



## Review

A decade+ of *operando* spectroscopy studies

Anisha Chakrabarti<sup>a</sup>, Michael E. Ford<sup>a</sup>, Daniel Gregory<sup>a</sup>, Rongrong Hu<sup>a,1</sup>,  
 Christopher J. Keturakis<sup>a,2</sup>, Soe Lwin<sup>a,3</sup>, Yadan Tang<sup>a,4</sup>, Zhou Yang<sup>a</sup>, Minghui Zhu<sup>a</sup>,  
 Miguel A. Bañares<sup>b</sup>, Israel E. Wachs<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Operando Molecular Spectroscopy & Catalysis Laboratory, Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015, USA*

<sup>b</sup> *Catalytic Spectroscopy Lab, Spectroscopy & Industrial Catalysis (SpeICat), Instituto de Catalisis (ICP), CSIC, Madrid, Spain*

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 20 September 2016

Received in revised form

21 November 2016

Accepted 5 December 2016

Available online 15 December 2016

## Keywords:

*Operando*

Spectroscopy

Catalysis

Review

*In situ*

## ABSTRACT

Because of the ability to directly probe the catalyst under reaction conditions, *operando* studies have significantly improved the catalysis literature. The number of *operando* publications continues to increase. Historical and current *operando* spectroscopy studies concerning all catalyst types and applications are extensively reviewed.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## Contents

1. Introduction: the <i>operando</i> spectroscopy methodology .....	28
1.1. History .....	29
1.1.1. Early <i>operando</i> IR spectroscopy studies .....	29
1.1.2. Early <i>operando</i> EPR spectroscopy studies .....	30
1.1.3. Early <i>operando</i> synchrotron-based spectroscopy studies .....	30
1.1.4. Early <i>operando</i> Raman spectroscopy studies .....	30
2. The <i>operando</i> spectroscopy experimental setup .....	31
2.1. Considerations for an <i>operando</i> spectroscopy reactor .....	31
2.2. <i>Operando</i> spectroscopy techniques .....	31
2.2.1. Steady-state isotopic transient kinetic analysis (SSITKA) .....	32
3. Unsupported metal catalysts .....	33
3.1. Oxidation of silver .....	33
3.2. Ethylene epoxidation by Ag .....	33
3.3. Methanol oxidation by Cu .....	33
3.4. Methanol oxidation by Ag .....	34
4. Supported metal catalysts .....	34

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [iew0@lehigh.edu](mailto:iew0@lehigh.edu) (I.E. Wachs).

<sup>1</sup> Despite exhaustive efforts, the author Rongrong Hu could not be contacted.

<sup>2</sup> Christopher J. Keturakis, Cummins Emission Solutions, Stoughton, WI.

<sup>3</sup> Soe Lwin, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID.

<sup>4</sup> Yadan Tang, Cummins Inc., Columbus, IN.

4.1.	Methanol synthesis	34
4.2.	Water-gas shift (WGS)	35
4.3.	Emission control	36
4.4.	Catalytic oxidation of methanol	36
5.	Supported metal oxide catalysts	38
5.1.	Oxidative dehydrogenation (ODH) of propane	38
5.2.	Dehydrogenation of propane	39
5.3.	CO oxidation	39
5.4.	Oxidative dehydrogenation (ODH) of ethane	40
5.5.	Methanol oxidation	40
5.6.	Butane dimerization	40
5.7.	Catalytic NO reduction	40
5.8.	Selective oxidation of propylene to acrolein	41
5.9.	Oxidation of H <sub>2</sub> S to sulfur	41
6.	Mesoporous silica molecular sieves	41
6.1.	Cinnamyl alcohol selective oxidation	41
6.2.	Mesoporous scaffolding for thermolysis of boranes to release hydrogen	41
7.	Zeolites	41
7.1.	Isomerization and cracking	41
7.2.	Oxidative carbonylation of methanol	42
7.3.	Selective catalytic reduction of NO <sub>x</sub>	42
7.4.	Decomposition of NO and N <sub>2</sub> O	43
7.5.	Methane dehydroaromatization (DHA)	43
7.6.	MTO process	44
8.	Polyoxometalates (POMs)	45
8.1.	Dehydration of glycerol to acrolein	45
8.2.	Selective oxidation of <i>i</i> -butane/ <i>i</i> -butene to methacrylic acid/methacrolein, respectively	45
8.3.	Propene oxidation	46
9.	Bulk mixed oxides	46
9.1.	Bulk mixed oxides in acid catalysis	46
9.1.1.	Methanol dehydration to DME	46
9.1.2.	Isomerization of <i>n</i> -pentane to isopentane	47
9.1.3.	Hydrogenation of toluene to methylcyclohexane by Pt/(sulfated-zirconia) catalysts	48
9.2.	Bulk mixed oxides for redox reactions	48
9.2.1.	Selective oxidation of <i>n</i> -butane to maleic anhydride	48
9.2.2.	Selective oxidation of propane to acrylic acid	48
9.2.3.	Ammonoxidation of ethane to acetonitrile	49
10.	Sulfides	49
10.1.	Hydrodesulfurization	49
11.	Sorbents for catalytic applications	49
11.1.	CO <sub>2</sub> capture for sorption-enhanced water-gas shift (WGS)	49
12.	Conclusions	49
	Funding	50
	References	50

## 1. Introduction: the *operando* spectroscopy methodology

The relationship between catalyst structure, especially surface structure, and reactivity/selectivity remains the most important question in modern heterogeneous catalysis because such fundamental information would allow for rational design of advanced catalysts. It is now well-appreciated that catalyst surfaces are dynamic and are altered by the environmental conditions (T, P, and gas or liquid composition). Consequently, it is critical to establish structure–performance relationships for catalysts operating under relevant reaction conditions given their dynamics.

*In situ* spectroscopy of heterogeneous catalysts has been practiced for over 60 years and is an invaluable approach for characterizing catalytic materials over a wide range of environmental conditions. *In situ* is Latin for “on site,” “on location,” or “in position,” meaning that catalyst characterization is performed under a controlled atmosphere (vacuum, reducing, oxidizing or reaction conditions) in an environmental cell or chemical reactor. If the treatment or reaction is stopped, and the catalyst is moved to a new location for analysis, then the characterization is referred to as *ex situ*, meaning “off-site” or “from site.” The adoption of *in situ* spectroscopy by catalyst scientists since 1965 is shown in Fig. 1.

Although its adoption was initially sluggish, the adoption of *in situ* spectroscopy for catalyst characterization started to become rapid during the 1980s and reaching ~480 *in situ* publications in 2015 in the catalysis literature.

*In situ* characterization studies have allowed scientists to observe catalysts under controlled conditions; however they fall short of providing a direct relationship between catalyst structure (bulk/surface) and performance (activity and selectivity) because of the absence of corresponding reaction product analysis. This is especially true when performed in vacuum or non-reaction conditions (inert (He, Ar, N<sub>2</sub>, etc.), O<sub>2</sub> or H<sub>2</sub>), as most of such studies tend to be. This limitation of *in situ* spectroscopy characterization, can be overcome by simultaneously collecting catalyst characterization and online product analysis data and has been referred to as *operando* spectroscopy. The term *operando* was coined by Miguel A. Bañares and is Latin for “working” or “operating” and first appeared in the catalysis literature in 2002 from several publications of the Bañares group [1–4]. By simultaneously performing time-resolved *in situ* spectroscopy and online product analysis, it is possible to directly relate the catalyst surface/bulk structure with catalyst performance. The *operando* spectroscopy methodology has been quickly adopted by catalyst scientists since 2002 and

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6455257>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6455257>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)