Green Chemistry



CORRECTION

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue



Cite this: *Green Chem.*, 2022, **24**, 2249

Correction: Continuous reactor for renewable methanol

Athanasios A. Tountas, a Geoffrey A. Ozin*b and Mohini M. Saina, c

DOI: 10.1039/d2gc90012b rsc.li/greenchem

Correction for 'Continuous reactor for renewable methanol' by Athanasios A. Tountas *et al., Green Chem.*, 2021, **23**, 340–353, DOI: 10.1039/D0GC03115A.

The definition of 'yield of product C' or 'per-pass yield of product C' used in this article refers to the 'molar flow of product C (F_C for example of product MeOH) divided by the total outlet product stream ($F_{T,outlet}$)', or $F_C/F_{T,outlet} \times 100$ (in mol%). It can otherwise be called the 'product stream concentration'.

The above is not a precise definition of 'yield of product C' or $Y_{C/A}$, for which a precise definition is the molar flow of product C (F_C) divided by the initial molar flow of reactant A (F_{A0}) or $F_C/F_{A0} \times 100$ (in %).

The authors regret using the former imprecise definition, which has been used consistently throughout the article and the ESI.

The following sentences should also be changed as follows:

On page 346, right column, third paragraph, "However, this SV represents a 95% reduction in throughput compared to the best (CO-rich feed) case, with 70% reduction in MeOH yield". should be changed to:

"However, this SV represents a 95% reduction in throughput compared to the best (CO-rich feed) case, with 70% reduction in CO_x conversion to MeOH".

In the same paragraph, "The overall disadvantage of the CO₂-rich pathway by taking the throughput and yield into account is 98.5% less productive compared to the best CO-rich case". Should be changed to: "The overall disadvantage of the CO₂-rich pathway by taking the throughput and CO_x conversion into account is 98.5% less productive compared to the best CO-rich case".

On page 347, left column, first paragraph, "The intermediate-CO feed has 35% less yield and 50% less throughput for an overall disadvantage of 68%". Should be changed to "The intermediate-CO feed has 35% less CO_X conversion and 50% less throughput for an overall disadvantage of 68%".

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

^aDepartment of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry, University of Toronto, 200 College St., Toronto, ON, M5S 3E5, Canada

^bDepartment of Chemistry, University of Toronto, 80 St George St., Toronto, ON, M5S 3H6, Canada. E-mail: g.ozin@utoronto.ca

^cDepartment of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Toronto, 5 King's College Rd., Toronto, ON, M5S 3G8, Canada