Reversible catalytic dehydrogenation of alcohols for energy storage
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Reversibility of a dehydrogenation/hydrogenation catalytic reaction has been an elusive target for homogeneous catalysis. In this report, reversible acceptorless dehydrogenation of secondary alcohols and diols on iron pincer complexes and reversible oxidative dehydrogenation of primary alcohols/reduction of aldehydes with separate transfer of protons and electrons on iridium complexes are shown. This reactivity suggests a strategy for the development of reversible fuel cell electrocatalysts for partial oxidation (dehydrogenation) of hydroxyl-containing fuels.

Hydrogenation and dehydrogenation reactions are fundamental in synthetic organic chemistry and used in a variety of large- and small-scale processes for manufacturing chemicals, pharmaceuticals, foods, and fuels. An increased need for energy storage technologies, in large part because of the recent deployment of intermittent renewable energy sources, has generated renewed interest in hydrogen as a form of chemical energy storage. Hydrogen, which may be used in fuel cells or internal combustion engines, is best-suited for longer-term energy storage and can be stored in the form of a compressed gas or a cryogenic liquid or chemically bonded in hydrides (1). The most attractive hydrogen storage media are liquid organic hydrogen carriers (LOHCs), because they have relatively high hydrogen content and can be transported and distributed using the existing liquid fuel infrastructure (2–5).

Two strategies for coupling the chemical energy stored in these LOHCs with an energy storage device include thermal dehydrogenation to provide H2(g) for a polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) fuel cell (expression 1) and electrochemical dehydrogenation to yield protons and electrons in a direct alcohol fuel cell (expressions 2 and 3) (2, 7). In the former (acceptorless strategy), hydrogen release from LOHCs frequently requires high reaction temperatures and expensive platinum group metal (PGM) catalysts. Regeneration of the hydrogen-depleted compounds can be achieved with both PGM and less expensive non-PGM catalysts (e.g., nickel-based); however, elevated hydrogen pressures are needed (8, 9). The latter was the basis for an Energy Frontier Research Center around Electrocatalysis, Transport Phenomena, and Materials for Innovative Energy Storage funded by the Department of Energy (Acknowledgments), which assumed the use of a single electrocatalyst for dehydrogenation and hydrogenation of LOHCs that would also simplify the conventional hydrogen storage process (10). The envisioned partial electrochemical dehydrogenation of LOHCs typically involves expensive PGM catalysts (11–18), with weak bases to serve as proton scavengers in lieu of a proton exchange membrane. Reversing the applied potential in the presence of these same components provides a mechanism for regenerating the LOHCs without the need for elevated hydrogen pressure:

\[
\text{LH}_n = L + n/2 \text{H}_2, \quad [1] \\
\text{LH}_n = L + n \text{H}^+ + n \text{e}^-, \quad [2] \\
\text{n/2 O}_2 + \text{n H}^+ + \text{n e}^- = \text{n/2 H}_2\text{O}. \quad [3]
\]

A thermodynamic analysis of a variety of potential LOHCs showed that cyclic hydrocarbons exhibit high hydrogen contents but that nitrogen heterocycles exhibit lower reaction enthalpies (9, 10). Nitrogen heterocycles are also more practical, because they display energy densities that are comparable with those of liquid hydrogen, and the theoretical open cell potentials of these materials are calculated to be close to or exceed the potential of the hydrogen–oxygen fuel cell (11). In addition, the overpotential of their electrooxidation is also smaller compared with cyclic hydrocarbons (12). However, basic nitrogen heterocycles are not compatible with commonly used acidic proton exchange membranes because of the formation of a nonconductive salt. One alternative class of LOHCs that does not suffer from this problem is hydroxyl-containing compounds (e.g., alcohols and diols) that feature reasonable hydrogen content and low oxidation potentials. Both mono- and polysubstituted alcohols have been proposed as hydrogen storage materials (13) and used as fuel for direct alcohol fuel cells, usually in the form of an aqueous alkaline solution (14).

Homogeneous catalysts for the acceptorless dehydrogenation of primary and secondary alcohols for the most part contain precious metals, such as Ru (19), Rh (20), and Ir (21). By comparison, catalysis | energy storage | reversibility | hydrogenation | dehydrogenation
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the same reaction with nonprecious, earth-abundant metal catalysts is, so far, a relatively unexplored area in the literature. The first cobalt catalyst bearing a noninnocent bis(dicyclohexylphosphino) amine (PNP<sup>Cy</sup>) ligand for acceptorless dehydrogenation of alcohols was reported by Hanson and coworkers (22, 23). Recently, Beller and coworkers (24) have shown hydrogen production from methanol in the presence of KOH with octahedral iron complexes (PNP<sup>iPr</sup>)Fe(H)(CO)X [X = BH<sub>4</sub> (1) and X = Br (2)]. Remarkably, very low catalyst loadings (parts per million level) were used, and catalysis was performed at 91 °C, which suggests high thermal stability of these iron complexes and related intermediate species. However, Guan and coworkers (25) have accomplished ester hydrogenation using catalyst I. In addition to these studies, it was recently shown that the same iron complexes can also efficiently catalyze the reversible dehydrogenation–hydrogenation of N-heterocycles (26). Yamaguchi et al. (27) have also reported Cp*Ir complexes with substituted pyridonate ligands that catalyze the reversible acceptorless dehydrogenation of 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline to quinoline in boiling xylene. Dehydrogenation is harder and routinely produced lower yields than hydrogenation, but with the 5-trifluoromethylpyridonate ligand, a quantitative yield was achieved in both directions (27). A computational analysis of the proposed catalytic cycle showed that two major pathways are possible: through a bifunctional species with coordinated pyridonate ligand or through a monomeric Cp*Ir(H)Cl complex (28).

As part of our ongoing effort to develop another strategy, specifically electrocatalysts for reversible partial oxidation (dehydrogenation) of alcohol-based fuels, we concentrated on the possibility of converting a known dehydrogenation catalyst to an electrocatalyst through separation of protons and electrons. We regard separately extracting protons and electrons in a catalytic dehydrogenation reaction together with the microscopic reverse (29) (i.e., separately injecting protons and electrons to effect substrate hydrogenation) as fundamental in the development of a reversible alcohol dehydrogenation–hydrogenation electrocatalyst. It was clear at the outset that the possibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Isolated yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="image" /></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[<sup>1</sup>] = 0.005 M, [substrate] = 0.5 M.
of oxidation of intermediate species containing metals in low-oxidation states during dehydrogenation and the competing proton reduction to H₂ in the reverse reaction substantially limited our selection of possible candidates. We recently reported electrocatalytic properties of an iridium amino-olefin complex [Ir(tropDACH)]OTf, which is capable of catalyzing alcohol dehydrogenation with chemical oxidants as well as electrocatalytic dehydrogenation of primary alcohols with excellent faradic efficiency (30). Two catalytic systems capable of oxidizing alcohols with a chemical oxidant (ferrocenium cation) in the presence of a base as a proton acceptor have been very recently described in literature (30, 31).

In this report, we describe catalytic systems that address both strategies outlined above as part of a unified effort to develop catalysts for reversible dehydrogenation of organic fuels in energy generation and storage reactions. These catalysts show reversible acceptorless (expression 1) and partial oxidative (expression 2) dehydrogenation of alcohols using non-PGM (iron-based) and PGM (iridium-based) catalysts, respectively.

Results and Discussion

Reversible Acceptorless Dehydrogenation of Alcohols with Iron Complexes. We initially studied acceptorless dehydrogenation of 1-phenylethanol with catalysts [P(N(H)P)Fe(H)(CO)(HBH₃)] (1) and [P(N(H)P)Fe(H)(CO)(Br)] (2). On investigating a variety of conditions, it was determined that the catalytic reaction was best carried out in toluene at 120 °C. Under these conditions, when 1 mol% 1 was used as the catalyst, 1-phenylethanol was quantitatively converted to acetophenone within 24 h as judged by GC-MS and NMR spectroscopy. In a closed system, only 28% of acetophenone formed after 24 h. Complex 2 was also found to be an active catalyst in the presence of a catalytic amount of KO'Bu; however, a lower conversion was achieved after the same amount of time. Therefore, we focused on complex 1 to investigate the scope of substrates for the iron-catalyzed acceptorless dehydrogenation of alcohols.

As depicted in Table 1, secondary benzylic alcohols (Table 1, entries 1–4) were successfully dehydrogenated by catalyst 1, and the corresponding acetophenone derivatives were isolated in good yields (64–92%). A variety of functionalities, such as -OMe, -NO₂, and -Cl, was unaffected under the catalytic conditions. Electronic influence on the dehydrogenation activity seemed to be significant, because a substrate containing an electron-withdrawing -NO₂ group (Table 1, entry 3) reacted much faster than the one with an electron-donating -OMe group (Table 1, entry 2) based on respective NMR conversions after 12 h. For the -OMe derivative, 68% conversion was achieved after 12 h, whereas 100% conversion was observed for the -NO₂ derivative after the same time. A more detailed kinetic analysis of the mechanism is required to rationalize these electronic effects, and these studies are currently underway. In addition to the aromatic substrates, cyclohexanol (Table 1, entry 5) was also successfully dehydrogenated to give cyclohexanone. In contrast to 1, activation of 2 with a base is required (SI Appendix; Table S1).

Because diols can potentially release 4 eq of H₂ to afford lactones, we investigated the reactivity of complex 1 toward several diol substrates. When 1,2-benzenedimethanol (Table 1, entry 6) was subjected to our catalytic conditions, it readily produced the corresponding lactone phthalide. Because this reaction suggested the formation of a transient aldehyde intermediate from a primary alcohol, we tried to verify its formation by performing dehydrogenation of benzyl alcohol itself. However, benzyl benzoate was isolated as the sole product as a result of an intermolecular condensation process; 1,5-pentanediol (Table 1, entry 7) was also dehydrogenated successfully to afford δ-valerolactone. Several research groups have previously reported homogeneous catalysts for the base-free oxidation of diols to lactones in the presence of a hydrogen acceptor, such as acetone (32–35). However, reports related to the acceptorless conversion of the same are extremely rare in the literature (36–39). To the best of our knowledge, only recently have a few iron-based homogeneous catalysts been reported for this transformation (40). Fe-catalyzed acceptorless alcohol dehydrogenation with a base as cocatalyst was also recently reported (41).

Reaction of diols with both primary and secondary hydroxyl groups with catalyst 1 results in similar yield and chemoselectivity (exclusive dehydrogenation of the secondary alcohol moiety) for compounds with different acidity of the methine C–H bond (Table 1, entry 8 compared with entry 9). This preference can be explained by the difference in thermodynamics for dehydrogenation of primary and secondary hydroxyl groups. For example, the Gibbs free energy of dehydrogenation for 1-butanol is 30 kJ/mol more positive than that for 2-butanol (4.3 kJ/mol) at 120 °C based on values from the National Institute of Standards and Technology database (42).

To show the possibility of using these iron catalysts for the reverse reaction of alcohol dehydrogenation, we examined their activity toward the hydrogenation of a corresponding ketone (Table 2). Although Guan and coworkers (25) have shown that

![Scheme 1. Proposed pathway for the alcohol dehydrogenation on iron PNP complexes.](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>NMR conversion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>KO'Bu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10 mol% KO'Bu was added. [Catalyst] = 0.005 M, [KO'Bu] = 0.05 M, [4-methoxyacetophenone] = 0.5 M.
complex 1 reduces ester functionalities with 10 atm H₂, hydrogenation of a simple ketone has not been reported so far. In our investigation, we found that 1 mol% complex 1 catalyzes quantitative hydrogenation of 4-methoxycacetophene with 5.4 atm H₂ pressure in toluene at room temperature (Table 2, entry 1). Both complexes 2 and [PNP]Fe(H)(CO)(Cp) (3) also served as equally effective catalysts in this hydrogenation reaction (Table 2, entries 2 and 3).

A plausible mechanism for the iron-catalyzed alcohol dehydrogenation is outlined in Scheme 1. Based on our current understanding of the dehydrogenation of N-heterocycles (26), we propose that the amido-iron complex 3 is the active catalyst in the alcohol dehydrogenation. Consistent with this hypothesis, catalytic hydrogenation of 4-methoxycacetophene (Table 2, entry 3) and dehydrogenation of 1-phenylethanol (in toluene at 120 °C) were quantitative when 1 mol% 3 was directly used as the catalyst. The other iron species that is possibly involved in the catalytic cycle is a trans-dihydride complex (4). The existence of this species, which tends to lose H₂ even at room temperature and thereby, regenerates the active dehydrogenation intermediate 3, was previously supported by NMR spectroscopy and trapping experiments (26). A computational analysis using density functional theory (DFT) suggests that the dehydrogenation of alcohol, a key elementary step, occurs in a concerted fashion through metal–ligand cooperation (43). A stepwise pathway involving an iron-alkoxide intermediate (shown in Scheme 1) is also possible, although less likely, because it would require higher activation energy (DFT calculations are shown in ref. 43). Catalytic results mentioned in this report indicate that iron complexes 1–3 represent a rare class of homogeneous catalysts for reversible dehydrogenation/hydrogenation of alcohols and ketones.

Reversible Oxidative Dehydrogenation of Primary Alcohols with Iridium Complexes. To drive a dehydrogenation reaction toward separate generation of protons and electrons requires a stoichiometric oxidant combined with a weak base as a proton source. Herein, we studied two iridium(I) complexes, [Ir(trop-DACH)][OTf] (5), a highly efficient catalyst used in the dehydrogenation of a broad range of primary alcohols to aldehydes (44), and the related [Ir(trop-DAD)][OTf] (6) (45), which features an unsaturated and sterically less encumbered ligand framework, as reversible alcohol dehydrogenation–hydrogenation catalysts (Scheme 2).

Dehydrogenation of benzylic and allylic alcohols proceeds at room temperature with very low loadings of 5 (0.01 mol%) and requires catalytic amounts of strong base (e.g., KO(Bu): 0.05 mol%) and stoichiometric 1,4-benzoquinone (BQ) as a hydrogen (H₂) scavenger (44, 46). We now report our findings with 5 and 6 for alcohol dehydrogenation in terms of separately extracting protons and electrons through chemical catalysis results that used stoichiometric oxidants (e.g., ferrocenium) combined with a weak base (phenolate). We targeted separation of proton and electron transfer processes (instead of simultaneous transfer of protons and electrons to the same molecule, such as in BQ) to show the first necessary step in a broader strategy to transition Grützmacher’s system to an electrocatalytic (i.e., electrode-driven) dehydrogenation and use such complexes as electrocatalysts (30). To verify the possibility of operating these catalysts in both directions, we have also studied the reverse reaction, separately injecting protons and electrons for aldehyde hydrogenation using 5 and 6 combined with stoichiometric reductants (e.g., cobaltocene) and weak conjugate acid (phenol).

Considering the high efficiency reported in the original system using 5 with stoichiometric BQ (example, TOF greater than 150,000 h⁻¹ for benzyl alcohol dehydrogenation in chlorobenzene at 90 °C (44, 46), we used phenolate anion as a substitute base combined with various chemical oxidants for the catalytic dehydrogenation of 4-methoxybenzaldehyde to p-anisaldehyde (Table 3). Oxidations were carried out anaerobically at room temperature with 0.03 mol% 5 or 0.1 mol% 6 and required 2 eq each phenol and oxidant relative to 4-methoxybenzaldehyde. Oxidants were surveyed with each catalyst over a relatively narrow range of chemical potentials in o-dichlorobenzene (o-DCB). All were greater than ~0.13 V vs. the ferrocenium/ferrocene couple (Fe⁺/Fe, which is the peak oxidation potential (observed to be pseudoreversible at scan rates ≥ 1 V/s) that we reported for monocarboxilated 5, namely the neutral ir-amido-amine complex [Ir(trop-DACH-1H)]⁺ (30). In Table 3, we found 5 to be more active and efficient for the dehydrogenation of 4-methoxybenzaldehyde alcohol compared with 6, exhibiting higher rates with lower catalyst loadings while maintaining comparable moderate-to-high conversions to aldehyde. We observed a 94% yield of p-anisaldehyde after 2 h when the reaction was carried out with 5, phenolate, and AgOTf (Table 3, entry 4), whereas the same reaction with 6 gave only 63% yield after 4 h (Table 3, entry 9). Oxidant solubility played an important role in catalysis—acetylated ferrocenium species ([Fe(n⁵-C₅H₄O)(Cp)] and [Fe(n⁵-C₅H₄O)(Me)₂] in Table 3, entries 3, 5, 8, and 10) showed very poor solubility and performance in o-DCB compared with [FeCP] and [Fe(n⁵-C₅H₄O)(Me)] oxidants. Of significant note was that, by separating proton and electron transfer events in 4-methoxybenzaldehyde dehydrogenation, no penalties were observed in terms of reaction rate or percentage conversion to aldehyde (Table 3, entry 4 specifically) relative to the concerted process (i.e., Grützmacher’s 5-BQ system exhibited a TOF of 625 h⁻¹ at 25 °C in chlorobenzene for oxidation of 4-methoxybenzalcohol).

Electrochemical studies of 5 and related complexes ([Ir(trop-DACH-1H)]⁺ and [Ir(trop-DACH-2H)]⁺ (46) allowed for refinement of our understanding around catalyst activation and determination of a thermodynamic cycle (details in SI Appendix). For example, calculation of H atom removal from 5 (homolytic).
bond dissociation) to form [Ir(trop-DACH-1H)]⁺ (Scheme 3). Center was determined to require 79.2 kcal/mol, with comparable energy necessary to repeat the deprotonation/oxidation step (77.6 kcal/mol). (Note that [Ir(trop-DACH-2H)]⁺ may also be considered as an Ir(III)-bis-amide complex.) By derivation of additional thermocatalytic data, the pKₐ of a monodeprotonated mono-oxygenated species, [Ir(trop-DACH-1H)]⁺, was calculated to be 9.2 (in DMSO), which is actually lower than the pKₐ of 10.5 measured for 5 (46). Together, these data are consistent with activation of 5 beyond simple monodeprotonation and oxidation under our catalysis conditions. Likely, a second deprotonation by phenolate base occurs to engender [Ir(trop-DACH-2H)]⁺—an intermediate also proposed by Gützamacher in the original KO'Bu-initiated BQ-mediated system. Additional oxidation of [Ir(trop-DACH-2H)]⁺ to [Ir(trop-DACH-2H)]²⁺ is reasonable given that the potentials of oxo is known and has been measured electrolyte shows two one-electron (quasi) reversible waves (E₁/₂ = −0.63 V and E₂/₂ = −1.35 V vs. Fe⁺/Fe) which can be attributed to consecutive reduction of the diazabutadiene ligand and is consistent with prior observations in THF (45). Addition of 4 eq phenolate base to 6 results in the appearance of two additional one-electron (quasi) reversible waves at more positive potentials (E₁/₂ = −0.33 V and E₂/₂ = −0.06 V vs. Fe⁺/Fe) (SI Appendix). It is presumed that activation of 6 for dehydrogenation catalysis involves formation of [Ir(trop-DAD)(OPh)]⁺ followed by oxidation of the coordinated phenolate complex. (Note that 4 mM phenolate does not show electrochemical activity up to +0.6 V vs. Fe⁺/Fe, which is well above any potential used in these experiments.)

We also studied the reverse reaction (catalytic hydrogenation of p-anisaldehyde to 4-methoxybenzyl alcohol) using 5 or 6 combined with phenol as a proton source and stoichiometric reductants (Table 4). It was necessary to run hydrogenations with excess phenol (acid), because we observed formation of large amounts of a precipitate, which was identified by ¹H NMR, CV, HPLC-TOF/MS, and thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) coupled FTIR as an adduct of cobaltocenium phenolate with phenol ([CoCp₄](OPh) HOPh). Therefore, hydrogenation reactions were carried out with 1 mol% 5 or 6, 5 eq phenol, and 2.5 eq reductant relative to p-anisaldehyde to achieve high yields. Reductants were surveyed with each catalyst over a relatively wide range of redox potentials in o-DCB (Table 4), most being strong enough to activate (reduce) 5 and 6 by one and two electrons, respectively. Reduction of 5 to metalloradical [Ir(trop-DACH)] was reported previously in DMSO (46), and in o-DCB/0.08 M n-Bu₄NPF₆ electrolyte, the peak potential observed by CV at −1.36 V vs. Fe⁺/Fe indicates that its formation should be possible by [CoCp₃]: [Co(n¹-C₆H₄Et₂)], and [CoCp₃]. Based on CV studies of 6 under the same electrochemical conditions, reductants [FeCp₃] and [Cr(n¹-C₆H₄(CH₃)₂)] listed in Table 4 are not strong enough to reduce both C=N bonds in 6.

Data from Table 4 support our expectations that [FeCp₃]⁺ was not strong enough to activate either 5 or 6 for catalytic aldehyde hydrogenation. Likewise, [Cr(n¹-C₆H₄(CH₃)₂)] was not expected or observed to activate both 5 and 6. Our initial hydrogenation attempts that used 2.5 eq each phenol and [CoCp₃] provided low yields of p-anisaldehyde (48% and 27% with 5 and 6, respectively) and produced large amounts of precipitate that indicated acid-starved conditions of this reaction. To avoid this acid-starved condition, all hydrogenation reactions in Table 4 were run as a 2:1 ratio of phenol to reductant. We identified a definitive sweet spot at the [CoCp₃] redox potential and found 6 to be more effective and active compared with 5. An 89% yield of 4-methoxybenzyl alcohol was observed after 24 h at room temperature with 6, phenol, and [CoCp₃] (Table 4, entry 8), whereas the same reaction with 5 afforded a 60% yield after 72 h (Table 4, entry 3). Such as was observed in the dehydrogenation reaction, solubility of the reductants used played an important role in the effectiveness of catalytic hydrogenation. [CoCp₃] has a reduction potential sufficient to reduce 5 and 6; however, very poor solubility in o-DCB rendered it largely ineffective with 5 (despite stirring for 3 d) and incapable of reducing 6. (Note that [CoCp₃] remained in a reduced state at the end of the reaction and did not consume/reduce phenol to any significant extent.) Conversely, [Co(n¹-C₆H₄Et₂)] is a liquid, and hydrogenations were observed to be homogeneous with near-complete consumption of reductant. With high o-DCB solubility, excess phenol consumed [Co(n¹-C₆H₄Et₂)] and low conversions resulted (despite negligible side products).

**Summary**

In conclusion, we have developed a rare class of homogeneous iron catalysts (1–3) for efficient reversible acceptorless dehydrogenation–hydrogenation of alcohols and diols under mild conditions. Moreover, we showed that it is possible to decouple proton and electron transfer processes in both directions through use of metalloocene-based chemical oxidants/reductants, presumably as surrogates for catalytic electrode-driven (de)hydrogenation reactions. This work further illustrates the importance of non-innocent ligands in enabling reversible (de)hydrogenation catalysis. In all cases, catalytically active metal complexes bear such ligands, with nitrogen atoms (capable of forming/breaking N–H bonds) acting as a proton sink/source. The obtained results are of importance for the development of reversible dehydrogenation electrocatalysts and ultimately, the application of such catalysts in regenerative liquid fuel cells using chemically bound hydrogen for energy storage.

**Methods**

All organometallic compounds were prepared and handled under a nitrogen atmosphere using standard Schlenk and glove box techniques. E₁/₂ values are reported relative to CP₂Fe/Cp₂Fe and were measured in o-DCB/0.08 M n-Bu₄NPF₆ as electrolyte at 0.1 Vs with Pt working and counter electrodes and Ag wire/10 mM AgNO₃ solution as reference electrode in CH₂CN/0.1 M n-Bu₄NPF₆ electrolyte. Experimental details are in SI Appendix.

**Table 4. Hydrogenation of p-anisaldehyde with chemical reductants in the presence of phenol as a proton source in o-DCB using 5 and 6 (1 mol%) as catalysts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Reductant</th>
<th>E₁/₂ (V)*</th>
<th>Time (h)</th>
<th>Yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[FeCp₃]⁺</td>
<td>−0.54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Cr(n¹-C₆H₄(CH₃)₂)]</td>
<td>−1.19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[CoCp₃]</td>
<td>−1.33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Co(n¹-C₆H₄Et₂)]</td>
<td>−1.44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[CoCp₃]⁻</td>
<td>−1.95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[FeCp₃]⁺</td>
<td>−0.54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Cr(n¹-C₆H₄(CH₃)₂)]</td>
<td>−1.19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[CoCp₃]</td>
<td>−1.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Co(n¹-C₆H₄Et₂)]</td>
<td>−1.44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[CoCp₃]⁻</td>
<td>−1.95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Relative to CP₂Fe/Cp₂Fe.

Bonitatibus et al.
General Procedure for the Iron-Catalyzed Dehydrogenation of Alcohols. In a glove box, a 50-mL flame-dried Schlenk flask equipped with a condenser was charged with an iron catalyst (25 μmol), an alcohol substrate (2.5 or 25 mmol), and 5 mL toluene. The solution was stirred at 120 °C for a specific time under a constant N2 flow. After the reaction, the solution was allowed to cool to room temperature, filtered through a short silica gel column, and eluted with THF. The resulting filtrate was evaporated under vacuum to afford the pure product. 1H and 13C{1H} NMR spectra of the products were recorded in CDCl3 and matched with the chemical shifts reported in the literature. The results are summarized in Table 1.

General Procedure for the Iron-Catalyzed Hydrogenation of 4-Methoxyacetophenone. In a glove box, a 25-mL stainless steel Parr pressure reactor was loaded with an iron complex (25 μmol), KO Bu (if required), 4-methoxyacetophenone (375 mg, 2.5 mmol), and 5 mL toluene (or THF). The reactor was sealed, flushed with H2 for three times, and finally, placed under 80 psig H2 pressure. The solution was then stirred at room temperature for 6 h. After the reaction, the solution was filtered through a short silica gel column and eluted with THF. The resulting filtrate was evaporated to dryness to afford the pure hydrogenation product. 1H and 13C{1H} NMR spectra of the product were recorded in CDCl3 and matched with the reported spectra in the literature. For all of the reactions, quantitative conversions were achieved (Table 2).

General Procedure for the Iridium-Catalyzed Oxidative Dehydrogenation of Alcohols. All hydrogenation reactions used 1 mol% catalyst (5 or 6), 1.25 mmol alcohol, 3.13 mmol reductant, and 6.26 mmol phenol as acid at room temperature in o-DCB (reaction volume ~ 10 mL). 1H NMR yields were determined against hexamethylenetetramine as an internal standard based on peak integration of either methoxy or aromatic protons.

General Procedure for the Iridium-Catalyzed Reductive Hydrogenation of Alcohols. All hydrogenation reactions used 1 mol% catalyst (5 or 6), 1.25 mmol alcohol, 3.13 mmol reductant, and 6.26 mmol phenol as acid at room temperature in o-DCB (reaction volume ~ 10 mL). 1H NMR yields were determined against hexamethylenetetramine as an internal standard based on peak integration of either methoxy or aromatic protons.
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