UC Berkeley UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Polyoxymethylene Upcycling into Methanol and Methyl Groups Catalyzed by a Manganese Pincer Complex.

Permalink https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8gz600ds

Journal Journal of the American Chemical Society, 146(31)

Authors

Lu, Lijun Luo, Jie Montag, Michael <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date

2024-08-07

DOI

10.1021/jacs.4c07468

Peer reviewed



Article

Polyoxymethylene Upcycling into Methanol and Methyl Groups Catalyzed by a Manganese Pincer Complex

Lijun Lu, Jie Luo, Michael Montag, Yael Diskin-Posner, and David Milstein*



ABSTRACT: Polyoxymethylene (POM) is a commonly used engineering thermoplastic, but its recycling by conventional means, i.e., mechanical recycling, is not practiced to any meaningful extent, due to technical limitations. Instead, waste POM is typically incinerated or disposed in landfills, where it becomes a persistent environmental pollutant. An attractive alternative to mechanical recycling is upcycling, namely, the conversion of waste POM into value-added chemicals, but this has received very little attention. Herein, we report the upcycling of POM into useful chemicals through three different reactions, all of which are efficiently catalyzed by a single pincer complex of earth-abundant manganese. One method involves hydrogenation of POM into methanol using H₂ gas as the only reagent, whereas another method converts POM into methanol and CO_2 through a one-pot process comprising acidolysis followed by Mn-catalyzed disproportionation. The third method utilizes POM as a reagent for the methylation of ketones and amines.

■ INTRODUCTION

Plastics are an inseparable part of modern human life, being applied in practically every industrial sector, and used for the manufacture of countless consumer products.¹ However, despite their widely appreciated advantages, plastics are very difficult to degrade and accumulate in the environment as persistent pollutants on a staggering scale, reaching 82 million tonnes (Mt) globally in 2019 alone, according to a recent report.² The environmental impact of plastic production and disposal can be mitigated by recycling, which can reduce our dependence on primary (virgin) plastics and decrease the amount of existing plastic waste. However, the actual rate of recycling is very low, as reflected by the estimate that only 9% of plastic waste was recycled globally in 2019.² One way to overcome this obstacle is to improve and diversify the available recycling processes. At present, almost all recycling is done mechanically, i.e., through grinding and remelting, without chemically altering the primary plastic.³ An alternative approach, which is more technologically challenging, and still far less common, is chemical recycling,^{4,5} whereby waste plastic is broken down chemically through various means, such as catalytic depolymerization.

Catalytic depolymerization converts waste plastic into monomers or oligomers that can be repolymerized into highquality primary plastic, and can do so with high selectivity and well-defined products.⁶ As part of the ongoing efforts to develop catalysts for such chemical recycling, several transition metal complexes of pincer ligands have been previously

examined by our group,^{7,8} as well as others,⁹⁻¹² and shown to promote the hydrogenolysis-based depolymerization of various plastics, namely, polycarbonates, polyesters, polyamides, and polyureas (see Figure 1a for examples). Pincer-type catalysts have also been instrumental in promoting another kind of chemical plastic recycling, beyond depolymerization, which is known as upcycling.¹³ This involves the conversion of low-cost plastic waste into value-added products, like fuels and fine chemicals, and has been the focus of various catalytic studies.^{5,14} For instance, as shown in Figure 1b, Ir-based pincer complexes have been reported to degrade polyethylene (PE) into liquid fuels and waxes,¹⁵ and were also involved in the generation of propylene from PE under ethylene gas.^{16,17} Nonpincer catalysts have also been applied for polymer upcycling, such as the conversion of PE and polypropylene (PP) into fatty acids,¹⁸ or into aldehydes and alcohols.¹

Polyoxymethylene (POM; Figure 1c) is a relatively common engineering thermoplastic,^{20,21} which is manufactured globally on a multimillion ton scale (e.g., ~ 2 Mt in 2020),²² and is used primarily in the automotive and electronics industries.²³ It is also applied in numerous other sectors, and can be found in

 Received:
 June 2, 2024

 Revised:
 June 25, 2024

 Accepted:
 June 26, 2024

 Published:
 July 24, 2024







Figure 1. Recycling and upcycling of plastics using metal complexes as catalysts. (a) Examples of plastic depolymerization catalyzed by pincer complexes. (b) Example of plastic upcycling into value-added chemicals catalyzed by a pincer complex. (c) Example of catalytic POM upcycling into value-added chemicals. (d) Mn-catalyzed upcycling of POM into methanol and other chemicals (this work).

everyday household items, such as buckles, lighters, and knife handles. Although POM is much less prevalent than commodity plastics like PE, polyethylene terephthalate, or PP,²² it poses an environmental concern at both ends of its life cycle. Thus, according to a recent study, the environmental impact of POM manufacturing, in terms of fossil fuel depletion, energy consumption, and climate change potential $(CO_2 \text{ equivalents})$, is higher than that of commodity plastics, when assessed per unit weight of plastic.²⁴ Another recent study indicates that POM waste is a more persistent pollutant than commodity plastics, because of its higher density and slower degradation, and is also more hazardous, since it emits toxic formaldehyde (CH₂O) upon decomposition.²⁵ Therefore, POM recycling is imperative for minimizing its effect on the environment. Nevertheless, although POM is recyclable,^{20,21} in practice it is not commercially recycled to any meaningful extent, due to technical limitations, and is instead incinerated or landfilled,²⁶ inevitably leading to pollution. This problem is likely to be exacerbated in the future, as POM production is expected to grow markedly in the coming years (i.e., by ~5% annually, as recently estimated for 2022- $2028).^{2}$

Mechanical recycling of POM, even if it were widely practiced, is hampered by reprocessing-induced degradation,²⁸ as is often the case for plastic materials. A favorable alternative

is therefore chemical recycling, but this has thus far received relatively little attention. As mentioned above, one approach to such recycling is depolymerization. Previous reports have shown that POM can be converted into CH₂O and its trimer (1,3,5-trioxane) by treatment with strong inorganic or organic Brønsted acids,²⁹ or through a mild process involving *in situ* electrogenerated acid.³⁰ Aside from such depolymerization efforts, POM upcycling into useful chemicals has also been explored. Thus, it was recently demonstrated that POM can be converted into hydrogen-rich syngas in supercritical water,³¹ and into liquid petroleum-like mixtures in supercritical toluene.³² Catalytic POM upcycling has also been examined, but reports thereof are rare. To the best of our knowledge, only three such systems are currently known, two of which employ $Bi(OTf)_3$ as the catalyst – one produces cyclic acetals from POM and diols (Figure 1c),³³ and the other affords various oxygenates from a mixture of POM and either a diol or carboxylic acid.³⁴ The third system involves alumina-catalyzed copyrolysis of POM and lignin to generate biofuel.³⁵ These three contributions represent initial efforts to catalytically upcycle POM, and it is clear that much room is left for development. Against this backdrop, we sought to construct a new upcycling system for this plastic, capitalizing on our own experience with pincer-type catalysts that promote a range of hydrogenation and dehydrogenation reactions through metal-



Figure 2. Catalytic Mn(I) complexes of the pincer ligands ⁱPr-PN^HP and Ph-PN^HP. (a) Previously reported *N*-formylation of amines using methanol as the formylating reagent and **Mn-1** as the catalyst.³⁹ (b) Synthesis of **Mn-2** and **Mn-3**. (c) X-ray crystal structures of **Mn-2** and **Mn-3** (thermal ellipsoids are set at the 50% probability level, and most hydrogen atoms were omitted for clarity).

ligand cooperation.³⁶ Herein, we report the unprecedented one-pot transformation of POM into methanol (MeOH), carried out through two alternative processes – hydrogenation or disproportionation – both catalyzed by the same Mn(I)-pincer complex (Figure 1d). In this manner, waste POM can be turned into a valuable alcohol that is an important industrial raw material.³⁷ In addition, we show that POM can be directly employed as a methylating reagent for ketones and amines, applying the same Mn(I) catalyst.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Catalyst Synthesis. The building block of POM, CH₂O, as well as its oligomeric variant paraformaldehyde, can be hydrogenated into MeOH using previously described heterogeneous³⁸ or homogeneous⁹ catalysts, but no such catalysts have been shown to transform POM itself into MeOH. We have previously demonstrated that the Mn(I)-pincer complex **Mn-1** (Figure 2a) can efficiently catalyze the *N*-formylation of amines using MeOH as the formylating reagent.³⁹ Because Mn-1 can dehydrogenate MeOH into formaldehyde, we reasoned that this type of Mn(I) catalyst could potentially hydrogenate POM - i.e., polyformaldehyde - into MeOH. However, synthesis of the pincer ligand featured in Mn-1, namely, ⁱPr-PN^HP, involves a cumbersome 5-step procedure, which could impede its use for practical applications. Therefore, we set to examine Mn-pincer complexes of a phenyl-substituted variant of ⁱPr-PN^HP, the previously reported ligand Ph-PN^HP (Figure 2b), which is accessible through a simpler two-step synthesis. The precursor to our new catalyst candidate, Mn-2 (Figures 2b, S1 and S2), was obtained in 80%

yield after heating an equimolar mixture of Ph-PN^HP and $Mn(CO)_5Br$ in THF at 90 °C (this and subsequently cited temperatures are nominal; see Supporting Information). Treating this precursor with 1 equivalent of ^tBuOK resulted in cyclometalation, furnishing the catalyst candidate **Mn-3** (Figures S3–S5), which was isolated in 50% yield. The crystal structures of these pincer complexes are depicted in Figure 2c, and their crystallographic data are provided in Table S1.

Hydrogenation of POM into MeOH. Complex Mn-3 was investigated as a catalyst for the conversion of POM into MeOH through hydrogenation. The catalytic conditions were explored using commercially available POM as the substrate, in its granular homopolymeric form (Figure 3a). When a sample of this polymer was combined with 0.1 mol % of Mn-3 in a 2:1 volumetric mixture of dioxane and H₂O, and the resulting slurry was stirred in a sealed reactor at 150 °C under pressurized H₂, initially at 7 bar, significant POM-to-MeOH conversion ensued, with the yield of MeOH reaching 86% after 20 h (table entry 1 in Figure 3a). This reaction also generated CO₂ in 13% yield, likely as a result of CH₂O disproportionation, which will be addressed below. No MeOH formation was observed when only 1 bar of H₂ was applied under otherwise identical conditions (entry 2), or when other individual or mixed solvents were used (entries 3-7), or as the temperature was reduced to 130 °C in dioxane/H₂O (entry 8). Thus, H₂ pressure, solvent composition, and reaction temperature are all critical factors in the hydrogenation of POM into MeOH.

The catalytic activity of Mn-3 vis-à-vis POM hydrogenation was compared with that of several other Mn(I) complexes, most of which were developed by our group (Figure 3b). The

pubs.acs.org/JACS



Figure 3. Hydrogenation of POM into MeOH by Mn-pincer complexes. (a) Screening of reaction conditions with **Mn-3** as the catalyst; each reaction was conducted using POM (3.0 mmol) and **Mn-3** (0.1 mol % vs POM), under the catalytic conditions detailed in the table, for 20 h, and the obtained MeOH yield is as noted in the table (CO_2 yield in parentheses). ⁴AmOH = *tert*-amyl alcohol. (b) Additional catalysts examined in this work, and a comparison of catalyst activities, based on MeOH yield (CO_2 yields in parentheses); each reaction involved POM (3.0 mmol) and Mn catalyst (0.1 mol % vs POM), under the conditions noted in table entry 1, for 20 h. (c) Catalytic turnover number (TON) for MeOH generation by complexes **Mn-1** and **Mn-3** at different catalyst loadings (MeOH yields in parentheses); each reaction was conducted using POM (3.0–15.0 mmol) and Mn catalyst (loading as noted in the graph, relative to POM), with catalytic conditions as detailed in table entry 1, but with H₂ pressure as noted in the graph, for a duration of 20–40 h. Yields of MeOH were determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy (dibromomethane was used as the internal standard). Yields of CO₂ were determined by GC-TCD analysis.

simple precursor $Mn(CO)_5Br$, as well as the complexes **Mn-4**, **Mn-5**, and **Mn-6**, exhibited low to negligible activity in this context. By contrast, **Mn-1** gave results similar to those of **Mn-3**, with MeOH being obtained in 90% yield and CO_2 in 7% yield. In light of these findings, **Mn-1** and **Mn-3** were chosen as our model catalysts. In an attempt to improve the practicality of our catalytic system and reach higher turnover numbers (TONs), we explored the effect of systematically lowering the

catalyst loading. As shown in Figure 3c, reducing catalyst loading from 0.1 to 0.01 mol % sharply decreased the yields of MeOH for both complexes, from ~90% to under 20%, but the MeOH-based turnover number [TON(MeOH)] increased, from ~900 to well over 1000 (see Table S2). Raising the H₂ pressure to 15 bar, with catalyst loading maintained at 0.01 mol %, further increased the TON(MeOH) to above 8000, with MeOH yields rebounding to over 80%. As the loading was



Figure 4. Upcycling of POM into MeOH through Mn-catalyzed disproportionation. (a) One-pot conversion of POM into MeOH and CO_2 through HCOOH-induced depolymerization followed by disproportionation catalyzed by **Mn-3**. (b,c) Conversion of commercial POM items into MeOH. The reactions outlined in Figure 4a,b were conducted through a two-step procedure: (1) pure POM (3.0 mmol) or POM clip shavings (3.0 mmol), HCOOH (2.0 mol % vs pure POM; 5.0 mol % vs POM clip), dioxane (2.0 mL), and H₂O (1.0 mL) were mixed and heated at 150 °C for 10 h; (2) **Mn-3** (0.1 mol % vs POM) was added to the reaction mixture, followed by heating at 150 °C for 10 h. The reaction depicted in Figure 4c also involved a two-step procedure: (1) POM waste shavings (5.0 mmol), HCOOH (5.0 mol % vs POM), dioxane (2.0 mL), and H₂O (1.0 mL) were mixed and heated at 150 °C for 10 h; (2) **Mn-3** (0.01 mol % vs POM) was added to the reaction mixture, followed by heating at 150 °C for 40 h. Yields of MeOH were determined by ¹H NMR spectroscopy (with dibromomethane as an internal standard). Yields of CO₂ were determined by GC-TCD analysis, and are based on POM and externally added HCOOH.

halved to 0.005 mol %, while H₂ pressure was raised to 40 bar, **Mn-3** became somewhat more active than **Mn-1**, with a TON of 17 800 vs 16 600. Remarkably, when catalyst loading was reduced to 7.5×10^{-4} mol %, with H₂ kept at 40 bar, **Mn-3** reached a TON of 116 000 after 40 h, with MeOH being produced in 87% yield and CO₂ in only 0.2% yield. By contrast, **Mn-1** gave a TON of only ~27 000, and a MeOH yield of merely 20%, under identical conditions. These results indicate that **Mn-3** is more stable than **Mn-1** under the current catalytic conditions.

Disproportionation of POM into MeOH and CO₂. Having achieved the hydrogenation of POM into MeOH with Mn-3 as a stable and efficient catalyst, we sought to examine whether such upcycling is feasible without externally added H₂. As mentioned above, POM can be depolymerized into CH₂O by acidolysis,²⁹ prompting us to explore MeOH generation through aldehyde disproportionation rather than hydrogenation. It is known that Cannizzaro self-disproportionation of aqueous formaldehyde, formally expressed as $2CH_2O +$ $H_2O \rightarrow CH_3OH +$ HCOOH, can afford MeOH at room temperature under basic conditions.⁴⁰ However, this transformation wastes half of the available CH₂O, turning it into formic acid. It is possible to extract more MeOH from this system by incorporating the cross-disproportionation of CH₂O and HCOOH (CH₂O + HCOOH \rightarrow CH₃OH + CO₂), thereby leading to the overall reaction 3CH₂O + H₂O \rightarrow 2CH₃OH + CO₂, but this requires harsh hydrothermal conditions (typically >200 °C at high pressure).⁴¹ Nonetheless, this reaction can be conducted at much lower temperatures, i.e., 25–80 °C, by using previously reported Ru(II)- or Ir(III)-based catalysts.^{42,43} These were shown to convert aqueous paraformaldehyde into MeOH and CO₂ in a 2:1 molar ratio, achieving a maximal TON of 493 for Ru and 18 200 for Ir, and an optimal MeOH yield of 93% for both. However, these catalytic systems rely on rare and expensive noble metals, as well as essential additives. To the best of our knowledge, there are no previous reports of catalytic CH₂O disproportionation into MeOH and CO₂, which involves nonnoble metal catalysts and requires no additives.

After screening various reaction conditions (Tables S3 and S4), we established a simple one-pot two-step procedure for the catalytic disproportionation of homopolymeric POM by Mn-3, involving acidolysis followed by Mn-catalyzed disproportionation. In the initial digestion step, a sample of POM is combined with 2 mol % of formic acid in a 2:1 dioxane/H₂O mixture, and the resulting slurry is stirred at 150 °C for 10 h. Despite being a weak acid, HCOOH has been shown to catalyze POM depolymerization.⁴⁴ Furthermore, we found that



Figure 5. Mechanistic study of the conversion of POM into MeOH catalyzed by Mn-3. (a,b) Proposed reaction pathways for POM hydrogenation and disproportionation. (c,d) Computed reaction profiles for the Mn-catalyzed hydrogenation and disproportionation of CH_2O .

Mn-3 can efficiently dehydrogenate HCOOH into H_2 and CO_2 , requiring no additives (Figure S6). This allowed us to fully depolymerize POM without having to subsequently neutralize the added acid, since it would be consumed by the Mn catalyst during the disproportionation step. The complete POM-to-MeOH transformation was demonstrated by subjecting a 90 mg sample of POM to HCOOH-induced digestion, and then adding 0.1 mol % of **Mn-3**, followed by 10 h of stirring at 150 °C in a closed vessel. This gave MeOH and CO_2 in a 2:1 molar ratio and very high yields, namely, 95% and 93%, respectively (Figures 4a and S7).

The practicality of our new POM disproportionation method was demonstrated by applying it to POM consumer products. For such commercially available items, the depolymerization step had to be modified to ensure full conversion, by increasing the amount of HCOOH to 5 mol % (Table S3), probably because these items are not made of homopolymeric POM but consist of a copolymer that is more acid-resistant.²⁰ Moreover, this copolymer is usually blended with various additives, such as stabilizers, fillers, and pigments, which may also impede decomposition. An attempt to develop a single-step catalytic process, wherein HCOOH and Mn-3 are

employed simultaneously, was unsuccessful because the rate of HCOOH dehydrogenation by Mn-3 surpasses that of POM depolymerization by HCOOH (Figure S8). The first POM object to be converted into MeOH was a laboratory clip (Figure 4b). By successively applying the modified acidolysis and Mn-catalyzed disproportionation, we were able to turn 90 mg of clip shavings into MeOH in 93% yield, accompanied by CO₂ in 90% yield. Subsequently, we applied this catalytic system to an assortment of POM waste objects, namely, various clips, a lighter, a schoolbag buckle, a scissors handle, and toy car gears (Figure 4c). Here, the Mn-catalyzed process was adjusted, using a lower Mn-3 loading of only 0.01 mol %, but a longer reaction time of 40 h. This afforded both MeOH and CO₂ in 87% yield, with a TON(MeOH) \geq 5800. Decreasing the catalyst loading even further, to 0.001 mol %, allowed us to reach a TON(MeOH) \geq 17 300, albeit with low POM conversion, and a correspondingly low MeOH yield of 26% (Table S5). All in all, we have demonstrated that our catalytic system can disproportionate POM into MeOH and CO₂ under weakly acidic to neutral conditions using a nonnoble metal catalyst, a process that has not been reported previously for either POM or CH₂O.

Mechanistic Study. The mechanisms by which Mn-3 promotes the conversion of POM into MeOH through hydrogenation or disproportionation were explored both experimentally and computationally. To clarify the role of this complex, we conducted several control experiments in its absence. In one of these experiments, a slurry of homopolymeric POM granules in a 2:1 dioxane/H₂O mixture was heated at 150 °C for 20 h under 7 bar of H₂. In this case, POM was fully consumed, but the only products observed in solution were CH_2O and $CH_2(OH)_2$, with no MeOH or HCOOH being detected (Figure S10). $CH_2(OH)_2$ is the product of reversible CH₂O hydration, which occurs spontaneously in aqueous solutions.⁴⁵ Interestingly, when this experiment was repeated under 7 bar of N₂ instead of H₂, no reaction was observed, indicating that dihydrogen is involved in POM depolymerization, although its exact role remains unclear (Figure S11). In two additional experiments, POM granules were combined with either a catalytic (2 mol %) or equivalent amount of HCOOH, and each mixture was heated in dioxane/ H_2O as described above (Figures S12 and S13). Here, too, the polymer fully converted into CH_2O and $CH_2(OH)_2$, but no MeOH was observed. Taken together, the above results clearly show that self- and cross-disproportionation of CH₂O do not occur to any significant extent as background reactions during our Mn-catalyzed POM-to-MeOH transformations and that Mn-3 is directly responsible for MeOH generation. Subjecting POM to the same reaction conditions in the absence of H_2 or HCOOH, but in the presence of Mn-3, resulted in no observable reaction, demonstrating that POM depolymerization is not catalyzed by Mn-3 (Figure S14) but is essential for MeOH formation. Indeed, when POM was replaced by an aqueous solution of formaldehyde, the latter was efficiently disproportionated by Mn-3 into MeOH and CO₂ (Figure S15).

The above observations indicate that **Mn-3** catalyzes hydrogenation and disproportionation reactions involving CH_2O and $CH_2(OH)_2$, which are the products of POM depolymerization. Based on the known chemistry of Mn-pincer complexes like **Mn-3**,³⁹ we propose catalytic mechanisms for these reactions, as outlined in Figure 5a,b. According to these suggested mechanisms, the hydrogenation of CH_2O into MeOH under an H₂ atmosphere is mediated by an H₂ adduct of the catalyst, [Mn]H₂ (Figure 5a; see below for more details). In the absence of H₂, wherein CH₂O disproportionation dominates, the catalyst dehydrogenates CH₂(OH)₂ into HCOOH, which is further dehydrogenated into CO₂. Each hydrogen extrusion reaction generates an equivalent of [Mn]H₂, which can hydrogenate CH₂O into MeOH, without requiring an external source of H₂. These mechanisms were probed by density functional theory (DFT) calculations, using water as an implicit solvent, since the 2:1 dioxane/H₂O reaction medium is mostly comprised of water, in molar terms [χ (H₂O) = 0.70]. The computed reaction profiles are shown in Figure 5c,d (also see Table S8).

Our calculations show that the catalytically active species is not Mn-3, but rather its isomer Mn-7 (Figure 5c), which is reversibly generated from the former through 1,2-migration of a proton and is 7.3 kcal/mol less stable, but still energetically accessible. This coordinatively unsaturated species can split an H₂ molecule across the Mn-N fragment to afford the thermodynamically more stable complex Mn-8 (Figure 5c, blue pathway), which is the aforementioned H_2 adduct, $[Mn]H_2$. An incoming CH₂O molecule can then insert into the Mn-H bond of Mn-8, thereby forming the Mn-alkoxide species Mn-9, which subsequently releases MeOH to regenerate Mn-7 and close the catalytic cycle for the hydrogenation process. The entire process is thermodynamically downhill (exergonic), with $\Delta G_{423,15} = -14.6$ kcal/mol, and its apparent activation energy is 25.2 kcal/mol, represented by the energetic span between Mn-9 and the transition state $TS_{7,8}$ from the subsequent catalytic cycle $[\Delta\Delta G(Mn-9 \rightarrow$ $TS_{7,8})].^{46}$

The disproportionation of depolymerized POM is proposed to involve the aforementioned dehydrogenation sequence, $CH_2(OH)_2 \rightarrow HCOOH \rightarrow CO_2$, wherein Mn-7 extracts an H_2 equivalent from each hydroxyl-containing molecule (Figure 5d, red pathways). Our computational results indicate that $CH_2(OH)_2$ reacts with Mn-7 through O-H bond activation across the Mn-N fragment to afford the Mn-alkoxide species Mn-10, which then undergoes β -hydride elimination to liberate HCOOH, with concomitant formation of Mn-8. Overall, this series of reactions is highly exergonic, with $\Delta G_{42315} = -19.0$ kcal/mol, and its rate-determining step is HCOOH elimination, with $\Delta\Delta G^{\ddagger}(\mathbf{TS}_{10,8}) = 29.3$ kcal/mol. The subsequent dehydrogenation of HCOOH also begins with O-H cleavage by Mn-7 to give the Mn-formate species Mn-11. However, β -hydride elimination from Mn-11 to generate **Mn-8** and CO_2 has a prohibitively high kinetic barrier of 39.7 kcal/mol (Figure 5d, gray pathway), which is practically insurmountable even at 150 °C. Nevertheless, as previously demonstrated for other pincer complexes of Mn and Fe,47,48 Mn-11 can follow an alternative, stepwise pathway that involves intramolecular rearrangement into Mn-12 (Figure 5d, red pathway), and exhibits an apparent activation energy of $\Delta\Delta G(Mn-11 \rightarrow TS_{12.8}) = 23.1$ kcal/mol. This represents the overall kinetic barrier for HCOOH dehydrogenation, which is also very exergonic, with $\Delta G_{423.15} = -19.5$ kcal/mol. The common product of both dehydrogenation reactions, Mn-8, can subsequently hydrogenate CH₂O into MeOH, or release H_2 into the reaction medium, regenerating **Mn-7** in either case. Nevertheless, H₂ liberation is both kinetically and thermodynamically less favorable than CH₂O hydrogenation (Figure 5c). This was corroborated experimentally when POM disproportionation was conducted in an open system, designed



Figure 6. POM as a methylating reagent for ketones and amines. (a) Ketone methylation; each reaction was conducted using POM (1.5 mmol), ketone (0.5 mmol), **Mn-3** (0.2 mol % vs ketone), NaOH (10.0 mol % vs ketone), dioxane (2.0 mL), H_2O (1.0 mL), and H_2 (30 bar), and the mixture was heated at 150 °C for 20 h. (b) Amine methylation; each reaction was conducted through a two-step procedure: (1) POM (3.0 mmol for primary amines, 1.5 mmol for secondary amines), HCOOH (2.0 mol % vs POM), dioxane (2.0 mL), and H_2O (1.0 mL) were mixed and heated at 150 °C for 10 h; (2) amine (0.5 mmol) and **Mn-3** (0.2 mol % vs amine) were added to the reaction mixture, followed by heating at 150 °C for 10 h. The noted yields are those of isolated products.

to enhance H₂ release, but notable amounts of MeOH were still observed (44% yield; Figure S16). All in all, our DFT calculations show that the overall rate-determining process for disproportionation of depolymerized POM is $CH_2(OH)_2$ dehydrogenation, which has a higher kinetic barrier (29.3 kcal/mol) than that of either CH_2O hydrogenation (25.2 kcal/mol) or HCOOH dehydrogenation (23.1 kcal/mol). These energy barriers are easily overcome under the experimental reaction conditions (i.e., 150 °C).

POM As a Methylating Reagent for Ketones and Amines. After demonstrating the ability of our Mn-based catalytic system to upcycle POM into MeOH, we set to examine whether it could facilitate the use of this polymer in the synthesis of other valuable chemicals. Considering the importance of the methyl group in medicinal chemistry,⁴⁹ ' and that POM is a convenient source of formaldehyde, we explored the possibility of utilizing POM as a methylating reagent. We first applied this polymer for the α -methylation of ketones using Mn-3 under an H_2 atmosphere (Figure 6a). After screening various reaction conditions (Table S6), a methylation protocol was established whereby a ketone substrate is combined with 3 equivalent of granulated homopolymeric POM in a 2:1 dioxane/H₂O mixture, together with 0.2 mol % of Mn-3 and 10 mol % of NaOH (with loadings relative to the ketone), and the resulting slurry is stirred at 150 °C for 20 h under 30 bar of H₂. In this manner, several aryl alkyl ketones were converted into the corresponding α -methylated products (1-5) in high yields (80-94%). An attempt to apply this

method for the methylation of a representative amine, benzylamine, was ineffective due to significant side reactions involving the amine, as well as fast POM hydrogenation (Figure S9). This prompted us to attempt amine methylation with our POM disproportionation system (Figure 6b), rather than directly using H₂ gas as the reductant. By adjusting the reaction conditions (Table S7), we were able to devise an appropriate procedure whereby a sample of granulated POM -6 equivalent for primary amines and 3 equivalent for secondary ones - was first depolymerized with HCOOH, followed by the addition of the amine substrate, together with Mn-3 at 0.2 mol % loading (relative to amine), and the mixture was stirred at 150 °C for 10 h in a sealed vessel. Under these conditions, a series of primary and secondary alkylamines were transformed into the respective dimethylated products (6-10) or monomethylated ones (11-13) in high yields (80-97%). Anilines were also tolerated under the same catalytic conditions, but the respective products (14,15) were obtained in only moderate yields (50-58%).

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have successfully demonstrated a series of catalytic reactions intended for the upcycling of POM. Instead of simply depolymerizing POM into formaldehyde, we use a Mn-based pincer catalyst to convert this polymer into MeOH and other value-added chemicals. This strategy provides new avenues and opportunities for the upcycling of POM waste, as well as using it as a reagent for catalytic methylation, with the aim of reducing the pollution associated with this plastic material. We are currently exploring similar strategies for the upcycling of other plastic materials.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

1 Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge at https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jacs.4c07468.

Catalyst synthesis, control experiments, experimental procedures, NMR spectra, and computational details (PDF)

Accession Codes

CCDC 2269139–2269140 contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif, by emailing data_request@ccdc.cam.ac.uk, or by contacting the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre, 12 Union Road, Cambridge CB2 1EZ, UK; fax: +44 1223 336 033.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

David Milstein – Department of Molecular Chemistry and Materials Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel; orcid.org/0000-0002-2320-0262; Email: david.milstein@weizmann.ac.il

Authors

- Lijun Lu Department of Molecular Chemistry and Materials Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel
- Jie Luo Department of Molecular Chemistry and Materials Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel
- Michael Montag Department of Molecular Chemistry and Materials Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel; occid.org/0000-0001-6700-1727

Yael Diskin-Posner – Department of Chemical Research Support, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 7610001, Israel; o orcid.org/0000-0002-9008-8477

Complete contact information is available at: https://pubs.acs.org/10.1021/jacs.4c07468

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

L.L. and J.L. are thankful to the Feinberg Graduate School of the Weizmann Institute of Science for senior postdoctoral fellowships.

REFERENCES

(1) Letcher, T. M. Plastic Waste and Recycling: Environmental Impact, Societal Issues, Prevention, and Solutions; Academic Press, 2020.

(2) OECD. Global Plastics Outlook: Economic Drivers, Environmental Impacts and Policy Options; OECD Publishing: Paris, 2022. DOI: 10.1787/de747aef-en.

(3) Schyns, Z. O. G.; Shaver, M. P. Mechanical Recycling of Packaging Plastics: A Review. *Macromol. Rapid Commun.* 2021, 42, 2000415.

(4) Vollmer, I.; Jenks, M. J. F.; Roelands, M. C. P.; White, R. J.; van Harmelen, T.; de Wild, P.; van der Laan, G. P.; Meirer, F.; Keurentjes, J. T. F.; Weckhuysen, B. M. Beyond Mechanical Recycling: Giving New Life to Plastic Waste. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 15402-15423.

(5) (a) Zheng, K.; Wu, Y.; Hu, Z.; Wang, S.; Jiao, X.; Zhu, J.; Sun, Y.; Xie, Y. Progress and Perspective for Conversion of Plastic Wastes into Valuable Chemicals. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2023**, *52*, 8–29. (b) Stadler, B. M.; de Vries, J. G. Chemical Upcycling of Polymers. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A* **2021**, *379*, 20200341.

(6) Coates, G. W.; Getzler, Y. D. Y. L. Chemical Recycling to Monomer for an Ideal, Circular Polymer Economy. *Nat. Rev. Mater.* **2020**, *5*, 501–516.

(7) Milstein, D.; Balaraman, E.; Gunanathan, C.; Gnanaprakasam, B.; Zhang, J. Novel Ruthenium Complexes and Their Uses in Processes for Formation and/or Hydrogenation of Esters, Amides and Derivatives Thereof. WO 2,012,052,996 A2, 2012.

(8) Kumar, A.; von Wolff, N.; Rauch, M.; Zou, Y. Q.; Shmul, G.; Ben-David, Y.; Leitus, G.; Avram, L.; Milstein, D. Hydrogenative Depolymerization of Nylons. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2020**, *142*, 14267–14275.

(9) Han, Z.; Rong, L.; Wu, J.; Zhang, L.; Wang, Z.; Ding, K. Catalytic Hydrogenation of Cyclic Carbonates: A Practical Approach from CO_2 and Epoxides to Methanol and Diols. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 13041–13045.

(10) Krall, E. M.; Klein, T. W.; Andersen, R. J.; Nett, A. J.; Glasgow, R. W.; Reader, D. S.; Dauphinais, B. C.; Mc Ilrath, S. P.; Fischer, A. A.; Carney, M. J.; Hudson, D. J.; Robertson, N. J. Controlled Hydrogenative Depolymerization of Polyesters and Polycarbonates Catalyzed by Ruthenium(II) PNN Pincer Complexes. *Chem. Commun.* **2014**, *50*, 4884–4887.

(11) Fuentes, J. A.; Smith, S. M.; Scharbert, M. T.; Carpenter, I.; Cordes, D. B.; Slawin, A. M.; Clarke, M. L. On the Functional Group Tolerance of Ester Hydrogenation and Polyester Depolymerisation Catalysed by Ruthenium Complexes of Tridentate Aminophosphine Ligands. *Chem.-Eur. J.* **2015**, *21*, 10851–10860.

(12) Kumar, A.; Luk, J. Catalytic Hydrogenation of Urea Derivatives and Polyureas. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2021**, 2021, 4546–4550.

(13) Zhao, X.; Boruah, B.; Chin, K. F.; Dokic, M.; Modak, J. M.; Soo, H. S. Upcycling to Sustainably Reuse Plastics. *Adv. Mater.* **2022**, *34*, 2100843.

(14) Yue, S.; Wang, P.; Yu, B.; Zhang, T.; Zhao, Z.; Li, Y.; Zhan, S. From Plastic Waste to Treasure: Selective Upcycling through Catalytic Technologies. *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2023**, *13*, 2302008.

(15) Jia, X.; Qin, C.; Friedberger, T.; Guan, Z.; Huang, Z. Efficient and Selective Degradation of Polyethylenes into Liquid Fuels and Waxes under Mild Conditions. *Sci. Adv.* **2016**, *2*, 1501591.

(16) Conk, R. J.; Hanna, S.; Shi, J. X.; Yang, J.; Ciccia, N. R.; Qi, L.; Bloomer, B. J.; Heuvel, S.; Wills, T.; Su, J.; Bell, A. T.; Hartwig, J. F. Catalytic Deconstruction of Waste Polyethylene with Ethylene to Form Propylene. *Science* **2022**, *377*, 1561–1566.

(17) Wang, N. M.; Strong, G.; DaSilva, V.; Gao, L.; Huacuja, R.; Konstantinov, I. A.; Rosen, M. S.; Nett, A. J.; Ewart, S.; Geyer, R.; Scott, S. L.; Guironnet, D. Chemical Recycling of Polyethylene by Tandem Catalytic Conversion to Propylene. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2022**, 144, 18526–18531.

(18) Xu, Z.; Munyaneza, N. E.; Zhang, Q.; Sun, M.; Posada, C.; Venturo, P.; Rorrer, N. A.; Miscall, J.; Sumpter, B. G.; Liu, G. Chemical Upcycling of Polyethylene, Polypropylene, and Mixtures to High-Value Surfactants. *Science* **2023**, *381*, 666–671.

(19) Li, H.; Wu, J.; Jiang, Z.; Ma, J.; Zavala, V. M.; Landis, C. R.; Mavrikakis, M.; Huber, G. W. Hydroformylation of Pyrolysis Oils to Aldehydes and Alcohols from Polyolefin Waste. *Science* **2023**, *381*, 660–666.

(20) Haubs, M.; Kurz, K.; Sextro, G. Polyoxymethylenes. In Ullmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: Weinheim, 2012; pp. 1–16.

(21) Lüftl, S.; Visakh, P. M.; Chandran, S. Polyoxymethylene Handbook: Structure, Properties, Applications and Their Nanocomposites; Wiley-Scrivener, 2014.

(22) Boersma, A.; Grigoriadi, K.; Nooijens, M. G. A.; Henke, S.; Kooter, I. M.; Parker, L. A.; Dortmans, A.; Urbanus, J. H. Microplastic Index-How to Predict Microplastics Formation? *Polymers* 2023, 15, 2185.

(23) Zöller, A.; Greulich, S.; Rebizant, V. Polyoxymethylene (POM): Moderate Growth in Traditional Applications and Ongoing Attractive Growth in Demand in Asia. *Kunstst. Int.* **2019**, *08*, 68–74.

(24) Jones, M. P.; Archodoulaki, V.-M.; Köck, B.-M. The Power of Good Decisions: Promoting Eco-Informed Design Attitudes in Plastic Selection and Use. *Resour., Conserv. Recycl.* **2022**, *182*, 106324.

(25) Yuan, Z.; Nag, R.; Cummins, E. Ranking of Potential Hazards from Microplastics Polymers in the Marine Environment. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2022**, 429, 128399.

(26) Olscher, C.; Jandric, A.; Zafiu, C.; Part, F. Evaluation of Marker Materials and Spectroscopic Methods for Tracer-Based Sorting of Plastic Wastes. *Polymers* **2022**, *14*, 3074.

(27) Global Market Insights Home Page. https://www.gminsights. com/industry-analysis/polyoxymethylene-pom-market#:~:text= Industry%20Overview,electrical%20%26%20electronics%20and%20au tomotive%20industrieshttps://www.gminsights.com/industryanalysis/polyoxymethylene-pom-market#:~:text= Industry%20Overview,electrical%20%26%20electronics%20and%20au tomotive%20industries. (accessed 30 May 2024).

(28) Archodoulaki, V. M.; Lüftl, S.; Koch, T.; Seidler, S. Property Changes in Polyoxymethylene (POM) Resulting from Processing, Ageing and Recycling. *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* **2007**, *92*, 2181–2189.

(29) Reuschel, G. Acidolysis of Polyoxymethylene (POM). In *Recycling and Recovery of Plastics*; Hanser Verlag, 1996; pp. 512–517. (30) Zhou, Y.; Rodriguez-Lopez, J.; Moore, J. S. Heterogenous Electromediated Depolymerization of Highly Crystalline Polyoxymethylene. *Nat. Commun.* **2023**, *14*, 4847.

(31) Lu, B.; Bai, B.; Zhang, R.; Ma, J.; Mao, L.; Shi, J.; Jin, H. Study on Gasification Characteristics and Kinetics of Polyformaldehyde Plastics in Supercritical Water. *J. Cleaner Prod.* **2023**, 383, 135459.

(32) Ghalandari, V.; Smith, H.; Scannell, A.; Reza, T. E-Waste Plastic Liquefaction Using Supercritical Toluene: Evaluation of Reaction Parameters on Liquid Products. *Waste Manage.* **2024**, *174*, 126–139.

(33) Beydoun, K.; Klankermayer, J. Efficient Plastic Waste Recycling to Value-Added Products by Integrated Biomass Processing. *ChemSusChem* **2020**, *13*, 488–492.

(34) Du, F.; Wang, M.; Wang, L.; Li, Y.; Wang, Y.; Deng, W.; Yan, W.; Jin, X. Catalytic Conversion of Polyoxymethylene with Bio-Derived Substrates: Kinetic Modeling on Solvent Enhancement Effect and Experimental Studies on Reaction Mechanism. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **2023**, 274, 118670.

(35) Xie, G.; Zhu, G.; Lv, T.; Kang, Y.; Chen, Y.; Fang, Z.; Xu, L. Sustainable Production of Aromatic-Rich Biofuel via Catalytic Co-Pyrolysis of Lignin and Waste Polyoxymethylene over Commercial Al₂O₃ Catalyst. *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis* **2023**, *174*, 106147.

(36) Kumar, A.; Milstein, D. Recent Advances in the Applications of Metal-Ligand Cooperation via Dearomatization and Aromatization of Pincer Complexes. In *Metal-Ligand Co-operativity Catalysis and the Pincer-Metal Platform*, Springer, 2020; pp. 1–24.

(37) Basile, A.; Dalena, F. Methanol Science and Engineering; Elsevier, 2018.

(38) Aika, K.-i.; Sekiya, H.; Ozaki, A. Selectivities of Group VIII Metals for the Hydrogenation of Formaldehyde and the Effect of Support and Promoter. *Chem. Lett.* **1983**, *12*, 301–304.

(39) Chakraborty, S.; Gellrich, U.; Diskin-Posner, Y.; Leitus, G.; Avram, L.; Milstein, D. Manganese-Catalyzed N-Formylation of Amines by Methanol Liberating H_2 : A Catalytic and Mechanistic Study. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2017**, *56*, 4229–4233.

(40) Morrison, R. T.; Boyd, R. N. Aldehydes and Ketones. Nucleophilic Addition. In *Organic Chemistry*, 6th ed. Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company, 1992; pp. 657–712.

(41) Tsujino, Y.; Wakai, C.; Matubayashi, N.; Nakahara, M. Noncatalytic Cannizzaro-Type Reaction of Formaldehyde in Hot Water. *Chem. Lett.* **1999**, *28*, 287–288.

(42) van der Waals, D.; Heim, L. E.; Vallazza, S.; Gedig, C.; Deska, J.; Prechtl, M. H. Self-Sufficient Formaldehyde-to-Methanol Con-

version by Organometallic Formaldehyde Dismutase Mimic. *Chem.*-*Eur. J.* **2016**, 22, 11568–11573.

(43) Wang, L.; Ertem, M. Z.; Murata, K.; Muckerman, J. T.; Fujita, E.; Himeda, Y. Highly Efficient and Selective Methanol Production from Paraformaldehyde and Water at Room Temperature. *ACS Catal.* **2018**, *8*, 5233–5239.

(44) Sedlář, J.; Kučera, M. The Effect of Formic Acid on the Degradation of Polyformaldehyde. *Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun.* **1967**, 32, 3442–3447.

(45) Winkelman, J. G. M.; Voorwinde, O. K.; Ottens, M.; Beenackers, A. A. C. M.; Janssen, L. P. B. M. Kinetics and Chemical Equilibrium of the Hydration of Formaldehyde. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 2002, *57*, 4067–4076.

(46) Kozuch, S.; Martin, J. M. L. The Rate-Determining Step is Dead. Long Live the Rate-Determining State! *ChemPhysChem* 2011, *12*, 1413–1418.

(47) Marino, T.; Prejanò, M. Dehydrogenation of Formic Acid to CO_2 and H_2 by Manganese(I)–Complex: Theoretical Insights for Green and Sustainable Route. *Catalysts* **2021**, *11*, 141.

(48) Bielinski, E. A.; Förster, M.; Zhang, Y.; Bernskoetter, W. H.; Hazari, N.; Holthausen, M. C. Base-Free Methanol Dehydrogenation Using a Pincer-Supported Iron Compound and Lewis Acid Co-Catalyst. ACS Catal. **2015**, *5*, 2404–2415.

(49) Barreiro, E. J.; Kummerle, A. E.; Fraga, C. A. The Methylation Effect in Medicinal Chemistry. *Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *111*, 5215–5246.