Supporting Information

An Ultrastable Zirconium-phosphonate Framework as Bifunctional

Catalyst for Highly Active CO₂ Chemical Transformation

Chao-Ying Gao,^{ab‡} Jing Ai,^{bc‡} Hong-Rui Tian,^b Dai Wu,^b Zhong-Ming Sun^{*b}

^a College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Inner Mongolia University for the Nationalities, Tongliao 02800, PR China.

^b State Key Laboratory of Rare Earth Resource Utilization, Changchun Institute of Applied Chemistry, Chinese

Academy of Sciences, 5625 Renmin Street, Changchun, Jilin 130022, China

^c University of Science and Technology of China

[‡] These authors contributed equally

*Corresponding Authors. E-mail: szm@ciac.ac.cn

Supplementary Index

Contents

- S1. Materials and Methods
- S2. Supplementary tables and figures
- S3. The NMR spectrums
- S4. References

S1. Materials and Methods

1.1 General information

Materials and Instrument All commercial chemicals were used without further purification except for organo-phosphonate ligand H_8L , which was synthesized by a modified procedure documented previously.¹

Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) was carried out with a MiniFlex 600 X-ray powder diffractometer equipped with a Cu sealed tube (λ = 1.541 78 Å) at 40 kV and 40 mA. Elemental analyses for C, H, and N were performed by a VarioEL analyzer. Thermal gravimetric analysis (TGA) was conducted under an air atmosphere with a heating rate of 10 °C/min on a SDT 2960 Simultaneous DSC-TGA of TA instruments up to 800 °C. The infrared (IR) spectra (diamond) were recorded on a Nicolet 7600 FT-IR spectrometer within the 4000-500 cm⁻¹ region. ¹H NMR spectra were carried out in CDCl₃ solvent on a Bruker 400 MHz spectrometer. The chemical shift is given in dimensionless δ values and is referenced relative to TMS in ¹H spectroscopy.

1.2 Synthesis of compound Zr(H₄L)

ZrOCl₂·8H₂O (0.2 mmol, 64 mg) and H₈L (0.2 mmol, 131 mg) were dissolved in a mixed distilled water (3 ml)-methanol (1 ml) in the presence of HF (200 μ L) as a mineralizer. The mixture was heated at 180 °C oven for 3 days. After the autoclave was cooled to room temperature, light-yellow block-shaped single crystals suitable for single-crystal X-ray crystallographic analysis were obtained. Then, the mother liquor was decanted, and the resulting crystals were dried at room temperature overnight. Yield: 96 mg (65 % based on Zr^{IV}). Phase purity was confirmed by PXRD analysis (Figure S2). FTIR (cm⁻¹): 1611 (w), 1582 (w), 1514 (vs), 1419 (s), 1364 (s), 1257 (m), 1172 (m), 1102(w), 1061 (vs), 872 (w), 855 (m), 764 (w), 717 (w), 639 (w). Elemental analysis calca (%) for ZrSiC₂₄P₄O₁₂H₂₀ (Mr = 743.6): C, 38.76; H, 2.71. Found: C, 38.88; H, 2.62.

1.3 Single-Crystal X-ray Crystallography

Single-crystal X-ray diffraction (SXRD) data of compound $Zr(H_4L)$ were collected on a Bruker diffractometer using Cu Ka radiation ($\lambda = 1.54178$ Å) at 293 K. Data processing was accomplished with the SAINT processing program.² The structure was solved by the direct methods and refined by full-matrix least-squares fitting on F^2 using the SHELXTL crystallographic software package.³ Non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters during the final cycles. All hydrogen atoms of the organic molecule were placed by geometrical considerations and were added to the structure factor calculation. The final formula of $Zr(H_4L)$ was determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction.

Crystallographic data for Zr(H₄L) (1502488) has been deposited with Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre. Data can be obtained free of charge upon request at www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif. Crystal data and structure refinement is summarized in Table S1.

1.4 Stability Test

Several batches of about 10 mg of freshly synthesized samples were added into vials containing 4 mL of HCl solutions (2 M, 4 M, 6 M, 8 M, 10 M and concentrated HCl), aqueous solutions (pH = 1-12), pure water, aqua regia and various organic solvents (propanol, isopropanol, ethanol, methanol, acetone, tetrachloromethane, trichloromethane, dichloromethane, n-hexane, acetonitrile, DMF and DMA), respectively. After immersion in those solutions for given times (1, 3, 5 and 7 days) at room temperature or at 100 °C, $Zr(H_4L)$ samples were centrifuged and then dried naturally.

1.5 Catalysis

Typically, Zr(H₄L) (0.01 mmol, 7.4 mg), tetrabutylammonium bromide (TBAB) (0.3 mmol, 90 mg), and epoxides (30 mmol, 2775 mg for epichlorohydrin, 4100 mg for epibromohydrin, 3600 mg for styrene oxide, 4500 mg for 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane) were added to a 10 mL autoclave reactor. The loading of the catalyst is a 0.33 % ratio based on the epoxide. The reactor was pressurized to 1 MPa with CO₂ under a constant pressure for 10 min to equilibrate the system. When the pressure of CO₂ decreased to 0.5 MPa, the reactor was pressurized to 1 MPa again. After given reaction time, the reactor was put into ice bath for 30 min and depressurized. A small aliquot of the supernatant reaction mixtures was dissolved in 0.8 mL of CDCl₃. The obtained solution was filtered through a syringe filter (PTFE) to be analyzed by ¹H NMR for calculating the conversion of the epoxide. For the recycle experiment, the catalyst was separated by centrifugation for the next cycle, and the supernatant was collected.

1.6 Cycloaddition of CO₂ to epoxides

The conversion was calculated from ¹H NMR according to the following equation.



S2 Supplementary tables and figures

compound	1		
Formula	$ZrSiC_{24}P_4O_{12}H_{20}$		
Fw	743.61		
Crystal system	monoclinic		
Space group	P2 ₁ /c		
a, Å	9.9688(2)		
b <i>,</i> Å	19.2157(4)		
c, Å	14.5392(3)		
β, °	99.702(2)		
V, Å ³	2745.26(11)		
Z	4		
D _c , mg/mm ³	1.799		
μ , mm ⁻¹	6.500		
reflection collected	5132		
GOF on F ²	1.054		
R_1/wR_2 (I > 2 σ (I))	0.0489/ 0.1369		
R_1/wR_2 (all data)	0.0612/ 0.1514		

 Table S1 Crystallographic data for compound Zr(H₄L).



Figure S1 ORTEP representation of the coordination environment in $Zr(H_4L)$ with thermal ellipsoids set at 50% probability. The asymmetric codes: A, -x, 0.5+y, 0.5-z; B, -1+x, 1.5-y, -0.5+z; C, 1-x, 0.5+y, 1.5-z; D, x, 1.5-y, 0.5+z; E, -1+x, y, z; F, 1+x, y, z; G, 1-x, -0.5+y, 1.5-z; H, 1+x, 1.5-y, 0.5+z; I, x, 1.5-y, 0.5+z; J, 1-x, -0.5+y, 0.5-z. Hydrogen atoms bonded to carbon atoms are omitted for clarity.



Figure S2 PXRD patterns of $Zr(H_4L)$ upon the treatment with various organic solvents.



Figure S3 PXRD patterns of Zr(H₄L) upon the treatment using aqueous solution with a wide range of pH values (1 - 12).



Figure S4 PXRD patterns of Zr(H₄L) upon the treatment with water.



Figure S5 PXRD patterns of Zr(H₄L) upon the treatment with boiling water.



Figure S6 PXRD patterns of $Zr(H_4L)$ after the treatment of HCl solution with different concentrations as well as aqua regia.



Figure S7 PXRD patterns of $Zr(H_4L)$ upon the treatment with concentrated HNO₃ solution at 100 °C.



Figure S8 PXRD patterns of $Zr(H_4L)$ upon the treatment with NaOH solution (pH = 12) at 100 °C.



Figure S9 Thermogravimetric analysis data for Zr(H₄L).

MOFs	DFs Metals Ligands Stable		Stable conditions	Ref.
PCN-57	Zr	2',3',5',6'- tetramethylterphenyl-4,4''-	pH = 2-11 solutions for 2 days	4
PCN-222	Zr	dicarboxviic acid tetrakis (4-carboxyphenyl) porphyrin	Concentrate HCl or boiling H ₂ O for 24h	5
PCN-223	Zr	tetrakis (4-carboxyphenyl) porphyrin	pH = 0-10 solutions for 24h	6
PCN-224	Zr	tetrakis (4-carboxyphenyl) porphyrin	pH = 0-11 solutions for 24h	7
PCN-225	Zr	tetrakis (4-carboxyphenyl) porphyrin	Boiling water or pH = 1-11 solutions for 12h	8
PCN-777	Zr	4,4',4''-s-triazine-2,4,6- triyl- tribenzoic acid	pH = 3-11 solutions for 12h	9
UiO-66-(CH ₃) ₂	Zr	2,5-dimethylterephthalic acid	pH = 1-14 solutions for 2h	10
Zr-DTDC	Zr	3,4-Dimethylthieno[2,3-b] thiophene-2,5- dicarboxylicacid	Boiling water or aqueous solutions over a wide pH range (from 8 M HCl to pH of 12) for 1 day; pH = 0- 11 solutions or boiling water for 7 days	11
BUT-12	Zr	5'-(4-carboxyphenyl)-2',4',6'- trimethyl-[1,1':3',1''- terphenyl]-4,4''-dicarboxylic	Boling water for 7 days; concentrated HCl for 24 h; NaOH solution for 24 h	12
BUT-13	Zr	6,6',6''- (2,4,6- trimethylbenzene-1,3,5- triyl)tris(2-naphthoic acid)	The same to BUT-12	12
DUT-67	Zr	2,5-Thiophenedicarboxylic	Concentrated HCl for 3 days.	13
DUT-68	Zr	2,5-Thiophenedicarboxylic	Concentrated HCl for 3 days.	13
Zr(H ₄ L)	Zr	tetraphenylsilane tetrakis-4- phosphonic acid	Concentrated HNO ₃ at 100 °C for 7 d; pH = 12 aqueous solution at 100 °C for 7 d; aqua regia for 24h	This work
Ni ₃ (BTP) ₂	Ni	1,3,5-tris(1H-pyrazol-4- yl)benzene	Boiling aqueous solutions of pH = 2-14 for 2 weeks.	14
PCN-601	Ni	5,10,15,20-tetra(1H-pyrazol- 4-yl)-porphyrin	saturated NaOH at 100 °C for 24 h	15
PCN-250(Fe ₂ Co)	Fe; Co	3,3',5,5'- Azobenzenetetracarboxylic	pH = 1-11 solutions for 24h.	16
ZIF-8	Zn	2-methylimidazole	8 M NaOH at 100 °C for	17
PCN-600	Fe	tetrakis (4-carboxyphenyl) porphyrin	pH = 2-11 solutions for 24h.	18
LaBTB	La	1,3,5-tris (4-carboxyphenyl) benzene	pH = 2 solution (60 °C) or pH = 14 solution (60 °C or 100 °C) for 3 days.	19
Eu ₂ (D-cam)(Himdc) ₂	Eu	D-camphoric acid; 4,5- imidazole dicarboxylic	pH = 2-13 solutions for 2 weeks.	20
Cd₃(L)(bipy)₂	Cd	hexa[4-(carboxyphenyl) oxamethyl]-3-oxapentane	pH = 2-13 solutions for 24h; water for 7 days.	21

 Table S2 Comparison of chemical stability conditions of selected stable MOFs.

Table S3 Control experiments of cycloaddition of CO_2 and styrene oxide as the model reaction. Reaction conditions: styrene oxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol), and TBAB (0.3 mmol). The yields were determined by ¹H NMR analysis. The optimal reaction was determined to be at 373 K and 1 MPa.

$\begin{array}{c} O \\ \hline \\$										
Entry	Catalyst	Co-catalyst	т (К)	P (MPa)	Time (h)	Yield (%)				
1	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	298	0.1	12	4				
2	$Zr(H_4L)$	TBAB	298	0.1	24	7				
3	$Zr(H_4L)$	TBAB	298	0.1	48	8.7				
4	$Zr(H_4L)$	TBAB	323	1	12	7				
5	$Zr(H_4L)$	TBAB	373	1	6	51				
6	$Zr(H_4L)$	TBAB	373	1	12	95				
7	Zr(H ₄ L)		373	1	12	0				

Table S4 Zr(H₄L)-catalyzed coupling of epoxides with CO₂. Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K. The conversion was determined by ¹H NMR analysis.

$$R \xrightarrow{O} CO_2, TBAB \xrightarrow{O} O$$
catalyst, T, P

Entry	Substrates	Time (h)	Conversion (%)	TON	TOF (h ⁻¹)	
1	OCI	2	91	2730	1365	
2	Br	2	97	2910	1455	
	3		2	64	1830	915
3		4	86	2580	645	
	Ť	6	>99	3000	500	
		6	51.2	1536	256	
4		12	95.2	2856	238	

Table S5 Comparison with diffe	ent MOF catalysts in the cycloadd	lition reaction of CO ₂ and epichlorohydrin.
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

0	CO ₂	000
	catalvst. T. P	

		Catalyst, 1	, F	∖CI			
Catalyst	Loading of catalyst (‰)	Т (К)	P (MPa)	T (h)	TON	TOF (h ⁻¹)	Ref.
Gea-MOF-1	1.5	393	2.0	6	593	99	22
CHB (M)	16.1	393	1.2	6	44.6	7	23
Ni(salphen)-MOF	2.8	353	2.0	4	300	75	24
MOF-5	6.5	323	0.1	12	22.3	2	25
[Cu4(L1)]n	20	298	0.1	48	425	9	26
Zr(H ₄ L)	0.33	373	1.0	2	2730	1365	This work

Table S6 Comparison with the only MOF catalyst reported in the cycloaddition reaction of CO_2 and epibromohydrin. *: the values were obtained through recalculation on the basis of the corresponding calculation formulas.

Catalyst	Loading of catalyst (‰)	Т (К)	P (MPa)	T (h)	TON	TOF (h⁻¹)	Ref.
$[Cu_4(L_1)]_n$	20	298	0.1	48	440*	9*	26
HKUST-1	20	298	0.1	48	285*	6*	26
Zr(H₄L)	0.33	373	1.0	2	2910	1455	This work

Table S7 Comparison with different MOF catalysts reported in the cycloaddition reaction of CO2 and 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane.

$\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ $									
Loading of catalyst (‰)	т (К)	P (MPa)	T (h)	TON	TOF (h ⁻¹)	Ref.			
0.5	373	1.0	12	2000	167	27			
2.8	353	2.0	4	196.4	49	24			
16.1	393	1.2	6	44	7	23			
6.5	323	0.1	3	13.4	5	25			
0.33	373	1.0	6	3000	500	This work			
	Loading of catalyst (‰) 0.5 2.8 16.1 6.5 0.33	CO2 CO2 catalyst, T, Loading of catalyst (%) T (K) 0.5 373 2.8 353 16.1 393 6.5 323 0.33 373		Loading of catalyst (%)T (K)P (MPa)T (h)0.53731.0122.83532.0416.13931.266.53230.130.333731.06					

Table S8 Comparison with the different MOF catalysts reported in the cycloaddition reaction of CO_2 and styrene oxide. N.A.: Not Available. The article does not list the data.

Catalyst	Loading of catalyst (‰)	т (к)	P (MPa)	T (h)	TON	TOF (h ⁻¹⁾	Ref.
Ni-TCPE-1	0.5	373	1.0	12	2000	167	27
Ni-TCPE-2	0.5	373	1.0	12	1720	143	27
Gea-MOF-1	1.5	393	2.0	6	567	95	22
Ni(salphen)-MOF	2.8	353	2.0	4	289	72	24
L _{Cu'}	N.A.	393	2.0	6	286	48	28
Co-MOF-74	33.3	373	2.0	4	29	7	29
CHB(M)	16.1	393	1.2	6	35	6	23
Mg-MOF-74	33.3	373	2.0	4	29	7	30
Cr-MIL-101	12.5	298	0.8	48	178	4	31
MOF-5	6.5	323	0.1	15	22	2	25
Hf-NU-1000	40	298	0.1	56	25	0.4	32
Zr(H ₄ L)	0.33	373	1.0	12	2850	238	This work

Table S9 Comparison analysis on catalytic activity of different catalysts. Reaction condition in this work: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K. The conversion was determined by ¹H NMR analysis. a, after 20 times of repeating catalytic reaction for 70 h; b, after 5 runs of repeated catalytic reaction for 50 h.

Entry	Substrates	Catalyst (mmol)	P (MPa)	т (к)	t (h)	Conversion (%)
1		ТВАВ (0.3)	1	373	6	50
2	C ^A	H ₈ L/TABA (0.01/0.3)	1	373	6	63
3		Zr(H₄L)/TBAB (0.01/0.3)	1	373	6	95

Table S10 The time-control experiments conducted in coupling of CO_2 with a large excess of epichlorohydrin. Reaction condition: epichlorohydrin (120 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.0083‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K. The conversion was determined by ¹H NMR analysis.



Entry	Catalyst	Co-catalyst	т (к)	P (MPa)	Time (h)	Yield (%)
1	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	4	70
2	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	6	82
3	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	8	93
4	Zr(H ₄ L)	ТВАВ	373	1	10	>99



Figure S10 The powder X-ray diffraction of simulated, experimental and recovered catalyst $Zr(H_4L)$. Results clearly indicate that the crystal structure of the material remains unaltered through the performed catalytic tests.

Table S11 Recyclability test performed by catalytic CO_2 cycloaddition with excess epichlorohydrin under the optimal conditions. The catalyst $Zr(H_4L)$ was collected by centrifugation after each cycle, and then reused by mixing with fresh epoxide and TBAB. It is worth noting that an unavoidable loss of catalyst would bring an inaccurate decrease of conversion as after several runs, as for as the small quantity of catalyst in the recyclable reactions. Reaction conditions: epichlorohydrin (120 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.0083‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under a constant CO_2 pressure of 1 MPa. The conversion was determined by ¹H NMR analysis.

Run	Catalyst	Co-catalyst	т (К)	P (MPa)	Time (h)	Yield (%)
1 st	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	>99
2 ^{ed}	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	>99
3 rd	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	>99
4 th	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	>99
5 th	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	98
6 th	Zr(H ₄ L)	TBAB	373	1	10	93



Scheme S1 The proposed mechanism for the cycloaddition of CO_2 and epoxide at the solid/liquid interface assisted by bifunctional catalysis from Lewis acid and Brønsted acid (L⁺ = tetra-n-butylammonium).



Figure S11 ¹H NMR spectra of styrene oxide (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.27 – 7.37 (m, 5H, Ar-H), 3.87 (t, J=4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH), 3.16 (q, J=4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.81 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂).



Figure S12 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of styrene oxide and CO₂ catalyzed by TBAB ((400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ =7.28 – 7.39 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 7.18 – 7.25 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 5.60 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH), 4.72 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.27 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.79 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH), 3.07 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂), 2.73 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂). Dosages: epoxide (30 mmol); TBAB (0.3 mmol).



Figure S13 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of styrene oxide and CO₂ under different conditions. (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ =7.28 – 7.39 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 7.18 – 7.25 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 5.60 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH), 4.72 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.27 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.79 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH), 3.07 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂), 2.73 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂). Dosages: epoxide (30 mmol); catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst); TBAB (0.3 mmol).



Figure S14 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of styrene oxide and CO₂ for filtration test (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ =7.28 – 7.39 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 7.18 – 7.25 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 5.60 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH), 4.72 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.27 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.79 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH), 3.07 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂), 2.73 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂). The filtration test was performed from the mixture after 2 hours. After removal of the catalyst, the reaction continued. Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K. The total reaction time is 12 hours.



Figure S15 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of styrene oxide and CO₂ catalyzed by H₈L (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ =7.28 – 7.39 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 7.18 – 7.25 (m, 8H, Ar-H), 5.60 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH), 4.72 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.27 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.79 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH), 3.07 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂), 2.73 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 2.20H, O-CH₂). Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K.



Figure S16 ¹H NMR spectra of epichlorohydrin (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 3.58 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H, Cl-CH₂), 3.23 – 3.27 (m, 1H, O-CH), 2.90 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.70 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂).



Figure S17 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of epichlorohydrin and CO₂ catalyzed by $Zr(H_4L)$ for 2h (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ = 4.88 – 4.93 (m, 1H, COO-CH), 4.53 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.35 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.65 – 3.74 (m, 1H, Cl-CH₂ of product), 3.50–3.52 (m, 0.10H, Cl-CH₂ of epichlorohydrin), 3.16 – 3.20 (m, 1H, O-CH), 2.83 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.63 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂). Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K.



Figure S18 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of epichlorohydrin and CO₂ catalyzed by Zr(H₄L) for 4h (a), 6h (b), 8h (c) and 10h (d). (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ = 4.88 – 4.93 (m, 1H, COO-CH), 4.53 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.35 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.65 – 3.74 (m, 1H, Cl-CH₂ of product), 3.50–3.52 (m, 0.10H, Cl-CH₂ of epichlorohydrin), 3.16 – 3.20 (m, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.83 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.63 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂). Reaction conditions: epoxide (120 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K.



Figure S19 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of epichlorohydrin and CO₂ catalyzed by Zr(H₄L) for the 6th recyclability test (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ = 4.88 – 4.93 (m, 1H, COO-CH), 4.53 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.35 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.65 – 3.74 (m, 1H, Cl-CH₂ of product), 3.50–3.52 (m, 0.10H, Cl-CH₂ of epichlorohydrin), 3.16 – 3.20 (m, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.83 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.63 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂). Dosages: epichlorohydrin (120 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.0083‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol).



Figure S20 ¹H NMR spectra of 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ = 7.18 – 7.23 (m, 2H, Ar-H), 6.84 – 6.91 (m, 3H, Ar-H), 4.14 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, ArO-CH₂), 3.88 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, ArO-CH₂), 3.26 – 3.30 (m, 1H,O-CH), 2.83 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H,O-CH₂), 2.68 (q, J = 4.00 Hz, 1H,O-CH₂).



Figure S21 ¹H NMR of the cycloaddition product of 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane and CO₂ for 2h (a), 4h (b) and 6h (c) (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 7.20 – 7.27 (m, 3.12H, Ar-H), 6.88 – 6.97 (m, 1.47H, Ar-H), 6.83 – 6.87 (m, 2.79H, Ar-H), 4.93 – 4.99 (m, 1H, COO-CH), 4.55 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.47 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.19 – 4.13 (m, 1.46H, 1H - ArO-CH₂ of product and 0.46H - ArO-CH₂ of 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane), 4.07 (dd, J = 8.0 Hz, 4.0 Hz, 1H, ArO-CH₂ of product), 3.90 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 0.46H, ArO-CH₂ of 1,2-epoxy-3-phenoxypropane), 3.28 – 3.31 (m, 0.46H, O-CH), 2.84 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 0.46H, O-CH₂), 2.70 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 0.46H, O-CH₂). Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K.



Figure S22 ¹H NMR spectra of epibromohydrin (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 3.42 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, Br-CH₂), 3.33 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, Br-CH₂), 3.25 – 3.29(m, 1H, O-CH), 2.95 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.67 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂).



Figure S23 ¹H NMR spectra of the cycloaddition product of epibromohydrin and CO₂ catalyzed by $Zr(H_4L)$ for 2h (400 MHz, CDCl₃) : δ = 4.83 – 4.93 (m, 1H, COO-CH), 4.54 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 4.29 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H, COO-CH₂), 3.53(d, J=8.0Hz, 2H, Br-CH₂ of product), 3.30–3.35 (m, 0.09H, Br-CH₂ of epibromohydrin and O-CH), 2.88 (t, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂), 2.61 (q, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H, O-CH₂). Reaction conditions: epoxide (30 mmol), catalyst (0.01 mmol, 0.33‰ based on the catalyst) and TBAB (0.3 mmol) under carbon dioxide (1 MPa) at 373 K.

S4 References

- 1. A. Schütrumpf, E. Kirpi, A. Bulut, F. L. Morel, M. Ranocchiari, E. Lork, Y. Zorlu, S. Grabowsky, G. Yücesan and Beckmann, *J. Cryst. Growth Des.* 2015, **15**, 4925.
- SMART and SAINT software package, Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, WI, 1996.
- (a) O.V. Dolomanov, L.J. Bourhis, R.J. Gildea, J. A. K. Howard and H. Puschmann, *J. Appl. Cryst.* 2009, 42, 339; (b) G. M. Sheldrick, *Acta Cryst. A*, 2008, 64, 112; (c) G. M. Sheldrick, *Acta Cryst. C*, 2015, 71, 3.
- 4. H.-L. Jiang, D. Feng, T.-F. Liu, J.-R. Li and H.-C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2012, 134, 14690.
- D. Feng, Z.-Y. Gu, J.-R. Li, H.-L. Jiang, Z. Wei and H.-C. Zhou, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2012, **51**, 10307.
- D. Feng, Z.-Y. Gu, Y.-P. Chen, J. Park, Z. Wei, Y. Sun, M. Bosch, S. Yuan and H.-C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2014, 136, 17714.
- D. Feng, W.-C. Chung, Z. Wei, Z.-Y. Gu, H.-L. Jiang, Y.-P. Chen, D. J. Darensbourg and H.-C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2013, 135, 17105.
- H.-L. Jiang, D. Feng, K. Wang, Z.-Y. Gu, Z. Wei, Y.-P. Chen and H.-C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2013, 135, 13934.
- D. Feng, K. Wang, J. Su, T.-F. Liu, J. Park, Z. Wei, M. Bosch, A. Yakovenko, X. Zou and H.-C. Zhou, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2015, 54, 149.
- 10. Y. Huang, W. Qin, Z. Li and Y. Li, *Dalton Trans.*, 2012, 41, 9283.
- 11. K. Wang, H. Huang, W. Xue, D. Liu, X. Zhao, Y. Xiao, Z. Li, Q. Yang, L. Wang and C. Zhonga, *CrystEngComm*, 2015, 17, 3586.
- 12. B. Wang, X.-L. Lv, D. Feng, L.-H. Xie, J. Zhang, M. Li, Y. Xie, J.-R. Li and H.-C. Zhou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2016, **138**, 6204.
- 13. V. Bon, I. Senkovska, I. A. Baburin, S. Kaskel, Cryst. Growth. Des., 2013, 13, 1231.
- 14. V. Colombo, S. Galli, H. J. Choi, G. D. Han, A. Maspero, G. Palmisano, N. Masciocchi, J. R. Long, *Chem. Sci.*, 2011, 2, 1311.
- 15. K. Wang, X.-L. Lv, D. Feng, J. Li, S. Chen, J. Sun, L. Song, Y. Xie, J.-R. Li and H.-C. Zhou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2016, **138**, 914.
- D. Feng, K. Wang, Z. Wei, Y.-P. Chen, C. M. Simon, R. K. Arvapally, R. L. Martin, M. Bosch, T.-F. Liu, S. Fordham, D. Yuan, M. A. Omary, M. Haranczyk, B. Smit and H.-C. Zhou, *Nat. Commun.*, 2015, 5, 5723.
- K. S. Park, Z. Ni, A. P. Cote, J. Y. Choi, R. Huang, F. J. Uribe-Romo, H. K. Chae, M. O'Keeffe and O. M. Yaghi, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 2006, 103, 10186.
- 18. K. Wang, D. Feng, T.-F. Liu, J. Su, S. Yuan, Y.-P. Chen, M. Bosch, X. Zou and H.-C. Zhou, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2014, **136**, 13983.
- 19. J. Duan, M. Higuchi, S. Horike, M. L. Foo, K. P. Rao, Y. Inubushi, T. Fukushima and S. Kitagawa, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2013, **23**, 3525.
- 20. Y.-H. Han, C.-B. Tian, Q.-H. Li and S.-W. Du, J. Mater. Chem. C, 2014, 2, 8065.
- 21. F.-Y. Yi, Y. Wang, J.-P. Li, D. Wu, Y.-Q. Lan and Z.-M. Sun, Mater. Horiz., 2015, 2, 245.
- V. Guillerm, Ł. J. Weseliński, Y. Belmabkhout, A. J. Cairns, V. D'Elia, Ł. Wojtas, K. Adil and M. Eddaoudi, *Nature Chem*. 2014, 6, 673.
- 23. A. C. Kathalikkattil, D. W. Kim, J. Tharun, H. G. Soek, R. Roshan and D. W. Park, *Green Chem*. 2014, **16**, 1607.

- 24. Y. W. Ren, Y. C. Shi, J. X. Chen, S. R. Yang, C. R. Qi and H. F. Jiang, RSC Adv. 2013, 3, 2167.
- 25. J. Song, Z. Zhang, S. Hu, T. Wu, T. Jiang and B. Han, *Green Chem.*, 2009, **11**, 1031.
- 26. P.-Z. Li, X.-J. Wang, J. Liu, J.S. Lim, R. Zou and Y. Zhao, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 2142.
- 27. Z. Zhou, C. He, J. Xiu, L. Yang and C. Duan, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 15066.
- 28. D. De, T. K. Pal, S. Neogi, S. Senthilkumar, D. Das, S. S. Gupta and P. K. Bharadwaj, *Chem. Eur. J*. 2016, **22**, 3387.
- 29. H.-Y. Choa, D.-A. Yanga, J. Kima, S.-Y. Jeongb and W.-S. Ahna, *Catalysis Today* 2012, 185, 35.
- 30. D.-A. Yang, H.-Y. Cho, J. Kim, S.-T. Yang and W.-S. Ahn, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2012, 5, 6465.
- O. V. Zalomaeva, A. M. Chibiryaev, K. A. Kovalenko, O. A. Kholdeeva, B. S. Balzhinimaev and V. P. Fedin, *Journal of Catalysis*, 2013, 298, 179.
- 32. M. H. Beyzavi, R. C. Klet, S. Tussupbayev, J. Borycz, N. A. Vermeulen, C. J. Cramer, J. F. Stoddart, J. T. Hupp and O. K. Farha, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2014, **136**, 15861.