

(19) **DANMARK**

(10) **DK/EP 3548474 T3**



(12) **Oversættelse af
europæisk patentskrift**

Patent- og
Varemærkestyrelsen

-
- (51) Int.Cl.: **C 07 D 307/68 (2006.01)** **B 01 J 31/12 (2006.01)** **B 29 B 7/00 (2006.01)**
B 29 B 7/88 (2006.01)
- (45) Oversættelsen bekendtgjort den: **2023-09-25**
- (80) Dato for Den Europæiske Patentmyndigheds bekendtgørelse om meddelelse af patentet: **2023-07-05**
- (86) Europæisk ansøgning nr.: **17872397.9**
- (86) Europæisk indleveringsdag: **2017-05-11**
- (87) Den europæiske ansøgnings publiceringsdag: **2019-10-09**
- (86) International ansøgning nr.: **US2017032233**
- (87) Internationalt publikationsnr.: **WO2018093413**
- (30) Prioritet: **2016-11-17 WO PCT/US2016/062491**
- (84) Designerede stater: **AL AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR HR HU IE IS IT LI LT LU LV MC MK MT NL NO PL PT RO RS SE SI SK SM TR**
- (73) Patenthaver: **Archer Daniels Midland Company, Michelle Watts , 4666 Faries Parkway, Decatur, Illinois 62526, USA**
DuPont Industrial Biosciences USA, LLC, Chestnut Run Plaza , 974 Centre Road, P.O. Box 2915, Wilmington, Delaware 19805, USA
- (72) Opfinder: **STENSRUD, Kenneth, 2017 W. William, Decatur, Illinois 62522, USA**
FERGUSON, Stuart, 820 Selkirk Road, K7P 1B6 Kingston, Ontario, Canada
- (74) Fuldmægtig i Danmark: **Zacco Denmark A/S, Arne Jacobsens Allé 15, 2300 København S, Danmark**
- (54) Benævnelse: **ORGANOTINKATALYSATORER I ESTERIFICERINGSPROCESSER AF FURAN-2,5-DICARBOXYLSYRE (FDCA)**
- (56) Fremdragne publikationer:
WO-A1-2016/098496
US-A- 4 950 746
US-A1- 2012 220 507
US-A1- 2013 171 397
US-A1- 2014 128 623
US-A1- 2015 307 704
US-A1- 2015 315 166
US-A1- 2016 215 119
Shuai Wang ET AL: "Toward the Rational Design of Galactosylated Glycoclusters That Target Pseudomonas aeruginosa Lectin A (LecA): Influence of Linker Arms That Lead to Low-Nanomolar Multivalent Ligands", CHEMISTRY - A EUROPEAN JOURNAL, vol. 22, no. 33, 14 July 2016 (2016-07-14) , pages 11785-11794, XP055732515, DE ISSN: 0947-6539, DOI: 10.1002/chem.201602047
E. Gubbels ET AL: "Synthesis and characterization of novel renewable polyesters based on 2,5-

Fortsættes ...

furandicarboxylic acid and 2,3-butanediol", *Journal of Polymer Science Part A: Polymer Chemistry*, 1 January 2012 (2012-01-01), pages n/a-n/a, XP055045000, ISSN: 0887-624X, DOI: 10.1002/pola.26446

Yao-Bing Huang ET AL: "Highly efficient metal salt catalyst for the esterification of biomass derived levulinic acid under microwave irradiation", *RSC Advances*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1 January 2016 (2016-01-01), pages 2106-2111, XP055732510, DOI: 10.1039/C5RA24305J

DESCRIPTION


FIELD OF INVENTION

[0001] The present disclosure pertains to processes for improving esterification of sugar-derived furan-2,5-dicarboxylic acid (FDCA). In particular, the invention involves methods for efficient preparation of derivatives of FDCA using organotin catalysts in Fischer-Speier esterification reactions.

BACKGROUND

[0002] Petroleum traditionally has been a primary source of raw material for making organic monomer precursors for common polymeric materials. However, with concerns about climate change and carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel sources, researchers have turned to bio-based, renewable carbon sources for plausible surrogate molecules. Carbohydrates, sometimes simply termed sugars, are a prodigious class of bio-based compounds that present a diverse array of extended, carbon-chained building blocks. For over 150 years, scientists have explored various chemical means for adapting the properties of sugars to an array of applications, including polymers. Dehydrative cyclization is a common transformation that sugars can undergo, particularly at elevated temperatures and in the presence of a catalyst, producing furan-based substances. For example, the common sugar, fructose, readily cyclizes at low pH to produce a versatile precursor, 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furfural, HMF. This process is illustrated in Scheme A.

Scheme A. Catalytic dehydrative cyclization of fructose to HMF



[0003] By virtue of its unique functionality, HMF can, in turn, be modified into other interesting molecular entities, such as furan-2,5-dimethanol (FOM), 2,5-bishydroxymethyl tetrahydrofuran (bHMTHF), diformylfuran (OFF), and 2,5-furandicarboxylic acid (FDCA). FDCA, in particular, has recently received considerable interest by myriad research groups as potentially renewable replacement for petro-based terephthalic acid in polymer applications.

[0004] Synthetic chemists have long sought to overcome challenges posed by the physical attributes of FDCA (e.g., its limited solubility in many common organic solvents and an extremely high melting point (>300°C)). The high melting point of FDCA is a particular encumbrance when one desires to employ melt polymerization processes. Simple chemical modifications, such as esterification, often enables one to overcome barriers that arise from such physical properties. Esterification of FDCA with methanol to make dimethyl 2,5-furandicarboxylate (FDME) allows chemists to work with an appreciably more "manageable" derivative chemical compound that has a melting point at 112°C, and boiling point of 140-145°C (10 torr), and facile solubility in a multitude of common organic solvents.

[0005] Over the years, esterification by autocatalysis has been demonstrated by several research groups in many publications. The inherent inefficiency of this process, however, arises from the need

to use high temperatures and long, protracted reaction times to attain copacetic conversions of FDCA and yields of the target esters. This phenomenon of the esterification process has been a drawback which adds significantly to the cost of manufacture on an industrial or commercial scale operation. One conventional approach to enhance the esterification process has been to employ Brønsted acid catalysis, which on one hand greatly improves FDCA conversions and ester yields, but on another hand also readily drives alcohol condensation to undesired, low molecular weight ethers. This generation of byproducts can reduce the overall yield of desired ester product, and can encumber downstream processing, particularly relating to recycling and waste. Alternatively, Lewis acid catalysis in esterification have also been used, but Lewis acid catalysts often suffer from limited activity (lability), and a propensity to generate undesired Brønsted acids when in an aqueous matrix. In order to offset the specified hindrances of common esterification methods, alternate catalysts are needed.

US 2014/128623 discloses a method of synthesising a furan-2,5-dicarboxylate derivative plasticizer. The method includes a step of contacting a purified furan-2,5-dicarboxylic acid composition and an alcohol stream in the presence of a catalyst.

WO 2016/098496 describes a plasticizer that is obtained by esterification of a furan dicarboxylic acid compound and a C₄₋₂₂ aliphatic alcohol.

US 2012/220507 discloses methods for producing mixtures of isononyl furan-2,5-dicarboxylate. The method includes esterification of furandicarboxylic acid, or a reactive derivative, with a mixture of isomeric nonanols which may be in the presence of a catalyst.

Wang et al. (Eur. J. Chem. 22(33), 2016) describes the synthesis of furan-based galactosides via diesterification of furan-2,5-dicarboxylic acid.


Gubbels et al. (J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem. 51(4), 2013) describes the synthesis of polyesters from 2,5-furandicarboxylic acid or 2,5-dimethyl-furandicarboxylate and 2,3-butanediol by bulk polycondensation catalysed by titanium (IV) *n*-butoxide, tin (IV) ethylhexanoate or zirconium (IV) butoxide.

Huang et al. (RSC Adv. 6(3), 2016) discloses a process of esterifying levulinic acid to alkyl levulinates in the presence of metal salt catalysts under microwave irradiation.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

[0006] The present disclosure describes, in part, a catalytic process for converting furan-2,5 dicarboxylic acid (FDCA) into monoalkylfuran-2,5-dicarboxylate (FDMAE) and dialkylfuran-2,5-dicarboxylate (FDAE), according to a reaction depicted in Figure 1.

Scheme 1. Esterification of FDCA to FDMAE and FDAE



wherein the R-group is methyl.

[0007] In general, the process involves: reacting FDCA with methanol as a solvent, ; in the presence of a homogeneous organotin catalyst at a loading level of up to 10 mol.% for a reaction time and temperature sufficient to esterify said FDCA and produce a di-ester species at a FDCA conversion of at least 80 mol.%.

[0008] The process can generate relatively high conversions of FDCA and yields at reduced

temperatures (150 °C-225°C) and at lower catalyst loadings (e.g., ≤ 1.0 mol. % relative to starting amount of FDCA) of the organotin catalysts. The organotin catalyst is selected from the group consisting of: butylstannoic acid, dibutyltin oxide, dibutyltin diacetate, stannous (II) acetate and butyltin tris 2-ethylhexanoate.

[0009] The process can convert FDCA at least 85 mol.% to a mono- or di-ester. Furthermore, the organotin catalysts manifest markedly reduced side product activities relative to Brønsted acid counterparts in forming undesired alcohol condensations to ethers.

[0010] Additional features and advantages of the present synthesis method and material compounds will be disclosed in the following detailed description. It is understood that both the foregoing summary and the following detailed description and examples are merely representative of the invention, and are intended to provide an overview for understanding the invention as claimed.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF INVENTION

Section I. Description

[0011] The present disclosure describes, in part, a highly efficient process for preparation of mono- and di-esters of furan-2,5-dicarboxylic acid (FDCA). According to embodiments, the process involves plying homogeneous organotin catalysts to produce both the mono- and di-esters of FDCA from reactions with methanol.

[0012] The process comprises: reacting FDCA with methanol as a solvent, in the presence of a homogeneous organotin catalyst at a loading level of up to 5 or 10 mol.% for a reaction time and temperature sufficient to esterify said FDCA and produce a di-ester species at a FDCA conversion of at least 80 mol.% .

[0013] The process produces less side products in amount of less than 0.05 mol.%, typically about 0.03-0.04 mol.%, and minimal to no decarboxylation.

[0014] Applicable homogeneous organotin catalysts as contemplated generally exhibit tin (IV) oxidation state, with an exception of tin (II) acetate. We have found unexpectedly that organotin catalysts having +4 oxidation state can be highly efficient for catalyzing the esterification reaction, with generation of minimal side products at reasonable reaction temperatures. The organotin catalyst can include at least one of the following: butylstannoic acid (BSA), dibutyltin oxide (DBTO), dibutyltin diacetate and butyltin tris 2-ethylhexanoate.

[0015] In certain particularly favored embodiments, the organotin catalyst can be selected from: butylstannoic acid, dibutyltin oxide, dibutyltin diacetate, butyltin tris 2-ethylhexanoate.

[0016] According to certain embodiments of the process the organotin catalyst loading level can be in a range from about 0.01 mol.% to about 5 mol.% (e.g., 2 mol.%, 3 mol.% or 4 mol.%). Typically, the catalyst loading level is in a range from about 0.05 mol.% to about 1.5 mol.%; more typically, the range is about 0.01 mol% to about 1 mol.%, preferably about 0.1 mol% to about 0.5 mol%.

[0017] Differentiated from heterogeneous catalysts, which are generally immobilized on carbon or aluminum scaffolds, homogeneous organometallic catalysts are monophasic with the reagents and can demonstrate advantages in catalyzing processes vis-d-vis supported metal catalyst species. One benefit of homogeneous catalysts over insoluble heterogeneous catalysts, particular to the application in the present method, is that the homogeneous species does not require filtration after use, which imparts improved economics, as an extra unit operation for such is avoided.

[0018] An advantageous feature of the current process with homogeneous organotin catalysis is that few side products are generated. This is a salient difference between the two kinds of catalysts. With the present organotin catalysts one can generate higher FDME yields than when using sulfuric acid (e.g., ~93% vs. ~87% respectively). Brønsted acids are significantly different and detrimental for producing more side-products, lower yields, and can trigger side reaction pathways - such as noticeable yields of dimethyl ether (DME) with Brønsted acid versus Lewis acid (-2-3 orders of magnitude more). This effect has not been sufficiently recognized or appreciated. Conventionally, a sulfuric acid catalyst produces a great amount of DME, nearly 2 mol% in yield. Furthermore, in conventional processes, one uses catalyst in amounts that can be up to about 50 mol.% relative to the starting amount of FDCA. The tin catalysts generate significantly less, only about 0.03 mol.% yield of DME. In contrast for instance, strong Bronsted acid (e.g., HCl, H₂SO₄) catalyzed processes one effects significant amounts of flammable, gaseous alkyl and aryl ethers from alcohol condensations, which would need to perform extensive downstream separation or purification processing to remove both side products and the catalysts themselves before the product mixture could be used in synthesis of other or additional compounds. At such amounts, downstream processing will require catalyst removal.

[0019] Using the homogeneous organotin catalysts, the process can achieve a FDCA conversion of at least 3% or 5% greater, or a mono- or di-ester yield of at least 8 mol.% or 10 mol.% greater than a process reacted using a comparable amount of Bronsted acid catalyst. The homogeneous organotin catalyzed process enables the conversion of FDCA to the corresponding di-esters in reasonably high mole yields of at least 75 mol.%-82 mol.% (e.g., -77 mol.%, 80 mol.%), typically 85 mol.%-89 mol.% or greater. Typically, the molar yield ranges from about 85% or 87% to about 99%+, or any combination of ranges therein (e.g., ~86%, 88%, 89%, 90%, 92%, 95%, 97%, 98%), depending on the reaction conditions (i.e., time, temperature pressure), and with the residue being the corresponding monoester. In particular examples, homogeneous organotin catalysts near quantitative conversions of FDCA to a furanic mono and diesters (2,5-furandimethyl ester, FDME,) in yields near 90 mol.%. In certain embodiments, FDCA conversion is at least about 92 mol.%, 95 mol.% or 96 mol.%, or preferably about 99 mol.%. The yield of diester can be at least 50 mole%, typically about 70 mol.% - 97 mol.%, more typically about 80 mol.% or 87 mol.% to about 90 mol.% or 95mol.%.

[0020] A summary of results from catalyst screenings with methanol are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Data synopsis from catalyst screening of FDCA esterification in methanol

Catalyst	Vendor/Product #	Product Name	FDCA conversion (mol%)	FDME yield (mol%)	Dimethyl ether yield (mol%, estimated from head space analysis)
Tin (IV)					
Butyltin tris-2-ethylhexanoate	PMC	FASCAT [®] 9102	99.61 ± 0.12	89.46 ± 1.15	0.0363 ± 0.0013
Dibutyltin oxide	SIAL		99.72 ± 0.29	90.05 ± 1.34	0.0351 ± 0.0017
Dibutyltin oxide	PMC	FASCAT [®] 4201	99.77 ± 0.28	90.47 ± 0.98	0.0362 ± 0.0029
Dibutyltin diacetate	PMC	FASCAT [®] 4200	99.55 ± 0.17	90.09 ± 1.23	0.0349 ± 0.0022
Butylstannoic acid	PMC	FASCAT [®] 9100	99.69 ± 0.08	91.21 ± 0.86	0.0334 ± 0.0021
Dibutyltin oxide blend	FOMREZ	FOMREZ [®] -SUL4	99.64 ± 0.11	89.04 ± 0.41	0.0343 ± 0.0013
Dibutyltin oxide blend	FOMREZ	FOMREZ [®] -SUL-11	99.59 ± 0.19	87.08 ± 1.89	0.0336 ± 0.0011
Dibutyltin dilaurate	PMC	FASCAT [®] 4202	99.06 ± 0.32	82.16 ± 0.97	0.0315 ± 0.0018
Dibutyltin maleate	SIAL		99.19 ± 0.15	84.58 ± 0.86	0.0374 ± 0.0023
Dibutyltin dichloride	PMC	FASCAT [®] 4201	99.26 ± 0.26	86.33 ± 1.16	1.1331 ± 0.0097
Dioctyltin oxide	PMC	FASCAT [®] 8201	98.11 ± 0.29	76.12 ± 0.94	0.0335 ± 0.0027
Monobutyltin dihydroxychloride	PMC	FASCAT [®] 4101	97.63 ± 0.10	80.15 ± 0.59	0.9126 ± 0.1073
Tin dioxide	SIAL		95.91 ± 0.22	64.55 ± 0.70	0.0257 ± 0.0011
Tin (II)					
Stannous octoate	PMC	FASCAT [®] 2003	96.54 ± 0.12	69.68 ± 1.66	0.0332 ± 0.0021
Stannous oxalate	PMC	FASCAT [®] 2001	97.17 ± 0.07	78.74 ± 0.77	0.0295 ± 0.0029
Tin acetate	SIAL		99.58 ± 0.16	88.99 ± 0.80	0.0526 ± 0.0014
Tin chloride	PMC	FASCAT [®] 2004	94.11 ± 0.55	81.26 ± 1.69	0.9951 ± 0.1561
Titanates					
Titanium tetrabutoxide	SIAL	TYZOR TBT	98.57 ± 0.15	74.98 ± 1.65	0.0526 ± 0.0014

Titanates					
Titanium tetraisopropoxide	SIAL	TYZOR TTIP	98.31 ± 0.22	72.07 ± 0.89	0.0409 ± 0.0032
Brønsted Acids					
Phosphonic	SIAL		97.42 ± 0.21	71.56 ± 1.15	0.1454 ± 0.0041
p-Toluenesulfonic monohydrate	SIAL		95.16 ± 0.70	67.42 ± 1.43	0.0691 ± 0.0072
Sulfuric	SIAL		99.49 ± 0.09	87.53 ± 1.23	1.6036 ± 0.1284
Autocatalysis			93.94 ± 1.47	64.26 ± 0.82	0.0367 ± 0.0020

[0021] When compared to standard catalyst loadings, the product tolerance for residual organometallic species is usually limited to organotin catalysts used in relatively low loads of 10 mol.% or less, such as in amounts in a range of about 5 mol.% to 8 mol.% or less, relative to the starting amount of FDCA. Typically, the catalysts amount ranges from about 0.01 mol.% to about 2, 3 or 4 mol.%, desirably, about 0.05 to about 1.0 or 1.8 mol.%. This feature of the present reaction system enables one to allow the catalyst to remain in the product mixture without exigent need for removal, further simplifying downstream demand.


[0022] Esterification of FDCA can be conducted either in an inert atmosphere (e.g., nitrogen or argon) or in air without detrimental effect the reaction. The reaction temperature for the present process is in a range from about 150°C to about 225°C, more preferably about 175°C or 180°C to about 200°C or 210°C (e.g., 185°C, 195°C, 205°C, 208°C). For instance, one can conduct the reaction in a Parr vessel of any material of composition (MOC) at a temperature in a range from about 150°C or 160°C to about 225°C, more typically about 170°C to about 200°C (e.g., about 175°C or 180°C to about 190°C or 195°C).

[0023] The reaction time for the esterification process can be up to about 10 or 12 hours. Typically, the reaction time is in a range from about 10 minutes to about 8 hours; more typically, the reaction time is within about 3 or 4 hours, and desirably within about 1-2 hours until equilibrium. In certain embodiments the reaction can reach equilibrium within about 0.5 hours (i.e., 30 minutes) (e.g., ~10, 15, 20 minutes). In an embodiment, for example, esterification can be performed within a 6 hour overall reaction time, typically within about 2 or 4 hours. More typically, the total reaction time ranges from about 1 or 2 hours to about 3 or 4 hours; particular durations can be about 0.5 to 1 hours or about 1-1.5 hours.


[0024] According to the process one can use an alcohol solvent sufficient to dissolve the FDCA. In other embodiments, the alcohol solvent can be at about 75 wt.% to about 97 wt.% relative to an amount of FDCA. The alcohol used for esterification of FDCA is methanol.

[0025] Mono-ester products of FDCA are also disclosed, for example the following compounds not forming part of the invention are disclosed:

formylfuran-2-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)furan-2-carboxylic acid (FDCA-HMF)




and 5-(((2-ethylhexyl)oxy)carbonyl)furan-2-carboxylic acid (FDCA-2EH)




[0026] Di-ester products of FDCA are also disclosed, for example the following compounds not forming part of the invention are disclosed:

bis((5-formylfuran-2-yl)methyl) furan-2,5-dicarboxylate (FDCA-HMF)



and bis(2-ethylhexyl) furan-2,5-dicarboxylate (FDCA di(2EH))



Section II. Examples

[0027] In the following examples we further demonstrate the present method of preparing mono and dialkyl esters catalyzed by organotin species. The particular examples presented herein use methanol in the esterification, producing FDME and FDMME .

[0028] A summary of are presented in the appended. In Tables 2-5, we summarize the additional examples of organotin catalysts and their efficacy in methanol and FDME solvents, respectively for esterification of FDCA to FDME at different concentrations, and under different catalyst loadings and operational conditions (i.e., time, temperature, pressure, etc.). Examples A, B, and C, respectively are at 17 wt.%, 26 wt.%, and 35 wt.% FCDA concentrations. Table 2 presents esterification reactions of FDCA in methanol solvent at 17 wt.% FDCA. In a first group, eight comparative examples are run without a catalyst; in a second group four examples are performed with an organotin catalyst loading of 0.1 mol.%, and four examples and two comparative examples in a third group have an organotin catalyst loading of 0.5 mol.%.

[0029] Generally, reactions with catalyst at temperatures between about 175°C to about 250°C were able to achieve near complete conversion of FCDA (i.e., ≥ 95 mol.%) and FDME yields of more than

85 mol.%.

[0030] Table 3 presents esterification reactions of FDCA in methanol solvent at 26 wt.% FDCA. In a first group six comparative examples are run without catalyst, and in a second group three examples and a comparative example have a catalyst loading of 0.5 mol.%. Even at lower temperatures (e.g., ~175°C, 200°C), the presence of the present organotin catalysts helps achieve better FDCA conversion (i.e., near complete) and FDME yield (e.g., ≥ 85 mol.%) than that produced at higher temperatures (e.g., 250°C) without catalyst.

[0031] Table 4 presents esterification reactions of FDCA in methanol solvent at 35 wt.% FDCA. In a first group four comparative examples are run without catalyst, and in a second group three examples and a comparative example have a catalyst loading of 0.5 mol.%. Similar to the results in Table 3, the catalyzed reactions performed better than reactions without catalyst; one can achieve about 5 mol.% more FDME yield at reaction temperatures of about 200°C or higher. This additional yield can be a significant benefit in industrial production.

[0032] Table 5 presents esterification of FDCA in FDME solvent. In the reference examples using the present organotin catalysts one can achieve similar or better conversion of FDCA, and a significant improvement in FDME yield over examples without catalyst. In some examples, the difference in FDME yield is at least 5 mol.%, others ≥ 10 mol.% or 12 mol.%.

TABLES: Batch Esterifications of FDCA to FDME

[0033]

I. TABLE 2. Esterification of FDCA in methanol solvent

Example A.							
17 wt.% FDCA (6 g FDCA + 30 g MeOH)							
Catalyst Load (mol.%)	Rxn Temp (°C)	Operating Pressure (psi)	Rxn Time (min)	Approximate Time to Equilibrium (min)	FDCA conversion	FDME yield (mol%)	Decarboxylation
* None	125	84	90	----	21.59	1.60	N
* None	150	170	90	----	71.99	21.90	N
* None	175	325	120	----	89.82 ± 0.33	46.06 ± 1.14	N
* None	185	360	180	----	98.58	73.82	N
* None	200	500	90	----	95.80	61.10	N
* None	210	590	150	135	98.86 ± 0.02	80.17 ± 1.03	N
* None	225	750	90	----	98.78 ± 0.03	77.35 ± 1.50	N
* None	250	1100	90	30	99.09	82.59	Y
0.1	150	165	90	----	79.18	28.30	N
0.1	175	325	90	----	97.21	77.47	N

Example A.							
17 wt.% FDCA (6 g FDCA + 30 g MeOH)							
Catalyst Load (mol.%)	Rxn Temp (°C)	Operating Pressure (psi)	Rxn Time (min)	Approximate Time to Equilibrium (min)	FDCA conversion	FDME yield (mol%)	Decarboxylation
0.1	200	500	90	60	99.46	85.20	N
0.1	225	750	90	30	99.40 ± 0.23	85.61 ± 1.26	N
* 0.5	125	84	90	----	40.71	4.98	N
0.5	150	175	90	----	95.87	67.70	N
0.5	175	325	150	120	99.54 ± 0.18	88.49 ± 0.54	N
0.5	200	500	60	15	99.60 ± 0.31	88.98 ± 2.07	N
0.5	225	725	60	Heat up	99.63 ± 0.17	88.76 ± 1.33	N
* 0.5	250	1100	60	Heat up	99.54 ± 0.13	88.36 ± 1.98	Y
*Comparative example							

TABLE 3.

Example B.							
26 wt.% FDCA (10 g FDCA + 29 g MeOH)							
Catalyst Load (mol%)	Rxn Temp (°C)	Operating Pressure (psi)	Rxn Time (min)	Approximate Time to Equilibrium (min)	FDCA conversion (mol%)	FDME yield (mol%)	Decarboxylation
* None	175	325	90	----	87.95	48.45	N
* None	185	336	180	----	98.87	75.70	N
* None	200	445	90	----	95.72	65.65	N
* None	210	590	150	150	98.88	80.16	N
* None	225	745	90	----	98.35	73.59	N
* None	250	1045	60	45	99.03	80.89	Y
0.5	175	310	120	----	99.67	87.52	N
0.5	200	475	90	30	99.52 ± 0.08	87.98 ± 0.61	N
0.5	225	735	60	15	99.62 ± 0.17	87.85 ± 0.57	N
* 0.5	250	1030	60	Heat up	99.57 ± 0.14	87.54 ± 1.92	Y

TABLE 4.

Example C.							
35 wt.% FDCA (15 g FDCA + 28 g MeOH)							
Catalyst	Rxn Temp (°C)	Operating Pressure (psi)	Rxn Time (min)	Approximate Time to Equilibrium (min)	FDCA conversion (mol%)	FDME yield (mol%)	Decarboxylation
* None	175	230	240	----	80.16	37.79	N
* None	200	400	240	----	98.47	78.01	N
* None	225	600	180	----	98.19	77.30	N
* None	250	920	60	----	98.73	77.65	Y
0.5 mol%	175	236	90	----	98.32	77.69	N
0.5 mol%	200	395	90	90	99.08	83.95	N
0.5 mol%	225	600	60	30	99.12	83.99	N
* 0.5 mol%	250	925	60	Heatup	99.10	83.31	Y
*Comparative example							

II. TABLE 5. Reference example, esterification of FDCA in FDME solvent

Trial set	Catalyst	Temp (°C)	P (psi)	MeOH (eq.)	Time (min)	Equilib.	FDCA conv. (mole%)	FDMME yld. (mole %)	FDME yld. (mole %)
1	Y	170	83	2	45	N	67	56	12
2	Y	170	103	4	60	N	95	67	28
3	Y	170	140	8	60	N	97	54	43
4	Y	170	174	12	60	N	98	48	50
5	Y	180	109	4	60	N	96	65	31
6	Y	180	144	8	60	N	97	52	45
7	Y	180	209	12	60	N	98	44	54
8	N	180	121	4	60	N	79	66	13
9	N	180	155	8	60	N	85	67	18
10	N	180	211	12	60	N	89	67	22
11	Y	200	115	4	150	Y (90 min)	97	58	39
12	Y	200	179	8	150	Y (45 min)	99	36	63
13	Y	200	301	12	60	Y (30 min)	99	34	65
14	N	200	112	4	60	N	94	74	20
15	N	200	185	8	60	N	96	63	33
16	N	200	297	12	60	N	97	60	37

Trial set	Catalyst	Temp (°C)	P (psi)	MeOH (eq.)	Time (min)	Equilib.	FDCA conv. (mole%)	FDMME yld. (mole %)	FDME yld. (mole %)
17	Y	220	135	4	150	Y (30 min)	97	58	39
18	Y	220	220	8	45	Y (15 min)	99	36	63
19	Y	220	375	12	60	Y (15 min)	99	34	65
20	N	220	134	4	150	Y (30 min)	96	74	23
21	N	220	221	8	45	Y (45 min)	98	61	37
22	N	220	379	12	60	Y (30 min)	98	54	44

I. Highly effective catalysts

A. Methanol solvent

[0034]

1. 1) Butylstannoic acid catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT®9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.6 mole% FDCA, 8.2 mole% FDMME, 91.2 mole% FDME, 0.03 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

2. 2) Dibutyltin oxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dibutyltin oxide (FASCAT®9201). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.5 mole% FDCA, 9.0 mole% FDMME, 90.5 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

3. 3) Dibutyltin diacetate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of

dibutyltin diacetate (FASCAT[®]4200). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.6 mole% FDCA, 9.1 mole% FDMME, 90.4 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

4. 4) Butyltin tris 2-ethylhexanoate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME.

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of butyltin tris 2-ethylhexanoate (FASCAT[®]9102). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 60 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.6 mole% FDCA, 9.3 mole% FDMME, 90.4 mole% FDME, 0.05 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

5. 5) Comparative Example: No Catalyst Added.

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 6.1 mole% FDCA, 38.5 mole% FDMME, 55.4 mole% FDME, DME 0.01 mole%. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

B. Reference examples, highly effective catalysts in FDME solvent, 8 mole equivalents methanol

[0035]

1. 1) Butylstannic acid catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 30 g of FDME, 16.4 g of methanol and 50 mg of butylstannic acid (FASCAT[®]9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.1 mole% FDCA, 36.1 mole% FDMME, 62.8 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

2. 2) Dibutyltin oxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 30 g FDME, 16.4 g of methanol and 50 mg of dibutyltin oxide (FASCAT[®] 9201). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was

dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.5 mole% FDCA, 36.5 mole% FDMME, 62.0 mole% FDME, 0.06 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

3. 3) Comparative example, no added catalyst

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 30 g of FDME, and 16.4 g of methanol. While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 3.5 mole% FDCA, 63.5 mole% FDMME, 33.0 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

II. Moderately effective catalysts

A. Methanol solvent

1) Comparative example,

Dibutyltin maleate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0036] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dibutyltin maleate (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.7 mole% FDCA, 10.4 mole% FDMME, 88.9 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

2) Comparative example,

Dibutyltin dilaurate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0037] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dibutyltin dilaurate (FASCAT® 4202). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.6 mole% FDCA, 10.6 mole% FDMME, 88.8 mole%

FDME, 0.07 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

3) Stannous (II) acetate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0038] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of stannous acetate (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.8 mole% FDCA, 11.2 mole% FDMME, 88.0 mole% FDME, 0.05 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

4) Comparative example,

Diocetyl tin oxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0039] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of diocetyl tin oxide (FASCAT® 8201). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.9 mole% FDCA, 12.6 mole% FDMME, 86.5 mole% FDME, 0.07 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

5) Comparative example,

Dibutyltin bis(1-thioglyceride) catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0040] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of diocetyl tin oxide (FASCAT® 4224). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.1 mole% FDCA, 13.8 mole% FDMME, 85.1 mole% FDME, 0.03 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

B. FDME solvent, 8 mole equivalents methanol

1) Comparative example,

Dibutyltin dilaurate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0041] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 30 g of FDME, 16.4 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dibutyltin dilaurate (FASCAT[®] 4202). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.8 mole% FDCA, 16.1 mole% FDMME, 82.1 mole% FDME, 0.05 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

2) Comparative example,**Diocetyl tin oxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME**

[0042] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dioctyltin oxide (FASCAT[®] 8201). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.9 mole% FDCA, 22.0 mole% FDMME, 76.1 mole% FDME, 0.07 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

III. Comparative Ineffective Catalysts**A. In Methanol solvent****[0043]****1. 1) Comparative example, dibutyltin dichloride catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME**

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of dibutyltin dichloride (FASCAT[®] 4201). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.7 mole% FDCA, 13.0 mole% FDMME, 86.3 mole% FDME, 1.4 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF

and FA, were described.

2. 2) Comparative example, monobutyltin dihydroxychloride catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of monobutyltin dihydroxychloride (FASCAT[®] 4101). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 2.4 mole% FDCA, 17.3 mole% FDMME, 80.3 mole% FDME, 0.9 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

3. 3) Comparative example, stannous (II) oxalate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of stannous oxalate (FASCAT[®] 2001). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 2.9 mole% FDCA, 19.0 mole% FDMME, 78.1 mole% FDME, 0.04 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

4. 4) Comparative example, stannous chloride catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of stannous chloride (FASCAT[®] 2004). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 3.3 mole% FDCA, 19.1 mole% FDMME, 77.6 mole% FDME, 1.2 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

5. 5) Comparative example, stannic chloride catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of stannic chloride (FASCAT[®] 4400). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UP Lt. PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.9 mole% FDCA, 13.6 mole% FDMME, 84.5 mole% FDME, 1.7 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

6. 6) Comparative example, stannous (II) octoate catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of stannous octoate (FASCAT[®] 2003). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to

200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 3.0 mole% FDCA, 18.5 mole% FDMME, 78.5 mole% FDME, 0.03 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

7. 7) Comparative example, titanium (IV) tetraisopropoxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of titanium tetraisopropoxide (TYZOR® TTIP). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 5.1 mole% FDCA, 22.2 mole% FDMME, 72.7 mole% FDME, 0.01 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

8. 8) Comparative example, titanium tetrabutoxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of titanium tetrabutoxide (TYZOR® TBT). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 5.0 mole% FDCA, 22.0 mole% FDMME, 73.0 mole% FDME, 0.01 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

B. In FDME solvent, 8 mole equivalents methanol

[0044]

1. 1) Comparative example, titanium tetraisopropoxide catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 30 g of FDME, 16.4 g of methanol and 50 mg of titanium tetraisopropoxide (TYZOR® TTIP). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 6.4 mole% FDCA, 50.3 mole% FDMME, 43.3 mole% FDME, 0.01 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

2. 2) Comparative example, stannic chloride catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of

stannic chloride (FASCAT[®] 4400). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 5.8 mole% FDCA, 44.7 mole% FDMME, 49.5 mole% FDME, 0.6 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

IV. Comparative Bronsted Acids

A. Sulfuric acid catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0045] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of sulfuric acid (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.7 mole% FDCA, 11.2 mole% FDMME, 88.1 mole% FDME, 2.5 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

B. Triflic acid catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0046] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of triflic acid (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA) The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.5 mole% FDCA, 10.7 mole% FDMME, 88.8 mole% FDME, 2.6 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

C. p-Toluenesulfonic acid catalyzed esterification of FDCA to FDME and FDMME

[0047] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of p-toluenesulfonic acid (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 2.6 mole% FDCA, 17.1 mole% FDMME, 80.3 mole% FDME, 1.1 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

D. Phosphonic acid

[0048] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of methanol (1.25 mol), and 50 mg of phosphonic acid (Sigma Aldrich). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The solid residual material was dried and analyzed (UPLC-PDA). The compositional analysis was as follows: 3.2 mole% FDCA, 17.9 mole% FDMME, 78.9 mole% FDME, 0.9 mole% DME. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

V. FDCA esterification with other alcohols, reference example effectiveness of select catalyst butylstannoic acid

A. FDCA esterification with ethanol to FDEE and FDMEE (reference)


[0049]



[0050] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of ethanol and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d⁶-DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.8 mole% FDCA, 15.4 mole% FDMEE, 83.8 mole% FDEE. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

B. FDCA esterification with n-butanol to FBDE and FDMBE (reference)

[0051]




[0052] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of n-butanol and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by

immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ^1H NMR (400 MHz, d^6 -DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 0.8 mole% FDCA, 17.2 mole% FDMBE, 82.0 mole% FDPE. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

C. FDCA esterification with phenol to FDPE and FDMPE (reference)


[0053]



[0054] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of phenol and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ^1H NMR (400 MHz, d^6 -DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.2 mole% FDCA, 15.5 mole% FDMPE, 82.1 mole% FDPE. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

D. FDCA esterification with benzyl alcohol to FDBzE and FDMBzE (reference)

[0055]




[0056] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of benzyl alcohol and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ^1H NMR (400 MHz, d^6 -DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 1.9 mole% FDCA, 21.1 mole% FDMBzE, 73.0 mole% FDBzE. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

E. FDCA esterification with 2-ethylhexanol to FD(2EH)and FDM(2EH) (reference)

[0057]






[0058] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of 2-ethylhexanol and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d⁶-DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 3.2 mole% FDCA, 21.1 mole% FDM(2EH), 75.7 mole% FD(2EH). No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described.

F. FDCA esterification with 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furfural (HMF) to FDCA-HMF monoester and FDCA-HMF diester (reference)

[0059]



[0060] Experimental: A 75 cc 316SS Parr vessels, each equipped with a glass enclosed magnetic stir bar, was charged with 10 g of FDCA (0.064 mol), 40 g of HMF and 50 mg of butylstannoic acid (FASCAT[®] 9100). While stirring at 875 rpm, the suspension was heated to 200°C for 60 minutes, including a 30 minute heat up requirement. After this time, the reaction was quickly quenched by immersion of the vessel in an ice bath. The liquid residual material was dried and analyzed by ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d⁶-DMSO). The compositional analysis was as follows: 2.1 mole% FDCA, 26.0 mole FDCA-HMF monoester, 68.7 mole% FDCA-HMF diester. No decarboxylation products, MF and FA, were described. In another reference example, one can compare batch esterification of terephthalic acid (TPA) and adipic acid (AA), two commodity non-furonic diacids, using methanol as catalyzed using tin (II) acetate, tin (II) octoate, tin (II) glucarate, respectively. Reaction conditions: 17 wt.% TPA or AA in methanol, 0.5 mole% catalyst, 200°C, 30 min (30 min heat up); 75 cc autoclave with magnetic stirring. Samples are withdrawn, dried, and analyzed by UPLC-UV (TPA) or ¹H NMR (AA). As summarized in Table 5, tin acetate demonstrated superior activity in both situations. With tin acetate or tin glucarate catalysts one can achieve greater than 85 wt.% conversion of TPA to the dimethylterephthalate ester. Between the two species, the tin acetate catalyst performs moderately better.

Table 5, TPA esterification: MMT = monomethyl terephthalic acid; DMT = dimethylterephthalate

Catalyst	TPA (wt.%)	MMT (wt.%)	DMT (wt.%)
Tin Acetate	0.4	10.7	88.9
Glucarate	0.4	13.1	86.4
Tin Octoate	3.8	36.3	59.9

[0061] Similarly, NMR analysis of AA esterification reveals that the tin acetate catalyst can achieve a significant advantage over the other two catalyst species. Tin acetate achieves 96 mole% AA conversion to mono and dimethyl esters in comparison to tin glucarate, which exhibits 70 mole% AA conversion to mono and dimethyl esters, and tin octoate, which produces 69 mole% AA conversion to mono and dimethyl esters.

[0062] In addition to the utility of the Sn (IV) catalysts, the foregoing experiments suggest that tin (II) acetate salt can also be a superior or beneficial catalyst not only for FDCA esterification as well as certain diacids. The effective tin catalysts comprise the organotins, which by definition, have at least one carbon-tin covalent bond, and are in their +4 oxidation state. Tin (II) salts, in general, were moderately effective as catalysts in esterification processes; however, tin (II) acetate was a surprising exception, which furnished high yields of diesters and conversed diacids in the diesterification examples provided. It is unclear whether tin (IV) acetate would afford any improvements over tin (II) acetate, as this species is not an organotin. Furthermore, one would unlikely utilized tin (IV) acetate, owing to its exorbitant cost relative to analogous organotins.

REFERENCES CITED IN THE DESCRIPTION

Cited references

This list of references cited by the applicant is for the reader's convenience only. It does not form part of the European patent document. Even though great care has been taken in compiling the references, errors or omissions cannot be excluded and the EPO disclaims all liability in this regard.

Patent documents cited in the description

- [US2014128623A](#) [0005]
- [WO2016098496A](#) [0005]
- [US2012220507A](#) [0005]

Non-patent literature cited in the description

- **WANG et al.** Eur. J. Chem., 2016, vol. 22, 33 [0005]
- **GUBBELS et al.** J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem., 2013, vol. 51, 4 [0005]
- **HUANG et al.** RSC Adv., 2016, vol. 6, 3 [0005]

Patentkrav

1. Fremgangsmåde til fremstilling af estere af furan-2,5-dicarboxylsyre (FDCA) omfattende:

- 5 at reagere FDCA med methanol som en solvent, i tilstedeværelsen af en homogen organotinkatalysator ved et belastningsniveau på op til 10 mol% for en reaktionstid og temperatur tilstrækkelig til at esterificere nævnte FDCA og producere en diesterspecies ved en FDCA-omdannelse på mindst 80 mol%, hvor nævnte organotinkatalysator er valgt fra gruppen bestående af:
- 10 butylstannoinsyre, dibutyltinoxid, dibutyltindiacetat, tin (II) -acetat, og butyltin-tris-2-ethylhexanoat, og hvor reaktionstemperaturen er i et område fra 150°C til 225°C.

2. Fremgangsmåden ifølge krav 1, hvor nævnte belastningsniveau af organotinkatalysator er i et område fra 0,01 mol% til 5 mol%, fortrinsvis fra 0,01
- 15 mol% til 1,5 mol%.

3. Fremgangsmåden ifølge krav 1, hvor nævnte reaktionstid er op til 12 timer, fortrinsvis fra 10 minutter til 8 timer.