

Combining Low-Pressure CO₂ Capture and Hydrogenation To Form Methanol


Julia R. Khusnutdinova,[†] Jai Anand Garg, and David Milstein*

Department of Organic Chemistry, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: This paper describes a novel approach to CO₂ hydrogenation, in which CO₂ capture with aminoethanols at low pressure is coupled with hydrogenation of the captured product, oxazolidinone, directly to MeOH. In particular, (2-methylamino)ethanol or valinol captures CO₂ at 1–3 bar in the presence of catalytic Cs₂CO₃ to give the corresponding oxazolidinones in up to 65–70 and 90–95% yields, respectively. Efficient hydrogenation of oxazolidinones was achieved using PNN pincer Ru catalysts to give the corresponding aminoethanol (up to 95–100% yield) and MeOH (up to 78–92% yield). We also have shown that both CO₂ capture and oxazolidinone hydrogenation can be performed in the same reaction mixture using a simple protocol that avoids intermediate isolation or purification steps. For example, CO₂ can be captured by valinol at 1 bar with Cs₂CO₃ catalyst followed by 4-isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone hydrogenation in the presence of a bipy-based pincer Ru catalyst to produce MeOH in 50% yield after two steps.

KEYWORDS: carbon dioxide, hydrogenation, methanol, oxazolidinone, ethanolamine, ruthenium, pincer




INTRODUCTION

Capturing and converting CO₂ gas to a liquid fuel is an important challenge for the future of a sustainable economy. In particular, the reaction of CO₂ with H₂, the latter obtained via renewable energy methods such as solar-driven water splitting, to form a liquid methanol fuel is an important pathway outlined in “The Methanol Economy”.¹ Because the integration of new energy sources into developed economies must necessarily proceed in a sequential manner, recent interest has focused on utilizing CO₂ streams from readily available power plant discharge or from natural gas streams, with a view toward transforming this waste gas to methanol fuel by reacting it with hydrogen in an energy-efficient manner.² Many efforts of power utilities today are devoted to CO₂ capture and storage, meaning a recycling option via converting waste CO₂ to methanol fuel is particularly attractive.

Various technologies have been developed for the minimization of CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere from the flue gas streams of fossil-fuel-powered plants. Most common methods are based on chemical CO₂ absorption using amines or aminoalcohols as solvents, with monoethanolamine (MEA, 1) being the most common CO₂ capture agent (Scheme 1).³ Current developed technologies for CO₂ capture involve several steps, including CO₂ absorption to produce hydrocarbonate (eq 1, Scheme 1) and carbamate (eq 2, Scheme 1) salts,^{4,5} followed by subsequent release of CO₂ by the high-temperature decomposition of these salts.^{6,7} The CO₂ gas separated by such methods is then compressed and transported to a storage site, while amine solutions are partially recycled.^{6,8}

Scheme 1. Chemical Processes That Occur during CO₂ Capture with Amines




One of the major problems of such processes is thermal degradation of amines occurring during thermal treatment of the hydrocarbonate and carbamate salts to liberate CO₂ and is responsible for the large amount of amine waste resulting from such CO₂ capture operations. In 2009, for example, Bellona Foundation reported that “a typical CO₂ capture plant with the capacity of 1 million tonnes of CO₂ annually is expected to produce from 300 to 3000 tonnes of amine waste annually”, thereby reducing the economic viability of such processes.⁹ The most common reported thermal degradation product from CO₂ capture with monoethanolamine is 2-oxazolidinone (2 in Scheme 2), which further reacts to give other products of decomposition (3, 4, and 5 in Scheme 2).¹⁰ An additional energy penalty comes from the need to heat the carbonate salt solutions to high temperatures in order to release CO₂ and regenerate the amine and also from the subsequent CO₂

Received: January 30, 2015

Revised: March 5, 2015


Scheme 2. Byproducts of CO₂ Capture with Monoethanolamine 1 [2 = 2-Oxazolidinone, 3 = *N,N'*-(2-Hydroxyethyl)urea, 4 = *N*-(2-Hydroxyethyl)ethylenediamine (HEEDA); 5 = 1-(2-Hydroxyethyl)-2-imidazolidone (HEIA)]



sequestration.⁸ Therefore, it would be highly beneficial if, instead of releasing and storing the CO₂ gas, the products of CO₂ chemical absorption with amines were to be directly converted into a liquid fuel such as methanol.

Taking a page from industry, where aminoalcohols are used to fix CO₂ streams and thus “capture” the gas, we hereby report a procedure where we capture CO₂ at low pressure and use the in situ created capture product, an oxazolidinone compound, to generate methanol in one step in yields up to a total of ~50% (Scheme 3). These results represent a novel approach for the

Scheme 3. Proposed Scheme for Selective CO₂ Capture and Conversion to MeOH




use of CO₂ capture products directly for their conversion to MeOH, thus avoiding additional energy costs required for CO₂ thermal regeneration and storage. This approach may be of practical use to the power utility industry which uses a similar chemical process to capture CO₂ waste gas.⁹

In the proposed approach, the selective formation of oxazolidinone via CO₂ capture at low pressures is accomplished through the use of Cs₂CO₃ as a catalyst, while hydrogenation of the latter to produce MeOH and regenerated aminoalcohol is achieved in the same reaction mixture using Ru pincer catalysts developed in our group (Scheme 3 and Chart 1).

This approach is conceptually different from the currently known examples for direct hydrogenation of CO₂ to MeOH using transition metal catalysts.¹¹ In particular, the existing homogeneous catalytic systems for direct CO₂ hydrogenation to MeOH rely on the use of pressurized CO₂ gas (10–20 bar), thus adding the cost of CO₂ concentration and pressurization,

Chart 1. Ru Hydrogenation Catalysts Used in This Study




making such processes less attractive.^{12–15} By contrast, the approach presented here allows for CO₂ capture at low pressure and direct utilization of the formed captured species for the generation of a valuable product: MeOH. It appears that, while this article was under preparation, a similar approach was recently reported by Sanford et al. based on the use of dimethylamine for hydrogenation of CO₂ to formamide and MeOH.¹⁶ For comparison, the previously reported system for CO₂ capture in an amidine base/alcohol mixture failed to produce MeOH upon catalytic hydrogenation, and only formate ester and formate salt were formed.¹⁷

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CO₂ Capture. CO₂ capture using monoethanolamine and other aminoalcohols has been studied previously and proceeds through the formation of hydrocarbonate salts as well as carbamate salts with a protonated amine as the counterion. During thermal decomposition of these salts that takes place during the CO₂ liberation step in CO₂ capture plants, oxazolidinone 2 (Scheme 2) is formed as a byproduct which further reacts to give 3, 4, and 5 (Scheme 2). However, the formation of oxazolidinone can be made selective through the use of catalysts such as ⁿBu₂SnO,¹⁸ CeO₂,^{19,20} or other systems. Considering that CO₂ capture from gas streams should occur at low partial CO₂ pressures, we focused our attention on a recently reported method for selective oxazolidinone formation from aminoalcohols and 1 atm of CO₂ using a Cs₂CO₃ catalyst in dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) solvent developed by Saito.²¹ According to Saito's density functional theory results, monoethanolamine (1) was not an ideal substrate for such cyclization due to unfavorable thermodynamics of the reaction, which leads to low yields when only 1 atm of CO₂ is used. However, substrates with bulky substituents in the α-position to the amine group, such as valinol 6 (derived from the natural amino acid, valine), show a higher propensity toward cyclization and form the corresponding oxazolidinone product in up to 90% yield at a pressure of 1 atm of CO₂.²¹

Indeed, when monoethanolamine 1 was reacted under 2 bar of CO₂ in the presence of 10 mol % of Cs₂CO₃ in DMSO for 90 h at 150 °C, only 19% of 2-oxazolidinone 2 was obtained (Scheme 4a). By contrast, valinol 6 reacted much more readily to produce the corresponding 4-isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone 7 in 90–95% yield after heating at 150 °C for 24 h under 1 bar of CO₂ (Scheme 4b). A control experiment using 1 mmol of Cs₂CO₃ and 1 mmol of valinol in the absence of CO₂ gas does not generate the oxazolidinone product, showing that Cs₂CO₃ does not act as a source of CO₂ in this reaction.

We have also examined the reactivity of 2-(methylamino)-ethanol 8 under these conditions. 8 was proposed previously as

Scheme 4. CO₂ Capture with Monoethanolamine (a) and Valinol (b)


an alternative for monoethanolamine in CO₂ capture processes, and it has a lower commercial price compared to valinol.²² When 2-(methylamino)ethanol was heated under 3 bar of CO₂ in DMSO in the presence of 15 mol % of Cs₂CO₃ for 72 h at 150 °C, the corresponding 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone product **9** was obtained in ~64–66% crude yield (Table 1, entry 3). The other products of the reaction are most likely bicarbonate and carbamic acid salts of the protonated 2-(methylamino)ethanol, which were previously reported as byproducts of CO₂ capture with 2-(methylamino)ethanol.²² Attempted replacement of Cs₂CO₃ with less expensive K₂CO₃ failed to produce satisfactory results (compare entries 1 and 4). The reaction catalyzed by Cs₂CO₃ in less polar solvents, such as THF or dioxane, also led to low yields of the product, likely due to the low solubility of Cs₂CO₃ in these solvents (compare entries 1, 5, and 6).

The CO₂ capture with 2-(methylamino)ethanol is also catalyzed by ⁿBu₂SnO in toluene; however, this catalytic system typically required higher temperature to obtain comparable yields of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone (entry 7). In addition, ⁿBu₂SnO is not compatible with the Ru pincer catalyst that is used for hydrogenation of oxazolidinone products to MeOH (see next sections).

These results indicate that using a simple catalyst, Cs₂CO₃, selective CO₂ capture at 1–3 bar of CO₂ can be achieved with valinol and 2-(methylamino)ethanol in DMSO to give oxazolidinones as the major products.

Hydrogenation of Oxazolidinones: Catalyst and Reaction Condition Screening. Hydrogenation of noncyclic carbamic esters using a Ru pincer catalyst has been previously reported by our group; however, cyclic substrates were not examined in this study.²³ We are unaware of literature reports

of hydrogenation of oxazolidinones. In the search for a system for oxazolidinone hydrogenation to MeOH, we first examined the reactivity of various Ru catalysts in hydrogenation of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone as a model substrate (Table 2). This model reaction was performed in THF as a solvent using pincer Ru catalysts developed in our group (A, B, and C). Catalyst A is currently commercially available. An additive of 1 equiv of base, ^tBuOK, was required in order to activate the catalyst precursors A and B and form a dearomatized catalytically active species A' and B', respectively, in situ (Chart 1).^{24,25} Two equivalents of ^tBuOK was used to activate complex C for the in situ generation of C', as shown in previous studies (Chart 1).²⁶

Comparison of catalysts A, B, and C at 0.5 mol % catalyst loading shows that catalyst B gives the highest yields of MeOH and 2-(methylamino)ethanol **8** under these conditions (Table 2, entries 1–3), 70 and 80%, respectively. Better yields of MeOH and **8** can be obtained at similar times using 1 mol % catalyst loading (Table 2, entries 4 and 5). Using a THF/water (2:1) solution leads to very low conversions (Table 2, entries 6 and 7).

Finally, hydrogenation of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone was examined in DMSO as a solvent, as the Cs₂CO₃/DMSO system was shown to be optimal for CO₂ capture to selectively form oxazolidinones. While DMSO was not the ideal solvent for hydrogenation of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone at 1 mol % catalyst loading (Table 2, entry 8), increasing the catalyst loading to 2 mol % and prolonging reaction time led to efficient conversion of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone to 2-(methylamino)ethanol and MeOH in 96 and 78% yields, respectively (Table 2, entry 9). Under these conditions, less than 2% of Me₂S was formed through DMSO hydrogenation, suggesting that the catalyst was selective toward hydrogenation of the oxazolidinone substrate in the presence of DMSO.

Similarly, hydrogenation of 4-isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone in DMSO in the presence of 2 mol % of B and 2 mol % of ^tBuOK led to the selective formation of valinol (>99%) and MeOH (83% yield) in DMSO as a solvent (Scheme 5a). For comparison, hydrogenation of **7** in DMSO under similar conditions in the presence of the commercially available Ru catalyst, RuMACHO (2 mol %) and ^tBuOK (2 mol %), leads to an unselective reaction and the formation of only 10% of MeOH at 41% conversion of **7** (see Supporting Information for more detail).

Overall, these results demonstrate that catalyst B is the most efficient catalyst for oxazolidinone hydrogenation to form

Table 1. CO₂ Capture with 2-(Methylamino)ethanol^a

entry	catalyst (mol %)	solvent	CO ₂ pressure (bar)	T (°C)	t (h)	conversion (%)	yield ^b of 9 (%)
1	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (10)	DMSO	1	150	48	95	50
2	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (15)	DMSO	3	160	48	99	70
3	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (15)	DMSO	3	150	53	99	66
4	K ₂ CO ₃ (10)	DMSO	1	150	48	95	<30
5	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (10)	THF	1	150	48	<10	nd ^c
6	Cs ₂ CO ₃ (10)	dioxane	1	150	48	<10	nd ^c
7	ⁿ Bu ₂ SnO (10)	toluene	1	160	54	98	64

^aTypical reaction conditions: substrate **8** (1 mmol), catalyst, and solvent were heated in a Fischer–Porter tube under 1–8 bar of CO₂ pressure.


^bYields were determined by NMR using pyridine or DMSO as an internal standard. ^cNot detected.

Table 2. Ru-Catalyzed Hydrogenation of 3-Methyl-2-oxazolidinone^a

entry	catalyst (mol %)	solvent	<i>t</i> (h)	conversion (%)	yield ^b of 8 (%)	yield ^b of MeOH (%)
1	A (0.5) ^t BuOK (0.5)	THF	23	57	57	51
2	B (0.5) ^t BuOK (0.5)	THF	19	80	80	70
3	C (0.5) ^t BuOK (1)	THF	19	64	64	56
4	A (1) ^t BuOK (1)	THF	19	>99	95	84
5	B (1) ^t BuOK (1)	THF	19	>99	100	92
6	A (1) ^t BuOK (1)	THF/H ₂ O ^c	19	8	7	7
7	B (1) ^t BuOK (1)	THF/H ₂ O ^c	21	4	<1	<1
8	B (1) ^t BuOK (1)	DMSO	21	64	36	32
9	B (2) ^t BuOK (2)	DMSO	48	>92	96	78

^aTypical reaction conditions: substrate **9**, 0.5–2 mol % of Ru catalyst, and 0.5–2 mol % of ^tBuOK were heated at 135 °C under 60 bar of H₂ in a stainless steel autoclave; the reaction mixtures were analyzed by NMR and GC-MS. ^bYields were determined by NMR integration versus internal standard. ^c2:1 v/v THF/H₂O ratio.

Scheme 5. Hydrogenation of 4-Isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone (a) and 2-Oxazolidinone (b) Catalyzed by B




selectively the corresponding aminoalcohol and methanol in high yields. This catalytic reactivity is general and is applied to other substrates, as well, including hydrogenation of an unsubstituted 2-oxazolidinone, although the latter required higher catalyst loading (5 mol %) to achieve good yields and conversions (Scheme 5b).

The high yields of MeOH obtained by hydrogenation of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone and 4-isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone in DMSO as a solvent imply that **B** can be a suitable catalyst for developing a combined process for CO₂ capture at low pressure coupled with hydrogenation to MeOH, as shown below.

Combining CO₂ Capture and Hydrogenation To Form MeOH. Based on the results above, we decided to explore a combined one-step process for CO₂ hydrogenation to MeOH at low CO₂ pressure, without isolation of the intermediate.

First, we attempted direct CO₂ hydrogenation in the presence of 2-(methylamino)ethanol **8** under pressurized CO₂ (20 bar) and H₂ (60 bar) in the presence of Cs₂CO₃ (10 mol %), **B** (1 mol %), and ^tBuOK (1 mol %) in DMSO or

THF as a solvent. However, under these conditions, no MeOH was formed, and the major product, formed in 97% yield, was identified as *N*-(2-hydroxyethyl)-*N*-methylformamide (OHC)-*N*(Me)(CH₂CH₂OH) by ESI and GC-MS (Scheme 6). The

Scheme 6. Attempted Direct Hydrogenation of CO₂ in the Presence of 2-(Methylamino)ethanol, Catalyst B, and Cs₂CO₃

formation of the formamide was also observed in the absence of Cs₂CO₃ and likely results from Ru-catalyzed CO₂ hydrogenation in the presence of a secondary amine.²⁷ Similarly, screening of other reaction conditions for hydrogenation of CO₂ directly in the presence of 2-(methylamino)ethanol **8** or valinol **6** in a solution containing ^tBuOK and Cs₂CO₃ (or ⁿBu₂SnO) failed to produce MeOH (see Supporting Information for more detail).


These results suggest that catalyst **B** cannot effectively hydrogenate formamides (or carbamates) in the presence of CO₂ gas. Complex **B** could also be modified or deactivated via the reactivity with CO₂ studied previously by our group and by Sanford.^{28,29}

We then proposed that the CO₂ capture and Ru-catalyzed hydrogenation steps should be performed consecutively to avoid exposure of catalyst **B** to CO₂ gas. However, since both CO₂ capture and oxazolidinone hydrogenation can be performed in DMSO, both steps can be carried out in the

same solution, without isolation of oxazolidinone. This would provide a simple protocol for captured CO₂ hydrogenation to MeOH that avoids the intermediate isolation or purification steps.

This modified protocol was first examined using 2-(methylamino)ethanol **8** as a CO₂ capture agent (Scheme 7).

Scheme 7. CO₂ Capture/Hydrogenation to MeOH Using 2-(Methylamino)ethanol



First, the CO₂ capture step was performed as described above, using 15 mol % of Cs₂CO₃ in DMSO and 3 bar of CO₂. After being heated for 72 h at 150 °C, the resulting solution containing 66% of 3-methyl-2-oxazolidinone **9** was evacuated at room temperature to remove excess CO₂ gas and was then combined with catalyst **B** (5 mol %) and ^tBuOK (25 mol %). Subsequent hydrogenation under 60 bar of H₂ at 135 °C produced MeOH and 2-(methylamino)ethanol **8** in 29 and 52% yields, respectively, after 69 h. Formate salt was also present as a major byproduct (24% yield based on **8**) that likely results from a Ru-catalyzed hydrogenation of remaining CO₂ or hydrocarbonate salts.^{30–33}

A large excess of ^tBuOK (25 mol %) relative to the catalyst is required in this reaction to obtain significant conversion to MeOH. For comparison, when 1 equiv of ^tBuOK was used, only a trace amount of MeOH was formed, while starting materials remained mostly unreacted. Excess base is most likely needed to neutralize acidic byproducts of CO₂ capture (e.g., hydrocarbonate and formate salts of a protonated 2-(methylamino)ethanol), which may react with a dearomatized catalyst **B'**, leading to its deactivation.

An analogous protocol using a lower catalyst loading, 2.5 mol % of **B** and 20 mol % of ^tBuOK, produced MeOH and 2-(methylamino)ethanol in 21 and 38% yields, respectively, after 48 h. A control experiment showed that when Cs₂CO₃ alone was heated in DMSO under 60 bar of H₂ in the presence of **B** (10 mol %) and ^tBuOK (10 mol %), no methanol formation was observed, indicating that Cs₂CO₃ does not act as a source of MeOH. Thus, these initial results demonstrate that MeOH can be obtained in a total yield of 29% in a simple reaction sequence and in the same solution, without intermediate product isolation or purification steps.

To further improve this process, this protocol was then tested using valinol **6**, which was shown to capture CO₂ more selectively under only 1 bar of CO₂. First, CO₂ capture was performed as described above, using 10 mol % of Cs₂CO₃ under 1 bar of CO₂ in DMSO to produce 4-isopropyl-2-oxazolidinone **7** in >90% yield after heating for 24 h at 150 °C (see above). After removal of CO₂ under vacuum and addition of **B** (2.5 mol %) and ^tBuOK (25 mol %), hydrogenation under 60 bar of H₂ produced MeOH and valinol in 37 and 62% yields,

respectively, after heating at 135 °C for 72 h (Table 3, entry 1). However, when less amounts of ^tBuOK were used (entries 2 and 3), the yield of MeOH decreased.

Table 3. CO₂ Capture/Hydrogenation to MeOH Using Valinol^a

entry	catalyst (mol %)	yield ^b of 7 (%)	yield ^b of MeOH (%)	yield ^b of 6 (%)	HCOO ⁻ (mmol) ^b
1	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (25)	9	37	62	0.193
2	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (15)	39	21	34	0.260
3	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (6)	67	6	~12	0.141
4 ^c	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (25)	nd ^e	53	74	0.057
5 ^d	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (25)	36	45	63	nd ^e
6 ^c	B (2.5) ^t BuOK (10)	6	44	63	0.089

^aTypical reaction conditions: 1 mmol of valinol and 0.1 mmol of Cs₂CO₃ in DMSO were heated at 150 °C for 24 h; the reaction mixture was then degassed under vacuum at room temperature for 20 min; **B** and ^tBuOK were added, and the reaction mixture was heated under H₂ (60 bar) at 135 °C for 72 h. ^bYields after the hydrogenation step. ^cReaction mixture was filtered before hydrogenation. ^dReaction mixture was diluted with toluene and filtered before hydrogenation. ^eNot detected.

Because formate salt was still present among the reaction products, this could indicate that inorganic impurities such as cesium or potassium hydrocarbonate salts could still be present in the reaction mixture and undergo further hydrogenation in the presence of a Ru catalyst upon heating.^{30–33} To remove possible inorganic contaminants, the reaction mixture after CO₂ capture step was combined with **B** (2.5 mol %) and ^tBuOK (25 mol %) and then filtered through a Celite plug at room temperature, and the resulting clear solution was subjected to typical hydrogenation conditions (60 bar of H₂, 135 °C, 72 h). This led to improved yields of MeOH and valinol, which were obtained in 53 and 74% yields, respectively (Table 3, entry 4). Accordingly, the fraction of formate salts significantly decreased. Attempted precipitation of inorganic salts with an equal volume of toluene from DMSO solution followed by filtration did not improve the results, and MeOH and valinol were obtained in 45 and 63% yields, respectively, under analogous conditions (entry 5).

This improved protocol also allowed us to lower the amount of ^tBuOK to 10 mol % to obtain MeOH and valinol in comparable yields, 44 and 63%, respectively, under analogous conditions (entry 6).

Overall, these results demonstrate that selective CO₂ capture under mild conditions (1 bar of CO₂) can be combined with Ru-catalyzed hydrogenation of in situ formed oxazolidinone product to MeOH and aminoalcohol in a simple procedure that does not require isolation or purification of the captured oxazolidinone product. Although the yields in such a combined procedure are moderate, our study of the catalytic activity of complex **B** in hydrogenation of oxazolidinones (see above) shows that these results can potentially be improved by developing a process engineering solution and improving the catalyst activity. Presently, complex **B** is the only reported catalyst for the highly selective hydrogenation of oxazolidinones to generate MeOH and the corresponding aminoalcohol.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we have demonstrated a novel approach to CO₂ hydrogenation to MeOH in which CO₂ capture at low pressure with aminoalcohols is coupled with hydrogenation of the captured product, oxazolidinone, to form MeOH. This approach was inspired by the CO₂ capture industry which utilizes aminoalcohols to capture CO₂ from waste streams. However, the capture of oxazolidinone product has previously not been considered a useful precursor for the production of liquid fuel such as MeOH due to the lack of methods for such conversion. We have shown here that the Ru pincer complexes (**A**, **B**, and **C**) are active catalysts for the unprecedented hydrogenation of oxazolidinones, which are often formed as byproducts of CO₂ capture. Moreover, we have shown that both steps, CO₂ capture to selectively produce oxazolidinones and their subsequent hydrogenation to MeOH, can be performed in the same reaction mixture using a simple protocol that avoids intermediate isolation or purification steps. For example, using valinol for selective CO₂ capture at 1 bar catalyzed by Cs₂CO₃ and hydrogenation of corresponding oxazolidinone using catalyst **B** allowed us to obtain MeOH in up to ~50% total yield.

The advantage of this approach is that it allows one to utilize the CO₂ capture product directly for MeOH production, thus avoiding the energy costs associated with CO₂ regeneration from capture products and pressurization. This is conceptually different from other previously reported catalytic processes where pressurized CO₂ is used to produce MeOH. We hope that these conceptually new results will stimulate the development of novel processes for direct utilization of CO₂ capture products to produce liquid fuels or other value-added products.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Typical Procedure for CO₂ Capture. A Fischer–Porter pressure tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar was charged with Cs₂CO₃ (0.1–0.15 mmol), valinol, or 2-(methylamino)ethanol (1 mmol) and a preweighed amount of DMSO (1 mL). The Fischer–Porter tube was filled with CO₂ gas to 1 bar (for valinol) or 3 bar (for 2-(methylamino)ethanol) pressure and heated at 150 °C for 24–72 h. The solution was cooled, and CO₂ was released. A sample of the reaction mixture was dissolved in D₂O or CDCl₃ and analyzed by NMR. Yields were determined versus DMSO as an internal standard.

Typical Procedure for Hydrogenation of Oxazolidinones. In a nitrogen-filled glovebox, an oven-dried 45 mL autoclave with a Teflon insert equipped with a magnetic stirring

bar was charged with the Ru complex (10 μmol), ^tBuOK (10–20 μmol), oxazolidinone substrate (1 or 2 mmol), and 1.5 mL of the solvent. The autoclave was filled with H₂ gas (60 bar) and heated at 135 °C for an indicated period of time. The reaction mixture was then cooled before releasing H₂ pressure, then 10 or 20 μL of pyridine was added as a standard, and a sample of the reaction mixture (50–100 μL) was dissolved in 0.6 mL of D₂O or CDCl₃ and analyzed by ¹H NMR and GC-MS. Yields were determined by NMR integration versus pyridine as an internal standard.

The unaccounted mass balance for MeOH formation (for example, Table 2, entry 9) could be due to partial loss of a volatile MeOH product in the headspace.

Typical Procedure for Combined CO₂ Capture/Hydrogenation. A Fischer–Porter tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar was charged with Cs₂CO₃, valinol, or 2-(methylamino)alcohol substrate (1 mmol) and 1 mL of DMSO and then filled with CO₂ at 1 bar (for reaction with valinol) or 3 bar (for reaction with 2-(methylamino)ethanol). The reaction mixture was heated at 150 °C for 24 h (for reaction with valinol) or 53 h (for reaction with 2-(methylamino)ethanol). The solution was then cooled and stirred under vacuum for 20 min at room temperature to remove CO₂. A solution of complex **B** (25–50 μmol) and ^tBuOK (60–250 μmol) in 2 mL of DMSO was then added. The reaction mixture was then transferred to a 45 mL autoclave equipped with a magnetic stirring bar, filled with H₂ (60 bar), and heated at 135 °C for 72 h. After being cooled, H₂ was released and 20 μL of pyridine was added as a standard. A sample of the reaction mixture (50–100 μL) was dissolved in 0.6 mL of D₂O (or CDCl₃ in entry 5, Table 3) and analyzed by ¹H NMR. The yields were determined versus pyridine as an internal standard. In an optimized procedure (entries 4–6, Table 3), the reaction mixture after addition of **B** and ^tBuOK was filtered through a short Celite plug before being transferred to an autoclave.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The following file is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acscatal.5b00194.

General information, experimental details, and characterization data (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: david.milstein@weizmann.ac.il.

Present Address

[†](J.R.K.) Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, 1919-1 Tancha, Onna-son, Kunigami-gun, Okinawa, Japan 904-0495.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the European Research Council under the FP7 framework (ERC No. 246837), by the Israel Science Foundation, and by the Kimmel Center for Molecular Design. We thank the Swiss Friends of The Weizmann Institute of Science for a generous Post Doctoral Fellowship to J.A.G.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) Olah, G. A.; Goeppert, A.; Prakash, G. K. S. *Beyond Oil and Gas: The Methanol Economy*; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, Germany, 2009; p 334.
- (2) Goeppert, A.; Czaun, M.; Jones, J.-P.; Surya Prakash, G. K.; Olah, G. A. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, 43, 7995–8048.
- (3) Rochelle, G. T. *Science* **2009**, 325, 1652–1654.
- (4) Vaidya, P. D.; Kenig, E. Y. *Chem. Eng. Technol.* **2007**, 30, 1467–1474.
- (5) Conway, W.; Wang, X.; Fernandes, D.; Burns, R.; Lawrance, G.; Puxty, G.; Maeder, M. J. *Phys. Chem. A* **2011**, 115, 14340–14349.
- (6) Rochelle, G. T.; Goff, G. S.; Cullinane, J. T.; Freguia, S. *LRGCC 2002 Conference Proceedings*, Norman, Oklahoma, February 24–27, 2002; pp 131–152.
- (7) Freguia, S.; Rochelle, G. T. *AIChE J.* **2003**, 49, 1676–1686.
- (8) Rao, A. B.; Rubin, E. S. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2002**, 36, 4467–4475.
- (9) Shao, R.; Stangeland, A. The Bellona Foundation. “Amines Used in CO₂ Capture: Health and Environmental Impacts”; Bellona Report, 2009; <http://bellona.org/news/uncategorized/2010-01-amines-used-in-co2-capture-health-and-environmental-impacts>.
- (10) Davis, J.; Rochelle, G. *Energy Procedia* **2009**, 1, 327–333.
- (11) Direct CO₂ hydrogenation in the presence of heterogeneous catalysts typically requires temperatures > 200 °C. See ref 2 and references therein.
- (12) Tominaga, K.; Sasaki, Y.; Kawai, M.; Watanabe, T.; Saito, M. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1993**, 629–631.
- (13) Tominaga, K.-i.; Sasaki, Y.; Watanabe, T.; Saito, M. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1995**, 68, 2837–2842.
- (14) Huff, C. A.; Sanford, M. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, 133, 18122–18125.
- (15) Wesselbaum, S.; vom Stein, T.; Klankermayer, J.; Leitner, W. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, 51, 7499–7502.
- (16) Rezayee, N. M.; Huff, C. A.; Sanford, M. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, 137, 1028–1031.
- (17) Yadav, M.; Linehan, J. C.; Karkamkar, A. J.; van der Eide, E.; Heldebrant, D. J. *Inorg. Chem.* **2014**, 53, 9849–9854.
- (18) Tominaga, K.-I.; Sasaki, Y. *Synlett* **2002**, 307–309.
- (19) Tamura, M.; Honda, M.; Noro, K.; Nakagawa, Y.; Tomishige, K. *J. Catal.* **2013**, 305, 191–203.
- (20) Juarez, R.; Concepcion, P.; Corma, A.; Garcia, H. *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, 46, 4181–4183.
- (21) Foo, S. W.; Takada, Y.; Yamazaki, Y.; Saito, S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2013**, 54, 4717–4720.
- (22) Figueira, I.; Teijido, I.; Garcia-Abuin, A.; Gomez-Diaz, D.; Rumbo, A. *Energy Fuels* **2014**, 28, 4737–4745.
- (23) Balaraman, E.; Gunanathan, C.; Zhang, J.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Milstein, D. *Nat. Chem.* **2011**, 3, 609–614.
- (24) Zhang, J.; Leitner, G.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 127, 10840–10841.
- (25) Balaraman, E.; Gnanaprakasam, B.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Milstein, D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, 132, 16756–16758.
- (26) Fogler, E.; Garg, J. A.; Hu, P.; Leitner, G.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Milstein, D. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **2014**, 20, 15727–15731.
- (27) Jessop, P. G.; Ikariya, T.; Noyori, R. *Chem. Rev.* **1995**, 95, 259–272.
- (28) Vogt, M.; Garg, M.; Iron, M. A.; Diskin-Posner, Y.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2012**, 18, 9194–9197.
- (29) Huff, C. A.; Kampf, J. W.; Sanford, M. S. *Organometallics* **2012**, 31, 4643–4645.
- (30) Joo, F.; Joo, F.; Nadasdi, L.; Elek, J.; Laurenczy, G.; Nadasdi, L. *Chem. Commun.* **1999**, 971–972.
- (31) Federsel, C.; Jackstell, R.; Boddien, A.; Laurenczy, G.; Beller, M. *ChemSusChem* **2010**, 3, 1048–1050.
- (32) Langer, R.; Diskin-Posner, Y.; Leitner, G.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2011**, 50, 9948–9952.
- (33) Ziebart, C.; Federsel, C.; Anbarasan, P.; Jackstell, R.; Baumann, W.; Spannenberg, A.; Beller, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, 134, 20701–20704.