


Volume 26  
Number 11  
7 June 2024  
Pages 6221-6840

# Green Chemistry

Cutting-edge research for a greener sustainable future

[rsc.li/greenchem](https://rsc.li/greenchem)



ISSN 1463-9262



## PAPER

Ana Rita C. Morais *et al.*  
Subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O hydrolysis of polyethylene  
terephthalate as a sustainable chemical recycling platform

**25**  
YEARS  
ANNIVERSARY



Cite this: *Green Chem.*, 2024, **26**, 6436

## Subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>–H<sub>2</sub>O hydrolysis of polyethylene terephthalate as a sustainable chemical recycling platform†

Dacosta Osei,<sup>a,b,c</sup> Lakshmi Prasad Gurralla,<sup>a,b</sup> Aria Sheldon,<sup>a,b</sup> Jackson Mayuga,<sup>a,b</sup> Clarissa Lincoln,<sup>d,e</sup> Nicholas A. Rorrer<sup>d,e</sup> and Ana Rita C. Morais<sup>id</sup>\*,<sup>a,b</sup>

The development of an efficient and environmentally sustainable chemical hydrolysis process for recycling waste plastics, based on green chemistry principles, is a key challenge. In this work, we investigated the role of subcritical CO<sub>2</sub> on the hydrolysis of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) into terephthalic acid (TPA) at 180–200 °C for 10–100 min. The addition of CO<sub>2</sub> into the reaction mixture led to the *in situ* formation of carbonic acid that helps to catalyze PET hydrolysis relative to hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O (*i.e.* N<sub>2</sub>–H<sub>2</sub>O). The highest TPA yield of 85.0 ± 1.3% was obtained at 200 °C, PET loading of 2.5 g PET in 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O for 100 min, and 208 psi of initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure. In addition, the subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>–H<sub>2</sub>O system demonstrated high selectivity toward hydrolyzing PET in a mixture with polyethylene (PE) at 200 °C for 100 min, thus providing “molecular sorting” capabilities to the recycling process. The robustness of the process was also demonstrated by the ability to hydrolyze both colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® waste PET bottles into high yields of TPA (>86%) at 200 °C. In addition, subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>–H<sub>2</sub>O hydrolysis of colored PET bottles resulted in a white TPA product similar to that generated from transparent PET bottles. Overall, this work shows that, under optimized reaction conditions, subcritical CO<sub>2</sub> can provide acid tunability to the reaction medium to favor waste PET hydrolysis for subsequent recycling.

Received 23rd November 2023,  
Accepted 6th February 2024

DOI: 10.1039/d3gc04576e

rsc.li/greenchem

## 1. Introduction

Plastics have become a common commodity in the global market and are indispensable to our society. The current worldwide production of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) is exceeding 82 million metric tons per year.<sup>1</sup> Despite their widespread use, PET mechanical recycling rates in the US are <19% and about 80% of waste PET is landfilled.<sup>2</sup> To address this issue, various chemical recycling processes (including solvolysis and thermal depolymerization approaches) have been actively developed over the past years to produce monomers from end-of-life PET.<sup>3–5</sup> The produced and purified monomers can undergo repolymerization to produce recycled PET with virgin-like properties.<sup>4</sup>

Hydrolysis of PET into terephthalic acid (TPA) and ethylene glycol (EG) has received increasing attention because TPA is the major component in commercial production of PET.<sup>6</sup> In the case of acid hydrolysis, mineral acids, such as concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and HNO<sub>3</sub>, are used.<sup>7–9</sup> However, the major limitations associated with the mineral acid-catalyzed hydrolysis are severe corrosion issues, the need for highly polar solvents for TPA recrystallization, and generation of both inorganic salts and deleterious wastes.<sup>10,11</sup> Another important limitation associated with H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>-catalyzed hydrolysis is the carbonization of the products, notably EG, induced by the strong dehydrating effect of the acid, leading to lower reaction yields.<sup>11</sup>

Neutral hydrolysis is an environmentally-friendly alternative to acid hydrolysis as it is performed using steam or water in the presence of water-soluble salts.<sup>5,12</sup> Pereira *et al.* studied the performance of H<sub>2</sub>O at varying temperatures (190–400 °C) and pressures (1–35 MPa) on the hydrolysis of both solid and molten PET.<sup>13</sup> A high TPA yield (>85%) was observed when molten PET was hydrolyzed in saturated liquid H<sub>2</sub>O (311 °C, 10 MPa and 30 min of reaction time). The cleavage of ester bonds by H<sub>2</sub>O is promoted by the development of acidity at high temperatures.<sup>14</sup> Marshal and Frank reported that the ion product (*K<sub>w</sub>*) of H<sub>2</sub>O increases with temperature and reaches a maximum of 6.34 × 10<sup>–12</sup>, which results in a pH of 5.5 at 220 °C.<sup>15</sup> Significantly faster hydrolysis rates have been

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA. E-mail: ana.morais@ku.edu

<sup>b</sup>Wonderful Institute for Sustainable Engineering, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 66045, USA

<sup>c</sup>Center for Environmentally Beneficial Catalysis, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66047, USA

<sup>d</sup>Renewable Resources and Enabling Sciences Center, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO, 80401, USA

<sup>e</sup>BOTTLE Consortium, Golden, CO 80401, USA


† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1039/d3gc04576e>



reported for molten PET than PET in the solid state; thus, reactions performed at temperatures greater than the melting temperature ( $T_m$ ) of the substrate are highly recommended.<sup>5,16</sup> Campanelli *et al.* reported that complete hydrolytic depolymerization of PET into monomer was achieved at 265 °C and with a H<sub>2</sub>O:PET ratio >5:1 w/w. However, lower H<sub>2</sub>O loadings (H<sub>2</sub>O:PET ratio of 2:1 w/w) resulted in incomplete depolymerization due to the establishment of equilibrium conditions.<sup>17</sup> It is worth mentioning that neutral hydrolysis requires high temperatures (>250 °C) and pressures (1–45 MPa),<sup>18</sup> and long reaction times.<sup>13,16,19</sup> In addition, the TPA produced through neutral hydrolysis has a considerably lower purity than that produced by acid hydrolysis. This is because impurities present in the waste PET, including dyes, pigments, metal catalysts, dicarboxylic acids, *etc.*, are not easily separated from the TPA during reaction, and additional purification steps are required.<sup>5,11</sup>

The aforementioned shortcomings associated with both acid and neutral hydrolysis can be alleviated by the use of CO<sub>2</sub>. CO<sub>2</sub> is known as a green chemical because it is nonflammable, nontoxic and readily available, and it is applied in diverse applications.<sup>5,20,21</sup> One of them is its use in polymer modification.<sup>22–24</sup> Due to its plasticization effect, the dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> in polymers alters their properties at both the glassy and rubbery states, promotes swelling,<sup>25–27</sup> and depresses both glass transition and crystallization temperature,<sup>28–30</sup> which can lead to crystallization of amorphous regions within the polymer.<sup>31</sup> Another application is the use of CO<sub>2</sub> for chemical deconstruction of plastics.<sup>32–36</sup> For instance, Liu and Yin reported that the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> to the supercritical methanolysis of PET resulted in superior dimethyl terephthalate (DMT) yields (up to 95%) relative to the process without CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>32</sup> Recently, Yu *et al.* reported that the addition of 2 MPa of CO<sub>2</sub> to the ethanolysis of PET resulted in 37% higher product yield in comparison with CO<sub>2</sub>-free ethanolysis.<sup>34</sup> Li *et al.* investigated the mechanism of hydrolysis of waste PET bottles in the presence of a solid super-acid catalyst (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/TiO<sub>2</sub>) and supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> (scCO<sub>2</sub>) and reported that scCO<sub>2</sub> improve the efficiency of the process due to its ability to carry more H<sub>2</sub>O and H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup> inside the substrate.<sup>37</sup> Also, the hydrolysis of waste bottle PET in WO<sub>x</sub>/TiO<sub>2</sub> solid acid catalysts and scCO<sub>2</sub> was investigated by Guo *et al.*, who reported that scCO<sub>2</sub> promotes the swelling of the substrate and carries H<sub>2</sub>O and hydronium ions into the amorphous region of PET matrix.<sup>33</sup>

The dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O provides a tunable acidic medium through the generation of carbonic acid (H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>) *in situ*, which loses protons to form bicarbonate (HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) and later carbonate (CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>) anions,<sup>38</sup> according to the following equations:



The acidity of the subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O system is influenced by the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> and dissociation of H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O.<sup>38</sup>

Hunter and Savage reported that at temperatures >150 °C, the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> (at given amount) in H<sub>2</sub>O increases with increasing temperature, while the dissociation of H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O decreases with temperature.<sup>38</sup> Thus, overall temperature dependence of pH in the CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O system is much more influenced by the temperature dependence of first dissociation constant ( $K_{a1}$ ) than the temperature dependence of dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O. This indicates that the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> will be mostly effective in inducing acid-hydrolysis of PET at temperatures between 150 and 200 °C.<sup>38</sup> At constant temperature, the extent of CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution in H<sub>2</sub>O increases with increasing pressure. Thus, through thermodynamic fine-control (*i.e.* temperature, pressure and composition), the CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O reaction mixture can reach pH values low enough to induce cleavage of acid-labile ester bonds and provide reaction rates that are greater than those that occur in hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O (no added CO<sub>2</sub>) reactions. Unlike mineral acid-catalyzed hydrolysis, the acidity of the medium generated by the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> does not represent an issue, as the pH of the system increases when CO<sub>2</sub> is released.<sup>20</sup> In addition, no neutralization waste is produced as CO<sub>2</sub> can be easily recovered and reused, and equipment corrosion issues are reduced relative to mineral acids.<sup>20</sup>

Although the use of subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O mixture for the processing of many different biomasses (*e.g.*, wheat straw, elephant grass) has been widely reported by our group<sup>20,39–43</sup> and other authors,<sup>44–46</sup> to the best of our knowledge, this technology has been scarcely applied to waste plastics, such as PET. In this work, the feasibility of subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O mixture to catalyze the hydrolysis of PET was investigated. The effect of key operational conditions, including CO<sub>2</sub> pressure, temperature and residence time on the hydrolysis performance was investigated to identify optimal conditions. Further, the potential of this process to selectively hydrolyze PET within a mixture with other plastics (such as PE), and its robustness to handle real waste PET substrates (colored and transparent waste PET bottles) was scrutinized.

## 2. Experimental section

### 2.1. Materials

Granular semicrystalline PET (3–5 mm, product code: ES30-GL-000115), powder semicrystalline PET (300 μm, product code: ES30-PD-000132), amorphous PET film (product code: ES30-FM-000145) and polyethylene (150 μm, product code: ET30-PD-000110) were procured from Goodfellow Corporation (Pittsburgh, PA, USA). Amorphous PET film was cut into squares of 1 × 1 cm dimensions before cryogrinding. Colored Canada Dry soda, Mountain Dew® and Twist Up and transparent Pure Life® PET bottles were used as examples of colored and transparent waste PET bottles, respectively. The bottles were thoroughly washed and dried before usage. Terephthalic acid (TPA, purity = 99%, #CAS 100-21-0) was obtained from ACROS Organics (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). Mono (2-hydroxyethyl) terephthalate (MHET) (95%



purity, #CAS 1137-99-1) was purchased from AmBeed (Arlington Heights, IL, USA). Bis(2-hydroxyethyl) terephthalate (BHET) (#CAS 959-26-2), dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) (HPLC grade, #CAS 67-68-5), methanol (HPLC grade, #CAS 67-56-1), formic acid (FA) (99% purity, #CAS 64-18-6) sodium hydroxide (#CAS 1310-73-2), acetonitrile (CH<sub>3</sub>CN) (HPLC grade, #CAS 75-05-8), and hydrochloric acid (#CAS 7647-01-0) were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, MO, USA). The carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrogen (N<sub>2</sub>) of research purity was procured from Matheson (Irving, TX, USA). All the chemicals were used as-received.

## 2.2. PET feedstock preparation

Granular semicrystalline PET was used directly with no additional sample preparation. Amorphous PET, colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® waste PET bottles, and colored waste PET Mountain Dew and Twist Up bottles were cryoground in a SPEX SamplePrep 6770 Freezer mill at conditions of 10 counts per second (CPS), 10 min precooling, 1 min run time and 1 min cooling. This procedure was performed until a particle size <300 μm was achieved. Then, after cryogrinding, cryoground samples were sieved using a Retsch vibratory sieve shaker (AS 200) by combining two sieves (American Standard Test Sieve Series) of different sizes (*i.e.* 106 μm and 300 μm) to obtain a particle size between 106 and 300 μm. Similarly, the pristine powder PET was also sieved between 106 and 300 μm. The sieved samples were then stored in sealed glass bottles at room temperature.

## 2.3. Subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O hydrolysis

Subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O hydrolysis experiments were carried out using a 100 mL Series 4590 micro stirred reactor from Parr Instrument Company (Moline, IL, USA), equipped with a thermocouple, flour-blade turbine impeller, heating jacket, and pressure transducer. Temperature and pressure were controlled using a Parr PID controller (4848). The reactions were carried out at varying temperatures, notably 180, 190 and 200 °C, initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressures ranging from 108 to 408 psi and up to 100 min of residence time. The PET-to-H<sub>2</sub>O loading of 1 : 8 (w/w) and an agitation speed of 400 rpm were maintained constant in all experiments. Prior to the reaction, the autoclave was flushed 3 times with CO<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>. Upon reaching set reaction times, the reactor was rapidly cooled down using a water bath to quench the reaction and CO<sub>2</sub> (or N<sub>2</sub>) was released when the reactor reached room temperature. The reactor contents were filtered under vacuum (Millipore vacuum pump, model no. WP6111560), using a Whatman filter paper (47 mm diameter and 0.2 μm pore size), and the volume of the post-reaction liquid fraction was measured. 200 μL of the filtrate was diluted in 25 mL of DMSO and analyzed by High-Pressure Liquid Chromatography (HPLC). Because the TPA is insoluble in H<sub>2</sub>O at room temperature, the solid fraction, which included leftover PET, TPA and other H<sub>2</sub>O-insoluble products, was dried in a vacuum oven 40 °C for 48 h. The dried insoluble solids were further dissolved in DMSO, and filtered to separate the solid leftover PET from DMSO-soluble products (*e.g.* TPA,

MHET, BHET, among others). The DMSO-soluble products were analyzed by HPLC, while the DMSO-insoluble fraction was dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C for 48 h. Both liquid and solid fractions were analyzed using the procedures presented below. To analyze the structure and purity of the TPA produced from waste colored PET bottle using subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O, TPA was firstly separated from other insoluble products. Initially, the post-reaction solid fraction was dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C for 48 h. The dried solid fraction was dissolved in 1 M NaOH to form a solution of sodium terephthalate (NaTPA) and filtered. 1 M HCl was added to the filtrate to reprecipitate TPA. TPA was then thoroughly washed with distilled H<sub>2</sub>O, and dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C for 48 h.

## 2.4. Combined severity factor

Combined severity factor (CS<sub>pCO<sub>2</sub></sub>) includes the effect of multiple CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O parameters, including temperature, CO<sub>2</sub> pressure, and reaction time into a single equation.<sup>47</sup> It has been applied to optimize the impact of temperature, reaction time and pH on the reaction outcomes as follows:<sup>39</sup>

$$CS_{pCO_2} = \log(R_0) - \text{pH} \quad (2)$$

Overend and Chornet developed a model where both temperature and residence time are combined into a single severity factor ( $R_0$ ), equivalent to the logarithmic form of eqn (3):<sup>48</sup>

$$R_0 = \int_0^t e^{\left(\frac{T-T_0}{14.75}\right)} dt \quad (3)$$

where  $R_0$  is the reaction ordinate,  $T$  is temperature in °C, 14.75 is the activation energy under the operational conditions where the reaction obeys Arrhenius law and follows kinetics of first order,  $T_0$  is the reference temperature assigned as 100 °C, and  $t$  is residence time in min.<sup>49,50</sup> To account for the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> and its impact on the *in situ* pH, the pH was calculated according to the following expression developed by Walsum:<sup>47</sup>

$$\text{pH} = 8.00 \times 10^{-6} \times T^2 + 0.00209 \times T - 0.216 \times \ln(p_{CO_2}) + 3.92 \quad (4)$$

where  $T$  is temperature (°C) and  $p_{CO_2}$  is partial pressure of CO<sub>2</sub> (atm). To calculate the partial pressure of CO<sub>2</sub>, the Henry's constant for CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O mixture was used.<sup>47</sup> The solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O at varying temperatures and pressures was determined using ASPEN Plus. CS<sub>pCO<sub>2</sub></sub> factor has been extensively applied in the field of biomass processing,<sup>39,40,47,51</sup> and its applicability for CO<sub>2</sub>-catalyzed hydrolysis of PET will be for the first time evaluated in this work.

## 2.5. Characterization of the liquid fraction

The liquid fraction samples were analyzed using a HPLC equipped with an Phenomenex Luna® 5 μm C18 (100 Å, 150 × 4.6 mm column, Part #00F-4252-E0) at 40 °C and 0.6 mL min<sup>-1</sup> flow rate with UV detector at 240 nm.<sup>52</sup> A gradient mobile phase (a combination of 1 wt% FA and CH<sub>3</sub>CN) was used with 99% FA and 1% CH<sub>3</sub>CN and finishing at 60% FA and 40 wt% CH<sub>3</sub>CN in 40 min. The theoretical yield of TPA,



BHET and MHET was calculated using external calibration curves performed by measuring the response of the respective standard compound of known concentration. The theoretical yield of TPA in the loaded PET was calculated by considering the molecular weight fraction of TPA within the PET monomer unit ( $C_{10}H_8O_4$ ), which has a molar mass of  $192 \text{ g mol}^{-1}$ . Similarly, for BHET and MHET, a  $254.2$  and  $210.2 \text{ g mol}^{-1}$  of molar mass was used, respectively. The formulas below were used to calculate the yield of each product:

$$\text{TPA yield} = \frac{\text{mass of TPA obtained}}{\text{theoretical mass yield of TPA from initial PET}} \times 100 \quad (5)$$

$$\text{BHET yield} = \frac{\text{mass of BHET obtained}}{\text{theoretical mass yield of BHET from initial PET}} \times 100 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{MHET yield} = \frac{\text{mass of MHET obtained}}{\text{theoretical mass yield of MHET from initial PET}} \times 100 \quad (7)$$

PET conversion was calculated as follows:

$$\text{PET conversion(\%)} = \frac{\text{mass of initial PET} - \text{mass of unreacted PET (DMSO-insoluble)}}{\text{mass of initial PET}} \times 100 \quad (8)$$

Unknown peaks found in HPLC chromatograms were identified through Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS). LC-MS spectra were acquired on a Waters Acquity UPLC HClass equipped with a Waters QDa Mass Detector using a XBridge Peptide BEH C18 XP Column ( $130 \text{ \AA}$ ,  $2.5 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $4.6 \text{ mm} \times 150 \text{ mm}$ ) using a linear gradient of  $95:5 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/0.1\% \text{ FA}:\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/0.1\% \text{ FA}$  to  $5:95 \text{ H}_2\text{O}/0.1\% \text{ FA}:\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/0.1\% \text{ FA}$ . Mass spectra were acquired in ESI- and UV traces were recorded at  $254 \text{ nm}$ .

## 2.6. Characterization of solids before and after depolymerization

**2.6.1. Size exclusion chromatography.** Weight average molar mass ( $M_w$ ) and number average molar mass ( $M_n$ ) values of pristine granular semicrystalline PET ( $M_w = 43.9 \text{ kDa}$ ,  $M_n = 32.1 \text{ kDa}$ ), ground colored Canada Dry ( $M_w = 48.6 \text{ kDa}$ ,  $M_n = 35.5 \text{ kDa}$ ), Mountain Dew® ( $M_w = 49.0 \text{ kDa}$ ,  $M_n = 33.8 \text{ kDa}$ ) and Twist Up ( $M_w = 50.4 \text{ kDa}$ ,  $M_n = 36.0 \text{ kDa}$ ) and transparent Pure Life® waste ( $M_w = 37.4 \text{ kDa}$ ,  $M_n = 27.6 \text{ kDa}$ ) PET bottles were determined by Size Exclusion Chromatography with Multi-Angle Light Scattering (SEC-MALS). SEC-MALS analysis was performed using a 1260 Infinity II LC system (Agilent), three sequential PL HFIPgel  $250 \times 4.6 \text{ mm}$  columns (Agilent), and a matching guard column. 1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoroisopropanol (HFIP, Chem-Impex) was filtered through a  $0.1 \mu\text{m}$  polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) filter,

amended with  $20 \text{ mM}$  sodium trifluoroacetate (NaTFAc, Sigma Aldrich, 98% purity), and used as the mobile phase. Samples were dissolved in this same solvent at a concentration of approximately  $5 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$ , then pushed through  $0.2 \mu\text{m}$  PTFE syringe filters. The HPLC operating conditions included a flow rate of  $0.35 \text{ mL min}^{-1}$ , a sample injection volume of  $100 \mu\text{L}$ , and the Multicolumn Thermostat (MCT) held at  $40 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ . Detectors consisted of a miniDAWN TREOS Multi-Angle Light Scattering (MALS) detector (Wyatt Technology) used in combination with a Optilab T-rEX Differential Refractive Index detector (Wyatt Technology). All calculations were performed using a differential refractive index ( $dn/dc$ ) value of  $0.257$  for PET in HFIP,<sup>53</sup> and Astra software (Wyatt Technology) was used for all data analysis.

**2.6.2. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC).** Thermal properties and crystallinity of the ground PET and waste bottles PET (before and after reaction) samples were simultaneously analyzed using a TA instruments SDT Q600 (New Castle, DE, USA). Approximately  $10 \text{ mg}$  of sample was loaded on an aluminum crucible and heated from  $25$  to  $800 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  (TGA) and  $25$  to  $300 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  (DSC) at a heating rate of  $10 \text{ }^\circ\text{C min}^{-1}$  in  $\text{N}_2$ . An empty aluminum crucible was used as reference. The percent crystallinity was calculated from cold crystallization ( $\Delta H_{cc}$ ) and heat of melting ( $\Delta H_m$ ) using eqn (9). The reference heat of melting ( $\Delta H_m^0$ ) for 100% crystalline PET is  $140.1 \text{ J g}^{-1}$ .<sup>54</sup>

$$\text{Crystallinity(\%)} = \frac{\Delta H_m - \Delta H_{cc}}{\Delta H_m^0} \times 100 \quad (9)$$


**2.6.3. Field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM).** Pristine PET, subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{-H}_2\text{O}$  and hot compressed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (control)-treated PET samples were mounted on sticky carbon surface above the aluminum stubs and sputter coated  $4 \text{ nm}$  conductive Iridium using EMS150R S sputter coater (Electron Microscopy Sciences, USA). A S4700 II cFEG SEM (Hitachi High Technologies-America) was used to image the surface morphology of the samples. All the SEM data reported were collected at an acceleration voltage of  $5 \text{ kV}$ , and the images were obtained with a secondary electron detector.

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Effect of subcritical $\text{CO}_2$ loading on PET hydrolysis

To better understand the effect of the subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{-H}_2\text{O}$  system on the hydrolysis of PET, a model substrate of semicrystalline, granulate ( $3\text{--}5 \text{ mm}$ ) PET was selected. Semicrystalline PET was expected to be more resistant to hydrolysis than amorphous PET (crystallinity acts as barrier to moisture and oxygen diffusion),<sup>55</sup> and thus semicrystalline PET can better highlight the relative robustness of the subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{-H}_2\text{O}$  process toward highly crystalline substrates. Also, we have selected granulate PET due to the higher resistance to decomposition relative to powder, thus allowing for insights on potential mass transfer benefits of the use of subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{-H}_2\text{O}$  system and its robustness. As a control experiment, hot com-





**Fig. 1** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> addition (A) and initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure (B) on the hydrolysis of semicrystalline, granulate PET. Reaction conditions: PET to H<sub>2</sub>O ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O), 180 °C, 208 psi of initial pressure (either CO<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>) for 100 min of residence time (A); PET to H<sub>2</sub>O ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O), 180 °C for 100 min residence time (B). Reactions were conducted, at least, in duplicate, and error bars represent standard deviation. PET conversion is given as mass conversion into DMSO-soluble products.

pressed H<sub>2</sub>O was used under 208 psi of initial N<sub>2</sub> pressure. Fig. 1 (and Table S1†) shows the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> versus N<sub>2</sub> (as inert gas) addition at 180 °C for 100 min, and the effect of initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure on the hydrolysis of PET at 180 °C for 100 min.


As shown in Fig. 1A, the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> resulted in increased PET depolymerization and product yield relative to compressed hot H<sub>2</sub>O (*i.e.* N<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O) control at 180 °C for 100 min. PET was almost completely converted to DMSO-soluble products (88.8 ± 0.5%), and a total product (TPA + MHET + BHET) yield of 55.7 ± 0.3% was reached. It is worth mentioning that intermediate compounds, such as dimers, were found at substantial levels after CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O reactions at 180 °C for 100 min (Fig. S1†). However, in the case of hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O, substantially lower PET depolymerization (and product formation) was observed. These results support the hypothesis that the dissolution of CO<sub>2</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>O, and thus *in situ* formation of H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> catalyzes the hydrolysis of PET ester bonds at 180 °C. It is challenging to compare the results obtained herein with those reported in the literature for neutral hydrolysis reactions, because of the wide variety of operational conditions reported and PET substrate properties/morphologies.<sup>13,16,56</sup> Pereira *et al.* have reported a TPA yield <10% when PET chips from sparking water bottles were hydrolyzed at 200 °C for 120 min.<sup>13</sup> It is worth mentioning that when we performed hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O reactions (in the absence of N<sub>2</sub>) a TPA yield <5% was observed at 200 °C for 100 min (Table S2†), which is in good agreement with the findings reported by Pereira *et al.* who did not use N<sub>2</sub> to pressurize the H<sub>2</sub>O in those experiments.

The impact of CO<sub>2</sub> pressure (and composition) on the hydrolysis of PET was evaluated by varying initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure before increasing temperature to 180 °C for 100 min of reaction time. As expected, increasing CO<sub>2</sub> pressures led to higher PET conversion into DMSO-soluble products and total product (*i.e.* TPA + MHET + BHET) yield (Fig. 1B). However, when the

initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure was further increased to 408 psi, the total product (TPA + MHET + BHET) yield was only 12.7% higher than that obtained at 308 psi. To better understand the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on product yield, we must understand the effect of varying CO<sub>2</sub> pressures on the pH of the system at a given reaction temperature and correlated with the obtained product yields. It is worth mentioning that the pH calculated herein does not include the contribution of the generated acidic products, such as TPA. The solubility of TPA in subcritical H<sub>2</sub>O was measured by Takebayashi *et al.*, who reported that the mole fraction of TPA in H<sub>2</sub>O varies from 0.610 × 10<sup>-3</sup> and 1.77 × 10<sup>-3</sup> at 174 and 200 °C, respectively.<sup>57</sup> Also, Yang *et al.* reported the hydrolysis of PET with TPA as a catalyst at 220 °C.<sup>58</sup> As shown in Fig. 2, an initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure of 108 psi (calculated pH ~4.17) was sufficient to promote an acidity low enough to induce acid hydrolysis of PET into its constituents at 180 °C for 100 min. An increase of initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure from 108 to 208 psi decreased the pH from 4.17 to 4.01, and this small difference in pH increased the TPA and MHET yields from 12.6 ± 1.4% to 39.1 ± 0.7% and 7.3 ± 0.8 to 14.3 ± 1.2%, respectively. A further increase in CO<sub>2</sub> pressure from 308 to 408 psi only decreased the pH value from ~3.91 to 3.84, but allowed for MHET conversion to TPA resulting in a maximum TPA yield of 73.6 ± 0.6% at 180 °C for 100 min. These findings suggest that slight variations of pH in the medium are crucial to enhance hydrolysis of PET into TPA.

Additional experiments showed that an increase of PET and H<sub>2</sub>O loadings (from 2.5 g PET : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O to 3.75 g PET : 30 g H<sub>2</sub>O), while keeping PET:H<sub>2</sub>O ratio of 1 : 8 w/w constant, resulted in a substantial decrease in both PET conversion into DMSO-soluble products (from 99 to 37.5%) and TPA yield (from 85 to 7%) at 200 °C, 208 psi of initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure for 100 min (Table S3†). In addition, at the same reaction conditions, when PET:H<sub>2</sub>O ratios were changed from 1 : 5.3 to 1 : 8 w/w, while keeping the same H<sub>2</sub>O amount (*i.e.*, from 3.75 g PET : 20 g H<sub>2</sub>O to 2.5 g PET : 20 g H<sub>2</sub>O), similar final






**Fig. 2** Impact of  $\text{CO}_2$ -induced pH (calculated using eqn (4)) on the yield of products. Reaction conditions: PET to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), 108 (estimated pH = 4.17), 208 (estimated pH = 4.01), 308 (estimated pH = 3.91) and 408 (estimated pH = 3.84) psi of initial  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure at 180 °C for 100 min of reaction time. Lines were added to guide the eye. The estimated *in situ* pH did not include the contribution of other products (e.g., TPA) and assumed the system was under equilibrium.

pressures, PET conversion into DMSO-soluble products and TPA yield were observed. These results can be explained by the fact that the time required to reach equilibrium is highly dependent on the quantity of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  introduced into the system due to the diffusion limitation of  $\text{CO}_2$  in the liquid phase. In other words, when the system is not under equilibrium conditions, the pH of the solution at reaction conditions will be less acidic. da Silva *et al.*, found that the performance of subcritical  $\text{CO}_2$ - $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  for hydrolyzing wheat straw was also impacted by the amount of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  added to the reactor.<sup>59</sup>

### 3.2. Effect of reaction severity on PET hydrolysis

A series of reactions were conducted under variable conditions of temperature and residence time to assess the performance of subcritical  $\text{CO}_2$ - $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  to hydrolyze PET into TPA (Fig. 3A and Table S4†). The results show that increasing temperature favors the rate of conversion of PET to DMSO-soluble products (TPA + MHET + BHET). For example, a significant increase in total product yield was obtained for the first 40 min of reaction by only increasing temperature from 180 to 200 °C.

In addition, TPA was the main compound present in all reactions, except for the 10 min of reaction time. The amount of TPA recovered increased with both temperature and reaction time reaching a maximum of  $85.0 \pm 1.3\%$  at 200 °C for 100 min. Under less severe conditions (e.g., 180 °C for 100 min and 190 °C for 40 min), BHET and MHET were found in appreciable amounts. This is expected, as BHET and MHET are reaction intermediates that are converted to TPA and EG over time. As shown here, every variable used in the system, notably temperature,  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure and residence time, contributes in different ways to the severity of the reaction, which in turn impacts hydrolysis yields. Thus, the use of a combined severity factor ( $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$ ) was further evaluated to predict PET conversion into DMSO-soluble products and TPA yield upon  $\text{CO}_2$ -aided hydrolysis.<sup>47</sup> The data obtained at temperatures ranging from 180 to 200 °C and from 10 to 100 min of reaction time (results from 180 to 200 °C for 10 min were not included due to negligible amount of TPA formed under those conditions) were used to evaluate the potential correlation between  $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$  and TPA yield. As shown in Fig. 3B, the TPA yield correlates linearly ( $R^2 = 0.977$ ) with  $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$ , indicating that the effect of temperature,  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure, and reaction time seem to be reasonably well expressed by the combined severity factor to predict TPA yields.



**Fig. 3** Effect of temperature and reaction time on the performance of  $\text{CO}_2$ - $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  hydrolysis of PET (A). TPA yield as a function of combined severity factor ( $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$ ) (B). Reaction conditions: PET to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) and 208 psi of initial  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure (A); PET to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) and 208 psi of initial  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure at varying temperatures (180, 190 and 200 °C), and residence times (40 and 100 min) (B). Reactions were conducted, at least, in duplicate, and error bars represent standard deviation. The numerical values for both  $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$  and TPA yield can be found in Table S4.† Fig. S3† shows the impact of  $\text{CS}_{p\text{CO}_2}$  on PET conversion. PET conversion is given as mass conversion into DMSO-soluble products.



### 3.3. Morphological characterization of leftover PET upon CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O reaction

Characterization of morphological changes in the leftover PET samples (DMSO-insoluble) upon reactions in CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O media would allow one to understand the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> addition to H<sub>2</sub>O on the ultrastructure and possible disruption of the PET surface. Fig. 4 shows the SEM images of pristine PET and leftover PET after compressed hot H<sub>2</sub>O (N<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O) and CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O reactions at 165 °C in non-isothermal conditions. In addition, Fig. S2† shows additional SEM images of pristine PET samples after both hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O and subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O process at varying operational conditions.

After CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O process, the PET granulates seemed to clump together, and the PET surface appeared to be subjected to morphological changes (Fig. 4C). Both pristine PET and leftover PET after hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O treatment exhibited a tight and contiguous surface (Fig. 4A and B, respectively), while the PET after CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O process showed irregular roughness and formation of pores (Fig. 4C). These morphological changes can be explained either by the polymer deconstruction or the

interaction between the polymer and CO<sub>2</sub>, and the enhanced diffusivity of CO<sub>2</sub> into the amorphous region of the substrate.

### 3.4. Assessment of subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O process robustness

The development of recycling technologies that can effectively process plastics, regardless of the presence of incompatible polymers, fillers and additives (*e.g.*, stabilizers, pigments and plasticizers) is critical for the commercial success of those technologies. Thus, the subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O system was evaluated for the selective depolymerization of PET within a mixture of polymers (*i.e.*, HDPE + PET) and for the performance in recycling colored Canada Dry relative to transparent Pure Life® waste PET bottles.

A mixture composed of 50 : 50 w/w powder PET and HDPE and a substrate-to-H<sub>2</sub>O ratio of 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g substrate : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O) was used to evaluate the selectivity of the proposed system for “molecular sorting” purposes. As can be seen in Fig. 5A (Table S5†), both total product and TPA yields obtained from the 50 : 50 w/w PET : PE powder mixture (PET and PE particle sizes were 300 and 150 μm, respectively) were very similar to the one obtained from pure 100% PET




Fig. 4 Scanning electron microscopy of untreated, granulate PET (A), leftover PET samples from hot compressed H<sub>2</sub>O (*i.e.* N<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O, with 208 psi of initial N<sub>2</sub> pressure) reaction (B), and CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O reaction (208 psi of initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure) (C) at 165 °C (non-isothermal conditions). Reaction conditions: PET to H<sub>2</sub>O ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g PET : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O).




Fig. 5 Effect of subcritical CO<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O on the hydrolysis of PET within 50 : 50 w/w PET-PE mixture and on colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® PET soda bottles (A). Pristine colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® PET soda bottles prior to reaction (B), H<sub>2</sub>O-insoluble solids after reaction (including TPA, insoluble oligomers, additives and others) (C), and liquid product samples after filtration (D). Reaction conditions: Substrate to H<sub>2</sub>O ratio 1 : 8 w/w (2.5 g substrate : 20 mL H<sub>2</sub>O), 200 °C for 100 min and with an initial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure of 208 psi. Reactions were conducted, at least, in duplicate, and error bars represent standard deviation.



(300  $\mu\text{m}$ ) at 200  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 100 min. These findings were highly expected, as the operational conditions used herein do not promote the cleavage of C–C bonds in the HDPE, but are sufficient to promote the hydrolysis of ester bonds in PET. This shows that the performance of the subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  process, at 200  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 100 min, does not seem to be impacted by the presence of other plastics and it can provide “molecular sorting” capabilities.

As shown in Table 1 and Fig. S4,† both colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® PET bottles show similar crystallinity content and thermal stability after cryogrinding. Fig. 5A shows that there were no differences in total product yields between colored Canada Dry and transparent Pure Life® PET bottles upon  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  processing under identical operational conditions. In addition, the green pigment initially present in the green Canada Dry soda bottle cannot be observed in the liquid product (Fig. 5D) nor in the leftover insoluble solids with the naked eye (Fig. 5C), resulting in a clean white product like that observed for the product derived from transparent PET bottle.

The chemical structure and purity of TPA recovered from colored waste PET bottle was compared with the TPA recovered from pristine PET through  $^1\text{H}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectroscopy as shown in Fig. S5–S8.† As shown in Fig. S5 and S6,†  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectra of TPA produced from both standard PET and colored PET bottle showed two singlets with chemical shift at 8.0 and 13.3 ppm corresponding to the aromatic protons of the benzene ring and COOH proton, respectively.<sup>60</sup> Besides the peaks corresponding to DMSO-*d*<sub>6</sub> (2.50 ppm) and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (3.38 ppm), no other significant peaks were observed in both  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectra.  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra of TPA from both standard PET and colored Canada Dry PET bottle showed three main peaks corresponding to aromatic carbon (130.1 ppm), quaternary aromatic carbon (135.0 ppm) and carbonyl carbon (167.1 ppm) atoms of TPA (Fig. S7 and S8†).<sup>61</sup> The absence of other peaks in both  $^1\text{H}$  NMR and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR indicate that subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  is able to produce TPA with high purity. We further investigated the performance of the  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  process in hydrolyzing other colored waste PET bottles (*i.e.*, Mountain Dew and Twist Up) (Tables S5, S6, and Fig. S9, S10†) at the same operational conditions, and similar results to colored Canada Dry PET bottle has been obtained (Table S5†). Although the pigments present in the colored PET bottles have been reported to contain somewhat acidic compounds,<sup>62</sup> they did not significantly impact the performance of subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  process at the studied conditions. The reason for the discoloration of the reaction products after subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--}$

$\text{H}_2\text{O}$  exposure is still unknown, as the chemical nature of the green dye in the commercial PET bottles has not been reported by the manufacturer. However, we hypothesize that the dye is susceptible to chemical change when exposed to the conditions present in the media during  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  processing.

## 4. Conclusions

This work shows the potential of adding subcritical  $\text{CO}_2$  to the aqueous hydrolysis of PET. The subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  process resulted in a TPA yield of  $39.1 \pm 0.7\%$  (*versus*  $1.7 \pm 0.4\%$  obtained in hot  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  control reaction) at 180  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , PET :  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  loading of 2.5 g PET : 20 g  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  for 100 min. At 200  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 100 min, a TPA yield of  $85.0 \pm 1.3\%$  was achieved. In addition, the performance of subcritical  $\text{CO}_2\text{--H}_2\text{O}$  was not impacted by the presence of polyolefins within the mixture and/or pigments present in waste PET bottles.

## Author contributions

Funding acquisition – ARCM; conceptualization – ARCM, DO, LG; investigation – DO, LG, AS, JM, CL; methodology – DO, LG, ARCM; supervision – LG, ARCM, NAR; visualization – DO, ARCM; writing – original draft – DO, ARCM; writing – review & editing – DO, LG, AS, JM, CL, NAR, ARCM.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

## Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. OIA – 2119754, and by the Kansas Board of Regents EPSCoR Grant Program. Also, the authors are grateful to the Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, and the School of Engineering at University of Kansas for their financial support. The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr Erhan Demirel from the Institute for Bioengineering Research (University of Kansas) and Dr Anoop Uchagawkar from Center for Environmental and Beneficial Catalysis (CEBC) (University of Kansas) for their assistance in acquiring and analyzing the DSC data. The authors also thank the access to the medicinal chemistry laboratory at the University of Kansas for LC-MS analysis provided by Samuel Gary and Dr Steven Bloom. We thank Dr Prem Thapa-Chetri from the Microscopy and Analytical Imaging Lab (University of Kansas) for his assistance collecting SEM data. This work was authored in part by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under Contract No. DE-AC36-08GO28308. C. L. and N. A. R. were funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy

**Table 1** Crystallinity content, enthalpy of melting ( $\Delta H_m$ ), cold crystallization enthalpy ( $\Delta H_{cc}$ ) of colored and noncolored PET soda bottles used in this work

Substrate	Crystallinity (%)	$\Delta H_m$ ( $\text{J g}^{-1}$ )	$\Delta H_{cc}$ ( $\text{J g}^{-1}$ )
Colored Canada Dry PET bottle	$17.9 \pm 0.5$	$25.0 \pm 0.7$	0
Transparent Pure Life® PET bottle	$20.6 \pm 0.1$	$29.1 \pm 0.0$	0



Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Advanced Materials and Manufacturing Technologies Office (AMMTO) and Bioenergy Technologies Office (BETO). This work was performed as part of the BOTTLE™ Consortium and was supported by AMMTO and BETO under contract no. DE-AC36-08GO28308 with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, operated by Alliance for Sustainable Energy, LLC. The views expressed in the article do not necessarily represent the views of the DOE or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

## References

- 1 A. Bescond and A. Pujari, PET polymer, in *Chemical Economics Handbook (IHS, Markit)*, 2020, p. 32. <https://ihsmarkit.com/products/chemical-economics-handbooks.html>.
- 2 E. Ormonde, U. Loechner, M. Yoneyama and X. Zhu, *Plastics recycling – Chemical Economics Handbook (IHS Markit)*, 2022, p. 56. <https://www.spglobal.com/commodityinsights/en/ci/products/plastics-recycling-chemical-economics-handbook.html>.
- 3 A. Rahimi and J. M. García, *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 2017, **1**, 0046.
- 4 V. Sinha, M. R. Patel and J. V. Patel, *J. Polym. Environ.*, 2010, **18**, 8–25.
- 5 D. Paszun and T. Spychaj, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 1997, **36**, 1373–1383.
- 6 T. E. Long and J. Scheirs, *Modern polyesters: chemistry and technology of polyesters and copolyesters*, John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- 7 T. Yoshioka, T. Motoki and A. Okuwaki, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2001, **40**, 75–79.
- 8 T. Yoshioka, N. Okayama and A. Okuwaki, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 1998, **37**, 336–340.
- 9 S. Mishra, A. Goje and V. Zope, *Polym. React. Eng.*, 2003, **11**, 79–99.
- 10 M. J. Kang, H. J. Yu, J. Jegal, H. S. Kim and H. G. Cha, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2020, **398**, 125655.
- 11 E. Barnard, J. J. R. Arias and W. Thielemans, *Green Chem.*, 2021, **23**, 3765–3789.
- 12 A. Jaime-Azuara, T. H. Pedersen and R. Wimmer, *Green Chem.*, 2023, **25**, 2711–2722.
- 13 P. Pereira, P. E. Savage and C. W. Pester, *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, 2023, **11**, 7203–7209.
- 14 C. Schacht, C. Zetzel and G. Brunner, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 2008, **46**, 299–321.
- 15 W. L. Marshall and E. Franck, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, 1981, **10**, 295–304.
- 16 C. N. Onwucha, C. O. Ehi-Eromosele, S. O. Ajayi, M. Schaefer, S. Indris and H. Ehrenberg, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2023, **62**, 6378–6385.
- 17 J. R. Campanelli, M. Kamal and D. Cooper, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 1993, **48**, 443–451.
- 18 M. Han, in *Recycling of Polyethylene Terephthalate Bottles*, Elsevier, 2019, pp. 85–108.
- 19 V. S. Zope and S. Mishra, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 2008, **110**, 2179–2183.
- 20 A. R. C. Morais, A. M. da Costa Lopes and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Chem. Rev.*, 2015, **115**, 3–27.
- 21 D. Damayanti, B. T. Basae, L. Al Mukarromah, D. S. S. Marpaung, D. R. Saputri, A. Sanjaya, Y. Fahni, D. Supriyadi, T. Taharuddin and H. S. Wu, *Clean. Eng. Technol.*, 2023, 100697.
- 22 S. P. Nalawade, F. Picchioni and L. Janssen, *Prog. Polym. Sci.*, 2006, **31**, 19–43.
- 23 X. Gao, Y. Chen, P. Chen, Z. Xu, L. Zhao and D. Hu, *J. CO2 Util.*, 2022, **57**, 101887.
- 24 I. Elmanovich, A. Stakhanov, E. Kravchenko, S. Stakhanova, A. Pavlov, M. Ilyin, E. Kharitonova, M. Gallyamov and A. Khokhlov, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 2022, **181**, 105503.
- 25 R. Wissinger and M. Paulaitis, *J. Polym. Sci., Part B: Polym. Phys.*, 1987, **25**, 2497–2510.
- 26 M. Champeau, J.-M. Thomassin, C. Jérôme and T. Tassaing, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 2014, **90**, 44–52.
- 27 I. Kikic and F. Vecchione, *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.*, 2003, **7**, 399–405.
- 28 Z. Zhang and Y. P. Handa, *J. Polym. Sci., Part B: Polym. Phys.*, 1998, **36**, 977–982.
- 29 S. G. Kazarian, N. H. Brantley and C. A. Eckert, *Vib. Spectrosc.*, 1999, **19**, 277–283.
- 30 M. Takada and M. Ohshima, *Polym. Eng. Sci.*, 2003, **43**, 479–489.
- 31 S. Lambert and M. Paulaitis, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 1991, **4**, 15–23.
- 32 J. Liu and J. Yin, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2022, **61**, 6813–6819.
- 33 W.-Z. Guo, H. Lu, X.-K. Li and G.-P. Cao, *RSC Adv.*, 2016, **6**, 43171–43184.
- 34 K. Yu, J. Liu, J. Sun, Z. Shen and J. Yin, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 2023, **194**, 105837.
- 35 Y. Li, M. Wang, X. Liu, C. Hu, D. Xiao and D. Ma, *Angew. Chem.*, 2022, **134**, e202117205.
- 36 Y. Yang, S. Sharma, C. Di Bernardo, E. Rossi, R. Lima, F. S. Kamounah, M. Poderyte, K. Enemark-Rasmussen, G. Ciancaleoni and J.-W. Lee, *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, 2023, **11**, 11294–11304.
- 37 X. K. Li, H. Lu, W. Z. Guo, G. P. Cao, H. L. Liu and Y. H. Shi, *AIChE J.*, 2015, **61**, 200–214.
- 38 S. E. Hunter and P. E. Savage, *AIChE J.*, 2008, **54**, 516–528.
- 39 A. R. C. Morais, A. C. Mata and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Green Chem.*, 2014, **16**, 4312–4322.
- 40 D. H. Fockink, A. R. C. Morais, L. P. Ramos and R. M. Lukasik, *Energy*, 2018, **151**, 536–544.
- 41 A. Toscan, A. R. C. Morais, S. M. Paixão, L. Alves, J. r. Andreus, M. Camassola, A. J. P. Dillon and R. M. Lukasik, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2017, **56**, 5138–5145.



- 42 A. R. C. Morais, M. D. D. Matuchaki, J. Andraus and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Green Chem.*, 2016, **18**, 2985–2994.
- 43 A. R. C. Morais and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Green Chem.*, 2016, **18**, 2331–2334.
- 44 J. S. Luterbacher, J. W. Tester and L. P. Walker, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2010, **107**, 451–460.
- 45 J. S. Luterbacher, J. W. Tester and L. P. Walker, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2012, **109**, 1499–1507.
- 46 J. S. Luterbacher, Q. Chew, Y. Li, J. W. Tester and L. P. Walker, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2012, **5**, 6990–7000.
- 47 G. P. Van Walsum, in *Severity function describing the hydrolysis of xylan using carbonic acid*, Twenty-Second Symposium on Biotechnology for Fuels and Chemicals, Springer, 2001, pp. 317–329.
- 48 R. P. Overend and E. Chornet, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc., A*, 1987, **321**, 523–536.
- 49 D. H. Fockink, J. H. Sánchez and L. P. Ramos, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2018, **123**, 563–572.
- 50 A. R. Abouelela, P. Y. Nakasu and J. P. Hallett, *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, 2023, **11**, 2404–2415.
- 51 A. Toscan, A. R. C. Morais, S. M. Paixão, L. Alves, J. Andraus, M. Camassola, A. J. P. Dillon and R. M. Lukasik, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2017, **224**, 639–647.
- 52 S. Kaabel, J. D. Therien, C. E. Deschênes, D. Duncan, T. Frišćić and K. Auclair, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2021, **118**, e2026452118.
- 53 S. Mori and H. G. Barth, *Size exclusion chromatography*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- 54 A. Mehta, U. Gaur and B. Wunderlich, *J. Polym. Sci., Polym. Phys. Ed.*, 1978, **16**, 289–296.
- 55 N. S. Allen, M. Edge, M. Mohammadian and K. Jones, *Eur. Polym. J.*, 1991, **27**, 1373–1378.
- 56 H. Abedsoltan, Z. Zoghi and A. H. Mohammadi, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 2023, e53949.
- 57 Y. Takebayashi, K. Sue, S. Yoda, Y. Hakuta and T. Furuya, *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 2012, **57**, 1810–1816.
- 58 W. Yang, R. Liu, C. Li, Y. Song and C. Hu, *Waste Manage.*, 2021, **135**, 267–274.
- 59 S. P. M. da Silva, A. R. C. Morais and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Green Chem.*, 2014, **16**, 238–246.
- 60 V. Štrukil, *ChemSusChem*, 2021, **14**, 330–338.
- 61 R. Pétiaud, H. Waton and Q.-T. Pham, *Polymer*, 1992, **33**, 3155–3161.
- 62 K. Fukushima, D. J. Coady, G. O. Jones, H. A. Almegren, A. M. Alabdulrahman, F. D. Alsewilem, H. W. Horn, J. E. Rice and J. L. Hedrick, *J. Polym. Sci., Part A: Polym. Chem.*, 2013, **51**, 1606–1611.

