## **Supporting Information**

## **Levulinic Acid Production from Furfural: Process Development and Techno-Economics**

Bharath Velaga and Nageswara Rao Peela\*

Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati, Assam – 781039, India

\*Corresponding author mail id: [peelanr@iitg.ac.in](mailto:peelanr@iitg.ac.in)

Table S1: List of different reaction conditions used in this study for the conversion of FF/xylose to LA







Figure S1: Theoretical and experimental FAH conversion and FA yields at varying a) temperature at 1h; b) time at 170°C and; c) temperature at 5 min (Reaction conditions: 2.5g solvent (formalin+water), 10 wt.%  $C_{FF}$ , formalin:catalyst:furfural=2:2:1 w/w/w, 2g water, catalyst= 1:1 Amberlyst-15:HZSM-5)



Figure S2: Theoretical and experimental FAH conversion and FA yields at varying a) formalin to furfural ratio; b) furfural concentration  $(C_{FF})$  (Reaction conditions: 2.5g solvent(formalin+water), 5 min reaction time, 160°C reaction temperature, catalyst= 1:0 Amberlyst-15:HZSM-5)

*Choice of organic solvent:* It is essential to choose a suitable organic solvent to suppress the side product formation, especially from the furanic compounds such as HMF. Organic solvents such as dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK), and tetrahydrofuran (THF) were extensively used in the literature to suppress the by-product (humins) formation in converting C6 carbohydrates to platform chemicals.1–3 Here, we utilized DMSO and MIBK as organic solvents in different proportions with water and studied their effect on the levulinic acid production (*[Figure](#page-2-0) S3*). The pure DMSO as organic solvent showed very low furfural conversion. The FF and FAH conversion was 4.0 and 2.0%, respectively, with HMF and LA yields as 3.6 and 1.1%. The yields of HMF, LA, and FF conversion were improved with water addition to DMSO in a 1:1 ratio. The side product formation was almost nullified and showed nearly 100% carbon balance. However, the conversions and yields were lower with DMSO than with the pure water as a solvent. This indicates that the DMSO suppresses the electrophilic substitution reaction along with the polymerization reactions of furanic compounds. The FF conversion was 67.8% and 52.8% with pure MIBK and MIBK+water, respectively. The LA yield in pure MIBK and MIBK+water mixture was 11.1 and 17.7%, with HMF yield of 0.2 and 5.2%, respectively. Where, the partition coefficient of FF, HMF, LA, and FA were 0.93, 0.48, 0.23, and 0.14 (mol/mL)/(mol/mL) respectively for the MIBK/water solvent system. Interestingly, complete conversion of FAH was observed in both cases with MIBK, which could be attributed to the formation of ketone-formaldehyde resins.<sup>4</sup> Thus, MIBK cannot be the right organic solvent for this reaction system as it forms ketone-formaldehyde resins. This study reveals that the organic solvents were not effective in suppressing the polymerization reaction but interfere with the hydroxymethylation reaction to form HMF/LA.



<span id="page-2-0"></span>Figure S3: Role of solvents on the furfural conversion and levulinic acid (LA) production (reaction conditions: 2.5g solvent (formalin+water/DMSO/MIBK), 10 wt.%  $C_{FF}$ , catalyst:formalin:furfural= 2:2:1 w/w/w, 5 min reaction time, 160°C reaction temperature, catalyst= 1:0 Amberlyst-15:HZSM-5), \* indicates catalyst:formalin:furfural= 2:1:1 w/w/w





Table S3: P-values from one-way ANOVA with conversion and yields as factor for variation of catalyst loading



Table S4: Energy consumption at various reaction temperatures



Table S5: Comparison with various literature reported catalysts for the direct conversion to levulinic acid/ester





17	Bagasse	DMM(10g) /ethanol $(10g)$	$H-\beta$ zeolite	<b>CH</b>	$200^{\circ}$ C; 4h; $2g$ ; $20g$	54.2		$24.4^\circ$	12
18	Rice straw	DMM(15g) /methanol $(25g)$	Amberlyst-	<b>CH</b>	$200^{\circ}$ ; 1h; 4g; 40g	83.5		38.9	13
MW- Microwave heating; CH- convectional heating; <sup>a</sup> yield of LA; <sup>b</sup> yield of MLE; <sup>c</sup> ELE: Ethyl levulinate									

Table S6: moles of formaldehyde consumed and formic acid formed at varying formalin to furfural ratio





Figure S4: FESEM images of a) fresh and b) spent catalyst (1:0 Amberlyst-15: HZSM-5)

Table S7: List of assumptions and economic considerations

Furfural price $(\frac{5}{kg})^a$	
Formalin price $(\frac{5}{kg})^a$	0.69
Xylose price $(\frac{6}{kg})^a$	0.23
Cellulose price $(\frac{8}{kg})^a$	0.69
Biomass price $(\frac{8}{kg})^a$	0.07



	<b>Initial weights fed</b> to reactor (kg)	Final converted/formed weights after reaction (kg)	<b>Normalized weights</b> (kg)
Furfural	100.0	74.1	1000
Formaldehyde	74.0	62.5	843
Water	800.0	800.0	10796
Levulinic acid		53.6	723
Formic acid		41.0	553
<b>HMF</b>		6.1	82
Humins		21.6	291

Table S8: Experimental and normalized weights of reactants and products

Table S9: Experimental weights of reactants and products feed/obtained at each reactor in the multi-step conversion of biomass to LA







Figure S5: a) Effect of furfural (FF) price and plant efficiency, b) discount rate on the MSP of LA (produced from furfural)



*Figure S6:* Sensitivity analysis of MSP of LA (produced from FF) with varying reaction parameters



Figure S7: Comparison of MSP's obtained from Microwave (MW) and Conventional reactors (Reaction conditions: 2.5g solvent (formalin+water), 10 wt.%  $C_{FF}$ , catalyst:formalin:furfural= 2:2:1 w/w/w, 2g water, 160°C reaction temperature, 5 min reaction time for microwave reactor and 60 min for convectional reactor)



Figure S8: Cost and revenue accounted for minimum selling price (MSP) of LA produced from cellulose



Figure S9: Cost and revenue responsible for the MSP of LA (produced from xylose)



Figure S10: Effect of biomass price on the MSP of LA

Table S10: Detailed Purchased/installed costs of equipment's, Total direct cost, Total indirect cost, fixed capital cost and total capital cost for production of LA from furfural in a microwave reactor





Lang factor (FCC/purchased capital cost<sup>b</sup>)

a ISBL includes LA production and separation costs only

<sup>b</sup>waste water treatment plant cost was not included in calculation of lang factor



Table S11: Discounted cash flow rate of return worksheet







## **References:**

- C. Antonetti, D. Licursi, S. Fulignati, G. Valentini and A. M. R. Galletti, *Catalysts*, 2016, 6, 196.
- B. Seemala, V. Haritos and A. Tanksale, *ChemCatChem*, 2016, **8**, 640–647.
- N. Shi, Q. Liu, H. Cen, R. Ju, X. He and L. Ma, *Biomass Convers. Biorefinery*, , DOI:10.1007/s13399-019-00414-4.
- US, US 2005/0080222 A1, 2004.
- B. Velaga and N. R. Peela, *Adv. Sustain. Syst.*, 2021, **5**, 1–10.
- X. Hu, S. Jiang, L. Wu, S. Wang and C. Z. Li, *Chem. Commun.*, 2017, **53**, 2938–2941.
- Y. Shao, X. Hu, Z. Zhang, K. Sun, G. Gao, T. Wei, S. Zhang, S. Hu, J. Xiang and Y. Wang, *Green Energy Environ.*, 2019, **4**, 400–413.
- J. Feng, L. Tong, Y. Xu, J. Jiang, C. Hse, Z. Yang and H. Pan, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2020, , 112084.
- Z. Zhang, X. Hu, S. Zhang, Q. Liu, S. Hu, J. Xiang, Y. Wang and Y. Lu, *Fuel*, 2019, , 263–275.
- X. Lyu, Z. Zhang, F. Okejiri, H. Chen, M. Xu, X. Chen, S. Deng and X. Lu, *ChemSusChem*, 2019, 12, 4400–4404.
- J. Feng, L. Zhang, J. Jiang, C. Hse, T. F. Shupe and H. Pan, *Green Chem.*, 2019, **21**, 4951–4957.
- J. Feng, T. Fan, C. Ma, Y. Xu, J. Jiang and H. Pan, *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2020, **68**, 13760–13769.
- J. Feng, L. Tong, C. Ma, Y. Xu, J. Jiang, Z. Yang and H. Pan, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2020, **315**, 123776.
- A. H. Motagamwala, K. Huang, C. T. Maravelias and J. A. Dumesic, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2019, **12**, 2212–2222.
- R. Davis, L. Tao, E. C. D. Tan, M. J. Biddy, G. T. Beckham, C. Scarlata, J. Jacobson, K. Cafferty, J. Ross, J. Lukas, D. Knorr and P. Schoen, *Process Design and Economics for the Conversion of Lignocellulosic Biomass to Hydrocarbons: Dilute-Acid and Enzymatic Deconstruction of Biomass to Sugars and Biological Conversion of Sugars to Hydrocarbons*, 2013.
- S. W. Fitzpatrick, *Final technical report: Commercialization of the Biofine technology for levulinic acid production from paper sludge*, 2002.
- M. Alam, D. Rammohan, A. Bhavanam and N. R. Peela, *Fuel*, 2021, **285**, 119188.
- B. Velaga, R. P. Parde, J. Soni and N. R. Peela, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.*, 2019, , 18–28.
- S. K. Yedla, B. Velaga, S. Chowdary, A. Namdeo, A. K. Golder and N. R. Peela, *React. Chem. Eng.*, 2020, **5**, 1738–1750.
- L. C. Nhien, N. V. D. Long, S. Kim and M. Lee, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2016, **55**, 5180–

5189.

21 A. H. Motagamwala, W. Won, C. Sener, D. M. Alonso, C. T. Maravelias and J. A. Dumesic, *Sci. Adv.*, , DOI:10.1126/sciadv.aap9722.