


Recent Advances in Preferential Oxidation of CO Reaction over Platinum Group Metal Catalysts

Kuo Liu,[†] Aiqin Wang, and Tao Zhang*

State Key Laboratory of Catalysis, Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 457 Zhongshan Road, Dalian 116023, People's Republic of China

ABSTRACT: Preferential oxidation of CO (PROX) is an important reaction for removing small amounts of CO to a parts-per-million level from the hydrogen-rich stream, which will be ultimately supplied as a fuel to polymer–electrolyte membrane fuel cells. The key to the application of PROX is to develop a highly active and selective catalyst that operates well in a wide temperature window (e.g., 80–180 °C) and has good resistance to CO₂ and steam. In the past decades, various catalyst formulations have been developed, among which platinum group metal catalysts, including Pt, Ru, and Ir—in particular, those modified with promoters such as alkali metals and reducible metal oxides—have received a great deal of attention for their significantly improved catalytic activities in the low-temperature range. In this minireview, the recent advances of the platinum group metal catalysts for the PROX reaction are summarized, including performances of unpromoted and promoted catalysts, reaction mechanisms, and kinetics. In addition, the important roles of hydroxyl groups in the PROX reaction are also discussed.

KEYWORDS: platinum group metal catalysts, PROX, activity, mechanism, O₂ activation, OH groups




1. INTRODUCTION

The high demand for clean energy triggers the intensive interest in fuel cell-powered systems for stationary and mobile source applications. Among various types of fuel cells, the polymer–electrolyte membrane fuel cell (PEMFC), which operates typically around 80 °C with H⁺ as a charge carrier, has been attracting much attention in the application to electric vehicles or residential power generations. The PEMFC possesses many attractive features, such as a low operating temperature, sustained operation at high current density, low weight, compactness, potential for low cost and volume, long stack life, rapid start-up, and suitability to discontinuous operation.¹ The PEMFC utilizes hydrogen as a fuel, and hydrogen is usually produced by autothermal reforming of hydrocarbons or alcohols (fuel + O₂ + H₂O ↔ CO_x + H₂), where without water, it is partial oxidation, and without oxygen, it is steam reforming and followed by the water gas shift reaction (CO + H₂O ↔ CO₂ + H₂) to eliminate most of the CO.^{2–5}

The typical composition of effluent gas from the water gas shift reactor contains about 1% of CO in a large excess of H₂. However, the anode of PEMFC is prone to be poisoned by CO at low temperatures, even in the presence of small amounts of CO in the hydrogen stream.^{6,7} Thus, carbon monoxide should be further removed to a trace level below 10 ppm.⁸ During the past decade, great efforts have been put into the development of advanced technologies toward the selective removal of CO from H₂-rich reformat while minimizing the loss of H₂. Three approaches, including Pd-membrane separation,⁹ catalytic methanation,¹⁰ and preferential oxidation of CO in a large

excess of H₂ stream (PROX),^{11,12} have been proposed and investigated intensively. Among the three purification methods, PROX appears to be the most promising one.

The PROX process involves two competitive reactions:



Since the PROX operation unit is positioned between the low-temperature shift reactor (~200 °C) and the PEMFC (~80 °C), the catalyst for PROX should work between the two temperatures for the efficient use of energy. Meanwhile, start-up at low temperatures (e.g., room temperature) is also very important for the transportation application of fuel cells. Thus, an efficient PROX catalyst is required to exhibit good performances over a wide temperature range.¹³

The first patent for the PROX catalyst was awarded to Engelhard in the 1960s,¹⁴ in which supported Pt catalysts were applied to purify the hydrogen for the application of ammonia synthesis. Later on, various catalysts were developed, with the aim of selectively removing CO while minimizing H₂ consumption in a wide operation temperature window (e.g., 80–180 °C) for the PEMFCs applications. According to the active metal used, the catalysts can be classified into group VIII metal catalysts (mainly platinum group metal catalysts, denoted as PGM catalysts^{15–19}) and group IB metal catalysts (Cu, Ag,

Received: February 25, 2012

Revised: April 19, 2012

Published: April 30, 2012

and Au-based catalysts^{20–24}). On the other hand, the support materials have a great influence on the catalytic performance of metals, and can be classified into “inert” and “active” supports.²⁵

Figure 1 gives a conceptual comparison of different types of metal catalysts for the PROX reaction. Supported gold catalysts




Figure 1. Conceptual illustration of catalytic performances of different types of catalysts for PROX reaction. For clarity, only the maximum CO conversion and reaction temperature window are shown, while the selectivity is not shown here.

are famous for their exceptionally high activity in low-temperature CO oxidation.^{26–32} However, for the PROX reaction, there are very few gold catalysts that are able to remove CO to below 10 ppm in the targeted temperature range (e.g., 80–180 °C) because of the competitive oxidation of H₂ at elevated temperatures.^{33–40} In addition, the deactivation trend of gold catalysts in a long operation term as well as their sensitivity to the preparation procedure also limits practical applications. In this context, supported gold catalysts may not be the best candidates for PROX applications. On the other hand, Cu-based catalysts, especially in combination with CeO₂ and Fe₂O₃, are usually active only above 100 °C and exhibit poor resistance toward water and CO₂.^{41–50} Therefore, the Cu-based catalysts are also less attractive considering the practical PROX applications, although they are cost-effective.

In comparison with Au- or Cu-based catalysts, PGM catalysts (such as Pt, Ru, Ir, Rh catalysts)—in particular, reducible metal oxide-promoted Pt catalysts—give rise to very promising performances in the reaction temperature range 60–150 °C, as illustrated in Figure 1.^{51–55} In the past decade, there have been intensive studies of the PROX reaction over promoted PGMs, including searching for more effective promoters, developing new advanced preparation methods, and clarifying the underlying mechanisms as well as kinetic studies. Especially, with the advancement of atomic resolution techniques as well as of theoretical calculation methods, the identification of active sites on the heterogeneous catalyst surface becomes possible. In this minireview, we give a summary of the recent advances of the PROX reaction over PGM catalysts, and the focus is put on the catalytic performances and the mechanisms of the reducible metal oxide-promoted PGM catalysts, since they have been considered as one of the most promising candidates used for practical hydrogen purification system connected to PEMFCs.

2. NONPROMOTED PGM CATALYSTS FOR THE PROX REACTION

Monometallic PGM catalysts such as Pt, Ru, Rh, and Ir on inert supports (named as nonpromoted PGM hereafter) usually give


very low activities at temperatures below 100 °C (see Figure 1). Noticeable PROX activities were observed only above 120 °C over these nonpromoted PGM catalysts.^{56–59} Oh and Sinkevitch tested various PGM catalysts for the PROX reaction and reported that Ru/Al₂O₃ and Rh/Al₂O₃ were active for CO oxidation at 100 °C with a gas composition of 900 ppm CO, 800 ppm O₂, and 0.85% H₂ in N₂.¹⁸ Nevertheless, this reaction condition is far from the practical application of PROX due to the very low concentration of hydrogen.


The supported Ru catalysts were found to be sensitive to preparation parameters such as Ru precursors, reducing agents, and pretreatment conditions, which significantly affected the activity and selectivity for the PROX reaction.^{60–70} Chin et al.⁶⁰ prepared Ru/SiO₂ and Ru/Al₂O₃ catalysts by incipient wetness impregnation and observed that the use of a nitrate precursor and hydrogen reduction treatment resulted in finely dispersed Ru catalysts capable of completely eliminating CO in the temperature range 120–150 °C for Ru/SiO₂ and 160–180 °C for Ru/Al₂O₃. In contrast, Ru catalysts prepared from RuCl₃ precursor showed comparatively lower CO conversions, which was ascribed to the selective blockage of the active sites by Cl[−] or Cl[−]-induced structural rearrangements. Addition of H₂O essentially had no effect on the CO oxidation over Ru/SiO₂, whereas a slightly negative effect was observed with Ru/Al₂O₃. On the other hand, the presence of CO₂ suppresses the CO oxidation over both catalysts at the high-temperature end.

Echigo's group^{61–67} prepared Ru/Al₂O₃ by an impregnation method and made a comparative study between the prereduced and the nonreduced Ru catalysts. The result showed that over the prereduced Ru catalyst, CO was removed to below 10 ppm from the reformed gas between 85 and 170 °C at [O₂]/[CO] = 1.5 and between 90 and 140 °C at [O₂]/[CO] = 1.0, respectively, which were much wider than that of the nonreduced catalyst. Decreasing O₂/CO molar ratio resulted in an increasing outlet CO concentration and a narrow temperature window. Moreover, Ru/Al₂O₃ showed good stability at 120 °C within 50 h in a reaction stream composed of 0.5% CO, 20% CO₂, 1.5% O₂, 6% N₂, 11% H₂O, and the balance H₂.⁶²


Kim et al.⁷¹ prepared 0.5 wt % Ru/γ-Al₂O₃ and 5 wt % Ru/γ-Al₂O₃ with a similar particle size distribution based on TEM analysis and found that the latter catalyst with a smaller amount of chemisorbed CO and O₂ per Ru metal showed much better PROX activity. In addition, Ru catalysts were reported to be stable for more than 10 000 h during the CO removal process.^{65,66}

Han et al. reported that Ru/γ-Al₂O₃ showed excellent stability over 1000 min at 150 °C in a reformed gas mixture (1 kPa CO, 1 kPa O₂, 65 kPa H₂, and 10 kPa H₂O in CO₂).⁷² The close correlation between the low-temperature PROX activity and the percent of Ru⁰ was revealed by XPS study.⁶³ The CO conversion increased with an increase in the surface Ru⁰ percent at low temperatures, but the selectivity for CO oxidation remained almost constant, regardless of the surface Ru⁰ percent. It is supposed that the PROX activity of the Ru catalyst at low temperatures is dominated by O₂ activation on Ru⁰, and the increase in the surface Ru⁰ percent by the H₂/N₂ reduction leads to the high activity of the activated Ru catalyst. On the reduced Ru catalyst, two reactions contribute together to the CO removal,⁶⁸ including:





In addition to the above two reactions, Echigo et al.⁶² also found that adding CO₂ into the feed mixture resulted in 100 ppm higher CH₄ concentration at 160 °C than that in the absence of CO₂, and the difference is wider at a higher temperature. Accordingly, the authors suggested that the methanation of CO₂ also occurred via the following reaction:



Nevertheless, the contribution of this reaction is very small in the low-temperature range (<180 °C).^{62–64} Similar conclusions have also been drawn by Xu and Zhang.⁷³

Specchia's group^{74,75} prepared a series of Rh catalysts by an incipient wetness impregnation method, including Rh catalysts supported on A-type zeolites (3A, 4A, and 5A) Al₂O₃, TiO₂, and CeO₂. The results of the PROX reaction under the realistic conditions indicated that Rh catalysts supported on the reducible supports, such as CeO₂ and TiO₂, were comparatively less active at 80–120 °C than that on the inert supports. The most suitable catalyst for application operating at a temperature range compatible with the PEMFC is Rh-zeolite 3A. In contrast with the pore sizes of 4A and 5A zeolite (4 Å and 5 Å, respectively), the pore size of 3A zeolite (3 Å) was close to the diameter of the CO₂ molecules, which could make admittance of CO₂ into pores difficult and lower the CO₂ concentration on the active sites.

In addition, the different nature of the counterions, such as K⁺, Na⁺, and Ca²⁺, may also have an effect on CO₂ affinity with the supports. Both effects relate to the enhancement of the PROX activity and the inhibition of the CO₂ methanation. It has also been found that an increase in the O₂ concentration widened the temperature window for 100% CO conversion. The authors optimized the catalyst composition and the reaction conditions and came to the conclusion that 0.5% Rh-3A catalyst operating at $\lambda = 2\text{O}_2/\text{CO} = 3$ could reach 100% CO conversion in the temperature range from 80 to 120 °C at a constant space velocity 0.66 N L min⁻¹ g_{cat}⁻¹, with no appearance of undesirable side reactions and at a possibly more acceptable cost for the reactor. In addition, the Rh catalyst supported on a mixture support of Al₂O₃ and 3A zeolite was also reported to be a promising candidate for the PROX reaction.⁷⁶

Ito et al.^{77,78} found that adding niobia to Rh catalysts increased the activity and selectivity for the PROX reaction, and the activity was as follows: Rh/Nb₂O₅ > Nb₂O₅-Rh/SiO₂ > Rh/SiO₂ > RhNbO₄/SiO₂. Rh/Nb₂O₅ exhibited 100% CO conversion at 100 °C in a feed mixture of 0.2% CO, 3% H₂, and 1% O₂ after reduction at 500 °C. Han et al.⁷⁹ made a comparison among Rh/MgO, Ru/ γ -Al₂O₃, and Pt/ γ -Al₂O₃ catalysts in idealized methanol reformat (1 kPa CO, 1 kPa O₂, and 75 kPa H₂ in N₂) and pointed out that the activity of Rh/MgO at 250 °C exceeded that of the other two catalysts at their optimum temperatures by 2 orders of magnitude, indicating that Rh/MgO was a more active catalyst at temperatures higher than 250 °C.

Alumina-supporting monometallic Pt catalysts are perhaps the earliest studied catalysts, and typically, they have noticeable PROX activities above 150 °C.^{80–82} Manasilp and Gulari⁵⁶ prepared Pt/Al₂O₃ catalyst by a sol-gel method and observed that 2% Pt/Al₂O₃ showed the maximum CO conversion (80%) at 170 °C with a selectivity of ~50%. Increasing the O₂ concentration from 0.5 to 1.35% increased the CO conversion

from 40–50% to 100% between 130 and 150 °C and decreased the selectivity from 55% to 35%. The presence of H₂O increased the activity over the whole temperature range of 110–190 °C by ~10-fold, and the activation energy was found to decrease from 74 to 37 kJ/mol after adding H₂O. On contrast, the CO conversion decreased dramatically with the addition of CO₂ in the whole temperature range, and the maximum CO conversion dropped from 80 to 65% after adding CO₂. On the other hand, Avgouropoulos et al.⁸¹ reported that Pt/Al₂O₃ could maintain 100% CO conversion for ~110 h at 100 °C in a reaction stream containing 1% CO, 1.25% O₂, 50% H₂, 15% CO₂, and the balance He. In addition, various zeolites were also employed as supports for Pt catalysts, such as ZSM-5,⁸³ A type and X type zeolites,^{82,84} mordenite,^{80,84} and Y type zeolite.^{85,86}

Igarashi et al.⁸⁴ prepared a series of Pt/zeolite catalysts by an ion-exchange method, including Pt/A-zeolite, Pt/mordenite, Pt/X-zeolite, and Pt/Al₂O₃, and found that the zeolite-supported Pt catalysts exhibited a much higher selectivity than the alumina-supported ones in feed gas containing a large excess of hydrogen with the addition of a low concentration of oxygen (nearly 100% at 0.05% O₂). Pt/mordenite showed the highest conversion of CO to CO₂ among these catalysts, and Pt/A-zeolite catalysts exhibited the highest selectivity with the same CO conversion. In addition, a two-stage reactor was developed to achieve 100% CO conversion at 200 °C on the Pt/mordenite. The Pt catalysts supported on alkali metal-type zeolites, such as NaY, NaX, Na mordenite, KL zeolite, NaZSM-5, and Na β zeolites were also claimed to be active for the PROX catalyst.⁸⁵

Recently, Sebastian et al.⁸⁶ prepared different zeolitic material (MOR, ZSM-5, FAU, and ETS-10)-supported Pt catalysts. Among these catalysts, Pt/FAU had a larger pore size and volume than the other three zeolites, which led to a higher Pt dispersion. For Pt/ETS-10, Pt particles aggregated outside the microporous structure, in accordance with a low Pt dispersion and the low pore volume of ETS-10. Both Pt/FAU and Pt/ETS-10 exhibited high activity and selectivity for the PROX reaction when CO₂ or H₂O (or both) were also present in the reaction atmosphere, but Pt/FAU was the only one that could achieve 100% CO conversion below 180 °C.

By decreasing the oxygen content, both the selectivity and the temperature required to achieve a given CO conversion were increased on Pt/inert supports.^{82,83} For example, Ren and Hong⁸⁰ found that if the O₂/CO decreased from 1.5 to 1, the temperature window for the parts-per-million level operation narrowed from 120–180 °C to 135–160 °C. Specchia's group prepared Pt-3A catalyst by an incipient wetness impregnation method, which showed a better performance than that prepared by an ion exchange method.^{87,88} With this catalyst, the complete CO conversion and the maximum selectivity were obtained at 264 °C at a space velocity of 536 000 h⁻¹ in the gas mixture, simulating water-gas shift (WGS) outlet composition (37% H₂, 5% H₂O, 18% CO₂, 0.5% CO, 0.75% O₂, and the rest He).⁸⁷

From a more practical point of view, a structured catalyst may be a better choice than a powdered one. Specchia's group⁸⁹ deposited a mixed carrier of 3A-zeolite and γ -Al₂O₃-supported Pt catalyst on the metal plates previously coated with γ -Al₂O₃, and the catalyst achieved complete CO conversion in the temperature range of 194–214 °C at GHSV = 2000 h⁻¹ in a synthetic gas mixture simulating the WGS outlet composition (37% H₂, 5% H₂O, 18% CO₂, 0.5–1% CO, and 1–2% O₂ in

He). Rh catalyst deposited on a microreactor could also eliminate CO in a similar gas mixture in the temperature range of 120–180 °C.⁹⁰

Until now, it has been difficult to compare strictly the activities of unpromoted PGM catalysts due to the broadly varied reaction conditions and preparation procedures. Nevertheless, Ru/Al₂O₃ catalyst appears as the most promising one for the PROX reaction among these catalysts on the basis of real operation data. Supported Ru catalysts are distinguished from other noble metal catalysts owing to their unique catalytic activities for CO/CO₂ methanation and reverse water gas shift reactions, which will consume additional H₂, accompanied by the removal of CO. The simultaneous consumption of H₂ reduces the scientific interest in developing this catalyst, although both oxidation and hydrogenation can be accomplished with one catalyst, which can provide a widened temperature range to achieve the acceptable CO removal. Other unpromoted monometallic noble metal catalysts, such as Rh, Pt, and Ir, were all suggested as bad candidates for the PROX reaction because they showed low activities at temperatures ranging from 80 to 120 °C (the operating temperature of PEMFCs) and low selectivities to CO₂ at higher temperatures. Over these catalysts, the use of a large excess of oxygen ($\lambda \geq 3$) was essential to achieve a 100% CO conversion, which would decrease the CO₂ selectivity and complicate the operation; therefore, the unpromoted PGM catalysts were not promising candidates for the PROX reaction. To increase the activities of the PGM catalysts at low reaction temperatures, promoters must be added. Here, the promoters indicate reducible metal oxides, alkali metal cations, or the second noble metal component, all of which have a remarkably promoting effect on the low-temperature activities of the PGM catalysts. The following part will focus on these promoted PGM catalysts.

3. PROMOTED PGM CATALYSTS FOR THE PROX REACTION

The conceptual illustration of Figure 1 clearly shows PGM catalysts modified by promoters exhibit greatly enhanced PROX activities in the operating temperature range of PEMFCs. To date, various promoters have been investigated, including reducible metal oxides either as the promoters or as the supports, the second noble metal that can form different bimetallic structures with the first PGMs, and alkali or alkali earth metal cations.

3.1. Bimetallic PGM Catalysts. Over the past few years, bimetallic catalysts have attracted much attention owing to their tunable chemical compositions and nanostructures, which in turn greatly affect the catalytic performances.^{91–98} In particular, with the advancement in the synthesis of colloid metal nanoparticles, the size, morphology, and structure of bimetallic nanoparticles have become controllable to some extent,^{99–102} which provides great opportunity for the development of high-performance bimetallic nanocatalysts. According to Eichhorn et al., the nanostructure of the bimetallic particles can be divided into core–shell, alloy, and linked monometallic nanoparticles.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, one must keep in mind that these structures may not be stable during the reaction, and some structural changes induced by the temperature and atmosphere^{97,104} often occur, as illustrated in Figure 2. Therefore, in situ techniques must be employed in identifying the active sites.

Pt–Ru catalysts supported on alumina,¹⁰⁵ silica,¹⁰⁶ and mordenite¹⁰⁷ were reported to be superior to the monometallic




Figure 2. Different bimetallic structures and the possible transformations induced by pretreatment and reaction conditions. One metal is black and the other is red.

Pt catalyst. Pt–Ru/Al₂O₃, which was prepared by an impregnation method, showed 99% CO conversion and 62% selectivity at 100 °C, with a feed composition of 35% H₂, 17% CO₂, 28% N₂, 17% H₂O, 1% CO, and air as the oxidant, and by using a multistaged reactor system.¹⁰⁵ Chin et al.¹⁰⁶ prepared a Pt–Ru/SiO₂ catalyst by an incipient wetness coimpregnation method with a Ru/Pt atomic ratio of ~2:1. The pretreatment of the Pt–Ru/SiO₂ catalyst by O₂/H₂ exhibited an activity between Pt/SiO₂ and Ru/SiO₂, whereas the pretreatment by H₂ resulted in a PROX activity similar to that of Ru/SiO₂. The prerduced Pt–Ru/SiO₂ by H₂ showed 100% CO conversion in the temperature range of 120–160 °C with 0.5% CO, 0.5% O₂, 45% H₂ in N₂.

Igarashi et al.¹⁰⁷ found that Pt–Ru/mordenite with a Pt/Ru atomic ratio of 2:1 showed 90% CO conversion and 90% CO₂ selectivity at 150 °C, with the gas mixture composed of 1% CO and 0.5% O₂ in H₂. Naknam et al.¹⁰⁸ also used an incipient wetness coimpregnation method to prepare Pt–Au/zeolite-A catalyst with a Pt/Au atomic ratio of 2. In this catalyst, Pt and Au appeared to be in separate phases. The Pt–Au catalyst has been found to be more active than the monometallic Pt catalyst, on which the temperature of 100% CO conversion has been shifted approximately 50 °C to a lower temperature. Furthermore, it was found that the Pt–Au catalyst exhibited good stability even in the presence of CO₂ and H₂O.

Parinyaswan et al.¹⁰⁹ prepared Pt–Pd/CeO₂ catalysts using a sol–gel method and found that the most active catalyst had a composition of Pt/Pd = 1/7. This catalyst showed ~76% CO conversion at 90–110 °C, with a feed composition of 1% CO, 1% O₂, 4% CO₂, and 40% H₂ in He. However, CO conversion could be increased to ~99% at 90 °C by increasing the O₂ concentration to 2%. In addition, adding 10% H₂O in the feed gas could also increase the CO conversion to 85%. In contrast, CO₂ was reported to exert a detrimental effect on CO conversion. Increasing CO₂ concentration from 4% to 25% resulted in a decrease in the CO conversion from 76% to 50%.

Eichhorn and co-workers^{103,110} reported a series of nanoparticle (NP) catalysts made of a transition metal core (M = Ru, Rh, Ir, Pd, or Au) covered with a 1–2-monolayer-thick shell of Pt atoms. These catalysts were synthesized by using a

sequential polyol process. The core nanoparticles were first synthesized by reducing the corresponding metal precursors in refluxing glycol in the presence of polyvinylpyrrolidone stabilizer, and then the resulting core nanoparticles were coated with Pt through adding PtCl_2 to the core metal colloid. This synthesis procedure produced a PGM@Pt core-shell structure. Among the studied systems, Ru@Pt core-shell NPs exhibited significantly higher activity for the PROX reaction when compared with monometallic mixtures and bulk non-segregated bimetallic nanoalloys. The best Ru@Pt catalyst showed a 100% CO conversion below 20 °C (0.1% CO and 0.5% O_2 in H_2) and good stability.

3.2. Reducible Metal Oxide-Promoted PGM Catalysts.

Noble metals promoted with reducible metal oxides (denoted as MO_x hereafter) showed remarkable low-temperature activities in the PROX reaction. Among the reducible metal oxides, iron oxide is the most intensively studied promoter for noble metal catalysts owing to its outstanding promotional effect, especially in the temperature range 80–120 °C.

The work of Korotkikh and Farrauto⁵¹ appears to be the first published study of supported PtFe catalysts for the PROX reaction. They found that with iron oxide promotion, CO conversion at 90 °C was increased significantly from 13.2% to 68.0% with a stoichiometric O_2/CO ratio and a pretty high weight hourly space velocity ($\text{WHSV} = 150\,000\text{ L g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$), but the selectivity remained relatively constant. Thereafter, many researchers studied the PtFe catalysts supported on zeolites, Al_2O_3 and SiO_2 .

Watanabe et al.⁵² developed a new Pt–Fe/mordenite catalyst by an ion-exchange method, and the activity of this catalyst was far superior to conventional Pt/ Al_2O_3 and Pt/mordenite catalysts. A complete removal of CO with 100% selectivity was achieved by the addition of a stoichiometric amount of O_2 from a simulated reformat at 80–150 °C with a high gas hourly space velocity ($\text{GHSV} = \sim 80\,000\text{ h}^{-1}$). Among various Pt/Fe ratios on a variety of zeolites, 4 wt % Pt–2 wt % Fe/mordenite gave the best activity and selectivity.⁵² The Pt–Fe/mordenite catalyst could maintain 100% CO conversion for more than 20 h, even in the presence of CO_2 and H_2O .⁵⁴ Furthermore, supported PtFe catalysts could be washed out on ceramic straight-channel monoliths^{111,112} and metal foams.^{113,114} Watanabe's group coated Pt–Fe/mordenite catalysts on ceramic straight-channel monoliths and demonstrated that the catalysts could achieve the 10-ppm target level at a low O_2/CO ratio ($\text{O}_2/\text{CO} = 1$) in a single-stage reactor. In addition, this catalyst exhibited excellent durability, since no deterioration in performance was observed during 500 h of operation.¹¹¹

Bao's group¹¹⁵ prepared a nanosized silica-supported PtFe catalyst, in which nanosized silica support was first functionalized with (3-aminopropyl)triethoxysilane (APTES) followed by sequential deposition of Pt and Fe precursors. This synthesis procedure produced a structure with Fe patches on the surface of Pt particles. The resultant catalyst (4% Pt and 0.5% Fe) gave very high activity and selectivity for the PROX reaction with 100% CO conversion and 100% CO_2 selectivity at RT with a GHSV of $36\,000\text{ h}^{-1}$. Even at 80 °C, the CO conversion and CO_2 selectivity attained $\sim 95\%$. More interesting, this catalyst showed 92% CO conversion and excellent stability under realistic PEMFC conditions when a considerable amount of CO_2 and H_2O was present. Under slight excess O_2 conditions, the CO can be removed, even to 1 ppm. With this catalyst assembled into a 1 kW PEMFC

working system, the cell performance remained stable for more than 900 h, which is in contrast to the deactivation after 30 min without the Pt–Fe catalyst.

Different from the above work in which Fe is added as a promoter in a small amount, our group used iron oxide directly as the support for the Pt catalyst. Surprisingly, at a low Pt loading (0.17 wt %), all the Pt species were dispersed as single atoms.¹¹⁶ Aberration-corrected high-angle annular dark field scanning transmission electron microscopy (HAADF-STEM) and extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) characterizations provide unambiguous evidence that Pt exists exclusively as single atoms on the whole catalyst without the presence of any clusters or particles. PROX activity tests showed that the single-atom catalyst Pt_1/FeO_x is 2–3 times more active than the cluster-sized catalyst, giving CO conversion of more than 95% at 80 °C at an extremely high GHSV of $11\,000\,000\text{ mL g}_{\text{Pt}}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$. More interesting, this single-atom catalyst was rather stable in a 1000 min run at 80 °C, without any sintering or agglomeration. This unprecedented high activity of Pt single atoms supported on FeO_x has an important implication of developing low-cost but highly active PROX catalysts.

The above iron oxide-promoted or -supported Pt catalysts were all prepared by simple impregnation, coprecipitation, or the ion-exchange method. An alternative approach to this type of catalysts is to use the colloid Pt–Fe bimetallic nanoparticles as precursors to get an improved interaction between Pt and Fe. Shen's group¹¹⁷ prepared colloid Pt–Fe bimetallic nanoparticles using a modified polyol method in which the Pt nanoparticles first were obtained and then acted as crystal nuclei for deposition of Fe. The as-prepared nanoparticles were deposited onto an Al_2O_3 support. It was found that the Pt–3Fe/ Al_2O_3 gave a CO conversion of 99% and CO_2 selectivity of 98% at 30–80 °C at a GHSV of $10\,000\text{ h}^{-1}$ and was stable at 80 °C within 50 h.¹¹⁷ Our group also reported Pt–Fe/ Al_2O_3 catalysts prepared with $\text{Pt}(\text{acac})_2$ and $\text{Fe}(\text{acac})_3$ as precursors and ethylene glycol as a soft reducing agent in Ar, which showed improved PROX activity over Pt/ Al_2O_3 .¹¹⁸ Siani et al.¹¹⁹ developed a cluster-derived PtFe/ SiO_2 catalyst by using $\text{PtFe}_2(\text{COD})(\text{CO})_8$ and $\text{Pt}_5\text{Fe}_2(\text{COD})_2(\text{CO})_{12}$ organometallic cluster precursors. Compared with PtFe/ SiO_2 prepared by conventional impregnation procedure, the cluster-derived catalysts possessed a high degree of metal dispersion and more homogeneous mixing of Pt and Fe and were therefore more active for the PROX reaction. However, this catalyst showed a slow deactivation during the PROX reaction.

In addition to iron oxide, other reducible oxides have also proved to be effective promoters for noble metal-catalyzed PROX reaction. For example, CeO_2 ^{120–125} as well as $\text{Ce}_x\text{Zr}_{(1-x)}\text{O}_2$ ^{126–128} supported Pt catalysts were reported to be much more active than the Pt/ Al_2O_3 catalyst in the low temperature range (60–100 °C). However, a complete conversion of CO was achieved only with an excess amount of O_2 , which caused additional consumption of H_2 . Thus, CO_2 selectivity is rather low at a total conversion of CO over CeO_2 -supported Pt catalysts.

Sn was also reported to be an effective promoter for the Pt-catalyzed PROX reaction.^{129–134} The carbon-supported Pt_3Sn catalyst showed lower activation energy for CO oxidation than that for H_2 oxidation, whereas Pt/ Al_2O_3 catalyst had similar activation energies for both reactions that are larger than that on Pt_3Sn catalysts.¹²⁹ The influence of Sn was remarkable, increasing the catalytic activity of Pt atoms by 1 order of

magnitude. Furthermore, the presence of hydrogen was found to promote the rate of CO oxidation.^{130,131} Pt supported on Nb₂O₅ catalysts presented higher activity than Pt/Al₂O₃ or PtSn/Al₂O₃ in the PROX reaction at low temperatures, but with a lower CO₂ selectivity.¹³²

Both Co and Cu can form intermetallic compounds (IMCs) with Pt. Komatsu and Tamura reported that Pt₃Co and PtCu IMCs supported on silica functioned as active catalysts for PROX in the temperature range of 100–180 °C.¹³⁵ The Pt₃Co catalyst was more selective than PtCu for CO₂ formation. Characterizations suggested that the formation of IMCs induced elongation of the Pt–Pt bond distance and electron transfer from Pt to Co or Cu; both effects weakened CO adsorption and therefore increased the low-temperature activity.

The promotional role of Co was also found in other supported Pt catalysts, such as Pt–Co/TiO₂¹³⁶ and Pt–Co/Al₂O₃.¹³⁷ In particular, Pt–Co/YSZ (yttria-stabilized zirconia) with Pt/Co = 1/5 (0.5 wt % Pt) exhibited the best performance among various Pt–Co catalysts, which could reduce the CO concentration to below 10 ppm in the temperature range of 110–150 °C, even under practical conditions (containing both CO₂ and H₂O in the inlet gas).¹³⁸ Similar to the Pt–Co catalysts, Pt–Ni catalysts supported on Al₂O₃ or CNT (carbon nanotube) were also active and selective at low temperatures for the PROX reaction.^{139–142} The maximum CO conversion could be obtained at 75 °C on Pt–Ni/CNTs, with the selectivity ~50% in 1% CO, 1% O₂, 50% H₂, and N₂ (WHSV = 48 000 mL g_{cat}⁻¹ h⁻¹). In addition, Pt–Ni/CNTs could maintain 100% CO conversion for ~31 h in the absence of CO₂ and H₂O at 115 °C.¹⁴¹ Surface science studies showed that the synergy arose from a sandwich structure consisting of surface Ni oxide nanoislands and subsurface Ni atoms at a Pt surface. The surface Ni oxide nanoislands activate O₂ to produce atomic O, and the subsurface Ni atoms promote the elementary reaction between CO and O.¹⁴²

In contrast to the extensive studies on the Pt-based catalysts, Ir catalysts received less attention, probably because of their inferior activity. Recently, effective supported Ir catalysts have been prepared. Okumura et al.¹⁵ prepared Ir/TiO₂ catalysts by deposition-precipitation and impregnation, both of which were proved to be active for CO oxidation after pretreatment in a stream of 20% H₂ in Ar at 250 °C for 1 h. These catalysts showed 100% CO conversion at room temperature with 1% CO in air at a space velocity of 20 000 mL g_{cat}⁻¹ h⁻¹. Mariño and co-workers¹²⁰ were the first to report Ir/CeO₂ as an active catalyst for the PROX reaction. They used an expensive chlorine-free Ir precursor, Ir[CH(COCH₃)₂]₃, instead of inexpensive and easily available H₂IrCl₆ in the preparation of Ir/CeO₂ and Ir/Ce_xZr_(1-x)O₂ by means of impregnation. Ceria–zirconia-supported Ir and Pt catalysts showed a similar behavior; the same trends were observed for both catalysts, and a maximum appeared at ~100 °C in the evolution of the CO conversion as a function of temperature, although the Ir catalyst was slightly less active than the Pt catalysts.

Our group performed an intensive study of Ir catalysts for the PROX reaction, including CeO₂-supporting Ir catalysts,^{143–149} and Al₂O₃- and SiO₂-supporting Ir catalysts promoted with FeO_x.^{150–155} It was found that deposition–precipitation (DP) with either NaOH or urea as the precipitation agent yielded highly active Ir/CeO₂ catalysts, whereas impregnation with Cl-containing precursor (H₂IrCl₆) gave a rather poor catalyst.¹⁴⁴ The underlying reason is that the

formation of Ce–O–Cl species inhibits the mobility of surface oxygen in the CeO₂ support. Among various supports investigated (CeO₂, TiO₂, Al₂O₃, and MgO), only CeO₂-supporting Ir catalysts were active for the low-temperature PROX reaction; the maximum CO conversion of ~70% was obtained at 80 °C with a stoichiometric ratio of CO/O₂ at a GHSV of 40 000 h⁻¹.^{143,144}

Since most of the Ir particles are on the surface of the CeO₂ support when a DP procedure is employed to produce the Ir/CeO₂ catalyst (denoted as Ir-on-CeO₂), this Ir-on-CeO₂ catalyst will be less selective for CO oxidation due to the competitive H₂ oxidation occurring on the exposed Ir surfaces. Therefore, we developed a new Ir-in-ceria catalyst in which most of the iridium particles are embedded in the ceria matrix through the redox reaction between Ce³⁺ and Ir⁴⁺ during coprecipitation.¹⁴⁵ The most attractive feature of this Ir-in-CeO₂ catalyst is the almost unchanged selectivity (over 70%) for CO oxidation over a wide temperature window (80–180 °C). Due to the absence of extensively exposed Ir species on the surface of the Ir-in-CeO₂ catalyst, H₂ oxidation occurring on the Ir species and the ceria support at high temperatures was significantly suppressed, thus keeping a high selectivity for CO oxidation, even at elevated temperatures. Making use of the different features of the two Ir/CeO₂ catalysts, we developed a dual bed system with the top Ir-in-CeO₂ and the bottom Ir-on-CeO₂.¹⁴⁶ This dual bed system is unique in affording a high CO conversion in a wide temperature window, from 80 to 200 °C, which is superior to a single bed catalyst.

In addition to Ir/CeO₂ catalysts, we also developed iron oxide-promoted Ir/Al₂O₃^{150,151} and Ir/SiO₂^{152–156} catalysts that were prepared by a simple impregnation method using H₂IrCl₆ and Fe(NO₃)₃ as the precursors. Similar to the iron oxide-promoted Pt catalysts, the Ir–Fe/Al₂O₃ and Ir–Fe/SiO₂ were also significantly more active than the nonpromoted counterparts for the low-temperature PROX. The IrFe catalyst showed a maximum CO conversion of ~90% and CO₂ selectivity of ~90% at 80 °C in 2% CO, 1% O₂, and 40% H₂ in He at a GHSV of 40 000 h⁻¹. Moreover, the impregnation sequence of Ir and Fe remarkably affected the activity; coimpregnation gave the best performance.^{150–153} Interestingly, when we directly used Fe(OH)_x as a support of Ir rather than as a promoter, the resulting catalyst exhibited an even higher activity in the PROX reaction.¹⁵⁶ CO conversion reached 100% at 20–40 °C on Ir/Fe(OH)_x catalyst with a feed gas composition of 1% CO, 1% O₂, and 40% H₂ in He and a WHSV of 18 000 mL g_{cat}⁻¹ h⁻¹. The calculated turnover frequency of the Ir/Fe(OH)_x catalyst was at least 1 order of magnitude higher than other reported PGM catalyst systems.

3.3. Alkali Metal-Promoted PGM Catalysts. It was found that the addition of a suitable amount of alkali (Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs) or alkali earth metals (Mg) to the precious metal catalysts led to a significant increase in the PROX activity and selectivity.^{157–163} Among various additives, the promotional effect of K is most remarkable. It was reported that when the atomic ratio of K/Pt = 10/1, the K–Pt/Al₂O₃ was 20 times as active as that of Pt/Al₂O₃ for the PROX reaction at 80 °C and was able to decrease the CO concentration below 10 ppm in the range of 100–140 °C.¹⁵⁸ Interestingly, it seems that the promotional effect of K is more pronounced on the inert-oxide-supported Pt catalysts than that on the reducible-oxide-supported ones. Tanaka et al.¹⁶² observed that K–Pt/Al₂O₃ and K–Pt/SiO₂ exhibited a much higher CO conversion and CO₂ selectivity than K–Pt/ZrO₂, K–Pt/Nb₂O₅, and K–Pt/

TiO₂, and the high performance on the former catalysts was temporarily ascribed to the high BET surface areas of Al₂O₃ and SiO₂. In addition, adding H₂ or increasing the O₂ concentration in the feed could enhance the CO oxidation rate much more dramatically on K–Pt/Al₂O₃ than Pt/Al₂O₃. The promotional role of H₂ has also been claimed on M–Pt/Al₂O₃ (M = Cs, Rb, Na, and Li);^{159,161} however, the CO₂ selectivity on K–Pt catalyst declined slightly with an increase in the O₂ concentration in the feed.¹⁶²

4. MECHANISTIC AND KINETIC STUDIES

4.1. The Mechanism of PROX on the Nonpromoted PGM Catalysts. For the PROX reaction occurring on the nonpromoted PGM catalysts, there is a competitive adsorption on the same active sites between O₂, CO, and H₂. At low temperatures, the surface is covered predominantly with adsorbed CO, whereas O₂ and H₂ can be adsorbed on the surface at high temperatures only when the desorption of CO becomes obvious (Figure 3a). Therefore, the desorption of CO




Figure 3. Different reaction pathways of PROX: (a) competitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood mechanism over nonpromoted PGM catalysts, (b) noncompetitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood mechanism over promoted PGM catalysts, and (c) Mars–van Krevelen mechanism over promoted PGM catalysts.

from the surface or the adsorption of O₂ is proposed as the rate-determining step on the nonpromoted PGM catalysts. As indicated in much of the literature,^{19,164–166} the kinetics of the PROX reaction over Al₂O₃-supported noble metal catalysts can be expressed by a simple power-law rate equation:

$$r = A \exp(-E_a/RT) P_{\text{CO}}^\alpha P_{\text{O}_2}^\beta$$

where r is the reaction rate; A is the exponential factor; E_a is the activation energy; and α and β are the reaction orders for CO and O₂ pressures, respectively.

The apparent activation energy is found to be in the range of 70–100 kJ/mol at temperatures up to 200 °C, increasing at higher temperatures and CO partial pressures. The reaction orders are found to be negative for the CO partial pressure and positive for the oxygen partial pressure, respectively. These

kinetics are consistent with a Langmuir–Hinshelwood reaction mechanism in the *low-rate branch*,^{165,167} on a surface predominantly covered with adsorbed CO. Such a competitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood reaction mechanism well predicts the low activity of noble metals at low temperatures owing to the inhibiting effect of CO adlayer on the O₂ adsorption. Increasing temperatures leads to the desorption of CO so that O₂ can be adsorbed and activated on the surface of noble metals.

Therefore, to reach the goal of removing CO in H₂, it is paramount to weaken the adsorption of CO on the surface of the noble metals. There are various approaches to make the CO adsorption weakened. For example, by changing the crystalline phase of γ -Al₂O₃ to α -Al₂O₃,⁶⁹ it was found that the adsorption of CO on Ru/ α -Al₂O₃ was greatly weakened, which imparted to Ru/ α -Al₂O₃ the highest activity for CO oxidation among the tested catalysts, especially at low temperatures, irrespective of the presence of H₂. It can reduce a high inlet concentration of CO to <10 ppm, even in the presence of H₂O and CO₂ over a wide temperature range. On the other hand, the strength of the CO adsorption is closely related to the particle sizes; it decreases with increasing the particle size, which results in the activity for CO oxidation being inversely proportional to the particle size of noble metals.^{168–172} The particle size of the catalysts could be tuned by calcination temperature and duration. The activation energy for the CO oxidation reaction was observed to decrease with increasing particle size.¹⁶⁸ The reaction orders with respect to oxygen partial pressures increase with increasing particle size, indicating a higher dependence of the reaction kinetics on the oxygen partial pressure on larger particles. The CO adsorption can also be weakened by forming bimetallic catalysts.¹⁷³ DFT studies suggest that the relative differences in the catalytic activities for the various core–shell M@Pt (M = Ru, Rh, Ir, Pd, or Au) NPs originate partially from the relative availability of CO-free Pt surface sites on the M@Pt NPs, which are necessary for O₂ activation.^{103,110} In addition, it was suggested that the presence of H₂ in the reactant gas mixture enhanced dramatically the PROX reaction rate on Pt/NaY and Pt/Al₂O₃ catalysts, which could be partially ascribed to the interaction between CO_{ad} and H_{ad} or the competitive adsorption between H₂ and CO that weakened the adsorption of CO on the surface of noble metals.^{165,167,174}

4.2. The Mechanism of PROX on the Promoted PGM Catalysts. For MO_x-promoted PGM catalysts, the widely accepted mechanism is the noncompetitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood mechanism in which CO adsorbed on the noble metal sites reacts with O provided by MO_x at the interface of the noble metal and MO_x (Figure 3b). In this mechanism, the adsorption and activation of O₂ is no longer a rate-determining step.^{53,129,175} The kinetics of the PROX reaction over this kind of catalysts can also be expressed by the same power-law rate equation as shown in section 4.1. E_a was found to be comparatively smaller than that on the nonpromoted PGM catalysts, which was in the range of 5–44 kJ/mol.^{129,155,156} The reaction order was found to be positive for CO partial pressures on IrFe catalyst,¹⁵⁵ implying that the poisonous effect of CO is eliminated by introducing promoters.

On the other hand, since the MO_x is easily reduced at the reaction temperature with the aid of PGMs, the Mars–van Krevelen mechanism (also called the redox mechanism) was also proposed in which the surface lattice oxygen directly participates in the reaction for CO oxidation (Figure 3c);¹⁴⁵ for example, on Ir-in-CeO₂¹⁴⁵ catalyst in which the iridium particles embedded in the ceria matrix and interacting strongly

with the ceria support could weaken the surface Ce–O bonds and facilitate the formation of more reducible oxygen. In CO oxidation, the CO takes an oxygen atom from the ceria surface and creates an oxygen vacancy. The gas-phase oxygen will adsorb on the vacancies and be activated by the electron-rich environment created by the vacancies. The role of gas-phase oxygen is limited to the regeneration of reduced ceria sites. The activated O₂ reacts with CO to form a carbonate, which decomposes to release CO₂ and heal the oxygen vacancy; thus, a catalytic cycle from CO to CO₂ is completed without direct participation of noble metals for providing CO adsorption sites.

By applying temporal analysis of products reactor measurements from 80 to 400 °C, Behm's group investigated the CO oxidation over MO_x-supported gold catalysts in detail and proposed a gold-assisted Mars–van Krevelen mechanism.^{176,177}

In this mechanism, the surface lattice oxygen of the support can be removed and replenished with the aid of gold, and the active oxygen species for CO oxidation are the surface lattice oxygen at the perimeter of the gold NPs on the support. Although the evidence for the Mars–van Krevelen mechanism was provided for the MO_x-supported gold catalyst system, a similar mechanism may be applicable to MO_x-supported PGM catalysts, considering that PGM NPs resemble gold NPs in promoting the reduction of MO_x support at a significantly decreased temperature. Actually, we have recently found that FeO_x-supported Pt and Pd catalysts also followed the noble metal-assisted Mars–van Krevelen mechanism in the PROX reaction.

Nevertheless, it must be kept in mind that various types of mechanisms may work together for some catalyst systems, depending on the reaction temperature.¹⁷⁸ For example, four types of reaction mechanisms were suggested to be present simultaneously for Pt/CeZrO_x catalysts:¹²⁸ (i) a competitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood mechanism on the Pt particles; (ii) a noncompetitive Langmuir–Hinshelwood mechanism on the interface of Pt and CeZrO_x, which was predominant at 90–130 °C; (iii) a hydrogen oxidation on the CeZrO_x support; and (iv) a water-gas-shift reaction at high temperatures.

The presence of MO_x not only provides reactive oxygen but also weakens the adsorption of CO on the noble metal sites due to the strong interaction between the noble metals and the MO_x.¹⁷⁵ For PtFe or IrFe catalysts, FTIR, TPR, and TPD data showed that CO coverage and CO bond strength on Pt or Ir were lowered significantly by the addition of FeO_x.^{116,119,175,179} The FeO_x is proposed to be located on the surface of noble metal particles, blocking some of the noble metal surface and, consequently, decreasing the amount of CO adsorbed. In addition, the bridged CO is proposed to be more reactive than the linearly bonded CO with respect to O₂ on FeO_x/Pt/TiO₂.¹⁸⁰ According to FTIR results, the addition of alkali metals to a Pt single metal catalyst gave the bridge and 3-fold CO, thus weakened the adsorption of CO and enhanced the activity for CO oxidation.¹⁶⁰ Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded that “the weaker the CO adsorption is, the higher the activity or selectivity is”. It was reported that the easier CO desorption from the niobia-promoted Pt catalyst resulted in lowering in the selectivity for CO oxidation, since the sites released by CO desorption accelerated the H₂ oxidation reaction.¹³² For Rh/Nb₂O₅ catalyst, although the chemisorption ability toward CO changed drastically by the strong metal–support interactions induced by the calcination or reduction treatments, no direct correlation between the CO

chemisorption ability and the activity and selectivity has been found.^{77,78}

When the reducible metal oxide is used as a promoter rather than as a support, it is usually highly dispersed together with the noble metal components on an inert support. HRTEM in combination with EDX reveals the noble metal is intimately contacting with the reducible metal oxide, which results in an enhanced interaction between them, thus giving a high activity for the PROX reaction.^{119,179} For the alloy catalyst systems such as Pt–Fe, Pt–Co, Pt–Ni, and Pt–Sn, although the alloy phase is formed during the synthesis or the prereduction treatment of the catalyst, it will segregate into the intimately contacted noble metal and MO_x in the PROX reaction conditions,^{141,181} as shown in Figure 2. For example, the formation of FeIr alloy was observed after the reduction in H₂, whereas the alloy phase was oxidized and segregated into Fe²⁺ and metallic Ir after the treatment in the PROX gas mixture.¹⁵⁴ A similar phenomenon was also observed for PtSn¹⁸¹ and PtNi^{139–142} catalysts. The entity PGM–MO_x which is derived from the PGM–M alloy, functions as the dual active sites where CO adsorbed on PGM reacts with the active oxygen provided by MO_x at the interface. The maximized interface due to the greatly reduced sizes of both PGM and MO_x and the strong interaction yielded by the alloy precursor are responsible for the enhanced activity for PROX;¹⁴¹ however, the synergistic effect between PGM and M appears to be limited to the case of inert support. For the active support such as Nb₂O₅,¹³² the addition of tin induces the Pt–Sn alloy formation, but the bimetallic interaction was partially suppressed by the niobia support while the Pt–Nb₂O₅ interaction was suppressed by the addition of Sn. In such a case, adding Sn has a negative effect on the activity of Pt/Nb₂O₅ catalyst.

In addition to the strong interaction between noble metals and reducible metal oxides, maintaining the reducible metal oxides at a low valence is also very important for keeping a high activity for CO oxidation because the low-valence metal oxides function as the sites for activating O₂. The presence of a large excess amount of H₂ in the PROX atmosphere plays a key role in maintaining the metal oxide at a low valence state. A commonly observed phenomenon in the PGM–MO_x catalyst systems is that the activity decreases with time on-stream in CO oxidation while it is stable in the PROX atmosphere.




Isotopic transient kinetic analysis revealed that the reoxidation of Fe, instead of carbon accumulation, was responsible for the activity loss of PtFe catalyst in CO oxidation.¹⁸² According to the XANES analysis,⁵⁵ Fe sites exist dominantly as FeO phase during the PROX reaction. We have used a combination of quasi in situ Mössbauer spectroscopy, in situ DRIFTS, and microcalorimetry to study systematically the oxidation state of Fe as a function of H₂ concentration for the PROX reaction over Ir–Fe catalysts.¹⁵⁴ The Fe³⁺ in the Ir–Fe/SiO₂ catalyst is easily reduced to low-valence Feⁿ⁺ (2 < n < 3), Fe⁰, Fe²⁺, and FeIr alloy with the aid of Ir, and the reduced Fe species are also easily oxidized upon exposure to oxygen.

Upon exposure to the PROX reaction gas mixture, the reduced catalyst turned into a real active catalyst that contained only three Fe species: Fe³⁺, Fe²⁺, and Fe⁰. It was found that the promotional role of Fe was associated with the presence of H₂, and the relative amount of Fe²⁺ increased with increasing the H₂ concentration in the reaction stream.¹⁵⁴ This is very consistent with the trend of reaction rate for CO oxidation, strongly suggesting that Fe²⁺ was the active site for oxygen activation. On the other hand, about half the amount of Fe⁰ in

the reduced Ir–Fe catalyst remained intact during the PROX reaction, implying that Fe^0 is probably encapsulated by iron oxide and does not play the part of activating O_2 in the PROX reaction. Moreover, by means of changing the deposition sequence of Ir and Fe, the amount of active Fe^{2+} species in the catalyst could be tuned, and consequently, the activity of the PROX reaction was altered. The IrFe catalyst prepared by coimpregnation contained more Fe^{2+} and gave a better performance for the PROX reaction.¹⁵³ The important role of Fe^{2+} is further confirmed by surface science and theoretical studies.¹¹⁵ Similar to the low-valence FeO_x in Pt–Fe or Ir–Fe catalyst systems, SnO_x islands adjacent to the PtSn particles are also proposed as the active sites for O_2 activation.¹²⁹



4.3. The Roles of the OH Group. The mechanism of PROX is often assumed as the competitive reaction of CO and H with O. In this assumption, the presence of H_2 will impose the only negative effect of decreasing the selectivity of CO oxidation. This is the actual case at high temperatures. However, the presence of H_2 is observed to have a remarkable enhancement for the low-temperature CO oxidation. Moreover, this effect is much more pronounced when a reducible oxide or an alkali promoter is present. Obviously, this promotional effect cannot be explained by the above competitive reaction mode. To give an insightful understanding of the effect of H_2 or H_2O , both the kinetic and theoretical calculations have been conducted, and various reaction mechanisms have been proposed accordingly.^{183–186}

By investigating the dynamics of the intermediates for low-temperature PROX over $\text{FeO}_x/\text{Pt}/\text{TiO}_2$ and Pt/carbons with in situ DRIFT technique,^{184–187} Tanaka et al. proposed that hydroxyl groups participate directly in the CO oxidation reaction through the following pathway:



In this mechanism, the reaction between the formate (HCOO) and hydroxyl groups is regarded as the rate-determining step.



In the absence of hydroxyl groups on the support surface, the hydroxyl groups can be produced by the reaction between H_2 and O_2 via the following pathway:¹⁸⁸



This route is also called H-assisted O_2 dissociation, which explains well the promotional effect of H_2 on the CO oxidation over Ru@Pt core–shell nanoparticles.^{103,110}





For some catalysts, the carboxyl (COOH) intermediates are proposed to play an important role in the PROX reaction. Microkinetic studies of CO oxidation, the water-gas shift reaction, and the PROX reaction on Pt and Rh catalysts reveal that the $\text{CO} + \text{O}$ reaction in WGS and PROX reactions is slow, and additional $\text{CO}-\text{H}_2$ coupling reactions, including the carboxyl and hydroxyl intermediates as well as H_2O , are crucial steps for these processes.^{189,190} Furthermore, $\text{CO}-\text{H}_2$ coupling via $\text{CO} + \text{OH}$ reaction may involve a direct CO_2 formation as well as an indirect pathway via the formate or carboxyl intermediate for these catalysts.¹⁸⁹ The direct oxidation path dominates over the indirect path in the water-promoted CO

oxidation, whereas the indirect carboxyl path plays a vital role in the WGS and PROX simulations.¹⁹⁰



In this mechanism, the formate path was suggested to be unimportant for PROX,^{189,190} Clearly, under these conditions, hydrogen acts as a “catalyst” for CO oxidation.

In some cases, the direct formation of CO_2 from CO and OH is the dominant pathway. Our group observed by IR spectroscopy that with the exception of CO, no other species, such as formyls or carbonates, are present on the surface of IrFe in the temperature range of 20–150 °C.¹⁵⁵ A similar phenomenon was also observed on PtSn.¹³⁰ On IrFe catalysts, a microkinetic model was established on the basis of the results of characterization and steady state kinetic data in a microreactor.¹⁵⁵ The elementary steps involved in the PROX reaction on the Ir–Fe catalyst can be described as eqs 1–7:



where the asterisk, *, denotes a reduced iron site (Fe^{2+}). In the absence of H_2 (i.e., CO oxidation only), only steps 1–3 are involved in the reaction model. The model suggested that no competitive adsorption between CO and O_2 was observed for CO oxidation; both the adsorption of CO and O_2 reached saturation on Ir and Fe^{2+} , respectively, and the coverages of CO and O were irrelevant to the partial pressure of CO or O_2 . The surface reaction between CO and O was the rate-determining step; however, for the PROX reaction, CO can be oxidized not only by atomic O, but also by the surface OH (step 7). The reaction between adsorbed H and O for the formation of OH (step 5) was rate-limiting for PROX, and the oxidation of adsorbed CO by surface OH (step 7) was the dominant pathway for PROX, rather than by atomic O. The fast increase in the coverage of OH on Fe^{2+} with the increase in the H_2 concentrations up to 10% coincides with the increase in the reaction rate of CO oxidation, indicating that OH plays an important role in the PROX reaction. The presence of H_2 increases the surface concentration of OH and, hence, lowers the activation energy and increases the reaction rate of PROX. Therefore, H_2 not only stabilizes Fe^{2+} species but also increases OH groups on the surface, both of which can promote CO oxidation. The reaction model of PROX on Ir–Fe catalyst is illustrated in Figure , where both steps 3 and 7 are considered.

It was suggested that the promotional role of alkali metals is also closely related to the increased concentration of OH groups neighboring to the noble metals. Very recently, Zhai et al.¹⁹¹ used sub-ångström resolution aberration-corrected HAADF-STEM in combination with theoretical approaches to study the water-gas shift reaction over a Na-promoted Pt/ SiO_2 catalyst. According to these observations, the promotional role of alkali metals can be understood in two aspects: one is to




Figure 4. Schematic illustration of the PROX reaction over IrFe catalyst where the important roles of OH are considered.

stabilize the active Pt atoms, and the other is to provide the reactive OH species neighboring to the Pt atoms.

Our recent findings on the Pt single atom catalyst provided even more clear evidence for the roles of OH group in stabilizing Pt atom on iron oxide support.¹¹⁶ By using a FeO_x support that is rich in OH groups and with a high surface area, the Pt metal can be well dispersed into single atoms on the surface of the FeO_x . Both experimental and theoretical studies show that Pt single atoms carry positive charges, and the remarkable catalytic activity of single Pt atoms in the PROX reaction is correlated with the partially vacant 5d orbitals of positively charged, high-valence Pt atoms, which help to reduce both the CO adsorption energy and the activation barriers for CO oxidation. Therefore, it appears that the active sites on the MO_x -promoted Pt catalysts are the same as those on the alkali metal-promoted Pt catalysts on inert supports. In the case of a reducible oxide as a promoter/support, the Pt single atoms can be stabilized with the OH groups on the MO_x , and the OH groups neighboring the Pt atoms are reactive toward CO to produce CO_2 .

Different from the explanation by enhancement of OH groups, Iglesia and co-workers proposed that alkali metals promoted the catalytic activity of Pt/ Al_2O_3 (or Pt/ SiO_2) for the PROX reaction mainly via the inhibition of the spillover-mediated H_2 oxidation pathway and of growth of dense chemisorbed CO islands on the surface of Pt clusters;¹⁶⁰ however, the coupling effect between H_2 and CO was not considered in their work.

In the above examples, the OH groups are associated with the presence of promoters, either on the reducible oxide support or on the alkali metal-promoted Al_2O_3 or SiO_2 surfaces. Quite different from these examples, Fukuoka's group found that Pt nanoparticles supported on FSM-type mesoporous silica were extremely active and selective for the PROX of CO; both the CO conversion and the CO_2 selectivity were above 95% at 25–150 °C over Pt/FSM-16.¹⁹² By using an isotopic tracer technique in combination with the IR experiments, the authors came to the conclusion that the OH groups at the internal surface of mesoporous silica are reactive toward CO to produce CO_2 . Such an unprecedented reactivity of OH groups on the silica surface appears to be closely related with the pore structure and pore size.¹⁹² Since only a very limited number of mesoporous silica possess such highly reactive OH groups, a more rational correlation between the reactivity of OH groups and the silica structure need to be established.

The important roles of OH groups are also demonstrated in the effect of water. It is commonly observed that the addition of water to the reaction stream^{157,180,184–186} or the pretreatment of catalyst with water vapor⁶ can lead to a large increase in the activity for a low-temperature PROX reaction. Such enhancement was proposed to be due in part to the formation of

oxidant hydroxyl groups on the catalyst surface because no evident WGS reaction was detected on most of the noble metal catalyst systems at relatively low reaction temperatures.

5. SUMMARY AND REMARKS

The supported transition metals are a kind of attractive candidate as catalysts for the PROX reaction. Usually, the unpromoted transition metal catalysts show poor activities in the low temperature range (<120 °C), since the metal surface is predominantly covered with CO, which inhibits the adsorption of O_2 . To enhance the low-temperature PROX activity of the transition metals, weakening the CO adsorption on the metal sites or providing vacant sites for O_2 adsorption/activation (or both) are the prerequisites. Following this rule, the catalytic performances of transition metal catalysts can be improved greatly by the employment of the following three types of promoters:

- (i) *Reducible oxides.* The transition metals in combination with reducible oxides, either as the supports or just as a minor amount of promoters, show high activities and selectivities for the PROX reaction in the low temperature range, which is quite different from the unpromoted counterparts. There are at least two important roles of the reducible oxides: one is to weaken the CO adsorption on the transition metal sites and the other is to provide additional sites for adsorption/activation of O_2 , thus changing the competitive L–H mechanism into a noncompetitive dual site L–H mechanism. Among various reducible oxides, iron oxide (FeO_x) appears to be the most remarkable one; the Pt–Fe catalyst shows the most promising catalytic performance in the real PROX operation conditions.
- (ii) *Alkali metal cations.* The addition of alkali or alkali earth metal cations to the transition metal catalysts brings about up to a 10-fold enhancement in the low-temperature PROX activity. Similar to the reducible oxides, the addition of alkali metal cations can also weaken the adsorption of CO on the transition metals. However, a more underlying reason for the promotional effect is that the alkali cations provide reactive OH groups neighboring the transition metals such as Pt. These OH groups react smoothly with CO adsorbed on neighboring Pt atoms to give CO_2 as the product. Actually, the important roles of surface OH groups in the PROX reaction are being accepted by more and more researchers, especially with the aid of theoretical calculations.
- (iii) *The second transition metal component.* Introduction of the second transition metal component to form a bimetallic nanostructure is another useful approach to weaken the CO adsorption. Depending on the miscibility and surface free energy of the two metals, different bimetallic nanostructures, such as core–shell and alloy, can be obtained just by variation in the deposition sequence of the two metals or changing the pretreatment temperature and atmosphere. A typical example is Ru@Pt core–shell nanocatalyst which shows a weakened interaction with CO and thus an enhanced low-temperature activity for PROX. One advantage of such bimetallic structure is its controllable size, morphology, composition, and structure, which endows it a good model catalyst system for studying the structure–performance relationship.

Although the above three types of promoters have been proved effective, the approaches for the enhancement of PROX activities of transition metal catalysts are absolutely not limited to them. In particular, by increasing the surface OH groups and making them more reactive toward CO, for example, by using a metal hydroxide rather than oxide as the support,¹⁵⁵ or by using a mesoporous silica support that possesses confined space with rich internal OH groups,^{192,193} one can also achieve a greatly improved performance for PROX. Even with the same promoter, different preparation methods and pretreatment conditions will lead to a quite different performances of the final catalysts. It can be expected that with the advancement of materials science, new catalysts with the desired activity, selectivity, and durability for the PROX reaction will be developed in the future.

On the other hand, the evaluation of a PROX catalyst requires the testing of the catalytic performance in a simulated reformat gas atmosphere, that is, a significant amount of CO₂ and steam is contained in the feedstock, which is ignored by most laboratory studies. Some highly active catalysts in an ideal feed gas condition may seriously lose their activities when exposed to a high concentration of CO₂ and H₂O. In addition, very few papers have focused on the lifetime of the catalysts during the PROX reaction, especially in reformat gas mixtures. Therefore, when a new catalyst is developed for the PROX process, the evaluation of its lifetime under simulated conditions should be strongly encouraged.

In fundamental science, a great deal of attention has been put on the clarification of the reaction mechanism over the promoted transition metal catalysts. In particular, with the advancement of in situ characterization techniques, of atomic-resolution electron microscopy techniques and of theoretical calculations on more complex systems, the identification of active sites is now becoming possible. Some excellent contributions in this respect have emerged recently.^{115,116,194} Future efforts in this area should be encouraged with the aim of revealing the nature of the active oxygen provided by reducible oxide, the identification of real active sites that are possibly composed of a transition metal and neighboring OH groups, and the understanding of the respective role of transition metals and promoters. Moreover, the promoted transition metal catalysts are reminiscent of gold nanocatalysts in the PROX reactions. Accordingly, a comparative study that will give a better understanding of the nature of catalysis should be encouraged.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*Phone: 86-411-84379015. Fax: 86-411-84691570. E-mail: taozhang@dicp.ac.cn.

Present Address

[†]Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100085, P. R. China

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Financial support from the National Science Foundation of China (20325620, 20773124, and 20803079) is greatly acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- (1) Wu, J. F.; Yuan, X. Z.; Martin, J. J.; Wang, H. J.; Zhang, J. J.; Shen, J.; Wu, S. H.; Merida, W. J. *Power Sources* **2008**, *184*, 104–119.
- (2) O'Connell, M.; Kolb, G.; Schelhaas, K.; Schuerer, J.; Tiemann, D.; Ziogas, A.; Hessel, V. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2010**, *35*, 2317–2327.
- (3) Trimm, D. L. *Appl. Catal., A* **2005**, *296*, 1–11.
- (4) Si, R.; Flytzani-Stephanopoulos, M. *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 2926–2929.
- (5) Ghenciu, A. F. *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.* **2002**, *6*, 389–399.
- (6) Son, I. H.; Shamsuzzoha, M.; Lane, A. M. *J. Catal.* **2002**, *210*, 460–465.
- (7) Jiménez, S.; Soler, J.; Valenzuela, R. X.; Daza, L. J. *Power Sources* **2005**, *151*, 69–73.
- (8) Lemons, R. A. *J. Power Sources* **1990**, *29*, 251–264.
- (9) Tosti, S. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2010**, *35*, 12650–12659.
- (10) Liu, Q. H.; Liao, L. W.; Zhou, X. H.; Yin, G. Q. *Adv. Mater. Res.* **2011**, *236–238*, 829–834.
- (11) Park, E. D.; Lee, D.; Lee, H. C. *Catal. Today* **2009**, *139*, 280–290.
- (12) Choudhary, T. V.; Goodman, D. W. *Catal. Today* **2002**, *77*, 65–78.
- (13) Thomas, C. E.; James, B. D.; Lomax, F. D.; Kuhn, I. F. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2000**, *25*, 551–567.
- (14) Cohn, J. G. E. U.S. Patent 3216782, 1965.
- (15) Okumura, M.; Masuyama, N.; Konishi, E.; Ichikawa, S.; Akita, T. *J. Catal.* **2002**, *208*, 485–489.
- (16) Li, B. D.; Wang, C.; Yi, G. Q.; Lin, H. Q.; Yuan, Y. Z. *Catal. Today* **2011**, *164*, 74–79.
- (17) Kipnis, M.; Volnina, E. *Appl. Catal., B* **2010**, *98*, 193–203.
- (18) Oh, S. H.; Sinkevitch, R. M. *J. Catal.* **1993**, *142*, 254–262.
- (19) Kim, D. H.; Lim, M. S. *Appl. Catal., A* **2002**, *224*, 27–38.
- (20) Scirè, S.; Riccobene, P. M.; Crisafulli, C. *Appl. Catal., B* **2010**, *101*, 109–117.
- (21) Avgouropoulos, G.; Papavasiliou, J.; Tabakova, T.; Idakiev, V.; Ioannides, T. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2006**, *124*, 41–45.
- (22) Laguna, O. H.; Sarria, F. R.; Centeno, M. A.; Odriozola, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2010**, *276*, 360–370.
- (23) Tu, C. H.; Wang, A. Q.; Zheng, M. Y.; Meng, Y.; Shan, J. H.; Zhang, T. *Chin. J. Catal.* **2005**, *26*, 631–633.
- (24) Tu, C. H.; Wang, A. Q.; Zheng, M. Y.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Appl. Catal., A* **2006**, *297*, 40–47.
- (25) Schubert, M. M.; Hackenberg, S.; van Veen, A. C.; Muhler, M.; Plzak, V.; Behm, R. J. *J. Catal.* **2001**, *197*, 113–122.
- (26) Haruta, M.; Kobayashi, T.; Sano, H.; Yamada, N. *Chem. Lett.* **1987**, 405–408.
- (27) Bond, G.; Thompson, D. *Gold Bull.* **2009**, *42*, 247–259.
- (28) Lippits, M. J.; Gluhoi, A. C.; Nieuwenhuys, B. E. *Top. Catal.* **2007**, *44*, 159–165.
- (29) Liu, Y.; Jia, C.-J.; Yamasaki, J.; Terasaki, O.; Schüth, F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 5771–5775.
- (30) Zhao, K. F.; Qiao, B. T.; Wang, J.; Zhang, Y. J.; Zhang, T. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, 1779–1781.
- (31) Qiao, B. T.; Wang, A. Q.; Takahashi, M.; Zhang, Y. J.; Wang, J.; Deng, Y. Q.; Zhang, T. *J. Catal.* **2011**, *279*, 361–365.
- (32) Lin, C.-H.; Liu, X. Y.; Wu, S.-H.; Liu, K.-H.; Mou, C.-Y. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2011**, *2*, 2984–2988.
- (33) Piccolo, L.; Daly, H.; Valcarel, A.; Meunier, F. C. *Appl. Catal., B* **2009**, *86*, 190–195.
- (34) Denkwitz, Y.; Schumacher, B.; Kučerová, G.; Behm, R. J. *J. Catal.* **2009**, *267*, 78–88.
- (35) Oh, H.-S.; Yang, J. H.; Costello, C. K.; Wang, Y. M.; Bare, S. R.; Kung, H. H.; Kung, M. C. *J. Catal.* **2002**, *210*, 375–386.
- (36) Carrettin, S.; Concepción, P.; Corma, A.; López-Nieto, J. M.; Puentes, V. F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 2538–2540.
- (37) Quinet, E.; Piccolo, L.; Morfin, F.; Avenier, P.; Diehl, F.; Caps, V.; Rousset, J. *J. Catal.* **2009**, *268*, 384–389.
- (38) Wang, H.; Zhu, H. Q.; Qin, Z. F.; Liang, F. X.; Wang, G. F.; Wang, J. G. *J. Catal.* **2009**, *264*, 154–162.

- (39) Galletti, C.; Fiorot, S.; Specchia, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2007**, *134*, 45–50.
- (40) Xu, J.; Li, P.; Song, X. F.; Qi, Z. W.; Yu, J. G.; Yuan, W. K.; Han, Y.-F. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2010**, *49*, 4149–4155.
- (41) Park, J. W.; Jeong, J. H.; Yoon, W. L.; Kim, C. S.; Lee, D.-K.; Park, Y.-K.; Rhee, Y. W. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2005**, *30*, 209–220.
- (42) Razeghi, A.; Khodadadi, A.; Ziaei-Azad, H.; Mortazavi, Y. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2010**, *164*, 214–220.
- (43) Mariño, F.; Baronetti, G.; Laborde, M.; Bion, N.; Le Valant, A.; Epron, F.; Duprez, D. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2008**, *33*, 1345–1353.
- (44) Kydd, R.; Ferri, D.; Hug, P.; Scott, J.; Teoh, W. Y.; Amal, R. J. *Catal.* **2011**, *277*, 64–71.
- (45) Maciel, C. G.; Profeti, L. P. R.; Assaf, E. M.; Assaf, J. M. *J. Power Sources* **2011**, *196*, 747–753.
- (46) Hornés, A.; Hungria, A. B.; Bera, P.; López Cámara, A.; Fernández-García, M.; Martínez-Arias, A.; Barrio, L.; Estrella, M.; Zhou, G.; Fonseca, J. J.; Hanson, J. C.; Rodriguez, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 34–35.
- (47) Caputo, T.; Lisi, L.; Pirone, R.; Russo, G. *Appl. Catal., A* **2008**, *348*, 42–53.
- (48) Sirichaiprasert, K.; Luengnaruemitchai, A.; Pongstabodee, S. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2007**, *32*, 915–926.
- (49) Zou, H. B.; Chen, S. Z.; Liu, Z. L.; Lin, W. M. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2009**, *34*, 9324–9333.
- (50) Qiao, B. T.; Wang, A. Q.; Lin, J.; Li, L.; Su, D. S.; Zhang, T. *Appl. Catal., B* **2011**, *105*, 103–110.
- (51) Korotkikh, O.; Farrauto, R. *Catal. Today* **2000**, *62*, 249–254.
- (52) Watanabe, M.; Uchida, H.; Ohkubo, K.; Igarashi, H. *Appl. Catal., B* **2003**, *46*, 595–600.
- (53) Kotobuki, M.; Watanabe, A.; Uchida, H.; Yamashita, H.; Watanabe, M. *J. Catal.* **2005**, *236*, 262–269.
- (54) Kotobuki, M.; Watanabe, A.; Uchida, H.; Yamashita, H.; Watanabe, M. *Appl. Catal., A* **2006**, *307*, 275–283.
- (55) Kotobuki, M.; Shido, T.; Tada, M.; Uchida, H.; Yamashita, H.; Iwasawa, Y.; Watanabe, M. *Catal. Lett.* **2005**, *103*, 263–269.
- (56) Manasilp, A.; Gulari, E. *Appl. Catal., B* **2002**, *37*, 17–25.
- (57) Zhou, S. L.; Yuan, Z. S.; Wang, S. D. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2006**, *31*, 924–933.
- (58) Snytnikov, P. V.; Sobyanyan, V. A.; Belyaev, V. D.; Tsyrlunikov, P. G.; Shitova, N. B.; Shlyapin, D. A. *Appl. Catal., A* **2003**, *239*, 149–156.
- (59) Alexeev, O. S.; Chin, S. Y.; Engelhard, M. H.; Ortiz-Soto, L.; Amiridis, M. D. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2005**, *109*, 23430–23433.
- (60) Chin, S. Y.; Alexeev, O. S.; Amiridis, M. D. *Appl. Catal., A* **2005**, *286*, 157–166.
- (61) Echigo, M.; Tabata, T. *Top. Catal.* **2009**, *52*, 739–742.
- (62) Echigo, M.; Tabata, T. *Appl. Catal., A* **2003**, *251*, 157–166.
- (63) Echigo, M.; Tabata, T. *Catal. Lett.* **2004**, *98*, 37–42.
- (64) Echigo, M.; Tabata, T. *Catal. Today* **2004**, *90*, 269–275.
- (65) Echigo, M.; Shinke, N.; Takami, S.; Tabata, T. *J. Power Sources* **2004**, *132*, 29–35.
- (66) Echigo, M.; Shinke, N.; Takami, S.; Higashiguchi, S.; Hirai, K.; Tabata, T. *Catal. Today* **2003**, *84*, 209–215.
- (67) Echigo, M.; Tabata, T. *J. Chem. Eng. Jpn.* **2004**, *37*, 558–562.
- (68) Rosso, I.; Antonini, M.; Galletti, C.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Top. Catal.* **2004**, *30–31*, 475–480.
- (69) Kim, Y. H.; Park, E. D. *Appl. Catal., B* **2010**, *96*, 41–50.
- (70) Kim, Y. H.; Park, E. D.; Lee, H. C.; Lee, D. *Appl. Catal., A* **2009**, *366*, 363–369.
- (71) Kim, Y. H.; Park, E. D.; Lee, H. C.; Lee, D.; Lee, K. H. *Catal. Today* **2009**, *146*, 253–259.
- (72) Han, Y.-F.; Kinne, M.; Behm, R. J. *Appl. Catal., B* **2004**, *52*, 123–134.
- (73) Xu, G. W.; Zhang, Z.-G. *J. Power Sources* **2006**, *157*, 64–77.
- (74) Galletti, C.; Specchia, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2008**, *47*, 5304–5312.
- (75) Galletti, C.; Fiorot, S.; Specchia, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Top. Catal.* **2007**, *45*, 15–19.
- (76) Specchia, S.; Galletti, C.; Fiorot, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *ECS Trans.* **2007**, *5*, 677–685.
- (77) Ito, S.-I.; Fujimori, T.; Nagashima, K.; Yuzaki, K.; Kunimori, K. *Catal. Today* **2000**, *57*, 247–254.
- (78) Ito, S.-I.; Tanaka, H.; Minemura, Y.; Kameoka, S.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *Appl. Catal., A* **2004**, *273*, 295–302.
- (79) Han, Y.-F.; Kahlich, M.; Kinne, M.; Behm, R. J. *Appl. Catal., B* **2004**, *50*, 209–218.
- (80) Ren, S.; Hong, X. *Fuel Process. Technol.* **2007**, *88*, 383–386.
- (81) Avgouropoulos, G.; Ioannides, T.; Papadopoulou, Ch.; Batista, J.; Hocevar, S.; Matralis, H. *Catal. Today* **2002**, *75*, 157–167.
- (82) Watanabe, M.; Uchida, H.; Igarashi, H.; Suzuki, M. *Chem. Lett.* **1995**, *24*, 21–23.
- (83) Kotobuki, M.; Watanabe, A.; Uchida, H.; Yamashita, H.; Watanabe, M. *Chem. Lett.* **2005**, 866–867.
- (84) Igarashi, H.; Uchida, H.; Suzuki, M.; Sasaki, Y.; Watanabe, M. *Appl. Catal., A* **1997**, *159*, 159–169.
- (85) Andorf, R.; Maunz, W.; Plog, C.; Stengel, T. U.S. Patent 5955395, 1999.
- (86) Sebastian, V.; Irusta, S.; Mallada, R.; Santamaría, J. *Appl. Catal., A* **2009**, *366*, 242–251.
- (87) Rosso, I.; Galletti, C.; Saracco, G.; Garrone, E.; Specchia, V. *Appl. Catal., B* **2004**, *48*, 195–203.
- (88) Rosso, I.; Galletti, C.; Fiorot, S.; Saracco, G.; Garrone, E.; Specchia, V. *J. Porous Mater.* **2007**, *14*, 245–250.
- (89) Galletti, C.; Specchia, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2009**, *154*, 246–250.
- (90) Galletti, C.; Specchia, S.; Saracco, G.; Specchia, V. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2008**, *33*, 3045–3048.
- (91) Wang, A. Q.; Liu, J.-H.; Lin, S. D.; Lin, T.-S.; Mou, C.-Y. *J. Catal.* **2005**, *233*, 186–197.
- (92) Wang, A. Q.; Chang, C.-M.; Mou, C.-Y. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2005**, *109*, 18860–18867.
- (93) Wang, A. Q.; Hsieh, Y.-P.; Chen, Y.-F.; Mou, C.-Y. *J. Catal.* **2006**, *237*, 197–206.
- (94) Liu, X. Y.; Wang, A. Q.; Wang, X. D.; Mou, C.-Y.; Zhang, T. *Chem. Commun.* **2008**, 3187–3189.
- (95) Liu, X. Y.; Wang, A. Q.; Yang, X. F.; Zhang, T.; Mou, C.-Y.; Su, D.-S.; Li, J. *Chem. Mater.* **2009**, *21*, 410–418.
- (96) Liu, X. Y.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T.; Su, D.-S.; Mou, C.-Y. *Catal. Today* **2011**, *160*, 103–108.
- (97) Liu, X. Y.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Zhang, T.; Mou, C.-Y.; Lee, J.-F. *J. Catal.* **2011**, *278*, 288–296.
- (98) Srnová-Šloufová, I.; Vlčková, B.; Bastl, Z.; Hasslett, T. L. *Langmuir* **2004**, *20*, 3407–3415.
- (99) Yin, A.-X.; Min, X.-Q.; Zhang, Y.-W.; Yan, C.-H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 3816–3819.
- (100) Tao, A. R.; Habas, S.; Yang, P. D. *Small* **2008**, *4*, 310–325.
- (101) Xia, Y. N.; Xiong, Y. J.; Lim, B.; Skrabalak, S. E. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 2–46.
- (102) Chen, J. Y.; Lim, B.; Lee, E. P.; Xia, Y. N. *Nano Today* **2009**, *4*, 81–95.
- (103) Alayoglu, S.; Nilekar, A. U.; Mavrikakis, M.; Eichhorn, B. *Nat. Mater.* **2008**, *7*, 333–338.
- (104) Yang, X. F.; Wang, Y. L.; Zhao, Y. F.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T.; Li, J. *J. Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *12*, 3038–3043.
- (105) Lee, S. H.; Han, J.; Lee, K.-W. *Korean J. Chem. Eng.* **2002**, *19*, 431–433.
- (106) Chin, S. Y.; Alexeev, O. S.; Amiridis, M. D. *J. Catal.* **2006**, *243*, 329–339.
- (107) Igarashi, H.; Uchida, H.; Watanabe, M. *Chem. Lett.* **2000**, 1262–1263.
- (108) Naknam, P.; Luengnaruemitchai, A.; Wongkasemjit, S.; Osuwan, S. *J. Power Sources* **2007**, *165*, 353–358.
- (109) Parinyaswan, A.; Pongstabodee, S.; Luengnaruemitchai, A. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2006**, *31*, 1942–1949.
- (110) Nilekar, A. U.; Alayoglu, S.; Eichhorn, B.; Mavrikakis, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 7418–7428.
- (111) Maeda, N.; Matsushima, T.; Uchida, H.; Yamashita, H.; Watanabe, M. *Appl. Catal., A* **2008**, *341*, 93–97.

- (112) Roberts, G. W.; Chin, P.; Sun, X. L.; Spivey, J. J. *Appl. Catal., B* **2003**, *46*, 601–611.
- (113) Chin, P.; Sun, X. L.; Roberts, G. W.; Spivey, J. J. *Appl. Catal., A* **2006**, *302*, 22–31.
- (114) Sirijiaruphan, A.; Goodwin, J. G., Jr.; Rice, R. W.; Wei, D. G.; Butcher, K. R.; Roberts, G. W.; Spivey, J. J. *Appl. Catal., A* **2005**, *281*, 11–18.
- (115) Fu, Q.; Li, W. X.; Yao, Y. X.; Liu, H. Y.; Su, H.-Y.; Ma, D.; Gu, X.-K.; Chen, L. M.; Wang, Z.; Zhang, H.; Wang, B.; Bao, X. H. *Science* **2010**, *328*, 1141–1144.
- (116) Qiao, B. T.; Wang, A. Q.; Yang, X. F.; Allard, L. F.; Jiang, Z.; Cui, Y. T.; Liu, J. Y.; Li, J.; Zhang, T. *Nat. Chem.* **2011**, *3*, 634–641.
- (117) Tang, X. L.; Zhang, B. C.; Li, Y.; Xin, Q.; Shen, W. J. *Chin. J. Catal.* **2005**, *26*, 1–3.
- (118) Yin, J.; Wang, J.; Zhang, T.; Wang, X. D. *Catal. Lett.* **2008**, *125*, 76–82.
- (119) Siani, A.; Captain, B.; Alexeev, O. S.; Stafyla, E.; Hungria, A. B.; Midgley, P. A.; Thomas, J. M.; Adams, R. D.; Amiridis, M. D. *Langmuir* **2006**, *22*, 5160–5167.
- (120) Mariño, F.; Descorme, C.; Duprez, D. *Appl. Catal., B* **2004**, *54*, 59–66.
- (121) Pozdnyakova, O.; Teschner, D.; Wootsch, A.; Kröhnert, J.; Steinhauer, B.; Sauer, H.; Toth, L.; Jentoft, F. C.; Knop-Gericke, A.; Paál, Z.; Schlögl, R. *J. Catal.* **2006**, *237*, 1–16.
- (122) Pozdnyakova-Tellingner, O.; Teschner, D.; Kröhnert, J.; Jentoft, F. C.; Knop-Gericke, A.; Schlögl, R.; Wootsch, A. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2007**, *111*, 5426–5431.
- (123) Ayastuy, J. L.; Gil-Rodríguez, A.; González-Marcos, M. P.; Gutiérrez-Ortiz, M. A. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2006**, *31*, 2231–2242.
- (124) Teschner, D.; Wootsch, A.; Pozdnyakova-Tellingner, O.; Kröhnert, J.; Vass, E. M.; Hävecker, M.; Zafeiratos, S.; Schnörch, P.; Jentoft, P. C.; Knop-Gericke, A.; Schlögl, R. *J. Catal.* **2007**, *249*, 318–327.
- (125) Teschner, D.; Wootsch, A.; Pozdnyakova, O.; Sauer, H.; Knop-Gericke, A.; Schlögl, R. *React. Kinet. Catal. Lett.* **2006**, *87*, 235–247.
- (126) Roh, H.-S.; Potdar, H. S.; Jun, K.-W.; Han, S. Y.; Kim, J.-W. *Catal. Lett.* **2004**, *93*, 203–207.
- (127) Ayastuy, J. L.; González-Marcos, M. P.; Gil-Rodríguez, A.; González-Velasco, J. R.; Gutiérrez-Ortiz, M. A. *Catal. Today* **2006**, *116*, 391–399.
- (128) Wootsch, A.; Descorme, C.; Duprez, D. *J. Catal.* **2004**, *225*, 259–266.
- (129) Schubert, M. M.; Kahlich, M. J.; Feldmeyer, G.; Hüttner, M.; Hackenberg, S.; Gasteiger, H. A.; Behm, R. J. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *3*, 1123–1131.
- (130) Dupont, C.; Delbecq, F.; Loffreda, D.; Jugnet, Y. *J. Catal.* **2011**, *278*, 339–245.
- (131) Dupont, C.; Jugnet, Y.; Loffreda, D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 9129–9136.
- (132) Marques, P.; Ribeiro, N. F. P.; Schmal, M.; Aranda, D. A. G.; Souza, M. M. V. M. *J. Power Sources* **2006**, *158*, 504–508.
- (133) Özkara, S.; Aksoylu, A. E. *Appl. Catal., A* **2003**, *251*, 75–83.
- (134) Caglayan, B. S.; Soykal, İ. I.; Aksoylu, A. E. *Appl. Catal., B* **2011**, *106*, 540–549.
- (135) Komatsu, T.; Tamura, A. *J. Catal.* **2008**, *258*, 306–314.
- (136) Epling, W. S.; Cheekatarla, P. K.; Lane, A. M. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2003**, *93*, 61–68.
- (137) Snytnikov, P. V.; Yusenko, K. V.; Korenev, S. V.; Shubin, Y. V.; Sobyenin, V. A. *Kinet. Catal.* **2007**, *48*, 276–281.
- (138) Ko, E. Y.; Park, E. D.; Lee, H. C.; Lee, D.; Kim, S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 734–737.
- (139) Ko, E.-Y.; Park, E. D.; Seo, K. W.; Lee, H. C.; Kim, S. *Catal. Lett.* **2006**, *110*, 275–279.
- (140) Suh, D. J.; Kwak, C.; Kim, J.-H.; Kwon, S. M.; Park, T.-J. *J. Power Sources* **2005**, *142*, 70–74.
- (141) Lu, S. H.; Zhang, C.; Liu, Y. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2011**, *36*, 1939–1948.
- (142) Mu, R. T.; Fu, Q.; Xu, H.; Zhang, H.; Huang, Y. Y.; Jiang, Z.; Zhang, S.; Tan, D. L.; Bao, X. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 1978–1986.
- (143) Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, A. Q.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2007**, *32*, 3880–3886.
- (144) Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Catal. Commun.* **2010**, *11*, 1090–1093.
- (145) Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Wang, X. D.; Su, D. S.; Zhang, T. *J. Catal.* **2008**, *255*, 144–152.
- (146) Lin, J.; Huang, Y. Q.; Li, L.; Qiao, B. T.; Wang, X. D.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2011**, *168*, 822–826.
- (147) Lin, J.; Li, L.; Wang, X. D.; Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T. *Sci. China Ser. B: Chem.* **2010**, *40*, 1409–1414.
- (148) Lin, J.; Li, L.; Huang, Y. Q.; Zhang, W. S.; Wang, X. D.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2011**, *115*, 16509–16517.
- (149) Lin, J.; Huang, Y. Q.; Li, L.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, W. S.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Catal. Today* **2012**, *180*, 155–160.
- (150) Zhang, W. S.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Catal. Lett.* **2008**, *121*, 319–323.
- (151) Zhang, W. S.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Catal. Today* **2008**, *131*, 457–463.
- (152) Zhang, W. S.; Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, J.; Liu, K.; Wang, X. D.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, T. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2010**, *35*, 3065–3071.
- (153) Liu, K.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, W. S.; Wang, J.; Huang, Y. Q.; Jin, C. Z.; Shen, J. Y.; Zhang, T. *Chin. J. Catal.* **2010**, *31*, 1335–1341.
- (154) Liu, K.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, W. S.; Wang, J.; Huang, Y. Q.; Shen, J. Y.; Zhang, T. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2010**, *114*, 8533–8541.
- (155) Liu, K.; Wang, A. Q.; Zhang, W. S.; Wang, J.; Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, X. D.; Shen, J. Y.; Zhang, T. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2011**, *50*, 758–766.
- (156) Lin, J.; Qiao, B. T.; Liu, J. Y.; Huang, Y. Q.; Wang, A. Q.; Li, L.; Zhang, W. S.; Allard, L. F.; Wang, X. D.; Zhang, T. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*; DOI: 10.1002/anie.201106702.
- (157) Cho, S.-H.; Park, J.-S.; Choi, S.-H.; Kim, S.-H. *J. Power Sources* **2006**, *156*, 260–266.
- (158) Minemura, Y.; Ito, S.; Miyao, T.; Naito, S.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 1429–1431.
- (159) Minemura, Y.; Kuriyama, M.; Ito, S.-I.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *Catal. Commun.* **2006**, *7*, 623–626.
- (160) Pedrero, C.; Waku, T.; Iglesia, E. *J. Catal.* **2005**, *233*, 242–255.
- (161) Kuriyama, M.; Tanaka, H.; Ito, S.-I.; Kubota, T.; Miyao, T.; Naito, S.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *J. Catal.* **2007**, *252*, 39–48.
- (162) Tanaka, H.; Kuriyama, M.; Ishida, Y.; Ito, S.-I.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *Appl. Catal., A* **2008**, *343*, 117–124.
- (163) Tanaka, H.; Kuriyama, M.; Ishida, Y.; Ito, S.-I.; Kubota, T.; Miyao, T.; Naito, S.; Tomishige, K.; Kunimori, K. *Appl. Catal., A* **2008**, *343*, 125–133.
- (164) Han, Y.-F.; Kahlich, M. J.; Kinne, M.; Behm, R. J. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *4*, 389–397.
- (165) Kahlich, M. J.; Gasteiger, H. A.; Behm, R. J. *J. Catal.* **1997**, *171*, 93–105.
- (166) Sirijiaruphan, A.; Goodwin, J. G., Jr.; Rice, R. W. *J. Catal.* **2004**, *227*, 547–551.
- (167) Xu, J.; Xu, X.-C.; Ouyang, L.; Yang, X.-J.; Mao, W.; Su, J. J.; Han, Y.-F. *J. Catal.* **2012**, *287*, 114–123.
- (168) Atalik, B.; Uner, D. *J. Catal.* **2006**, *241*, 268–275.
- (169) Joo, S. H.; Park, J. Y.; Renzas, J. R.; Butcher, D. R.; Huang, W. Y.; Somorjai, G. A. *Nano Lett.* **2010**, *10*, 2709–2913.
- (170) van Santen, R. A. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2009**, *42*, 57–66.
- (171) Gracia, F. J.; Bollmann, L.; Wolf, E. E.; Miller, J. T.; Kropf, A. J. *J. Catal.* **2003**, *220*, 382–391.
- (172) Guerrero, S.; Wolf, E. E. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **2011**, *66*, 4477–4487.
- (173) Li, L.; Wang, X.; Shen, J.; Zhou, L.; Zhang, T. *J. Therm. Anal. Calorim.* **2005**, *82*, 103–107.
- (174) Mhadeshwar, A. B.; Vlachos, D. G. *J. Catal.* **2005**, *234*, 48–63.
- (175) Liu, X. S.; Korotkikh, O.; Farrauto, R. *Appl. Catal., A* **2002**, *226*, 293–303.
- (176) Widmann, D.; Liu, Y.; Schüth, F.; Behm, R. J. *J. Catal.* **2010**, *276*, 292–305.

- (177) Widmann, D.; Behm, R. J. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 10241–10245.
- (178) Li, M. J.; Wu, Z. L.; Overbury, S. H. *J. Catal.* **2011**, *278*, 133–142.
- (179) Siani, A.; Alexeev, O. S.; Lafaye, G.; Amiridis, M. D. *J. Catal.* **2009**, *266*, 26–38.
- (180) Tanaka, K. I.; Shou, M.; He, H.; Shi, X. Y. *Catal. Lett.* **2006**, *110*, 185–190.
- (181) Margitfalvi, J. L.; Borbáth, L.; Lázár, K.; Tfirst, E.; Szegedi, A.; Hegedűs, M.; Gőbölös, S. *J. Catal.* **2001**, *203*, 94–103.
- (182) Sirijaruphan, A.; Goodwin, J. G., Jr.; Rice, R. W. *J. Catal.* **2004**, *224*, 304–313.
- (183) Schubert, M. M.; Gasteiger, H. A.; Behm, R. J. *J. Catal.* **1997**, *172*, 256–258.
- (184) Tanaka, K.; Moro-oka, Y.; Ishigure, K.; Yajima, T.; Okabe, Y.; Kato, Y.; Hamano, H.; Sekiya, S.; Tanaka, H.; Matsumoto, Y.; Koinuma, H.; He, H.; Zhang, C. B.; Feng, Q. C. *Catal. Lett.* **2004**, *92*, 115–121.
- (185) Shou, M.; Tanaka, K.-I. *Catal. Lett.* **2006**, *111*, 115–118.
- (186) Tanaka, K.; Shou, M.; He, H.; Shi, X. Y.; Zhang, X. L. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2009**, *113*, 12427–12433.
- (187) Tanaka, K.-I.; He, H.; Shou, M.; Shi, X. Y. *Catal. Today* **2011**, *175*, 467–470.
- (188) Salomons, S.; Hayes, R. E.; Votsmeier, M. *Appl. Catal., A* **2009**, *352*, 27–34.
- (189) Mhadeshwar, A. B.; Vlachos, D. G. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2004**, *108*, 15246–15258.
- (190) Grabow, L. C.; Gokhale, A. A.; Evans, S. T.; Dumesic, J. A.; Mavrikakis, M. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2008**, *112*, 4608–4617.
- (191) Zhai, Y. P.; Pierre, D.; Si, R.; Deng, W. L.; Ferrin, P.; Nilekar, A. U.; Peng, G. W.; Herron, J. A.; Bell, D. C.; Saltsburg, H.; Mavrikakis, M.; Flytzani-Stephanopoulos, M. *Science* **2010**, *329*, 1633–1636.
- (192) Fukuoka, A.; Kimura, J.; Oshio, T.; Sakamoto, Y.; Ichikawa, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 10120–10125.
- (193) Huang, S. J.; Hara, K.; Okubo, Y.; Yanagi, M.; Nambu, H.; Fukuoka, A. *Appl. Catal., A* **2009**, *365*, 268–273.
- (194) Herzing, A. A.; Kiely, C. J.; Carley, A. F.; Landon, P.; Hutchings, G. J. *Science* **2008**, *321*, 1331–1335.