DTA from room temperature to 800 °C with a heating rate of 10 °C/min under N₂ atmosphere. An Angilent 8453 UV-visible spectrometer was used to determinate the Hammett functions (H_0) of the PGTACs. The experiments were carried out in methanol solution (2 mmol/L) of PGTACs and other catalysts at room temperature (25 °C). Dimethyl yellow ($pK_a(I)_{aq} = 3.3$) was used as the indicator (0.085 mmol/L), and the UV-visible determination was carried out in the range of 200–700 nm.

2.3. Synthesis and characterization of PGTACs

To a vigorously stirred ethanol solution (100 mL) of 1,10-phenanthroline (18.02 g, 0.1 mol), ethanol solution (50 mL) of sulfuric acid (19.60 g, 0.2 mol) was added at 0 °C. The mixture was stirred for a further 12 h at reflux temperature. The ethanol was removed by evaporation to give a reddish liquid. Then, the colored residue was washed with benzene three times and dried in vacuum to give the purified PGTACs **1a**. This catalyst was solidified on cooling (yield: 99%). PGTACs **2a** to **3b** were synthesized similarly to the preparation of PGTACs **1a**. The yields of these PGTACs were all above 99%. The structural maps of **1a-3b** are shown in Figure 1.

PGTACs **1a**. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ = 9.34 (1 H, d), 9.33 (1 H, d), 9.13 (1 H, d), 9.10 (1 H, d), 8.39 (2 H, s), 8.27 (1 H, d), 8.25 (1 H, d), 2.44 (6 H, s). ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ = 148.22, 141.98, 138.03, 129.77, 127.82, 126.03, 40.37. MS (ESI): *m/z* = 181.08 [M + H]⁺. Anal. Calcd. for C₁₄H₁₆N₂O₆S₂: C 45.16, H 4.30, N 7.53; Found: C 45.14, H 4.31, N 7.55.

PGTACs **3a**. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ = 9.33 (1 H, d), 9.32 (1 H, d), 9.12 (1 H, d), 9.10 (1 H, d), 8.38 (2 H, s), 8.26 (1 H, d), 8.25 (1 H, d), 7.49 (4 H, d), 7.13 (4 H, t), 2.29 (6 H, s). ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ = 147.62, 145.29, 142.03, 137.82, 137.30, 129.58, 128.10, 127.54, 125.77, 125.46, 20.75. MS (ESI): *m/z* = 181.08 [M + H]⁺. Anal. Calcd. for C₂₆H₂₄N₂O₆S₂: C 59.54, H 4.58, N 5.34; Found: C 59.50, H 4.63, N 5.30.

PGTACs **1b**. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ = 9.31 (1 H, d), 9.30 (1 H, d), 9.06(1 H, d), 9.04 (1 H, d), 8.35 (2 H, s), 8.21 (1 H, d), 8.19 (1 H, d), 2.31 (3 H, s). ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ = 148.09, 142.44, 137.59, 129.94, 127.95, 126.23, 40.18. MS (ESI): m/z = 181.08 [M + H]⁺. Anal. Calcd. for C₁₃H₁₂N₂O₃S: C 56.52, H 4.35, N 10.14; Found: C 56.55, H 4.35, N 10.13.

PGTACs **3b**. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ = 9.32 (1 H, d), 9.31 (1 H, d), 9.09 (1 H, d), 9.07 (1 H, d), 8.37 (2 H, s), 8.24 (1 H, d), 8.23 (1 H, d), 2.28 (3 H, s). ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ = 148.14, 146.14, 142.30, 138.13, 137.85, 129.94, 128.54, 127.94, 126.17, 125.99, 21.24. MS (ESI): m/z = 181.08 [M + H]+. Anal. Calcd. for C₁₉H₁₆N₂O₃S: C 64.77, H 4.55, N 7.95; Found: C 64.70, H 4.57, N 8.04. Data for PGTACs **2a** and **2b** have been reported in other being published articles.



Fig. 1. Prepared PGTACs samples 1a, 2a, 3a, 1b, 2b and 3b.

2.4. Esterification of geraniol

Geraniol (1.54 g, 0.01 mol) and acetic anhydride (1.02 g, 0.01 mol) were added to a 100 mL three neck round bottom flask and heated to a designed temperature. Then **1a** (0.074 g, 0.2 mmol) was added to the mixture and stirred at 50 °C for 2 h. **1a** was separated from the reaction system by easy decantation. The yield of geranyl acetate was determined by GC-MS with an internal standard (*n*-butyl acetate). The proposed mechanism for the reaction of geraniol with acetic anhydride with the use of PGTACs as catalyst is shown in Scheme 2.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Structure analysis

In this paper, we focused on the exploration of the novel protonic catalysts. The reaction between Phen and HX 1:1 can generate [Phen–H][X] compounds (**1b–3b**) that are in fact analogues of PILs, even though the melting points of [Phen–H][X] were a bit high (Table 1). There is still one N atom with a lone electron pair in [Phen–H][X]. It was a surprise to find that one more HX can react with [Phen–H][X] to produce the dicationic compounds [Phen–2H][X]₂ (Scheme 1, **1c–3c**). All the experimental characterization of the 2:1 (acid:Phen) reaction products suggested the formation of complexes (**1a–3a**) between



Scheme 2. Suggested mechanism for the reaction of geraniol with acetic anhydride with the use of PGTACs as catalyst.

Table 1

	Physical and	d chemical	l properties	of the	catalysts.
--	--------------	------------	--------------	--------	------------

5		5	
Catalyst	Tm ^a ∕°C	T _d ^b / °C	H ₀ c
1a	62.2	300.1	2.86
2a	180.6	298.3	2.81
3a	110.3	286.1	2.60
1b	103.2	299.5	4.59
2b	198.6	331.9	4.23
3b	157.2	332.2	4.35
MSA	_	—	2.62
H_2SO_4	_	—	2.58
PTS	_	_	2.60

^a Melting point; ^b Decomposition temperature; ^c Hammett acidity.

[Phen–H][X] and HX. Both the ¹H NMR and elemental analysis clearly showed that the complexes were composed of Phen and acid in 1:2 mole ratio. However, the ESI MS analysis for all the products gave $[M + H]^+ = 181.1$, revealing that the complexes contain only a single cation ([Phen–H]⁺) rather than the di-cation ([Phen–2H]²⁺). Furthermore, the acid strength of **1a–3a** was about two orders of magnitude larger than that of **1b–3b** (Table 1), also indicating that the two protons in **1a–3a** were not equivalent. That is, the 2:1 (acid:Phen) reaction products were not [Phen–2H][X]₂. The melting points of the 2:1 products (**1a–3a**) were close to those of some PILs [9], but obviously lower than those of the corresponding 1:1 products (**1b–3b**).

To understand why the two protons are not equivalent and explore the structures of **1a–3a**, the optimization of the 2:1 (acid:Phen) complexes were performed at the B3LYP/ $6-31++G^{**}$ level using methanol as solvent. The calculations further confirmed the experimental results that only H_a formed a covalent bond with the N atom and H_b only formed a hydrogen bond with another N atom. The N–H_a and N–H_b distances ranged from 1.032 to 1.036 Å and 3.068 to 3.571 Å, respectively (Fig. 2).

3.2. Catalytic performance of the PGTACs

Geranyl acetate is known as terpenol [34]. The olefin functional groups in terpenols are susceptible to the acids used in the esterification reaction [35]. Strong acids give total conversion but much byproducts, while weak acids exhibit excellent selectivity but poor catalytic activity. In this paper, the two protons in PGTACs gave it an appropriate acidity (**1a**, H_0 = 2.86, Table 2) between a strong acid (MSA, H_0 = 2.62, Table 2) and weak acid (**1b**, H_0 = 4.59, Table 2). The PGTACs have both the advantages of strong and weak acids, and gave excellent catalytic activity and selectivity for the esterification of geraniol (Entries 1 and 2, Table 2). Although the reactions catalyzed by



Fig. 2. Optimized structure of [Phen–H][CH₃SO₃]···CH₃SO₃H **(1a)**, [Phen–H][HSO₄]···H₂SO₄ **(2a)**, and Phen–H][CH₃–Ph–SO₃]···CH₃–Ph– SO₃H **(3a)**. All H atoms of C–H are omitted for clarity. The values shown are N–H distance in Å. Values in parentheses are relative energy in kcal/mol.

 Table 2

 Catalyst screening for the synthesis of geranyl acetate^a.

	~он +	Catalyst		р +он
Entry	Catalyst	Time (min)	Conversion ^a (%)	Selectivity (%)
1	1a	120	99.5	96.9
2	2a	120	100	90.7
3	1b	120	45.3	95.7
4	2b	120	59.3	98.6
5 ^b	CH ₃ SO ₃ H	10	100	65.0
6 ^c	H_2SO_4	1	100	57.1
7 ^d	D72	120	72.3	83.3
8 d	Lewatit®K 620	120	83.2	77.4

Reaction condition: geraniol (0.02 mol), acetic anhydride (0.02 mol), 2% (mol) catalyst, temperature = 50 °C.

^a Conversion of geraniol determined by GC with *n*-butyl acetate as the internal standard. ^b 20 °C. ^c 0.2% (mol) catalyst and 20 °C. ^d The dosage of the two resins is equal to the amount of 2% (mol) **1a**.

the PILs analogues (**1b** and **2b**) gave good selectivity, their catalytic activities were low due to their weak acidity (Entries 3 and 4) [9]. On the contrary, the free acids (MSA and H₂SO₄) were too active and gave low selectivity even when the reaction temperature was reduced to 20 °C (Entries 5 and 6). Hence, the PGTACs were good compromises between the free acid HX (strong acid) and the PILs analogues [Phen–H][X] (weak acid).

The widely used homogeneous inorganic and organic acids are very difficult to separate and reuse. Resins have been widely used for many esterification reaction because they are easily separated [24,25]. We tested two resins (D72 and Lewatit®K 620) in the esterification of geraniol and found that these resins were of lower reactivity and poorer selectivity (Entries 7 and 8, Table 2) than that of **1a** with the same catalyst dosage.

To optimize the reaction conditions of PGTACs 1a in the catalytic reaction of geraniol, the effects of reaction time, temperature and catalyst dosage on the conversion of geraniol and selectivity to geranyl acetate were explored systematically. In Fig. 3, it is shown that the conversion of geraniol increased dramatically in the first 1 h (to 94.7%) and was nearly complete at 2 h (99.6%) in the presence of 1a. It is worthwhile to



Fig. 3. Conversion versus time for the esterification of geraniol with different catalysts.



Fig. 4. Effect of reaction temperature on the conversion of geraniol and selectivity to geranyl acetate.

note that the reaction catalyzed by 4% (mol) **1b** was far slower than that using 2% (mol) **1a**. This reaction data further proved that the two protons in **1a** are not equivalent.

The effect of reaction temperature was examined from 20 °C to 60 °C with a 1:1 molar ratio of geraniol and acetic anhydride to the catalyst dosage of 2% (mol) at 2 h. The results are shown in Fig. 4. It was found that the conversion of geraniol increased from 35.2% to 100% with increased reaction temperature from 20 to 60 °C, while the selectivity was only slightly decreased (from 99.5% to 95.7%). In addition, the 96.4% yield of geranyl acetate at 50 °C, 0.7% more than that at 60 °C, illustrated that the optimal reaction temperature was 50 °C.

The effect of catalyst dosage on the conversion of geraniol and selectivity to geranyl acetate was also investigated. The results are illustrated in Fig. 5. The conversion of geraniol increased with the increase of catalyst dosage from 0.5% (mol) to 2% (mol), while the selectivity to geranyl acetate remained almost unchanged (98.7% to 96.9%). Therefore, an appropriately increased dosage of catalyst **1a** was beneficial to the production of geranyl acetate, and the suggested catalyst dosage is 2% (mol).

Using **1a** as catalyst, we explored the scope of this highly effective reaction for the esterification of different terpenols under the standard conditions (Table 3). Good to excellent yields



Fig. 5. Effect of catalyst dosage on the conversion of geraniol and selectivity to geranyl acetate.

of esters were obtained for all the reactions investigated. For easily oxidizable terpenols, such as 6a, 10a and 11a, the yields ranged from 85% to 89%. It is beneficial that the reasonable acidity and excellent selectivity of PGTACs could decrease the shedding of OH groups. As we know, the shedding of OH groups is the main process to produce water in the esterification of terpenols and acetic anhydride. The hydration products can be easily generated between terpenols and water with the acid as catalyst. Therefore, the PGTACs were appropriate catalysts in the esterification of terpenols and acetic anhydride. The esterification yields of all the other alcohols investigated here were >95%. PGTAC 1a was super effective for the esterification of aromatic alcohols and the reactions were completed in 2 h with almost 99% yield. All the esters produced can be easily separated due to their immiscibility with the catalyst. It is worthwhile to note that all the materials used for the production of PGTAC 1a are very cheap, which would make these esterification reactions of high yield very competitive.

3.3. The recycle of PGTACs

It was exciting to find that the PGTACs are "reaction-induced self-separation catalysts" [3]. PGTAC **1a** has good solubility in alcohols whereas it is insoluble in esters. Hence, at the end of

 Table 3

 Esterification of different terpenols catalyzed by 1a.

Enter	Doostant		Temperature	Time	Yield ^b
Entry	Reactant		(°C)	(h)	(%)
1	OH	5a	50	3	95
2	HO	6a	50	6	85
3	Но	7a	50	4	>99
4	С	8a	60	3	>99
5	он	9a	50	3	>99
6	-	10a	40	4	89
7		11a	40	5	89
8		12a	30	2	98
9	ОН	13a	50	2	>99
10	ОН	14a	50	2	>99
11	⟨он	15a	50	2	>99
12	Он	16a	50	2	98

Reaction conditions: alcohol (0.02 mol), acetic anhydride (0.02 mol), **1a** (0.4 mmol). ^a Determined by GC with *n*-butyl acetate as the internal standard.



Fig. 6. Recycling of catalyst 1a in the esterification of geraniol.

the reaction, a liquid-liquid biphase was formed and the heavy phase contained catalyst **1a**. The heavy phase can be used as catalyst directly without any treatment. The ¹H NMR of recycled **1a** showed that there was little anionic loss. After regeneration of **1a** by reacting with a small amount of acid at the fourth cycle, catalyst **1a** can be regenerated and reused for at least 5 cycles without significant loss of catalytic activity (Fig. 6).

3.4. Kinetics study of the esterification of geraniol with the use of PGTACs as catalyst

For future process design, the kinetics with PGTACs in the esterification of geraniol was also investigated. The kinetic study was carried out under the above conditions with the use of **1a** as catalyst. From the consideration of the generation of byproducts, the main reaction can be expressed as:

Geraniol + Acetic anhydride
$$\xrightarrow{k_1}$$
 Geranyl acetate + Acetic acid (1)
A B C D
Geraniol $\xrightarrow{k_2}$ By-products (2)
A E

Here, a widely used pseudohomogeneous (PH) model [36,37] was used to describe the kinetics of the esterification of geraniol catalyzed by PGTACs **1a**. Combining reactions (1) and (2), we can express the rate equation of geranyl acetate, by-products and geraniol as:

$$dC_{\rm C}/dt = k_1 C_{\rm A} C_{\rm B} \tag{3}$$

$$dC_E/dt = k_2 C_A \tag{4}$$

$$-dC_A/dt = k_1 C_A C_B + k_2 C_A$$
(5)

Using Eqs. (3)–(5), the reaction rate constants k_1 and k_2 can be estimated from the experiment data. The results are listed in Table 4. The values of k_1 and k_2 increased notably with the increasing temperature. In addition, the comparison of the experimental and calculated conversion of geraniol was also studied (Fig. 7). It illustrated that the PH model is a good kinetic model for the esterification of geraniol with PGTACs **1a** as catalyst.

The activation energy (E_a) is also an important factor that determines the catalytic ability of the catalyst in the esterification of geraniol. From the reaction rate constants k_1 and k_2 at different temperatures, E_a and the pre-exponential factors can

 Table 4

 Reaction rate constants at different temperatures.

Temperature (°C)	$k_1(10^3 \text{kL}/(\text{mol}\cdot\text{min}))$	$k_2(10^3 \text{ min}^{-1})$
30	68.7	3.5
40	197.9	6.1
50	986.4	29.0
60	1041.1	46.2

Reaction conditions: Catalyst used for the kinetic study was **1***a*, catalyst loading was 2% (mol), molar ratio of geraniol to acetic anhydride was 1:1, and reaction time was 2 h.



Fig. 7. Comparison of the experimental and calculated conversion of geraniol at different temperatures.

be calculated using the Arrhenius law (Eq. (6)), written as Eq. (7). The linear fit between $\ln k$ and 1/T is shown in Fig. 8.

$$k = A e^{-E_{a}/RT}$$
 (6)

$$\ln k = \ln A - E_{\rm a}/RT \tag{7}$$

The activation energies E_{a1} and E_{a2} and pre-exponential factors A_1 and A_2 were 72.36 and 79.68 kJ/mol, and 2.23×10¹¹ and 1.60×10¹¹, respectively. The rate constants were written as:

$$k_1 = 2.23 \times 10^{11} \exp(-72.36 \times 10^3/RT)$$
(8)

 $k_2 = 1.60 \times 10^{11} \exp(-79.68 \times 10^3 / RT)$ (9)

The lower activation energy of the side reaction (Eq. (2)) than that of the primary reaction (Eq. (1)) implied that a low temperature is beneficial for the synthesis of geranyl acetate, while an elevated temperature can generate more byproducts.



Fig. 8. Arrhenius plots for the esterification of geraniol with acetic anhydride.

4. Conclusions

Reactions between acid and Phen in the mole ratio of 2:1 generated special proton-gradient-transfer acid complexes (PGTACs) where the two protons are not equivalent and have gradients in transfer ability, acidity, and reactivity. The PGTACs gave excellent catalytic activity and selectivity for esterification with a series of terpenols as substrate. The PGTACs are a good compromise between strong and weak acids from the aspect of activity. These PGTACs are "reaction-induced self-separation catalysts" and can be easily reused. The advantages of the PGTACs in catalytic activity, selectivity, separation, and price are attractive for use in the esterification reactions in industry.

References

- A. C. Cole, J. L. Jensen, I. Ntai, K. L. T. Tran, K. J. Weaver, D. C. Forbes, J. H. Davis Jr, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2002**, 124, 5962–5963.
- [2] A. Sakakura, K. Kawajiri, T. Ohkubo, Y. Kosugi, K. Ishihara, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2007, 129, 14775–14779.
- [3] Y. Leng, J. Wang, D. R. Zhu, X. Q. Ren, H. Q. Ge, L. Shen, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2008, 121, 174–177.
- [4] F. J. Liu, L. Wang, Q. Sun, L. F. Zhu, X. J. Meng, F. S. Xiao, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2012, 134, 16948–16950.
- [5] J. Otera, J. Nishikido, Esterification: Methods, Reactions, and Applications, 2nd ed., Wiley-VCH, New York, 2010.
- [6] Y. Kita, Y. Nishii, T. Higuchi, K. Mashima, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2012, 51, 5723–5726.
- [7] S. H. Zhu, X. Q. Gao, F. Dong, Y. L. Zhu, H. Y. Zheng, Y. W. Li, J. Catal., 2013, 306, 155–163.
- [8] M. Kuzminska, T. V. Kovalchuk, R. Backov, E. M. Gaigneaux, J. Catal., 2014, 320, 1–8.
- [9] T. L. Greaves, C. J. Drummond, Chem. Rev., 2008, 108, 206-237.
- [10] D. J. Tao, Y. T. Wu, Z. Zhou, J. Geng, X. B. Hu, Z. B. Zhang, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **2011**, 50, 1989–1996.
- [11] D. J. Tao, X. M. Lu, J. F. Lu, K. Huang, Z. Zhou, Y. T. Wu, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2011, 171, 1333–1339.
- [12] C. Chiappe, S. Rajamani, F. D'Andrea, Green Chem., 2013, 15, 137–143.
- [13] H. P. Zhu, F. Yang, J. Tang, M. Y. He, Green Chem., 2003, 5, 38–39.
- [14] P. Lozano, J. M. Bernal, A. Navarro, Green Chem., 2012, 14, 3026–3033.
- [15] H. Wan, C. Chen, Z. W. Wu, Y. G. Que, Y. Feng, W. Wang, L. Wang, G. F. Guan, X. Q. Liu, *ChemCatChem.*, **2015**, *7*, 441–449.
- [16] T. V. Kovalchuk, J. N. Kochkin, H. Sfihi, V. N. Zaitsev, J. Fraissard, J. Catal., 2009, 263, 247–257.
- [17] J. Bedard, H. Chiang, A. Bhan, J. Catal., 2012, 290, 210-219.
- [18] C. Gonzalez-Arellano, R. A. D. Arancon, R. Luque, Green Chem., 2014, 16, 4985–4993.
- [19] M. Minakawa, H. Baek, Y. M. A. Yamada, J. W. Han, Y. Uozumi, Org. Lett., 2013, 15, 5798–5801.
- [20] D. C. Boffito, V. Crocella, C. Pirola, B. Neppolian, G. Cerrato, M. Ashokkumar, C. L. Bianchi, J. Catal., 2013, 297, 17–26.
- [21] J. M. Fraile, E. Garcia-Bordeje, E. Pires, L. Roldan, J. Catal., 2015, 324, 107–118.
- [22] C. Poonjarernsilp, N. Sano, N. Sawangpanich, T. Charinpanitkul, H. Tamon, *Green Chem.*, 2014, 16, 4936–4943.
- [23] C. C. Huang, C. J. Yang, R. J. Gao, N. C. Wang, C. L. Chen, J. S. Chang, Green Chem., 2015, 17, 3609–3620.
- [24] M. Kouzu, A. Nakagaito, J. S. Hidaka, Appl. Catal. A, 2011, 405, 36–44.



- [25] A. K. Purohit, A. Kumar, V. Singh, R. Goud, R. Jain, D. K. Dubey, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2014, 55, 6844–6846.
- [26] M. G. Kulkarni, R. Gopinath, L. C. Meher, A. K. Dalai, *Green Chem.*, 2006, 8, 1056–1062.
- [27] Z. H. Zhang, K. Dong, Z. B. Zhao, ChemSusChem., 2011, 4, 112–118.
- [28] K. Ishiara, S. Nakagawa, A. Sakakura, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, 127, 4168–4169.
- [29] T. Funatomi, K. Wakasugi, T. Misaki, Y. Tanabe, *Green Chem.*, 2006, 8, 1022–1027.
- [30] S. Q. Zhan, X. C. Tao, L. Z. Cai, X. H. Liu, T. P. Liu, Green Chem., 2014, 16, 4649–4653.
- [31] J. P. Belieres, C. A. Angell, J. Phys. Chem. B, 2007, 111, 4926–4937.
- [32] K. Fumino, V. Fossog, K. Wittler, R. Hempelmann, R. Ludwig, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, **2013**, 52, 2368–2372.
- [33] L. Zhang, L. He, C. B. Hong, S. Qin, G. H. Tao, Green Chem., 2015, 17,

5154-5163.

- [34] M. Sato, K. Matsushima, H. Kawanami, Y. Ikuhsima, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2007, 46, 6284–6288.
- [35] R. H. Qiu, Y. Y. Zhu, X. H. H. Xu, Y. H. Li, L. L. Shao, X. F. Ren, X. T. Cai, D. L. An, S. F. Yin, *Catal. Commun.*, **2009**, 10, 1889–1892.
- [36] A. K. Kolah, N. S. Asthana, D. T. Vu, C. T. Lira, D. J. Miller, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2008, 47, 5313–5317.
- [37] P. E. J. Babu, K. Sandesh, M. B. Saidutta, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2011, 50, 7155–7160.

Page numbers refer to the contents in the print version, which include both the English version and extended Chinese abstract of the paper. The online version only has the English version. The pages with the extended Chinese abstract are only available in the print version.