

Clarification for the comments on our article “Cyclopropanation of olefins using a silica gel anchored palladium phosphine complex” *Catal. Lett*, 83, 187, 2002 by Jose M. Fraile, Jose I. Garcia, and Jose A. Mayoral, “Cyclopropanation of olefins with heterogeneous catalysts” *Catal. Lett*, 88, 31, 2003.

M. Lakshmi Kantam^{a,*}, Y. Haritha^a, N. Mahender Reddy^a, B.M. Choudary^a, and F. Figueras^b

^aIndian Institute of Chemical Technology, Hyderabad-500007, India

^bInstitut de Recherches sur la Catalyse, 2, Avenue Albert Einstein, 69626, Villeurbanne

Received 10 July 2003; accepted 29 July 2003

At the outset, we are shocked to learn of the comments of Jose M. Fraile, Jose I. Garcia and Jose A. Mayoral, *Catal. Lett*, 88, 31, 2003 published as a separate article on our published article M. Lakshmi Kantam, Y. Haritha, N. Mahender Reddy, B. M. Choudary and F. Figueras, *Catal. Lett*, 83, 187, 2002.

I wish to submit some clarifications on their comments published as a separate article on our paper, *Catal. Lett*, 83, 187, 2002. Firstly, we did not mention anywhere about asymmetric cyclopropanation reactions. In fact, our results focus only on non-chiral heterogeneous catalysts; as such we have not cited any references on asymmetric heterogeneous catalysts. So, we thought there was no need to cite the references on Cu-catalyzed asymmetric cyclopropanation reactions of our esteemed colleagues, J.M. Fraile *et al.*, though we are following their work regularly. I request you to kindly note that this does not mean that a thorough bibliographical search has not been carried out. Our esteemed colleagues themselves pointed out in their comments (*Catal. Lett.*, 88, 31, 2003) that if only non-chiral heterogeneous catalysts are taken into account, this claim “there are few reports on the cyclopropanation reaction catalyzed by heterogeneous catalysts, copper bronze, Cu-exchanged clays, and zeolites” might be correct. Moreover, it is very difficult to cite all the references on cyclopropanation as we have not

written a review. Therefore, our non-citation of their references related to asymmetric cyclopropanation is not a mistake at all. As to the projection of their data in our publication, there is indeed a small error, which is highly regretted. (Unfortunately, we calculated the specific activity on the basis of 1 mmol of styrene by oversight; actually they have taken 10 mmols.) I would like to bring to your kind notice that in the projection of their own results in comparison with our results brought down in their comments, there is an error. In that data, they had calculated the productivity based on 40% yield when they used diazoacetate/styrene 2 : 1. In fact, under identical conditions used by us (diazoacetate/styrene 1 : 1 only), the yield they obtained was 22% only. If we calculate the productivity based on 22% yield, it comes to 81.4, and not 148 as they claimed. (Table 1, page 575, J.M. Fraile, B. Garcia, J.I. Garcia, J.A. Mayoral, F. Figueras, *Heterogeneous Catalysis and Fine Chemicals IV* (1997) 571–578.) On the basis of the new calculations, we admit that Cu-K10 is twice as good as our catalyst. If we take the productivity of the other catalysts such as Cu-laponite and Cu-bentonite, etc., our catalyst is still superior by a factor of 4 over those catalysts. We never claimed that the efficiency of our catalyst is superior in terms of economics. Such mistakes due to oversight often happen.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed.