

# Promoter Effect on Carbon Nanosphere-Encapsulated Fe-Co Catalysts for Converting CO<sub>2</sub> to Light Olefins

Daniel Weber <sup>1,†</sup>, Akash Gandotra <sup>1,†</sup>, John Schossig <sup>2</sup>, Heng Zhang <sup>3</sup>, Michael Wildy <sup>2</sup>, Wanying Wei <sup>2</sup>, Kevin Arizapana <sup>2</sup>, Jin Zhong Zhang <sup>3</sup>, Ping Lu <sup>2,\*</sup> and Cheng Zhang <sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, Physics and Mathematics, Long Island University (Post), Brookville, NY 11548, USA; daniel.weber4@my.liu.edu (D.W.); akash.gandotra@my.liu.edu (A.G.)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Rowan University, Glassboro, NJ 08028, USA; schoss43@students.rowan.edu (J.S.); wildym28@rowan.edu (M.W.); weiw8@rowan.edu (W.W.); arizap27@students.rowan.edu (K.A.)

<sup>3</sup> Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA; hzhan290@ucsc.edu (H.Z.); zhang@ucsc.edu (J.Z.Z.)

\* Correspondence: lup@rowan.edu (P.L.); cheng.zhang@liu.edu (C.Z.); Tel.: +1-856-256-5463 (P.L.); +1-516-299-2013 (C.Z.); Fax: +1-516-299-3944 (C.Z.)

<sup>†</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

## Catalyst Evaluation

The synthesized catalysts were tested using a standard procedure reported in a previously published work [46]. The testing procedure was carried out using a quartz tube (4 mm i.d., 6.35 mm o.d.) flow bed reactor at varying temperatures and ambient pressures. For each catalyst evaluation, approximately 0.1000 g of catalyst with a uniform mesh size of 40–60 was loaded into the quartz tube with two pieces of quartz wool to hold the catalyst in place. The catalyst was reduced in a 50% H<sub>2</sub>/N<sub>2</sub> stream (40 mL min<sup>−1</sup> in total) at 350 °C for 2 hours and then cooled down to 275 °C prior to CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation. The feed gas, CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>, with a 1/3/1 ratio (40 mL min<sup>−1</sup> in total), was introduced into the reactor at atmospheric pressure. The catalyst was then ramped from 275 °C to 400 °C at 25–50 °C increments. The product stream was analyzed online using a gas chromatographer (GC, Agilent 8890) equipped with a flame ionization detector (FID) and a thermal conductive detector (TCD). HP-PLOT Q capillary column was attached to FID for the separation and quantification of hydrocarbons. The Mol Sieve 5 Å PLOT capillary column was attached to TCD for the detection of N<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and CH<sub>4</sub>. A sequence run was arranged in a queue to collect data at different temperatures. At each temperature, six GC data points were collected. The reaction parameters, such as CO<sub>2</sub> conversion (Eqn. 1), hydrocarbon distribution (CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>–C<sub>4</sub><sup>−</sup>, C<sub>2</sub>–C<sub>4</sub><sup>0</sup>, C<sub>5</sub><sup>+</sup>) (Eqn. 2), and selectivity (Eqn. 3), were defined as follows:

$$\text{CO}_2 \text{ Conversion} = \frac{n_{\text{CO}_2}(\text{in}) - n_{\text{CO}_2}(\text{out})}{n_{\text{CO}_2}(\text{in})} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Hydrocarbon distribution} = \frac{n_{\text{product } i}(\text{out}) \times \text{carbon number}}{\sum n_i(\text{out}) \times \text{carbon number} - n_{\text{CO}}(\text{out})} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Selectivity} = \frac{n_{\text{product}}(\text{out}) \times \text{carbon number}}{\sum n_i(\text{out}) \times \text{carbon number}} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

where  $n_{\text{CO}_2}(\text{in})$  and  $n_{\text{CO}_2}(\text{out})$  are the number of moles of CO<sub>2</sub> fed and not converted, respectively.  $n_{\text{product } i}$  refers to the mole of the product  $i$ ; carbon number refers to the number of carbons contained in the product  $i$ ;  $\sum n_i(\text{out})$  refers to the total number of moles of the carbon-containing products produced in the reaction.

### ***Metal analysis***

The contents of Fe and Co in the CNS was determined using ICP-MS (Agilent 7900 ICP-MS). The samples were first acid-extracted using concentrated HNO<sub>3</sub> (67–70%, VWR Aristar Plus for trace metal analysis) under intermittent sonication for 24 h, followed by filtration to remove carbon particles using a 0.45 µm syringe filter, and the clear filtrate was diluted to the estimated final concentrations in a range of 1–200 ppb using 1% HNO<sub>3</sub> aqueous solution. Eight standard solutions containing 0, 1, 5, 10, 30, 50, 100, and 200 ppb of Fe, Co, K, Na, Mn, Ce, Zn, respectively, were used to construct a standard calibration curve for calculating the specific metal concentration in sample solutions. ICP-grade HNO<sub>3</sub> (metal contents < 1 ppb) and HPLC-grade water (18.2 MΩ•cm, filtered by a 0.22 µm membrane filter) were used to prepare the sample and standard solutions.

### ***XRD-TGA-DSC-Raman measurements***

Powder XRD patterns were collected on a Bruker D8 Discover diffractometer using Cu Ka radiation (40 kV and 40 mA) with degrees per step and time/step parameters of 0.02° per step and 0.5 s/step, respectively, at a 2θ angle from 10 to 70°. XRD patterns were plotted in Origin and processed using the GSAS II software 34 to obtain structural information via Rietveld refinement. TGA was performed using a TA Q600 thermal analyzer. For a typical measurement, around 10 mg of catalysts were heated in an alumina pan from room temperature (~20 °C) to 650 °C at a 10 °C/min ramp rate with a 100 mL/min dry nitrogen purging rate. Raman analysis was performed using a Thermo Fisher DRX3 Raman micro spectrometer. The laser excitation source was a diode laser (λ<sub>ex</sub> = 785 nm). Spectra were recorded using the following materials and conditions: a stainless steel substrate, 50× objective, collected exposure time of 30 s for eight accumulations, laser power of 1.5 mW (in focus), and an aperture of 50 µm slit. Raman spectra were recorded from ~five different sample spots depending on the homogeneity of the sample.