

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Tandem Catalysis for CO₂ Hydrogenation to C₂-C₄ Hydrocarbons

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/81k388rc>

Journal

Nano Letters, 17(6)

ISSN

1530-6984

Authors

Xie, Chenlu
Chen, Chen
Yu, Yi
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2017-06-14

DOI


10.1021/acs.nanolett.7b01139

Peer reviewed

Tandem Catalysis for CO₂ Hydrogenation to C₂–C₄ HydrocarbonsChenlu Xie,[†] Chen Chen,^{†,||} Yi Yu,^{†,⊥} Ji Su,[‡] Yifan Li,[†] Gabor A. Somorjai,^{*,†,‡,§} and Peidong Yang^{*,†,‡,§}[†]Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, United States[‡]Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States[§]Kavli Energy NanoScience Institute, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Conversion of carbon dioxide to C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons is a major pursuit in clean energy research. Despite tremendous efforts, the lack of well-defined catalysts in which the spatial arrangement of interfaces is precisely controlled hinders the development of more efficient catalysts and in-depth understanding of reaction mechanisms. Herein, we utilized the strategy of tandem catalysis to develop a well-defined nanostructured catalyst CeO₂–Pt@mSiO₂–Co for converting CO₂ to C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons using two metal-oxide interfaces. C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons are found to be produced with high (60%) selectivity, which is speculated to be the result of the two-step tandem process uniquely allowed by this catalyst. Namely, the Pt/CeO₂ interface converts CO₂ and H₂ to CO, and on the neighboring Co/mSiO₂ interface yields C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons through a subsequent Fischer–Tropsch process. In addition, the catalysts show no obvious deactivation over 40 h. The successful production of C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons via a tandem process on a rationally designed, structurally well-defined catalyst demonstrates the power of sophisticated structure control in designing nanostructured catalysts for multiple-step chemical conversions.



KEYWORDS: CO₂ hydrogenation, tandem catalysis, interfaces, C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons

Transformation of CO₂ into transportable chemicals has been spurred by emerging environmental issues and rising energy demands.^{1–5} Of particular interest is the synthesis of hydrocarbons containing two to four carbon atoms (C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons), which are key chemical feedstocks to synthesize a wide range of products such as polymers, solvents, drugs, and detergents. This is a challenging task because of the difficulties associated with the chemical inertness of CO₂ and the competing formation of methane.^{6–8}

Currently, the conversion of CO₂ to C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons mainly relies on iron-based catalysts [via the Fischer–Tropsch process (F-T process)] and composite oxide catalysts such as Cu–ZnO–Al₂O₃/zeolite (via a methanol mediated pathway).^{9–15} However, these catalysts are mostly synthesized through coprecipitation, impregnation, or physical mixing and contain multiple components including structural promoters. Thus, they exhibit large morphological variations and great uncertainties on the spatial arrangements of active sites.^{10–12,16} We believe the development of structurally well-defined catalysts would not only facilitate discovery of new catalysts but also enable the fundamental study of reaction mechanisms to unravel principles for rational catalyst design. Specifically, the importance of spatial control of catalytic interfaces was emphasized in a recent development in tandem catalysis, where two metal-oxide interfaces in a single nanostructure were employed to catalyze two sequential chemical reactions.^{17,18}

Herein, we demonstrate the rational design and controlled synthesis of a nanostructured catalyst with well-defined architecture for CO₂ conversion to C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons via tandem catalysis. The designed catalyst CeO₂–Pt@mSiO₂–Co (mSiO₂ denotes mesoporous silica) has two types of metal-oxide interfaces that catalyze two sequential reactions. The CeO₂/Pt interface converts CO₂ and H₂ into CO through the reverse water gas shift (RWGS) reaction, and the Co/mSiO₂ interface subsequently reacts the formed CO with H₂ through the Fischer–Tropsch process. Thus, this catalyst could carry out the CO₂ conversion to C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons through a two-step tandem process. As a result, a C₂–C₄ selectivity up to 60% of all hydrocarbons (carbon atom-based) through this tandem process was achieved.

To create these two interfaces, the catalyst was designed with a CeO₂–Pt core and a mesoporous silica shell, which is further decorated with cobalt nanoparticles. Considering the compatibility of synthetic conditions of different types of nanoparticles, the integration of all the four components in one single nanoparticle is challenging and requires an elegant synthetic design. In particular, synthesis of monodisperse cobalt nanoparticles could only be conducted under hydrophobic

Received: March 16, 2017

Revised: May 7, 2017

Published: May 11, 2017




Figure 1. Synthesis and characterization of the $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2\text{-Co}$ tandem catalyst. (a) Schematic of synthetic process. TEM images of each step: (b,c) CeO_2 nanoparticles, (d,e) overgrowth of Pt nanoparticles on CeO_2 , (f,g) silica shell coating on $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt}$ composite nanoparticles, (h,i) deposition of Co nanoparticles on $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2$, and (j) scaled up preparation of $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2\text{-Co}$ nanoparticles. One-pot synthesis can yield 300 mg of catalyst.




Figure 2. (a) Imaging of $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2\text{-Co}$ by high-angle annular dark-field scanning transmission electron microscopy. (b) Elemental mapping of $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2\text{-Co}$ with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS). Corresponding EDS elemental mapping for (c) Ce, (d) Pt, (e) O, (f) Si, and (g) Co, respectively. Scale bar: 20 nm.

conditions as they are prone to oxidation in aqueous solution, whereas the silica shell is typically synthesized in aqueous solution.^{19–21} This incompatibility requires the preparation of monodisperse $\text{CeO}_2\text{-Pt@mSiO}_2$ and subsequent homogeneous loading of cobalt nanoparticles on the silica surface.

The optimized synthesis involves four steps. The first step is to synthesize well-dispersed and uniform CeO_2 nanoparticles. Considering that the subsequent silica coating step is typically performed in aqueous solution, the CeO_2 nanoparticles need to be dispersible in aqueous media. Thus, we carried out the synthesis of CeO_2 in ethanol and water solution with

poly(vinylpyrrolidone) (PVP) as capping ligand.¹⁸ This procedure enabled the production of uniform CeO_2 nanoparticles with very good dispersity, which is confirmed by transmission electron microscopy (TEM) (Figure 1b,c, Figure S1). The size of CeO_2 could be tuned by changing the ratio between ethanol and water. A higher ethanol/water ratio yields CeO_2 nanoparticles with smaller size (Figure S1). In order to gain higher dispersity of Pt nanoparticles on the CeO_2 support, a smaller CeO_2 nanoparticle with size around 35 nm was chosen. The second step is to load Pt nanoparticles onto the presynthesized CeO_2 nanoparticles by Pt overgrowth.^{18,22}




Figure 3. (a) Catalytic performance of single-interface catalysts CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂ and CeO₂@mSiO₂-Co, physical mixture catalyst and tandem catalyst CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂-Co (H₂/CO₂ ratio is 3, reaction temperature is 250 °C). (b) CO₂ conversion and hydrocarbons distribution at different H₂/CO₂ ratios over the tandem catalyst at 250 °C.

Tetradecyltrimethylammonium bromide (TTAB) and PVP were used as capping ligands to give 3 nm loaded Pt NPs (Figure 1d,e). Compared to the electrostatic absorption method, where the presynthesized Pt nanoparticles were absorbed on the CeO₂ surface, the overgrowth method gave stronger interaction between Pt and CeO₂, which helped maintain the structure of the nanocrystals in the silica coating step. Moreover, the loading amount of Pt could be easily tuned by adding different amount of (NH₄)₂Pt(IV)Cl₆ (Figure S2). Subsequently, a sol-gel approach was adopted to coat a mesoporous SiO₂ shell on the CeO₂-Pt core.^{18,20,23,24} The as-synthesized CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂ was calcined at 350 °C in air to remove the cetrimonium bromide (CTAB) template to generate the mesopores and clean interfaces. The average thickness of the silica layer surrounding the CeO₂-Pt core was 25 nm (Figure 1f,g). With different amount of tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS) added, the thickness of the mesoporous silicon shell can be tuned (Figure S3). Finally, homogeneous loading of cobalt NPs on the silica shell was achieved by an approach utilizing the weak interactions between cobalt and silica in aprotic solvents.²⁵ Monodisperse Co nanoparticles were synthesized first by decomposing dicobalt carbonyl under the protection of oleic acid, which was dispersed in hexanes (Figure S4).²⁶ The as-synthesized CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂ powder was also dispersed in hexanes, and the cobalt-hexanes solution was added slowly under stirring to gain a uniform distribution of cobalt nanoparticles on the silica shell. The dispersion of Co nanoparticles was then locked in place by calcination under air at 350 °C (Figure 1h,i), which simultaneously removed the oleic acid ligands.^{25,27} This four-step synthesis of CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂-Co can be readily scaled up to produce the tandem catalysts at gram scale (Figure 1j). This highly tunable and versatile synthetic protocol can be generalized toward the synthesis of other systems with multiple metal-oxide interfaces, which paves the way for the development of other sophisticated multifunctional catalysts for multistep chemical reactions.

High-angle annular dark-field scanning transmission electron microscopy (HAADF-STEM) and the corresponding energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) mapping further confirmed the elemental distribution and structure of the catalyst (Figure 2). The Pt and Co loading were determined to be 4.3% and 5.8% (Table S1), respectively, from inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES). Nitrogen physisorption revealed the mesoporous nature of the catalyst,

and its Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface area was calculated to be 236 m² g⁻¹ with average pore size of 2.4 nm, which provides accessibility to reactant molecules (Figure S5).

The catalytic performance of the tandem catalyst for CO₂ hydrogenation was examined under a series of temperatures with a pressure of 90 psi and a H₂/CO₂ ratio of 3. To monitor the role of each interface individually, we prepared single-interface catalysts CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂ and CeO₂@mSiO₂-Co and tested their catalytic performance under the same conditions. Pt and Co loading amounts of these catalysts were controlled to be identical to the tandem catalyst (Table S1). It is known that Pt loaded on CeO₂ shows high activity and selectivity toward CO₂ hydrogenation to produce CO through the RWGS reaction,^{28,29} while supported Co catalysts are widely used for hydrocarbons production from CO via the F-T process.³⁰⁻³⁴ However, supported Co catalysts were reported to be almost only active for methane formation when replacing CO by CO₂ and a high CO partial pressure is necessary for the production of hydrocarbons beyond methane.^{32,35-37} As shown in Figure 3a and Figure S6, the CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂ catalyst indeed produced CO with excellent selectivity (>99%) at all temperatures, which substantiated that CO₂ and H₂ could be converted into CO via RWGS reaction on Pt/CeO₂ interface in the tandem catalyst. As to the CeO₂@mSiO₂-Co catalyst, CO₂ hydrogenation over the catalyst led to methane as the only hydrocarbon product at 250 °C (Figure 3a). With elevated temperatures, methane was still the dominant product with selectivity >99%, with a very small amount of C₂-C₄ hydrocarbon produced (Figure S7).

Upon controlled integration of Pt/CeO₂ interface and Co/mSiO₂ interface into a tandem catalyst, the products shifted and the formation of C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons was clearly observed with a selectivity of 40% whereas methane selectivity dropped to 60% at 250 °C (Figure 3a). At increased temperatures, the selectivity toward C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons decreased but was still well above the C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons production over the single-interface catalysts (Figures S6, S7, and S9). The decline in selectivity toward C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons under higher temperature is due to the more favorable methanation of CO at higher temperature.³⁸ This outstanding selectivity toward C₂-C₄, not observed for the single-interface catalysts, suggests that CO₂ hydrogenation to C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons on the CeO₂-Pt@mSiO₂-Co catalyst undergoes a tandem process. The uniqueness of the tandem catalyst is further confirmed by

the comparison with a physical mixture of Pt–CeO₂ and Co–SiO₂, which produced methane as a primary product and only a small amount of C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons at all temperatures (Figure 3a and Figure S8). As the Co catalysts produce mainly CH₄ from CO₂ and a high CO/CO₂ ratio is necessary for C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons formation,^{32,35–37} we speculated that favorable formation of C₂–C₄ in the tandem system could be attributed to the locally high CO partial pressure at the Co/mSiO₂ interface due to the well-controlled spatial arrangement of Pt/CeO₂ and cobalt nanocrystals. Considering the well-defined core–shell structure and confinement of Pt/CeO₂ interface within the mesoporous silica shell, all produced CO molecules on Pt/CeO₂ interface can be transported to the neighboring cobalt surface before diffusing out of the shell. Moreover, CO molecules have shown a higher sticking probability to cobalt than CO₂ and could be strongly adsorbed on a cobalt surface.³⁹ Consequently, a CO-rich local environment at the Co/mSiO₂ interface was created, which favors the production of C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons. In the case of a physical mixture, however, the uncontrolled spatial arrangement of the Pt–CeO₂ and Co–SiO₂ interfaces resulted in a very low chance for CO from Pt–CeO₂ to be involved in the second reaction. Thus, the low CO partial pressure on the Co/mSiO₂ interface in the physical mixture catalysts resulted in low selectivity toward C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons. In accordance with our hypothesis, any measures that could further increase the localized CO partial pressure at Co/SiO₂ interface should benefit the selectivity of C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons, for example, decreasing the H₂/CO₂ ratio. This in turn would decrease the H₂/CO ratio for the second F–T reaction, and thus lead to a more localized CO environment in Co/SiO₂ interface. As demonstrated in Figure 3b, with the H₂/CO₂ ratio decreased from 7.0 to 0.3 the selectivity toward C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons increased from 23% to 59%, while the selectivity of methane dropped from 77% to 41%.

The harsh reaction conditions employed to study these reactions prompted us to examine the stability of the catalyst and its performance. As shown in Figure 4 and Figure S10, the




Figure 4. Stability test of CeO₂–Pt@mSiO₂–Co catalyst with H₂/CO₂ of 3.0 at 250 °C.

CeO₂–Pt@mSiO₂–Co tandem catalyst produced no significant change in catalytic activity and product selectivity while running the catalysts for up to 40 h. Moreover, the tested catalysts were also evaluated by TEM, and no obvious morphology change was observed (shown in Figure S11), indicating good structural and chemical stability of the tandem catalysts.

In conclusion, we developed a highly tunable method to synthesize a well-defined nanostructured catalyst CeO₂–Pt@

mSiO₂–Co for the selective production of C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons from CO₂. This catalyst achieved a selectivity of 60% toward C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons with two interfaces Pt/CeO₂ and Co/SiO₂ in close proximity, catalyzing the RWGS reaction and the F–T reaction, respectively. This high C₂–C₄ hydrocarbons selectivity is attributed to the unique spatial arrangement of two metal-oxide interfaces, which creates local environments conducive for multistep reactions that a physical mixture fails to achieve. Our synthetic protocol offers a highly generalizable method to integrate different metal-oxide interfaces for design and synthesis of next generation nanostructured catalysts. These advances give impetus to the rational design and development of high-performance, multifunctional catalysts for multiple-step chemical conversions.

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.nanolett.7b01139.

Detailed protocol for nanoparticles synthesis and catalytic performance test, TEM images of catalysts with different size, loading amount and silica thickness and catalytic performance of catalysts under different temperatures (PDF)

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Authors

*E-mail: somorjai@berkeley.edu (G.A.S.).

*E-mail: p_yang@berkeley.edu (P.Y.).

ORCID

Chenlu Xie: 0000-0001-9215-6878

Yifan Li: 0000-0003-2146-2266

Gabor A. Somorjai: 0000-0002-8478-2761

Peidong Yang: 0000-0003-4799-1684

Present Addresses

^{||}(C.C.) Department of Chemistry, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China.

[†](Y.Y.) School of Physical Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai. 201210, China

Author Contributions

The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given approval to the final version of the manuscript. C.X., and C.C. contributed equally to this work.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES), Materials Sciences and Engineering Division, under Contract No. DE-AC02-05-CH11231 within the Chemical and Mechanical Properties of Surfaces, Interfaces and Nanostructures program (FWP KC3101). Work at the Molecular Foundry was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences under Contract No. DE-AC02-05-CH11231. This work made use of the facilities at the ICP facility, College of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley. C.X. acknowledges support from Suzhou Industrial Park fellowship.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) Dresselhaus, M. S.; Thomas, I. L. *Nature* **2001**, *414*, 332–337.
- (2) Lewis, N. S.; Nocera, D. G. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2006**, *103*, 15729–15735.
- (3) Aresta, M. Carbon Dioxide: Utilization Options to Reduce its Accumulation in the Atmosphere. In *Carbon Dioxide as Chemical Feedstock*; Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, 2010; pp 1–13.
- (4) Graciani, J.; Mudiyansele, K.; Xu, F.; Baber, A. E.; Evans, J.; Senanayake, S. D.; Stacchiola, D. J.; Liu, P.; Hrbek, J.; Sanz, J. F.; Rodriguez, J. A. *Science* **2014**, *345*, 546–550.
- (5) Li, C.-S.; Melaet, G.; Ralston, W. T.; An, K.; Brooks, C.; Ye, Y.; Liu, Y.-S.; Zhu, J.; Guo, J.; Alayoglu, S.; Somorjai, G. A. *Nat. Commun.* **2015**, *6*, 6538.
- (6) Rodemerck, U.; Holeňa, M.; Wagner, E.; Smejkal, Q.; Barkschat, A.; Baerns, M. *ChemCatChem* **2013**, *5*, 1948–1955.
- (7) Müller, K.; Mokrushina, L.; Arlt, W. *Chem. Ing. Tech.* **2014**, *86*, 497–503.
- (8) Dorner, R. W.; Hardy, D. R.; Williams, F. W.; Willauer, H. D. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2010**, *3*, 884–890.
- (9) Sai Prasad, P. S.; Bae, J. W.; Jun, K.-W.; Lee, K.-W. *Catal. Surv. Asia* **2008**, *12*, 170–183.
- (10) Dorner, R. W.; Hardy, D. R.; Williams, F. W.; Willauer, H. D. *Appl. Catal., A* **2010**, *373*, 112–121.
- (11) Kishan, G.; Lee, M.-W.; Nam, S.-S.; Choi, M.-J.; Lee, K.-W. *Catal. Lett.* **1998**, *56*, 215–219.
- (12) Fujiwara, M.; Kieffer, R.; Ando, H.; Souma, Y. *Appl. Catal., A* **1995**, *121*, 113–124.
- (13) Jeon, J.-K.; Jeong, K.-E.; Park, Y.-K.; Ihm, S.-K. *Appl. Catal., A* **1995**, *124*, 91–106.
- (14) Sathawong, R.; Koizumi, N.; Song, C.; Prasassarakich, P. *Catal. Today* **2015**, *251*, 34–40.
- (15) Niemelä, M.; Nokkosmäki, M. *Catal. Today* **2005**, *100*, 269–274.
- (16) Riedel, T.; Schulz, H.; Schaub, G.; Jun, K.-W.; Hwang, J.-S.; Lee, K.-W. *Top. Catal.* **2003**, *26*, 41–54.
- (17) Yamada, Y.; Tsung, C.-K.; Huang, W.; Huo, Z.; Habas, S. E.; Soejima, T.; Aliaga, C. E.; Somorjai, G. A.; Yang, P. *Nat. Chem.* **2011**, *3*, 372–376.
- (18) Su, J.; Xie, C.; Chen, C.; Yu, Y.; Kennedy, G.; Somorjai, G. A.; Yang, P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, *138*, 11568–11574.
- (19) Kresge, C. T.; Leonowicz, M. E.; Roth, W. J.; Vartuli, J. C.; Beck, J. S. *Nature* **1992**, *359*, 710–712.
- (20) Joo, S. H.; Park, J. Y.; Tsung, C.-K.; Yamada, Y.; Yang, P.; Somorjai, G. A. *Nat. Mater.* **2009**, *8*, 126–131.
- (21) Qi, Z.; Xiao, C.; Liu, C.; Goh, T. W.; Zhou, L.; Maligal-Ganesh, R.; Pei, Y.; Li, X.; Curtiss, L. A.; Huang, W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*, 4762–4768.
- (22) Tsung, C.-K.; Kuhn, J. N.; Huang, W.; Aliaga, C.; Hung, L.-L.; Somorjai, G. A.; Yang, P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 5816–5822.
- (23) Zhao, E. W.; Maligal-Ganesh, R.; Xiao, C.; Goh, T.-W.; Qi, Z.; Pei, Y.; Hagelin-Weaver, H. E.; Huang, W.; Bowers, C. R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2017**, *56*, 3925–3929.
- (24) Maligal-Ganesh, R. V.; Xiao, C.; Goh, T. W.; Wang, L.-L.; Gustafson, J.; Pei, Y.; Qi, Z.; Johnson, D. D.; Zhang, S.; Tao, F.; Huang, W. *ACS Catal.* **2016**, *6*, 1754–1763.
- (25) Zheng, N.; Stucky, G. D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 14278–14280.
- (26) Iablokov, V.; Beaumont, S. K.; Alayoglu, S.; Pushkarev, V. V.; Specht, C.; Gao, J.; Alivisatos, A. P.; Kruse, N.; Somorjai, G. A. *Nano Lett.* **2012**, *12*, 3091–3096.
- (27) Ma, G.; Binder, A.; Chi, M.; Liu, C.; Jin, R.; Jiang, D.-e.; Fan, J.; Dai, S. *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, *48*, 11413–11415.
- (28) Fu, Q.; Saltsburg, H.; Flytzani-Stephanopoulos, M. *Science* **2003**, *301*, 935–938.
- (29) Goguet, A.; Meunier, F. C.; Tibiletti, D.; Breen, J. P.; Burch, R. J. *Phys. Chem. B* **2004**, *108*, 20240–20246.
- (30) Iglesia, E. *Appl. Catal., A* **1997**, *161*, 59–78.
- (31) den Breejen, J. P.; Radstake, P. B.; Bezemer, G. L.; Bitter, J. H.; Frøseth, V.; Holmen, A.; Jong, K. P. d. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 7197–7203.
- (32) Melaet, G.; Ralston, W. T.; Li, C.-S.; Alayoglu, S.; An, K.; Musselwhite, N.; Kalkan, B.; Somorjai, G. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 2260–2263.
- (33) Jacobs, G.; Das, T. K.; Zhang, Y.; Li, J.; Racoillet, G.; Davis, B. H. *Appl. Catal., A* **2002**, *233*, 263–281.
- (34) Khodakov, A. Y.; Chu, W.; Fongarland, P. *Chem. Rev.* **2007**, *107*, 1692–1744.
- (35) Riedel, T.; Claeys, M.; Schulz, H.; Schaub, G.; Nam, S.-S.; Jun, K.-W.; Choi, M.-J.; Kishan, G.; Lee, K.-W. *Appl. Catal., A* **1999**, *186*, 201–213.
- (36) Zhang, Y.; Jacobs, G.; Sparks, D. E.; Dry, M. E.; Davis, B. H. *Catal. Today* **2002**, *71*, 411–418.
- (37) Akin, A. N.; Ataman, M.; Aksoylu, A. E.; Önsan, Z. I. *React. Kinet. Catal. Lett.* **2002**, *76*, 265–270.
- (38) Dry, M. E. *Catal. Today* **2002**, *71*, 227–241.
- (39) Visconti, C. G.; Lietti, L.; Tronconi, E.; Forzatti, P.; Zennaro, R.; Finocchiaro, E. *Appl. Catal., A* **2009**, *355*, 61–68.