View Article Online View Journal

ChemComm

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: J. Heltzel, M. T. Finn, D. Ainembabazi, K. Wang and A. Voutchkova, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, DOI: 10.1039/C8CC03157F.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the **author guidelines**.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the ethical guidelines, outlined in our <u>author and reviewer resource centre</u>, still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



rsc.li/chemcomm

Journal Name



Transfer Hydrogenation of Carbon Dioxide and Bicarbonate from Glycerol Under Aqueous Conditions

Jacob Heltzel, Matthew Finn, Diana Ainembabazi, Kai Wang and Adelina M. Voutchkova-Kostal*

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

Published on 16 May 2018. Downloaded by Universite Pierre et Marie Curie on 16/05/2018 16:05:58

The transfer hydrogenation of CO_2 from glycerol to afford formic and lactic acid is a highly attractive path to valorizing two waste streams, and is significantly more thermodynamically favorable process than direct CO_2 hydrogenation. We report the first homogeneous catalyst for this transformation, consisting of watersoluble Ru N-heterocyclic carbene complex. The catalyst affords lactic and formic acid selectively in the presence of base at temperatures between 150 and 225 °C. Carbonate salts can also be utilized in place of CO_2 , affording the same products at higher rates.

Methods to convert CO₂ to formaldehyde, formic acid (FA) and methanol have been the subject of intense investigation in recent years, given the abundance of CO₂ as a C1 feedstock.¹ Among these products, FA is particularly attractive due to its widespread utility as a chemical feedstock,² commodity chemical for food and agriculture,² fuel³ and hydrogen storage medium.⁴ Catalytic methods for CO₂ direct hydrogenation continue to be intensively studied: highly active homogeneous catalysts with Rh,⁵ Ru,⁶ Ir,⁷ Fe⁸ and Co⁹ have been reported, with turnover numbers (TONs) on the order of 10⁶. Base or amine additives help stabilize the product as formate, but recent examples demonstrate the feasibility of the aqueous reaction in the absence of additives.^{6c, 10} Since CO₂ is in equilibrium with HCO_3^- in aqueous media (pK_{a1} = 6.35), hydrogenation of bicarbonate has also been demonstrated with Rh^{5, 11}, Ru¹², Ir¹³ and Fe¹⁴ catalysts. However, reported activities are often lower than those for CO₂, despite the fact that the thermodynamics of bicarbonate hydrogenation in water are reported to be slightly more favourable than that of CO₂.¹⁵

Although a number of highly active catalysts for direct hydrogenation of CO_2 have been reported, the ability to directly utilize a renewable source of hydrogen would be highly advantageous from a sustainability perspective. Transfer

hydrogenation (TH) from a renewable hydrogen source could also afford an additional product in a single process. The generation of an additional by-product could improve the economics of the process, provided the product is more valuable than the hydrogen donor and is formed selectively, and could offer additional thermodynamic driving force for the reaction.

We thus compared free energies of reaction for direct hydrogenation and transfer hydrogenation of CO_2 in aqueous media. TH from isopropanol, a common H₂-donor, is more favourable by ca. 9.7 kcal/mol compared to direct hydrogenation of CO_2 (Scheme 1, entries 1-2). Catalytic examples of TH from isopropanol have been reported by Peris et al^{1e} using water-soluble Ru and Ir NHC complexes.¹⁶ Compared to isopropanol, glycerol is a more desirable H₂-donor due to its abundant supply as a renewable by-product of biodiesel production. Furthermore, using glycerol as hydrogen donor in TH of CO_2 could provide a route to glycerol valorization.¹⁷ However, CO_2 TH from glycerol is considered challenging compared to reactions with isopropanol.¹⁸

Scheme 1. Calculated free energies of reaction (ΔG°_{aq}) for the CO₂ direct hydrogenation and transfer hydrogenation (Gaussian16, G3B3, PCM water). ^a Reaction includes carbonate base, and was calculated as-stated. ∆G°_{aq} Entry (kcal/mol) 13.4 → ⁰_H, + 3.70 12.3 он + ОН _он --9.21 4.44 $\overset{OH}{\longrightarrow} \overset{O}{\longrightarrow} \overset{O$ -83.9

^{a.} Chemistry Department, the George Washington University, 800 22nd St NW, Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20052 (USA)

E-mail: avoutchkova@gwu.edu

⁺ Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: (catalyst synthesis, characterization, and additional figures/tables). See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

COMMUNICATION

This notion is consistent with our calculations, which show ΔG°_{aq} of CO₂ TH from glycerol (entry 3) is 8.6 kcal/mol *less* favourable than TH from isopropanol when dihydroxyacetone (DHA) is the glycerol by-product. However, recent reports show that glycerol dehydrogenation reactions under basic conditions afford lactic acid,¹⁹⁻²⁰ likely via DHA isomerization, dehydration and intramolecular Cannizzaro reaction.^{19a} When lactic acid is the glycerol by-product, CO₂ TH becomes 22.6 kcal/mol *more* favourable than direct hydrogenation (entries 4 and 1). Furthermore, while all CO₂ hydrogenation processes are more favourable in the presence of base, the formation of two acids in the reaction of CO₂ and glycerol provides additional driving force under basic conditions (ESI Table S2). Consistent with this, the calculated ΔG°_{aq} for TH of bicarbonate from glycerol is also highly favourable (entry 6).

Given that the TH from glycerol to CO₂ or bicarbonate is thermodynamically favourable, we were surprised that catalytic examples of this reaction have not been more extensively exploited. In the first of two important advances, Lin et al reported use of heterogeneous Pd/C for TH of bicarbonate using glycerol, but with CO₂ only 22 turnovers were obtained in 12 hours at 240 °C.^{18a} In a significant advance towards a homogeneous process, Aresta et al reported a stoichiometric reaction of RuCl₂(PPh₃)₂ with CO₂ in aqueous glycerol, which affords glycolic and formic acid at 82 °C.^{18b} The authors propose that DHA undergoes dehydrogenation and decarbonylation to afford glycolic acid and Ru(H)(CO)(formate), and the latter could not eliminate formic acid. This suggests that preventing decarbonylation is important for facilitating catalytic turnover.

Here were we report the first homogeneous catalyst with appreciable activity for the TH of glycerol with CO_2 and bicarbonate, selectively affording lactic and formic acids with high turnover numbers and concentrations that show potential for development into a competitive hydrogenation process.



Recently we reported that Ir and Ru *N*-heterocyclic carbene (NHC) complexes with sulfonate-functionalized wingtips are highly active for acceptorless dehydrogenation of glycerol to lactic acid,²⁰ with no detectable formation of decarbonylation product. When we performed this reaction with carbonate as base, formate was observed. This prompted us to examine a series of water-soluble complexes for TH of both bicarbonate and CO₂ from glycerol. This initial report focuses on the most active Ru compound we have identified, Ru(II) CNC with propanesulfonate wingtips (1), synthesized via a literature procedure.²¹

Journal Name

Transfer hydrogenation reactions were carried out in a bighe pressure Parr reactor and sampled period Cally maintaming the designated CO₂ pressure. Products were identified and quantitated with HPLC (ESI Figure S1) and ¹H NMR (Figure 2) with an internal standard. Control reaction without catalyst afford no appreciable conversion of glycerol, while control reactions without CO₂ or carbonate afford only lactate. Esters of glycerol lactate or formate were not observed under basic conditions. An extensive series of optimization reactions was performed for this process, given that the speciation of CO₂ in aqueous solution is pH-dependent, and that catalyst **1** was suspected to be also capable of facilitating pH-dependent formate dehydrogenation.

Therefore, it was not surprising that the turnovers of lactate and formate observed with catalyst **1** were found to depend on the temperature and availability of base. In the absence of base, no products are observed from a reaction at 150 °C. However, reactions with cat 1 (0.15 mM), 1 M KOH, 1:1 glycerol:water (conditions optimized previously for glyceroat 46 bar CO2 and 150 °C afford 330 turnovers in 24 h, equivalent to ~50 mM of formate and lactate (Table S1 entry 3). Further increase in reaction time afforded more lactic but no more formic acid. Doubling the base concentration (2 M KOH) affords similar TONs in 24 hours, but the initial activity (TON at t=1hr) is doubled (Table S1 entry 4). This is attributed to the fact that the initial KOH concentration is higher for the reaction with 2 M KOH, resulting in higher initial rate. However, as the vessel is pressurized, the KOH solubility reaches saturation, which results in a similar effective base concentration in both reactions. When KOH concentration is decreased to 0.25 M, the reaction still affords ~50 mM lactate, but significantly less formate (18 mM, Table S1 entry 1), and a drop in pH to 6.9 is observed after 24 hr. The 1-hr TONs are 141 and 71 respectively for lactate and formate, with lactate concentration steadily increasing and that of formate becoming steady (ESI Figure S2a). We hypothesized this observation was due to competing CO₂ hydrogenation and formic acid dehydrogenation at the lower pH. Indeed, experiments with cat 1 at 150 °C confirm that the catalyst has pH-dependent activity for decomposition of formic acid/formate (Figure S4).

Given that maintaining high pH is necessary to minimize formate decomposition, we opted to increase the effective base concentration by decreasing CO₂ pressure. A reaction with 26 bar CO2 at 150 °C and 2 M KOH affords almost double the activity observed with 48 bar CO₂ (~600 turnovers in 24 hr, Figure 1a and Table S1 entry 7). Thus, lower CO₂ pressure is favourable for both formate and lactate production. When the same reaction was performed at 180 °C, the catalyst affords 1065 turnovers of formate and 1685 of lactate in 24 hr (Figures 1b), corresponding to 166 mM and 262 mM respectively. The reaction was monitored until 86 hr, at which time TONs of lactate and formate reached 5046 and 2200 respectively (NMR spectra in Figure 2). The difference in formate vs lactate concentration is likely the result of catalytic dehydrogenation and thermal decomoposition of potassium formate (thermally decomposes at 167 °C²²).

Published on 16 May 2018. Downloaded by Universite Pierre et Marie Curie on 16/05/2018 16:05:58

COMMUNICATION

Journal Name

Further increase in reaction temperature exacerbates the difference in lactate vs formate produced. In addition, at temperatures higher than 180 °C significant etching is observed on the glass insert of the autoclave, which necessitates the use of lower base concentration. For example, at 225 °C the reaction could only be performed with 0.25 M KOH, affording 0.328 M lactate (3160 turnovers), but only 28 mM formate (268 turnovers) in 24 hours (ESI Figure S2).







Figure 2. Sections of ¹H NMR spectra corresponding to t=0 (1), t=1h (2), t=8h; t=15h (3), t=19h (4), t=24h (5) and t=86 h (6) for reaction of CO₂ and glycerol using catalyst 1 (pCO2 26 Bar (6.85 M aqueous glycerol and 2.00 M KOH at 180 °C). Key: **L**actate; **#** Formate; **V**Pyruvaldehyde; ©TSP (standard).

The effect of temperature, base and CO_2 pressure are summarized by contour plots based on temperature and the "effective" base concentration (estimated as [KOH]/ $p(CO_2)$ (Figure 3). Thus, optimal equimolar production of formate and lactate occurs when temperature and effective base concentration are maximized. However, higher lactate production can be achieved with higher reaction temperature and lower base concentration. The conditions can thus be used to "tune" the ratio of formate and lactate produced.

Given that CO₂ in aqueous base forms carbonate and bicarbonate, we performed a reaction with 2.0 M K₂CO₃ and 26 bar N₂ at 150 °C. Carbonate was selected over bicarbonate in order to increase initial pH. The initial pH of 12.1 drops to 10.8 over 20 hours of reaction. The theoretical ratios of HCO₃⁻:CO₃²⁻ at pH 12.1 and 10.8 are 2:98 and 40:60 respectively, which is important because bicarbonate is likely the only species that can undergo transfer hydrogenation.¹⁵ In 20 hours the reaction affords 42610, 3588 and 5649 turnovers respectively of lactate, formate and 1,2-PDO (Figure 4 and additional visualization in Figure S4). The formate yield based on carbonate is 25% (505 mM formate). The higher lactate vs formate concentration observed is consistent with previous observationsoning dehydrogenation activity of cat **1** at lower ውዝ (ተ፪ሬዮሬን የታወ



is only observed under the lower pH conditions, as we previously reported.^[21]

Figure 3. Contour plots showing TONs in 24h for (a) formate and (b) lactate using cat 1.



Figure 4. Time course for production of formate and lactate from the reaction of glycerol using catalyst **1** using pN_2 26 Bar, 6.85 M aqueous glycerol, 2.00 M K₂CO₃, at 150 °C.

We propose a mechanism for PDO formation either via (i) dehydration, transfer hydrogenation, or (ii) dehydrogenation to DHA or glyceraldehyde, then dehydration and transfer hydrogenation. The only proposed intermediate that has been directly observed is minute amounts of pyruvaldehyde (Figure 2).



We considered potential formation of lactate and formate esters as side reactions that could interfere with product quantitation. Thus, formate and lactate esters of glycerol were synthesized under acidic conditions and characterized by NMR (ESI Figure S5). These esters were not observed by NMR in the reactions under the current conditions.

Mechanistically, we postulate that the TH likely proceeds via coordination of glycerol, followed by deprotonation by base. Subsequent β -hydride elimination likely occurs at the secondary position of glycerol, affording Ru-H and DHA. DHA is converted

emComm Accepted Manuscri

Journal Name

to lactic acid via isomerization, dehydration and intramolecular Cannizzaro reaction.^{19b} Bicarbonate next binds to the catalyst and undergoes a hydroxide elimination, which has been previously proposed by DFT calculations for the Ru-catalysed hydrogenation of bicarbonate.¹⁵ The resulting H-Ru-CO₂ complex undergoes insertion^{15, 23} to generate ruthenium formate. The final formate dissociation is likely facilitated by the polar aqueous reaction medium, which allows excellent solvation of formate anions, making the dissociation energetically possible in water.¹⁵

Conclusions

Here we demonstrate a homogeneous catalytic process for CO₂ and bicarbonate transfer hydrogenation (TH) from glycerol with a water-soluble Ru N-heterocyclic carbene complex (cat 1) and base. The reaction selectively affords two value-added products: potassium formate and lactate. Calculations show that TH of CO₂ and bicarbonate are made thermodynamically more favourable by the ultimate conversion of glycerol to lactic acid. As a result, CO2 TH from glycerol becomes significantly more favorable than direct hydrogenation under basic conditions. Equimolar amounts of lactate and formate are afforded (~600 turnovers) at 150 °C, while greater lactate than formate production is observed at T > 150 °C. At 180 °C cat 1 affords 1685 and 1065 turnovers respectively of lactate and formate in 24 h. Carbonate salts can also be utilized in place of CO₂, affording 42610, 3588 and 5649 turnovers respectively for lactate, formate and 1,2-propanediol. A preliminary mechanism is proposed, but further experimental and theoretical investigations of mechanism, as well as comparable activity of other catalyst precursors, are under investigation.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Notes and references

- (a) J. Artz; T. E. Muller; K. Thenert; J. Kleinekorte; R. Meys; A. Sternberg; A. Bardow; W. Leitner, *Chem Rev*, 2018, **118**, 434-504. (bP. G. Jessop; T. Ikariya; R. Noyori, *Chem. Rev.*, 1995, **95**, 259-272;
- 2 M. G. Mura; L. D. Luca; G. Giacomelli; A. Porcheddu, *Adv. Synth. Catal.*, 2012, **354**, 3180-3186;
- 3 J. Albert; A. Jess; C. Kern; F. Pöhlmann; K. Glowienka; P. Wasserscheid, ACS Sust. Chem. Eng., 2016, 4, 5078-5086;
- 4 K. Sordakis; C. Tang; L. K. Vogt; H. Junge; P. J. Dyson; M. Beller; G. Laurenczy, *Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **118**,372-433.
- 5 (a) P. G. Jessop; T. Ikariya; R. Noyori, *Nature*, 1994, 368, 231-233. (b) I. Jószai; F. Joó, *J. Mol. Cat. A*, 2004, 224, 87-91.
- 6 (a) P. Munshi; A. D. Main; J. C. Linehan; C.-C. C. Tai; P. G. Jessop, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2002, 124, 7963-7971; (b) G. A. Filonenko; M. P. Conley; C. Copéret; M. Lutz; E. J. M. Hensen; E. A. Pidko, ACS Catal., 2013, 3, 2522-2526; (c) K. Rohmann; J. Kothe; M. W. Haenel; U. Englert; M. Hölscher; W. Leitner, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2016, 55, 8966-8969.
- 7 (a) J. F. Hull; Y. Himeda; W. H. Wang; B. Hashiguchi; R.
 Periana; D. J. Szalda; J. T. Muckerman; E. Fujita, *Nat Chem*, 2012, 4, 383-388; (b) N. Onishi; S. Xu; Y. Manaka; Y. Suna;

W.-H. Wang; J. T. Muckerman; E. Fujita; Y. Himeda, *Inorg Chem.*, 2015, **54**, 5114-5123; (c) R. Tanaka; <u>Μ</u>₁ γamashita; 157F Nozaki, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2009, **131**, 14168-14169.

- 8 (a) A. Boddien; D. Mellmann; F. Gärtner; R. Jackstell; H. Junge; P. J. Dyson; G. Laurenczy; R. Ludwig; M. Beller, *Science*, 2011, **333**, 1733-1736; (b) Y. Zhang; A. D. MacIntosh; J. L. Wong; E. A. Bielinski; P. G. Williard; B. Q. Mercado; N. Hazari; W. H. Bernskoetter, *Chem. Sci.*, 2015, **6**, 4291-4299; (c) C. Federsel; A. Boddien; R. Jackstell; R. Jennerjahn; P. J. Dyson; R. Scopelliti; G. Laurenczy; M. Beller, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 9777-9780.
- 9 Y. M. Badiei; W. H. Wang; J. F. Hull; D. J. Szalda; J. T. Muckerman; Y. Himeda; E. Fujita, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, 52, 12576-12586.
- 10 (a) S. Moret; P. J. Dyson; G. Laurenczy, *Nat. Commun.*, 2014,
 5, 4017; (b) S. Ogo; R. Kabe; H. Hayashi; R. Harada; S. Fukuzumi, *Dalton Trans.*, 2006, 4657-4663; (c) S. M. Lu; Z. J. Wang; J. Li; J. L. Xiao; C. Li, *Green Chem.*, 2016, 18, 4553-4558.
- (a) F. Joó; G. Laurenczy; P. Karády; J. Elek; L. Nádasdi; R. Roulet, *Appl. Orgmet. Chem.*, 2000, **14**, 857-859; (b) G. Zhao; F. Joó, *Catal. Commun.*, 2011, **14**, 74-76; (c) D. Jantke; L. Pardatscher; M. Drees; M. Cokoja; W. A. Herrmann; F. E. Kuhn, *Chemsuschem*, 2016, **9**, 2849-2854.
- (a) F. Joó; L. Nádasdi; J. Elek; G. Laurenczy, *Chem. Commun.*, 1999, 971-972; (b) H. Horváth; G. Laurenczy; Á. Kathó, *J. Orgmet. Chem.*, 2004, **689**, 1036-1045; (c) S. S. Bosquain; A. Dorcier; P. J. Dyson; M. Erlandsson; L. Gonsalvi; G. Laurenczy; M. Peruzzini, *Appl. Orgmet. Chem.*, 2007, **21**, 947-951; (d) G. Laurenczy; F. Joó; L. Nádasdi, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2000, **39**, 5083-5088.
- 13 M. Erlandsson; V. R. Landaeta; L. Gonsalvi; M. Peruzzini; A. D. Phillips; P. J. Dyson; G. Laurenczy, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, 2008, 620-627.
- 14 C. Federsel; A. Boddien; R. Jackstell; R. Jennerjahn; P. J. Dyson; R. Scopelliti; G. Laurenczy; M. Beller, Angewandte Chemie-International Edition, 2010, 49, 9777-9780.
- 15 G. Kovacs; G. Schubert; F. Joo; I. Papai, *Catal. Today*, 2006, **115**, 53-60.
- 16 (a) A. Azua; S. Sanz; E. Peris, *Chemistry*, 2011, **17**, 3963-3967;
 (b) S. Sanz; A. Azua; E. Peris, *Dalton Trans.*, 2010, **39**, 6339-6343;
 (c) S. Sergio; B. t. Miriam; P. Eduardo, *Organometallics*, 2010, **29**, 275–277.
- 17 M. Pagliaro; R. Ciriminna; H. Kimura; M. Rossi; C. Della Pina, Angew Chem Int Edit, 2007, 46, 4434-4440.
- 18 (a) J. Su; L. S. Yang; X. K. Yang; M. Lu; B. Luo; H. F. Lin, ACS Sust. Chem. Eng., 2015, 3, 195-203; (b) A. Dibenedetto; P. Stufano; F. Nocito; M. Aresta, ChemSusChem, 2011, 4, 1311-1315; (c) A. Azua; J. A. Mata; E. Peris, Organometallics, 2011, 30, 5532-5536.
- (a) L. S. Sharninghausen; J. Campos; M. G. Manas; R. H. Crabtree, Nat. Commun., 2014, 5; (b) Z. Y. Lu; I. Demianets; R. Hamze; N. J. Terrile; T. J. Williams, ACS Catal., 2016, 6, 2014-2017; (c) Y. Li; M. Nielsen; B. Li; P. H. Dixneuf; H. Junge; M. Beller, Green Chemistry, 2015, 17, 193-198; (d) L. S. Sharninghausen; B. Q. Mercado; R. H. Crabtree; N. Hazari, Chemical Commun., 2015, 51, 16201-16204.(e) A. Azua; M. Finn; H. Yi; A. Beatriz Dantas; A. Voutchkova-Kostal, ACS Sust. Chem. Eng., 2017, 5, 3963-3972.
- 20 M. Finn; J. A. Ridenour; J. Heltzel; C. Cahill; A. Voutchkova-Kostal, Organometallics, 2018, DOI: 10.1021/acs.organomet. 8b00081.
- 21 D. Jantke; M. Cokoja; A. Pothig; W. A. Herrmann; F. E. Kuhn, Organometallics, 2013, **32**, 741-744.
- 22 M. J. O'Neil, The Merck Index: An Encyclopedia of Chemicals, Drugs, and Biologicals. 14th ed.; Rahway, New Jersey:, 2006.
- 23 Y. Y. Ohnishi; T. Matsunaga; Y. Nakao; H. Sato; S. Sakaki, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, **127**, 4021-4032.

ChemComm Accepted Manuscript

