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## General Considerations

Reagents and solvents were purchased from Sigma Aldrich Company or TCI chemicals. Solvents were dried and distilled before use. Deuterated solvents were degassed under a nitrogen flow and stored over activated $4 \AA$ molecular sieves. Epoxides were stored on $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$ under inert atmosphere and freshly distilled before use. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker AM 300 spectrometer ( 300 MHz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$; 75 MHz for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ), Bruker AVANCE 400 spectrometer ( 400 MHz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} ; 100 \mathrm{MHz}$ for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ) and Bruker ASCEND 600 spectrometer ( 600 MHz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$; 150 MHz for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ). NMR sample were prepared dissolving about 10 mg of compound in 0.5 mL of deuterated solvent. Measurements of the effective magnetic moments ( $\mu_{\text {eff }}$ ) were performed on a Bruker ASCEND 600 spectrometer in deuterated methylene chloride using a 5 mm Wilmad coaxial NMR tube. The $\mu_{\text {eff }}$ values were calculated from the equation $\mu_{\text {eff }}=8 X_{g} M w T$, where $X_{g}$ $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{3} / \mathrm{g}\right)$ is the corrected molar susceptibility calculated with the equation $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{g}}=3 \Delta \mathrm{f} / 4 \mathrm{mfoCMw}+\mathrm{c}_{0}$ in which $\Delta f$ is the frequency shift $(\mathrm{Hz})$ of the residual ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ signal of the solvent in the complex solution from the value of the pure solvent, C and Mw are the concentration ( $\mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ ) and the molecular weight of the complex ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mol}$ ), respectively, $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ is the operating frequency of the spectrometer $(\mathrm{Hz})$ and $\mathrm{c}_{0}$ is the mass susceptibility of the pure solvent $\left(-0.6179 \cdot 10^{-6} \mathrm{~cm}^{3} / \mathrm{g}\right)$. $4 \pi / 3$ is the shape factor for a cylindrical sample in a superconducting magnet. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ chemical shifts are listed in parts per million (ppm) downfield from TMS and are referenced from the solvent peaks or TMS. Spectra are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity and integration. Multiplicity are abbreviated as follows: singlet (s), doublet (d), triplet ( t , , multiplet ( m ), broad (br), overlapped (o). ESI-MS and MALDI-TOF analysis were performed on a Waters Quattro Micro triple quadrupole mass spectrometer equipped with an electrospray ion source. Infrared spectra were recorded with a Bruker Vertex70 spectrometer. SEC measurements were performed on PolymerLaboratoriesGPC50 equipped with a refraction index detector THF served as the solvent against polystyrene standards. Measurements were performed at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a continuous solvent flow of $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$. Overlapping peaks were analyzed through deconvolution of the chromatogram.

## Synthesis and characterization of $\mathbf{b}$

A round-bottom flask equipped with a condenser and a magnetic stirrer was charged with 32.0 mmol of 2,4-di-tert-butyl-6-mercaptophenol, 32.0 mmol of NaOH and 70 mL of methanol. The mixture was refluxed at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until complete dissolution of the reagents. Then, the system was left at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for about 20 minutes. At this point, 1,2,7,8-diepoxyoctane ( 16.0 mmol ) was added. The reaction mixture was refluxed overnight. The solid produced was dissolved in 300 mL of diethyl ether and extracted with 300 mL of water. The organic phase was dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The product precipitated from petroleum ether as a white solid. Yield $84 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}$ ): $\delta 7.35$ (d, 2H, Ar-H); 7.31 (d, 2H, Ar-H); 7.18 (b s, 2H, Ar-OH); 3.63 (m, 2H, $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); 2.72 (ddd, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{S}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); 2.13 (br s, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 1.49 (o m, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}-$ $\left.\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 1.40\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right.$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})$ ); $1.28\left(\mathrm{~s}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right.$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}\right): \delta 153.3$ (Ar-C-OH); 142.5 (Ar-C-S); 135.7 (Ar-C-tBu); 130.4 (Ar-C-H); 126.1 ((Ar-C-H); 118.5 (Ar-C-tBu); $70.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{OH})-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 44.5\left(\mathrm{~S}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right) ; 35.4$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right) ; 34.5\left(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right) ; 29.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right) ; 25.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$.

Elemental analysis (\%): Found (calcd) C 69.56; H 9,55; O 10.41; S 10,48 (C 69.86; H 9,45; O 10.34; S 10,36 )


Figure S1. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure S2. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure $\mathbf{S 3}$. COSY NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure S4 Enlargement of COSY NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure $\mathbf{S 5}$. HSQC NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure S6. Enlargement of HSQC NMR of $\mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.

## Synthesis and characterization of $\mathbf{c}$

Compound $\mathbf{b}$ ( 8.1 mmol ) was dissolved in 30 mL of dichloromethane and left in a cooling bath ( $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) for 20 minutes. Then, 16.1 mmol of thionyl chloride were added. After 10 min , the reaction mixture was refluxed overnight. The obtained mixture was concentrated, dissolved in 100 mL of diethyl ether and extracted with a solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w})$. The organic phase was dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The product was obtained as a transparent oil after purification via column chromatography (eluent petroleum ether : diethyl acetate 9:1). Yield $53 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{HNMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$ ): $\delta 7.37$ (o m, 4H); 7.08 (o m, 2H); 3.88 (br s, 1 H ), 3.61 (o m, 1 H ); 3.51 (o m, 1H); 2.98 (o m, 3H); 1.93 (o m, 2H); 1.72 (o m, 2H); 1.41 (s, 20H); 1.28 (s, 20H).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right): \delta 153.8 ; 153.2 ; 142.6 ; 142.5 ; 135.6 ; 131.1 ; 130.3 ; 126.7 ; 126.4 ; 117.9$; 116.1; 61.3; 51.7; 47.2; 44.7; 36.7; 35.4; 34.5; 31.7; 31.3; 29.6; 26.2; 25.8.

Elemental analysis (\%): Found (calcd) C 66.10; H 8,45; CI 10.99; O 4.65; S 9.81 (C 65.93; H 8,61; Cl 10.81; O 4.88; S 9.78)


Figure S7. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of $\mathbf{c}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure S8. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR of $\mathbf{c}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.

## Synthesis and characterization of pro-L

A flask equipped with a condenser and magnetic stirrer was charged with 5.13 mmol of 2,4-di-tert-butyl6 -mercaptophenol a, 5.13 mmol of NaOH and 10 mL of methanol. The mixture was refluxed at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until complete dissolution of the reagents. After 20 min at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2.56 \mathrm{mmol}$ of $\mathbf{c}$ were added and the mixture was refluxed overnight. The solid produced was dissolved in 50 mL of diethyl ether and extracted with 50 mL of water. The organic phase was dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated. The product was precipitated as a white solid from methanol. Yield 66\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{HNMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right): \delta 7.30(\mathrm{om}, 8 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.21(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.01$ (br s, 2 H ); 2.78 (br s, 6 H ), 1.57 (o m, 1H); 1.58 (o m, 2H); 1.39 (s, 41H); 1.24 (s, 36H).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right): \delta 154.1 ; 153.3 ; 142.7 ; 142.5 ; 135.5 ; 131.1 ; 130.4 ; 126.6 ; 126.3 ; 118.7$; 116.4; 50.7; 42.3; 35.5; 34.6; 33.2; 31.5; 30.1; 29.6.
$\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}=1097.613\left(\mathrm{MK}^{+}\right)$
Elemental analysis (\%): Found (calcd) C 72.22; H 9,44; O 6.10; S 12.24 (C 72.54; H 9,32; O 6.04; S 12.10)


Figure S9. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of pro-L $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.


Figure S10. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\} \mathrm{NMR}$ of pro-L $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$.

## List of ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ MNR data for the Cyclic Organic Carbonate products

4-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}$ )
4.99-4.82 (m, 1H, ring $\left.\mathrm{CHCH}_{3}\right), 4.53(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHH$), 4.00(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHH ), 1.46 (d, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ).


4-phenyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}$ )
7.45-7.41 (m, 2H, Ar-H), 7.38-7.32 (m, 2H, Ar-H), $5.52(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHPh), $4.64(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{J}=8.36 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CHH}), 4.19(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.37 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CHH})$


## 4-butyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}$ )

4.73-4.64 (m, 1H, ring $\mathrm{CHCH}_{3}$ ), $4.51(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHH ), $4.06(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHH ), 1.85-1.77 (m, 1H, $\mathrm{CHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 1.74-1.67 (m, 1H, CHCH $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 1.53-1.33 (m, 4 H , $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $0.91\left(\mathrm{t}, 3 \mathrm{H},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$


## Allyloxymethyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}$ )

5.84-5.74 (m, 1H, CH=CH2), 5.23 (dd, 1H, (E)-CH=CHH, J = 17.33 Hz, J = 1.4 Hz ), 5.17 (dd, 1H, (Z)-CH=CHH, J = 10.4 Hz, J = 1.4 Hz ), 4.82-4.75 (m. 1H, ring $\mathrm{CHCH}_{2}$ ), 4.47 (t, 1 H , ring $\mathrm{CHCH}_{2}, 8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.35\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ring $\left.\mathrm{CHCH}_{2}, \mathrm{~J}=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, ring $\left.\mathrm{CHCH}_{2}, \mathrm{~J}=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $3.65-3.59\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$.


## 4-chloromethyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$

5.02-4.96 (m, 1 H , ring $\left.\mathrm{CHCH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right), 4.57(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring CHH), $4.40(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{~J}=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ring $\mathrm{CH} H), 3.76\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right)$


4,4'-dimethyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$
4.15 (s, 2H, ring $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}\right), 1.53\left(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$


## Synthesis and characterization of dinuclear complexes $2-\mathrm{Br}$ and $\mathbf{2 - C l}$

Pro-L ( 0.52 mmol ) was dissolved in 20 mL of THF. The solution was added to a suspension of sodium hydride ( 2.62 mmol ) in 10 mL of THF and the mixture was stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. The resulting suspension was filtered through celite and slowly added to 1.02 mmol of the iron precursor (anhydrous iron(III) bromide or chloride) dissolved in 50 mL of THF. The reaction was kept overnight at room temperature. The resulting mixture was filtered through celite and concentrated affording the product as a dark blue crystalline solid. Quantitative yield.
$2-\mathrm{Br}=\left(\mathrm{C}_{64} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{4}\right)\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{Na}\right)^{+}=1347.2998$ calctd, 1347.001 found; $\left(\mathrm{C}_{64} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{4}\right)(\mathrm{M}-$ $\left.\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{K}\right)^{+} 1363.2732$ calctd. 1363.2741 found.

Elemental analysis (\%): Found (calcd) C, 58.44; H, 7.67; Br, 11.01; Fe, 7.38; O, 6.71; S, 8.79 (C, 58.77; H, 7.54; Br, 10.86; Fe, 7.59; O, 6.52; S, 8.72)
$\mathbf{2 - C l}=\left(\mathrm{C}_{64} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{4}\right)\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{Na}\right)^{+}=1259.4008$ calctd, 1259.4054 found; $\left(\mathrm{C}_{64} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{4}\right)(\mathrm{M}-$ $\left.\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{K}\right)^{+} 1275.3748$ calctd. 1275.3803 found.

Elemental analysis (\%): Found (calcd) C, 62.41; H, 8.23; CI, 5.27; Fe, 8.22; O, 6.75; S, 9.12 (C, 62.55; H, 8.02; CI, 5.13; Fe, 8.08; O, 6.94; S, 9.28)


Figure S11. Effective magnetic moment $\mu_{\text {eff }}$ of complex $\mathbf{2}-\mathrm{Br}$ versus temperature.


Figure S12. Effective magnetic moment $\mu_{\text {eff }}$ of complex $\mathbf{2 - C I}$ versus temperature.


Figure S13. Mass Spectrum of complex 2-Br: experimental (up), $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{K}^{+}$calctd (middle), $\mathrm{M}-$ $\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$calctd (bottom).


Figure S14. Mass Spectrum of complex 2-CI: experimental (up), $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{Na}^{+}$calctd (middle), $\mathrm{M}-$ $\mathrm{THF}_{2}+\mathrm{K}^{+}$calctd

## Typical Procedure for the coupling of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ with epoxides

A 60 mL stainless steel autoclave, equipped with a magnetic stirrer, was purged with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. After that, the catalyst and the cocatalyst, dissolved in the epoxide, were added. The reactor was charged with an appropriate pressure of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, heated at the appropriate temperature and stirred. After that, the reactor was cooled with ice, depressurised and mesitylene ( $10 \% \mathrm{~mol}$ with respect to the epoxide) was added as the internal standard. The crude reaction mixture was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy using $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ as solvent.

## Additional experimental data

Table S1. Effect of the nature of the nucleophile source in the presence of complex 2-Br.

| Entry $^{[\mathrm{ab]}}$ | cocat. $^{[b]}$ | Conversion <br> $(\%)^{[d]}$ | $\mathrm{TOF}^{[\mathrm{Cl}}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{h}^{-1}{ }^{[d]}\right.$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | TBAC | - | - |
| 2 | TBAI $^{2}$ | 25 | 500 |
| 3 | TBAN $_{3}$ | - | - |

[a] Reaction conditions: $\mathrm{PO}(0.028 \mathrm{~mol}, 2 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{PCO}_{2}(10 \mathrm{bar})$, temperature $\left(35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, [cocat]/[Fe] (2), loading cat. ( $0.05 \% \mathrm{~mol}$ ), time (1h), neat. [b] Nucleophile sources abbreviated as follows: TBAC (tetrabutylammonium chloride), TBAI (tetrabutylammonium iodide), TBAN $_{3}$ (tetrabutylammonium azide). [c] Determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using mesitylene as the internal standard. Selectivity towards the COC was always $>99 \%$. For selected experiments, consistency of these results was proven by comparing with the PC isolated yields. [d] TOF = mol PO conv. $\cdot\left(\mathrm{mol} 2-\mathrm{Br} \cdot \mathrm{time}^{-1}{ }^{-1}\right.$.

Table S2. Couplings promoted by TBAB/ 2-Br

| Entry ${ }^{\left[{ }^{\text {a }]}\right.}$ | Epoxide ${ }^{[b]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { time } \\ & (h) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Conversion (\%) ${ }^{[c]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{TOF}_{\left(h^{-1}\right)}^{[d]} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | HO | 6 | 51 | 170 |
| 2 | HO | 24 | 80 | 66 |
| 3 | SO | 6 | 38 | 126 |
| 4 | SO | 24 | 80 | 66 |
| 5 | CHO | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | CHO | 6 | 16 | 54 |
| 7 | CHO | 24 | 32 | 26 |
| $8{ }^{\text {[e] }}$ | EPC | 1 | 13 | 65 |
| $9{ }^{\text {[e] }}$ | EPC | 24 | 100 | 21 |
| 10 | EPC | 6 | 50 | 83 |
| 11 [e] | AGE | 6 | 92 | 144 |
| 12 | AGE | 6 | 80 | 266 |
| 13 | AGE | 24 | 82 | 68 |
| 14 [e] | IBO | 1 | 40 | 66 |
| 15 [e] | IBO | 24 | 66 | 28 |
| 16 | 1,2-EPD | 24 | 20 | 66 |

[a] Reaction conditions: epoxide ( $0.028 \mathrm{~mol}, 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ (10 bar), temperature $\left(70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, [cocat]/[Fe] (2), loading cat. ( $0.05 \% \mathrm{~mol}$ ), neat. [b] Epoxides abbreviated as follows: HO (hexene oxide), SO (styrene oxide), CHO (cyclohexene oxide), EPC (epichlorohydrine), AGE (allyl glycidyl ether), IBO (isobutylene oxide), 1,2-EPD (1,2-epoxidodecane). [c] Determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR using mesitylene as the internal standard. [d] TOF $=$ mol epoxide conv. • $(\mathrm{mol} 2-\mathrm{Br} \cdot \text { time })^{-1}$. [e] loading cat. $(0.1 \% \mathrm{~mol})$.

Kinetic experiments for PC formation promoted by TBAB/2-Br

## General procedure for $\mathrm{PO} / \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ coupling with in situ ATR-IR

$T B A B / 2-B r$ were dissolved in a solution of propylene oxide in methylene chloride. The reaction mixture was put in the preheated autoclave and immediately pressurized with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The experiment was stopped when a constant intensity for the signal of the carbonyl oxygen ( $1802 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) was observed (Figure 29-32). Value of initial velocities $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{o}}$ were obtained from the slope of the initial straight line at low conversion of the epoxide.

Determination of the reaction order respect to $2-\mathrm{Br}$
Table S3. Determination of the reaction order respect to $2-\mathrm{Br}$

| Entry | PO/TBAB/2-Br | $[2-\mathrm{Br}]$ <br> $(\mathrm{mM})$ | $\mathrm{V}_{0}$ <br> $(\mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}) \cdot 10^{-4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $250 / 1 / 1$ | 14.3 | 8.1 |
| 2 | $500 / 2 / 1$ | 7.2 | 5.1 |
| 3 | $1000 / 4 / 1$ | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| 4 | $1500 / 6 / 1$ | 2.4 | 1.7 |



Figure S15. Coupling of Table S3 entry 1: Variation of the intensity of the PC C=O stretching band vs time (top), growth trace (bottom). Reaction conditions: [PO] (7.14 M in methylene chloride), $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ (10 bar), loading 2-Br ( $0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); TBAB ( $0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); $\mathrm{T}=50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S16. Coupling of Table S3 entry 2: Variation of the intensity of the PC C=O stretching band vs time (top), growth trace (bottom). Reaction conditions: [PO] ( 7.14 M in methylene chloride), $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ (10 bar), loading 2Br ( $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); TBAB ( $0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); $\mathrm{T}=50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S17. Coupling of Table S3 entry 3: Variation of the intensity of the PC C=O stretching band vs time (top), growth trace (bottom). Reaction conditions: [PO] ( 7.14 M in methylene chloride), $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ (10 bar), loading 2-Br ( $0.05 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); TBAB ( $0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); $\mathrm{T}=50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S18. Coupling of Table S3 entry 3: Variation of the intensity of the PC C=O stretching band vs time (top), growth trace (bottom). Reaction conditions: [PO] (7.14 M in methylene chloride), $\mathrm{PCO}_{2}$ (10 bar), loading 2-Br ( $0.033 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); TBAB ( $0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ); $\mathrm{T}=50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## GPC Analysis



Figure S19. GPC curve from entry 6 of Table 2.


Figure S20. GPC curve from entry 7 of Table 2.


Figure S21. GPC curve from entry 8 of Table 2.

