Supporting information

Simple and Robust AgI/KOAc Catalytic System for the Carboxylative Assembly of Propargyl Alcohols and Carbon Dioxide at Atmospheric Pressure

Ye Yuan,^{a,b} Yu Xie,^a Cheng Zeng,^b Dandan Song,^b Somboon Chaemchuen,^a Cheng Chen,^{*,a} Francis Verpoort^{*,a,b,c,d}

^a State Key Laboratory of Advanced Technology for Materials Synthesis and Processing, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, PR China.

^{b.} School of Materials Science and Engineering, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, PR China

^c National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Lenin Avenue 30, Tomsk 634050, Russian Federation.

^{d.} Ghent University Global Campus, Songdo, 119 Songdomunhwa-Ro, Yeonsu-Gu, Incheon, Korea

E-mails: francis.verpoort@ghent.ac.kr

This file includes:

- 1. General information
- 2. Experimental section
- 3. Further investigations about the reaction conditions
- 4. Characterization of products

1. General information

Unless otherwise noted, all the compounds involved were commercially purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, Aladdin, TCI, Alfa, Macklin in China and used without further dryness and purification. The purity of CO₂ used for purging and reacting was 99.999%.

NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker 500 MHz NMR (¹H NMR, 500 MHz; ¹³C NMR, 126 MHz) spectrometer. Their peak frequencies were referenced versus an internal standard (TMS) shifts at 0 ppm for ¹H NMR and against the solvent (CDCl₃, 77.0 ppm; DMSO- d_6 , 39.9 ppm) for ¹³C NMR, respectively. Multiplicity abbreviations: s = singlet, d = doublet, t = triplet, q = quartet, m = multiplet. The coupling constants, *J*, were reported in Hertz (Hz).

2. Experimental section

General procedures of the carboxylative cyclization of propargyl alcohols with CO_2 to access the α -alkylidene cyclic carbonates:

Agl (11.7 mg, 0.05 mmol), KOAc (4.9 mg, 0.05 mmol), a propargyl alcohol (5 mmol) and DMF (10 mL) were added to a Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The system was quickly purged 3 times with CO_2 . Then the mixture was stirred at 45°C, 1 bar of CO_2 for the required time. Upon completion, the mixture was diluted with 20 mL deionized water and extracted with diethyl ether (3 × 30 mL). The organic layers were combined and dried over MgSO₄. Then the solvent was removed and the crude product was purified by column chromatography on silica gel using petroleum ether/ethyl acetate (100:1-20:1) as an eluent to give the desired product. Other conditions employing Agl/KOAc system in Table 2 followed the same procedures and the amounts of Agl, KOAc, substrate and DMF were tuned according to the footnotes in Table 2.

Investigation experiments about the activation state

Substrate **1a**, and the mixture of **1a**/AgI, **1a**/KOAc, **1a**/AgI/KOAc were added into 5 ml of DMSO- d_6 according to the amounts below. These systems were allowed to stir at 45°C without CO₂ and monitored by NMR.

- 1a system: 1a = 1 mmol
- 1a/Agl system: 1a = 1 mmol, Agl = 1 mmol.

1a/KOAc system: 1a = 1 mmol, KOAc = 1 mmol.

1a/AgI/KOAc system: 1a = 1 mmol, AgI = 1 mmol, KOAc = 1 mmol.

3. Further Investigation about the reaction conditions.

Further optimization of the reaction conditions of the Agl/KOAc-catalyzed carboxylative cyclization protocol were performed and the results were depicted in Table S1, Obviously, the Agl/KOAc system exhibited excellent activity in high-polar aprotic solvents of DMF and DMSO under identical conditions (entries 1, 2). Nevertheless, a detectable but much lower yield was obtained when the catalytic reaction was performed in acetonitrile (CH₃CN) (entry 3). In relatively low-polar solvents, such as toluene, THF and CH₂Cl₂, the Agl/KOAc system was ineffective for the carboxylative cyclization

(entries 4-6). This tendency implied that the Agl/KOAc system required a high-polar circumstance to interact with the substrates. On the other hand, CH₃OH was proved to be not suitable for this reaction probably due to the hydroxyl groups of the solvent which seriously interfered with the activation of the hydroxyl groups of the substrates (entry 7). Furthermore, the Agl/KOAc system couldn't catalyze this reaction under neat conditions (entry 8). Gratifyingly, when decreasing the temperature to 45°C, the CO₂ pressure to 1 bar and the Ag loading to 1 mol%, the Agl/KOAc system still exhibited excellent activity (entry 9). The yield would slightly decrease when the amounts of both Agl and KOAc were reduced to 0.5 mol% (entry 10). However, employment of a higher amount of the economical KOAc would make this Agl/KOAc system continue to exhibit excellent activity even when the Ag loading was largely decreased to 0.05 mol% (entry 11). Furthermore, the yield would also decrease obviously if the temperature was tuned to room temperature (entry 12), implying that slight heating was essential. Consequently, conditions of entry 9 and entry 11 were selected as the optimal reaction conditions for further screening of the substrates.

 $= \underbrace{OH}_{+} + CO_2 \xrightarrow{Cat./Co-Cat.} \underbrace{O}_{+} \underbrace{$

Entry	Catalyst	Co-catalyst	Solvent	Т	P(CO ₂)	[Ag]	Yield ^e
1 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	DMF	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	>99%
2 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	DMSO	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	97%
3 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	CH₃CN	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	11%
4 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	Toluene	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	0
5 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	THF	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	0
6 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	CH_2Cl_2	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	0
7 ^a	Agl	KOAc	CH₃OH	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	0
8 ^{<i>a</i>}	Agl	KOAc	/.	65°C	2 bar	2 mol%	2%
9 ^b	Agl	KOAc	DMF	45°C	1 bar	1 mol%	>99%
10 ^c	Agl	KOAc	DMF	45°C	1 bar	0.5 mol%	83%
11 ^{<i>d</i>}	Agl	KOAc	DMF	45°C	1 bar	0.05 mol%	>99%
12 ^b	Agl	KOAc	DMF	rt	1 bar	1 mol%	42%

Table S1. Further screening of the reaction conditions ^{a-d}

^a 0.1 mmol of AgI, 0.1 mmol of KOAc, 5 mmol of 2-methylbut-3-yn-2-ol, 10 mL of solvent, 12 h.

^b 0.05 mmol of AgI, 0.05 mmol of KOAc, 5 mmol of 2-methylbut-3-yn-2-ol, 10 mL of DMF, 12 h.

^c 0.025 mmol of AgI, 0.025 mmol of KOAc, 5 mmol of 2-methylbut-3-yn-2-ol, 10 mL of DMF, 12 h.

^d 0.01 mmol of AgI, 20 mmol of KOAc, 20 mmol of 2-methylbut-3-yn-2-ol, 40 mL of DMF, 12 h.

^e Yields were determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy using 1, 1, 2, 2-tetrachloroethane as the internal standard.

4. Characterization of Products



2a

4, 4-Dimethyl-5-methylene-[1,3]dioxolan-2-one (2a)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.77 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 4.33 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 1.62 (s, 6H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 158.74, 151.27, 85.30, 84.65, 27.56. The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.¹



4-Ethyl-4-methyl-5-methylene-[1,3]dioxolan-2-one (2b)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.83 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 4.28 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 1.93 (dq, J = 14.6 Hz, 7.4 Hz, 1H), 1.78 (dq, J = 14.7 Hz, 7.4 Hz, 1H), 1.60 (s, 3H), 1.01 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 157.48, 151.53, 87.56, 85.53, 33.40, 25.95, 7.32. The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.¹



4, 4-Diethyl-5-methylene-[1, 3] dioxolan-2-one (2c)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.88 (d, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 4.24 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 1.95 (dq, J = 14.6 Hz, 7.3 Hz, 2H), 1.72 (dt, J = 14.8 Hz, 7.4 Hz, 2H), 0.99 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 6H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 155.83, 151.85, 90.83, 85.78, 31.90, 7.10. The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.¹



4-Isobutyl-4-methyl-5-methylene-[1, 3] dioxolan-2-one (2d)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.81 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 4.29 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 1.90 – 1.80 (m, 2H), 1.70 – 1.66 (m, 1H), 1.60 (s, 3H), 1.00 – 0.98 (m, 6H).

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 158.37, 151.45, 87.30, 85.54, 48.57, 27.02, 24.29, 23.98, 23.68. The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.¹



4-Methylene-1, 3-dioxa-spiro [4.4] nonan-2-one (2e)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.81 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 4.36 (d, J = 3.9 Hz, 1H), 2.28 – 2.23 (m, 2H), 1.98 – 1.83 (m, 6H).

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 157.79, 151.46, 94.21, 85.31, 40.65, 24.25.

The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.²



4-Methylene-1, 3-dioxa-spiro [4.5] decan-2-one (2f)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.78 (d, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 4.30 (d, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 2.04 – 2.02 (m, 2H), 1.79 – 1.59 (m, 7H), 1.38 – 1.28 (m, 1H).

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 158.79, 151.48, 86.38, 85.46, 36.53, 24.37, 21.62.

The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.¹



4-Methyl-5-methylene-4-phenyl-1, 3-dioxolan-2-one (2g)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.51 – 7.50 (m, 2H), 7.47 – 7.40 (m, 3H), 4.98 (d, *J* = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 4.49 (d, *J* = 4.0 Hz, 1H). 2.00 (s, 3H)

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 157.49, 151.16, 139.30, 129.19, 128.93, 124.70, 88.16, 87.16, 27.47 The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.²



4-Isopropyl-4-methyl-5-methylene-1, 3-dioxolan-2-one (2h)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 4.84 (d, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 4.28 (d, J = 3.8 Hz, 1H), 1.99-1.93 (m, 1H), 1.59 (s, 3H), 1.03 (dd, J = 13.4 Hz, 13.4 Hz, 6H).

 ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 157.14, 151.71, 89.82, 86.21, 36.99, 24.04, 16.34, 16.04.

The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.²





4, 4-Dimethyl-5-(phenylmethylene)-1, 3-dioxolan-2-one (2i)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 7.58-7.56 (m, 2H), 7.40-7.37 (m, 2H), 7.30-7.27 (m, 1H), 5.53 (s, 1H), 1.72 (s, 6H).

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃) δ = 151.31, 150.76, 132.42, 128.67, 128.47, 127.63, 101.59, 85.54, 27.76. The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.²



4-methyl-5-methylene-1,3-dioxolan-2-one (2j)

¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 5.30-5.26 (m, 1H), 4.86-4.84 (m, 1H), 4.38-4.37 (m, 1H), 1.60-1.59 (m, 3H).

¹³C NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 154.63, 151.93, 86.58, 76.24, 20.45.

The spectroscopic data matched those reported in the literature.³













¹³C NMR



S12









¹³C NMR





¹³C NMR











¹³C NMR

 $< 4.839 \\ 4.832$ $\swarrow^{4.288}_{4.280}$ $\begin{array}{c} 1.985 \\ 1.971 \\ 1.957 \\ 1.957 \\ 1.944 \\ 1.930 \\ 1.588 \end{array}$ -7.284 $\overbrace{1.054}^{1.054} 1.041 1.027 1.014$ 0 C 1 2h -----· · · Т Т Т Т 7.5 7.0 6.5 6.0 5.5 5.0 4.5 4.0 3.5 3.0 2.5 2.0 1.5 1.0 ppm 1.00 1.00 3.01 6.11 1.00



¹³C NMR





¹³C NMR



S26



¹H NMR



S28

References

- 1. J. Hu, J. Ma, Q. Zhu, Q. Qian, H. Han, Q. Mei and B. Han, *Green Chem.*, 2016, **18**, 382-385.
- 2. Q. W. Song, W. Q. Chen, R. Ma, A. Yu, Q. Y. Li, Y. Chang and L. N. He, *ChemSusChem*, 2015, **8**, 821-827.
- 3. A. Buzas and F. Gagosz, *Organic Letters*, 2006, **8**, 515-518.