ChemComm

COMMUNICATION

Cite this: *Chem. Commun.*, 2020, 56, 12142

Received 21st June 2020, Accepted 17th September 2020

DOI: 10.1039/d0cc04310a

rsc.li/chemcomm

Hydrogenation and electrocatalytic reduction of carbon dioxide to formate with a single Co catalyst†

Fang Wang, **D** Austin T. Cannon, **D** Moumita Bhattacharya, **D** Robert Baumgarten, Ryan T. VanderLinden **D** and Caroline T. Saouma \mathbf{D} *

A cobalt(I) complex is shown to be capable of both electrocatalytic reduction and hydrogenation of CO₂ to formate. Several proposed intermediates are characterized and thus form the basis for a proposed mechanism that allows for the dual reactivity: reduction of CO_2 via H_2 addition, and H^+ /e $^-$ equivalents. The work makes use of a novel tris(phosphino) ligand. When a pendent amine is attached to the ligand, no change in catalytic reactivity is observed.

Reduction of $CO₂$ to fuels and/or fuel precursors is integral to minimize global warming and advance future energy schemes.¹ One approach is to use H_2 to hydrogenate CO₂ to formic acid (FA) or MeOH, though challenges include transportation of the gas, the necessity of high pressures of H_2 and/or elevated temperatures required for many catalysts, and improving catalyst performance. Lifecycle analysis for $CO₂$ hydrogenation to FA (using a homogeneous catalyst) suggests that this approach can decrease the net greenhouse gas emissions when compared to FA production from CO.² Despite showing an improvement, this analysis also indicates that H_2 production accounts for a significant amount of the emissions.³

An alternative method is the solar-derived electrochemical reduction of CO $_2.^4$ While the 2e $^-$ /2H $^+$ reduction of CO $_2$ to CO is well-established, reduction to FA has proven more challenging at homogenous systems due to competing H_2 production.⁵ This latter reaction can be thought of as an electrochemical hydrogenation. It necessitates a proton source capable of generating a metal hydride, and that the subsequent insertion of $CO₂$ be favoured over loss of H_2 ; both reactions have similar thermodynamic driving forces.⁴ Berben's group showed that selectivity for FA over H_2 can be achieved by exclusion of a pendent proton shuttle, which alters the kinetics of proton transfer to the active-site.⁶ Recently, the groups of Kubiak⁷ and Yang⁵ have shown how H_2 production can be circumvented on thermodynamic arguments if the product is formate and not FA.

Given the widespread utility of hydrogenations, advancement of electrochemical alternatives may have significant impact. Waymouth showed that a Ru transfer hydrogenation catalyst can serve as an electrocatalyst for the oxidation of alcohols to ketones;⁸ in this system a cationic solvent species is proposed as an intermediate. With regards to $CO₂$ conversion to formate, Meyer and Brookhart reported that the $2e^-/1H^+$ reduction of a PCP-ligated IrH $(MeCN)_2^+$ ⁹ gives a species capable of inserting $CO₂$, with subsequent formate release. This system also necessitates a labile solvent molecule to avoid an 18-electron species that cannot be reduced. The limited literature examples of electrocatalytic hydrogenations re-enforce the need for better understanding how the two mechanistic pathways intersect, as well as establishing catalyst design criteria that allows for the desired reactivity. **COMMUNICATION**
 Published on 21 2020.
 Published on 2220.
 Published Conditalystic and Caroline T. Saouma O*
 Publ

> Herein we describe a new family of Co complexes that perform both hydrogenation and electrocatalytic reduction of $CO₂$ to formate with excellent product selectivity. To our knowledge, this is the first system capable of this dual reactivity: reaction of $CO₂$ with H₂ to give FA, and reaction of $CO₂$ with \rm{H}^{+} and \rm{e}^{-} equivalents to selectively give FA (over competing \rm{H}_{2} production). Mechanistic studies indicate how the mechanisms are related. The ligand features a pendent amine that does not impact either reaction type.

> To explore the dual reactivity of electrocatalytic reduction $10,11$ and hydrogenation^{12–15} of CO₂, phosphine-ligated Co complexes were targeted. Electrocatalytic generation of Co–H is known to occur for proton reduction catalysts;¹⁶ one example¹⁷ employs a tris(phosphino) ligand that has also been shown to catalytically hydrogenate $CO₂$ to MeOH using $Co¹⁸$ To explore the role that pendent proton-relays may have on both catalytic pathways, a tris(phosphino) scaffold was developed that features a single pendent amine and is flexible in *mer/fac* coordination to the metal.

Department of Chemistry, University of Utah, 315 S. 1400 E., Salt Lake City, UT, 84112, USA. E-mail: caroline.saouma@utah.edu

[†] Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. CCDC 2010200–2010206, 2022544 and 2022545. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/d0cc04310a

Chart 1 Ligands and abbreviations used in this study.

Entries 1–3 of Table 1 indicate that the base strength impacts catalysis; increasing the base strength from K_3PO_4 to $\rm KO^t$ Bu gives higher turnover number (TON), suggesting that a deprotonation event may limit the catalysis. Two of the $Co(i)Cl$ species gave \sim quantitative TON with respect to base (entries 5, 8) when 100 eq. KO^tBU is employed. Increasing the amount of base diminishes catalysis (entries 5–7); a color change is noted when large amounts of base are added to the catalyst solution, suggestive of catalyst degradation. Recycling studies indicate that a viable catalyst is present at the end of catalysis, though the paramagnetic nature of the complexes makes it difficult to ascertain the identity (see ESI†).

Table 1 Catalytic hydrogenation of $CO₂$ to formate with $Co(1)$

	View Article Online		
Communication	ChemComm		
P ⁱ Pr ₂ Pr ₂ P $P^i Pr_2$ 'Pr ₂ P Me	Table 1 Catalytic hydrogenation of $CO2$ to formate with $Co($ l)		
	5 mmol catalyst HCOO. (1 mol\%) base + $CO2 + H2$ 30 bar 30 bar 120 °C, 16 h		
$Bz2NP_3$ R' = R" = Bz $\mathsf{Me}\mathbf{p}_3$ $Ph2NP_3$ R' = R" = Ph	Equiv. of base Formate $TONc$ Entry Catalyst Base		
Chart 1 Ligands and abbreviations used in this study.	$\boldsymbol{1}^a$ $\binom{\text{Ph2N}}{2} \text{CoCl}$ K_3PO_4 100 12		
	$\tilde{P}^{\text{h2N}}P_3$)CoCl 2^{α} KO ^t Bu 65 (\pm 6) 100 3^{α} $\overline{P^{h2N}P_3}$ CoCl		
Tris(phosphino) ligands with a central phosphine that	DBU 100 51 4^b $\overline{P_{3}^{P_{12}N}P_{3}}$ Co(MeCN)][BArF] KO ^t Bu 100 111 (± 4)		
	5^b $B_{22}N_{P_3}COCl$ KO ^t Bu 100 124 (± 9)		
can be functionalized were prepared (Chart 1). The ligands	6^b $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{Bz2N}}\mathbf{P}_3$ CoCl KO ^t Bu 200 37 (± 8)		
that feature a pendent amine are readily prepared by addition	7^b $(Bz2Np_3)$ CoCl KO ^t Bu 2000 242		
of a suitable amine and paraformaldehyde to the precursor	8^b $\mathrm{^{Me}P_{3})COCl}$ KO ^t Bu 100 122 (± 6) \mathbf{q}^b $\widetilde{P}^{\rm Bz2N}(\widetilde{\bf P}_3)$ CoCl 9		
secondary phosphine (see ESI [†]). ¹⁹ For this study, two tertiary amines ($B^{z2N}P_3$, $P^{h2N}P_3$) were chosen for the pendent amine. A	$10^{b,d}$ $KOtBu$ 100 20		
ligand with CoCl ₂ or Co(PPh ₃) ₃ Cl to give $(^{R}P_3)$ CoCl ₂ or $({}^{R}P_3)$ CoCl respectively. Solid-state structures of $({}^{Bz2N}P_3)$ CoCl ₂ , $(^{Ph2N}P_3)$ CoCl ₂ , $(^{Bz2N}P_3)$ CoCl, $(^{Ph2N}P_3)$ CoCl and $(^{Me}P_3)$ CoCl were	runs with standard deviation in parenthesis. If no standard deviation, single run. d Run for 20 h.		
obtained and exemplary structures shown in Fig. 1. All of	To determine if the chloride is pertinent to catalysis, $Ph^{2N}P_3$ CoCl was treated with NaBArF to give cationic $\left[\right]^{Ph^{2N}P_3}$ Co		
the Co(II) species feature two inner-sphere chloride ions, and	$(MeCN))$ [BArF] (BArF = tetrakis[3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]		
have distorted square pyramidal geometry ($\tau \sim 0.15$). ²¹ The	borate), the structure of which is shown in Fig. 1. Using the		
Co(I) species are 4-coordinate and are best described as dis-	cation as a catalyst for the hydrogenation of $CO2$ improves the		
torted tetrahedral ($\tau \sim 0.75$). ²² In no instances does the amine	TON compared to that of the chloride (entries 2 and 4) and		
nitrogen coordinate the metal centre.	indicates that \sim quantitative conversion is possible using com-		
Hydrogenation of $CO2$ under basic conditions was then explored	plexes of all ligands examined.		
with the Co(I) complexes (Table 1). No MeOH was observed by GC	A mechanism that includes $CO2$ insertion into a Co-H		
analysis, and the only product detected was formate.	(to give Co-OCHO) seems plausible and hence this reactivity		
Entries 1-3 of Table 1 indicate that the base strength	was explored. Addition of 2 eq. of NaBHEt ₃ to a stirring THF		
impacts catalysis; increasing the base strength from K_3PO_4 to	solution of $\text{Ph2Np}_3\text{CoCl}_2$ at -70 °C results in formation of a new		
KOt Bu gives higher turnover number (TON), suggesting that a	species. The ³¹ P NMR spectrum shows two singlets at 101.6 and		
deprotonation event may limit the catalysis. Two of the $Co(i)Cl$	98.9 ppm, suggesting that a single diamagnetic $Co(i)$ species		
species gave \sim quantitative TON with respect to base (entries 5,	has formed. The corresponding ${}^{1}H$ NMR spectrum shows a		

^a Reactions run in 3 mL THF, at 150 °C for 20 h. $\frac{b}{c}$ Reactions run in 10 mL THF with the conditions provided in the scheme. c Average of two runs with standard deviation in parenthesis. If no standard deviation, single run. $\frac{d}{dx}$ Run for 20 h.

A mechanism that includes $CO₂$ insertion into a Co–H (to give Co–OCHO) seems plausible and hence this reactivity was explored. Addition of 2 eq. of NaBHEt₃ to a stirring THF solution of $\text{Ph2Np}_3\text{CoCl}_2$ at -70 °C results in formation of a new species. The ³¹P NMR spectrum shows two singlets at 101.6 and 98.9 ppm, suggesting that a single diamagnetic $Co(i)$ species has formed. The corresponding ¹H NMR spectrum shows a doublet of triplet at -11.35 ppm, consistent with a Co-H and IR analysis shows a stretch at 2082 cm^{-1} . Vapor diffusion of benzene into heptane gave crystals suitable for diffraction, and the solid-state structure indicates the formation of a dimeric species, $\{P^{h2N}P_3COH\}_2(\mu-N_2)$ (Fig. 1). Each Co is 5coordinate with the hydride in the plane of the three phosphines and the N_2 coordinating in the apical position.

Fig. 1 50% thermal ellipsoid plot of several complexes. All hydrogen atoms not located in the difference map are removed for clarity. Only the cation of [(Ph_{2N}P₃Co(MeCN))][BArF] is shown.

To determine if the hydride is sufficiently hydridic to insert $CO₂$, 0.85 atm of $CO₂$ was added to a solution of ${P^{h2N}P_3COH}_2(\mu-N_2)$. NMR analysis shows complete conversion of the diamagnetic hydride to a new paramagnetic species. Now, the IR spectrum shows disappearance of the hydride resonance and a new peak at 1628 cm^{-1} , consistent with formation of a species such as $\frac{Ph2N}{P_3}Co-OCHO$. The related species, $(PPh_3)_3Co(H)(N_2)$, inserts CO_2 to give $(PPh_3)_3Co(OCHO)$,²³ and the corresponding formate stretch is at 1620 cm^{-1} .

A proposed mechanism is shown in Scheme 1. Entry into the catalytic cycle occurs from the reaction of ${}^{R}P_{3}CoCl$ with H_{2} and base, which would give a 5-coordinate species such as ${}^{R}_{R_3}$ Co(H)(L) (L = N₂ or solvent). Subsequent insertion of CO₂ gives
 ${}^{R}_{R_3}$ Co-OCHO. The resulting 16-electron species ${}^{R}_{R_3}$ Co-OCHO may \mathbf{P}_3 Co-OCHO. The resulting 16-electron species ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3$ Co-OCHO may then coordinate H_2 to give the proposed 18-electron ${}^{R}P_3Co(H_2)$ **OCHO.** Base-mediated deprotonation of the bound H_2 coupled with formate loss regenerates ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\!P_3\mathbf{Co(H)(L)}$. Another mechanism would be deprotonation of the bound H_2 by the inner-sphere formate to generate ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}(\mathbf{H})(\mathbf{L})$ and formic acid (B = formate in Scheme 1). Indeed, this may explain the >100 TON (entries 4, 5, 8) when only 100 equivalents of base is added, as well as the low TON obtained in the absence of base (entry 9). This is proposed to be a minor pathway that is viable in the absence of base, that proceeds with slower kinetics. Chem Comm

The determine if the hydride is sufficiently hydridic to

insert Co_p (assume of Co_p (assume of the specific specific specific specific specific specific on a solution of $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$

An alternative mechanism that has been proposed for related complexes is that the formate dissociates from the Co to give $[{}^{\text{Ph2N}}P_3\text{Co}(\text{MeCN})]^+$ and free formate (Scheme 1, inner pathway). The cation then coordinates H_2 and base-mediated deprotonation of the bound $H_2^{\ 12}$ or oxidative addition product (not shown) then ensues. 13,14 Given that both $\rm [^{Ph2N}P_{3}Co(MeCN)]^{+}$ and $^{R}P_{3}Co\text{-}OCHO$ are stable, this seems unlikely. Moreover, in related work on Ru we have shown that binding of formate to a cationic Ru centre is favorable.²⁴

Though it was envisioned that the pendent amine may facilitate deprotonation of H_2 via hydrogen-bonding,²⁵ the similar catalytic performances amongst all the catalysts indicates that such an effect, if present, is irrelevant in the catalytic hydrogenations investigated.

With the feasibility to hydrogenate $CO₂$ to formate established, we sought to determine if electrocatalytic hydrogenation of $CO₂$ is also accessible. The cyclic voltammograms (CVs) of several complexes are shown in Fig. 2. Cationic $\text{[}^{\text{Ph2N}}\text{P}_3\text{Co}(\text{MeCN})\text{]}^+$ shows a reversible reduction at -0.863 V (vs. Fc^{+/0}) that corresponds to the Co(11/1) couple. A second reduction event occurs at \sim – 1.9 V,

Scheme 1 Proposed mechanism for hydrogenation of $CO₂$ to formate, with alternate mechanism shown in grey

Fig. 2 Cyclic voltammograms of the various Co complexes. Conditions: GC working electrode, 0.1 M TBAPF₆ electrolyte in MeCN. Initial scan is in the positive direction.

with a return oxidation at \sim -1.3 V. This tentatively is assigned to the Co($I/0$) couple. Consistent with this, the reaction of $\frac{Ph2N}{P_3}$ CoCl with Na/Hg gives $\frac{Ph2N}{P_3Co(N_2)}$ (see ESI†); the irreversible nature of the couple is attributed to N_2 coordination upon reduction. The irreversibility may also be attributed to different numbers and types of L-type ligands upon reduction $(L = \text{MeCN or N}_2)$. The CVs of $\text{Ph2Np}_3\text{CoCl}_2$ and $\text{Ph2Np}_3\text{CoCl}$ are similar, and show a quasireversible reduction at -1.050 V. Both CVs show peaks that correspond to [Ph2NP₃Co(MeCN)]⁺, consistent with chloride loss upon reduction to Co(0). Notably, the peaks that correspond to the second reduction are super-imposable with those in the CV of $\left[\binom{\text{Ph2N}}{2} \text{Co}(\text{MeCN}) \right]^+$. Modest changes in the reduction potentials is anticipated as the R group on the central phosphine is varied.¹⁰ Indeed, the Co(π /I) potential of ${}^{\text{Bz2N}}P_3$ CoCl occurring at -1.013 V, and that of ${}^{Me}P_3$ CoCl at -1.089 V.

In the presence of 50 eq. water, no noticeable changes to the CVs are observed for all ${}^{\text{R}}\text{P}_3$ CoCl (Fig. 3 and ESI†). However, upon addition of $CO₂$, a catalytic current is observed, suggesting formation of CO or formate. The current increases further with 1617 eq. H_2O (3% by volume, see ESI†) at potentials close to the Co^{I/0} couple; other Co electrocatalysts reduce CO₂ at potentials well shifted from the redox couples of the catalyst.¹⁰ Indeed, rapid current enhancement at ~ -2.5 V suggests that there may be two pathways for catalytic reduction.

Controlled potential electrolysis with 3% water and 0.85 atm of CO₂ at -2.1 V vs. Fc/Fc⁺ was conducted using ^{Me}P₃CoCl and

Fig. 3 Cyclic voltammograms of 1 mM $\text{Ph2Np}_3\text{CoCl}_2$ under various conditions. (Black): under N_2 ; (red): in the presence of 50 eq. H₂O; (green): in the presence of 50 eq. H_2O and CO_2 . Conditions: GC working electrode, 0.1 M TBAPF₆ electrolyte in MeCN solvent, scan rate of 0.06 V s⁻¹, initial scan is positive.

Table 2 Product distribution of the controlled potential electrolysis (CPE) experiments^a

Complex	$FE^b H_2$	$FE^{b} CO$	FE^b HCOO ⁻
${}^{Me}_{Bz2N}P_3CoCl$ ${}^{Bz2N}P_3CoCl$	$2.5 \ (\pm 2.8)$	nd^c	58 (± 15)
	3.2 (± 0.4)	nd^c	$36 (\pm 18)$

 a See ESI. b Faradaic efficiency; average of four runs, standard deviation given in parentheses. ^c None detected.

Scheme 2 Proposed (black) & alternative (gray) mechanisms for $CO₂$ and H^+ reduction.

 $BzzNp_3CoCl$ as the catalyst (Table 2). This potential is chosen to see if catalysis does occur near the reduction potential of the complexes. In both instances, no CO was detected in the headspace, and H_2 is only produced in small quantities with both catalysts. No other gaseous products are produced, and the solution phase shows the presence of formate and MeOH. Communication

Table 2 Product distinctive of the corrected potential electrophic (2PD of several intermediates, including a entionic solvent species

members $\frac{w_1(x_0)}{1-x_0^2(x_0)}$ and $\frac{w_1(x_0)}{1-x_0^2(x_0)}$ and $\frac{w_$

The catalysts are stable, as ascertained by CVs after electrolysis and the steady current (see ESI†).

A proposed mechanism is shown in Scheme 2. Upon reduction to ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}^0\mathbf{L}$ (L = N₂ or solvent), protonation ensues to give $\left[^{\bf R}P_3{\bf C}{\bf o}^{\bf II}{\bf H}\right]^{\bf +}$. This is reduced at the electrode to give ${}^{\text{R}}P_{3}Co^{\text{I}}H$, which then inserts CO₂ to give ${}^{\text{R}}P_{3}Co^{\text{I}}(\text{OCHO})$; this sequence being identical to that in the hydrogenation reaction. Reduction to ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}^0(\mathbf{OCHO})$ and subsequent formate release then regenerates ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\!P_3\mathbf{Co}^0\mathbf{L}$. The lack of lability of the formate in ${}^{\text{R}}\text{P}_3\text{Co}^{\text{I}}(\text{OCHO})$ and the cathodic potential of catalysis is consistent with this EC mechanism. While we cannot rule out initial CO₂ insertion to $\left[^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}^{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{H}\right]^+$ followed by reduction, this reactivity is not known for this system. Finally, the pH of the solution increases during the course of catalysis, indicating that formate and not formic acid is lost.

Regarding proton reduction, the following can be gleaned. As ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}^{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{H}$ is stable, we rule out a bimetallic mechanism that would generate ${}^{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{P}_3\mathbf{Co}^0\mathbf{L}$. A bimetallic mechanism from $\left[{^{\text{R}}P_{3}Co^{\text{II}}{\cdot }H} \right]^{+}$ also seems unlikely, as it would not explain why $H₂$ is only produced in the presence of pendent amines; these species are also more sterically encumbering and hence should minimize this pathway on steric grounds. Protonation of ${}^{\text{R}}\text{P}_3\text{Co}^{\text{I}}\text{H}$ seems most plausible, and literature precedence is consistent with proton relays enhancing H_2 production over formate.⁶

The work presented here provides the first example of a welldefined catalyst that can hydrogenate $CO₂$ to formate and electrocatalytically reduce $CO₂$ to formate. Notably, the latter reaction occurs with good selectivity for formate. The stability

of several intermediates, including a cationic solvent species that seems essential for the dual reactivity, allows for further mechanistic insight. Optimization studies and detailed mechanistic work is ongoing.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the NSF CAREER (1945646), NSF REU (1659579) and start-up funds. NIH provided funds for the NMR facilities (1S10OD25241-01, 1C06RR017539- 01A1, 3R01GM063540-17W1). We acknowledge Dr. Stacey J. Smith and BYU for the use of their single crystal X-ray instrumentation.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Notes and references

- 1 W.-H. Wang, Y. Himeda, J. T. Muckerman, G. F. Manbeck and E. Fujita, Chem. Rev., 2015, 115, 12936–12973.
- 2 A. Sternberg, C. M. Jens and A. Bardow, Green Chem., 2017, 19, 2244–2259.
- 3 J. Artz, T. E. Müller, K. Thenert, J. Kleinekorte, R. Meys, A. Sternberg, A. Bardow and W. Leitner, Chem. Rev., 2018, 118, 434–504.
- 4 R. Francke, B. Schille and M. Roemelt, Chem. Rev., 2018, 118, 4631–4701.
- 5 B. M. Ceballos and J. Y. Yang, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2018, 115, 12686–12691.
- 6 N. D. Loewen, E. J. Thompson, M. Kagan, C. L. Banales, T. W. Myers, J. C. Fettinger and L. A. Berben, Chem. Sci., 2016, 7, 2728–2735.
- 7 K. M. Waldie, A. L. Ostericher, M. H. Reineke, A. F. Sasayama and C. P. Kubiak, ACS Catal., 2018, 8, 1313–1324.
- 8 K. M. Waldie, K. R. Flajslik, E. McLoughlin, C. E. D. Chidsey and R. M. Waymouth, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2017, 139, 738–748.
- 9 P. Kang, C. Cheng, Z. Chen, C. K. Schauer, T. J. Meyer and M. Brookhart, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2012, 134, 5500–5503.
- 10 S. Roy, B. Sharma, J. Pécaut, P. Simon, M. Fontecave, P. D. Tran, E. Derat and V. Artero, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2017, 139, 3685–3696.
- 11 F.-W. Liu, J. Bi, Y. Sun, S. Luo and P. Kang, ChemSusChem, 2018, 11, 1656–1663.
- 12 A. Z. Spentzos, C. L. Barnes and W. H. Bernskoetter, Inorg. Chem., 2016, 55, 8225–8233.
- 13 M. S. Jeletic, M. T. Mock, A. M. Appel and J. C. Linehan, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2013, 135, 11533–11536.
- 14 M. V. Vollmer, J. Ye, J. C. Linehan, B. J. Graziano, A. Preston, E. S. Wiedner and C. C. Lu, ACS Catal., 2020, 10, 2459–2470.
- 15 Y. M. Badiei, W.-H. Wang, J. F. Hull, D. J. Szalda, J. T. Muckerman, Y. Himeda and E. Fujita, Inorg. Chem., 2013, 52, 12576–12586.
- 16 E. S. Rountree, D. J. Martin, B. D. McCarthy and J. L. Dempsey, ACS Catal., 2016, 6, 3326–3335.
- 17 S. C. Marinescu, J. R. Winkler and H. B. Gray, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2012, 109, 15127–15131.
- 18 J. Schneidewind, R. Adam, W. Baumann, R. Jackstell and M. Beller, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2017, 56, 1890–1893.
- 19 E. Payet, A. Auffrant, X. F. Le Goff and P. L. Floch, J. Organomet. Chem., 2010, 695, 1499–1506.
- 20 Y.-E. Kim, J. Kim and Y. Lee, Chem. Commun., 2014, 50, 11458–11461.
- 21 A. W. Addison, T. N. Rao, J. Reedijk, J. van Rijn and G. C. Verschoor, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1984, 1349–1356, DOI: 10.1039/ DT9840001349.
- 22 L. Yang, D. R. Powell and R. P. Houser, Dalton Trans., 2007, 955–964, DOI: 10.1039/B617136B.
- 23 L. S. Pu, A. Yamamoto and S. Ikeda, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1968, 90, 3896.
- 24 C. L. Mathis, J. Geary, Y. Ardon, M. S. Reese, M. A. Philliber, R. T. VanderLinden and C. T. Saouma, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2019, 141, 14317–14328.
- 25 M. Rakowski Dubois and D. L. Dubois, Acc. Chem. Res., 2009, 42, 1974–1982.