

## What Are the Adsorption Sites for CO on the Reduced TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1 $\times$ 1 Surface?

Yan Zhao, Zhuo Wang, Xuefeng Cui, Tian Huang, Bing Wang,\* Yi Luo, Jinlong Yang, and

Jianguo Hou\*

Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at the Microscale, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China

Received March 30, 2009; E-mail: bwang@ustc.edu.cn; jghou@ustc.edu.cn

A knowledge of CO adsorption behavior on reduced TiO<sub>2</sub> surfaces is of great importance for a wide variety of applications,<sup>1</sup> such as CO oxidation at low temperature,<sup>2</sup> CO hydrogenation, and the water-gas shift reaction.3 Many efforts to obtain a detailed atomic-scale understanding of the principles governing catalyzed reactions on oxidesupported metal-based catalysts have been made using scanning tunneling microscopy (STM).<sup>4</sup> Surprisingly, adsorption and diffusion of CO molecules even on the widely studied rutile TiO\_2(110)-1  $\times$  1 surface are not well-understood, 5-8 though they are fundamentally important. To date, the detailed adsorption information for CO on TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1  $\times$  1 is highly controversial. For instance, an early study by Göpel and co-workers suggested bridge-bonded oxygen vacancies  $(BBO_V's)$  to be the adsorption sites for CO,<sup>5</sup> and this conclusion was supported by some theoretical work.9 However, the results from temperature-programmed desorption (TPD) experiments suggested that at low coverages, CO adsorption occurs at nonadjacent five-coordinate  $Ti^{4+}$  (Ti<sub>5c</sub>) sites on the reduced TiO<sub>2</sub>(110) surface,<sup>7,8</sup> as supported by a different set of theoretical calculations.<sup>10</sup> It was recently found that the clean TiO<sub>2</sub>(110) surface and the inverse catalysts of TiO<sub>2</sub> and CeO<sub>2</sub> particles on bulk gold can perform the oxidation of CO,<sup>11</sup> where the CO adsorption behavior at oxygen vacancies plays a key role.<sup>4a,12</sup> There is thus an urgent need to clearly understand the performance of CO on reduced oxide surfaces. This communication reports our experimental study of the adsorption of CO on a reduced clean  $TiO_2(110)-1 \times 1$  surface at an atom-resolved scale using in situ STM, combined with density functional theory (DFT) calculations. Our STM results reveal that the next-nearest-neighbor  $Ti_{5c}$  sites close to a BBO<sub>V</sub> are the most preferred adsorption sites, and our DFT calculations show that this can be well-understood energetically.

To conduct our experiment, the reduced rutile TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1 × 1 samples were prepared in an ultrahigh vacuum chamber with a base pressure of  $<3 \times 10^{-11}$  Torr that had been baked for a long time to minimize the background water in the chamber.<sup>13</sup> All of the STM measurements were performed at 80 K. We allowed an in situ CO (99.999%) dosing of 0.1 L at 80 K, where 1 L = 1 × 10<sup>-6</sup> Torr s. Figure 1 shows STM images before and after CO dosing in the same areas of the hydroxyl-free TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1 × 1 surface; these images show that after the CO dosing, CO molecules adsorb predominantly at Ti<sub>5</sub>*c* sites close to BBO<sub>V</sub>'s (Figure 1b) and are separated from each other by at least one lattice distance in a given Ti<sub>5</sub>*c* row. No CO adsorption at the bridge-bonded oxygen (BBO) site was observed.

In the magnified STM images superposed with the structure of  $\text{TiO}_2(110)$ -1 × 1, the CO adsorption sites can be determined (Figure 1d). Statistically, we counted the adsorbed CO at different  $\text{Ti}_{5c}$  sites with respect to the BBO<sub>V</sub> (the sites are defined in Figure 2a). The events of CO adsorption at site 0 and the BBO<sub>V</sub> are extremely low. The probability distributions for CO adsorption at different sites for three TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1 × 1 samples with BBO<sub>V</sub> concentrations of 22, 11, and 5% are plotted in Figure 2b. It is noteworthy that in each case the probability at sites 1 and 2 was over 60% and the probability at site 1 was ~2 times that at site 2, indicating that these two sites are the most



**Figure 1.** STM images acquired in the same area  $(8.2 \times 8.2 \text{ nm}^2)$  of a hydroxyl-free TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1 × 1 surface (a) before and (b) after CO dosing. (c, d) Corresponding magnified images with superposed structure  $(4.4 \times 3.0 \text{ nm}^2)$ . Green squares denote BBO<sub>V</sub>'s and blue dots the CO adsorption sites on a Ti<sub>5c</sub> row. Conditions:  $V_{\text{bias}} = 1.4 \text{ V}$ ,  $I_{\text{set}} = 10 \text{ pA}$ , T = 80 K.

preferred adsorption sites for CO, in contrast to the suggestion by Sorescu et al.,<sup>10f</sup> without an obvious dependence on the BBO<sub>V</sub> concentration. This result is coincident with our recent result that the excess charge of a BBO<sub>V</sub> defect is delocalized over multiple surrounding titanium atoms, mainly at sites 1 and 2.<sup>13b</sup> The CO molecules adsorbed at these sites may thus be negatively charged through backdonation of the charge from the surface.<sup>9b</sup>

For a better understanding of the adsorption behavior, we used DFT to calculate the adsorption energy of CO on TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1  $\times$  1, employing a  $(6 \times 2)$  unit cell with one oxygen atom removed from the BBO row in the uppermost layer; this unit cell is larger than that in previous calculations.9,10 It was found that the CO adsorption at site 1 has the lowest adsorption energy, 8.8 kcal/mol. The calculated energy differences,  $\delta E$ , for other sites with respect to site 1 are plotted in Figure 2c. The adsorption energies at the BBO<sub>V</sub> and site 0 are higher than that at site 1 by 5.0 and 1.4 kcal/mol, respectively. In comparison, the adsorption energies at sites 2 and 3 are higher than that of site 1 by only 0.1 and 0.3 kcal/mol, respectively. These values are in good agreement to the experimental value of 9.9 kcal/mol<sup>7</sup> and on the same order of magnitude as obtained in previous calculations.<sup>9,10</sup> Qualitatively, it is thus easy to understand that the  $BBO_V$  and site 0 are not energetically favorable. More interestingly, these values make it possible to analyze the adsorption behavior quantitatively. With the calculated adsorption energy differences, the equilibrium distribution of CO adsorption at different sites can be estimated with the Boltzmann relation  $\exp(-\delta E/kT)$  (where k is Boltzmann's constant), as shown in Figure 2d. The calculated distribution largely reproduces the experimental observations in Figure 2b. Thus, it can be suggested that the



**Figure 2.** (a) Schematic drawing of  $TiO_2(110)-1 \times 1$  with a BBO<sub>V</sub>; the Ti<sub>5c</sub> sites are labeled according to the lattice distance with respect to the  $BBO_V$ . (b) Plots of distributions of CO adsorption on  $Ti_{5c}$  with  $BBO_V$ concentrations of (left to right) 22, 11, and 5%. (c) Calculated adsorption energy difference,  $\delta E$ , for CO adsorption at different sites with respect to the lowest energy (at site 1). (d) Simulated distribution of CO adsorption at different sites obtained using the Boltzmann distribution.

CO adsorption follows the Boltzmann distribution, which reflects thermally driven behavior. This may be attributed to "hot" CO molecules from the gas initially landing on the different sites of the surface and eventually reaching equilibrium through thermal diffusion. Significantly, our finding here reveals that CO adsorbs preferentially at site 1, namely, the next-nearest-neighbor Ti<sub>5c</sub> site close to the BBO<sub>V</sub>, and not at the BBO<sub>V</sub> itself.<sup>1b</sup> A similar site dependence for the adsorption of O<sub>2</sub> has been predicted.<sup>14</sup>

In addition, we obtained CO diffusion barriers (in kcal/mol) of 5.3  $(BBO_V \text{ to site } 0)$  and 9.0 (site 0 to  $BBO_V$ ), 7.6 (site 0 to site 1) and 8.0 (site 1 to site 0), 8.1 (site 1 to site 2) and 8.0 (site 2 to site 1), and 7.6 (site 2 to site 3) and 7.4 (site 3 to site 2). Our observed diffusion events at the initial adsorption stage agree well with our calculated adsorption energies and diffusion barriers. As shown in Figure 3 by a series of consecutively acquired STM images, frames A in Figure 3a-c show CO diffusion crossing a BBO row through a BBO<sub>V</sub>. The intermediate state of CO on the BBO<sub>V</sub> site, which was occasionally observable (as marked by frame A in Figure 3c and frame C in Figure 3d), always diffuses to site 0 and then to site 1. Frames B in Figure 3c,d demonstrate CO diffusion from site 2 to site 1.

In conclusion, we have studied in situ the low-coverage adsorption of CO molecules on TiO<sub>2</sub>(110)-1  $\times$  1 surfaces using STM at 80 K. Our results show that CO molecules preferentially adsorb at the nextnearest-neighbor Ti<sub>5c</sub> atoms close to the BBO<sub>V</sub> at equilibrium, which disagrees with the idea that the  $BBO_V$  itself acts as an adsorption site for CO. Adsorbed CO molecules diffuse along Ti<sub>5c</sub> rows and across the BBO row through the BBO<sub>V</sub>. Although CO adsorption on the  $BBO_V$  can be observed occasionally, the  $BBO_V$  is not a stable adsorption site but rather an intermediate state during CO diffusion across a BBO row, even at 80 K.

Acknowledgment. This work was supported by the NBRP (2006CB922000) and NSFC (50721091, 60771006, 10825415, 50532040), China.



Figure 3. (a-f) Consecutively acquired STM images  $(5.4 \times 7.3 \text{ nm}^2)$ . The frames labeled by A show the CO diffusion across the BBO row through a BBO<sub>V</sub>, frames B the CO diffusion from site 2 to site 1, and frames C the CO diffusion from the BBO<sub>V</sub> to site 0 and then to site 1.

Supporting Information Available: Computational details and consecutively acquired STM images showing the CO adsorption and diffusion. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http:// pubs.acs.org.

## References

- (1) (a) Linsebigler, A. L.; Lu, G.; Yates, J. T., Jr. Chem. Rev. 1995, 95, 735. (b) Diebold, U. Surf. Sci. Rep. 2003, 48, 53. (c) Bond, G. C.; Thompson,
   D. T. Catal. Rev.—Sci. Eng. 1999, 418, 319. (d) Chen, Y.; Crawford, P.;
   Hu, P. Catal. Lett. 2007, 119, 21. (e) Ganduglia-Pirovano, M. V.; Hofmann, A.; Sauer, J. Surf. Sci. Rep. 2007, 62, 219.
   (2) (a) Haruta, M.; Kobayashi, T.; Sano, H.; Yamada, N. Chem. Lett. 1987,
- 405. (b) Campbell, C. T.; Parker, S. C.; Starr, D. E. Science 2002, 298, 811. (c) Meyer, R.; Lemire, C.; Shaikhutdinov, S. K.; Freund, H.-J. Gold Bull. 2004, 37, 72.
- (3) (a) Fu, Q.; Saltsburg, H.; Flytzani-Stephanopoulos, M. Science 2003, 301, 935. (b) Rodriguez, J. A.; Wang, X.; Liu, P.; Wen, W.; Hanson, J. C.; Hrbek, J.; Perez, M.; Evans, J. Top. Catal. 2007, 44, 73. (c) Sato, Y.; Koizumi, M.; Miyao, T.; Naito, S. Catal. Today 2006, 111, 164.
- (4) (a) Matthey, D.; Wang, J. G.; Wendt, S.; Matthiesen, J.; Schaub, R.; Laegsgaard, E.; Hammer, B.; Besenbacher, F. Science 2007, 315, 1692. Lacgsaud, L., Halin, X.; Goodman, D. W. Science **1998**, 281, 1647. (c) Chen, M. S.; Kumar, D.; Yi, C. W.; Goodman, D. W. Science **2005**, 310, 291. (d) Chen, M. S.; Goodman, D. W. Science 2004, 306, 252
- (d) Gipel, W.; Rocker, G.; Feierabend, R. Phys. Rev. B 1983, 28, 3427.
  (b) Rocker, G.; Göpel, W. Surf. Sci. 1986, 175, L675.
  (6) Kunat, M.; Burghaus, U. Surf. Sci. 2003, 544, 170.
  (7) Linsebigler, A.; Lu, G.; Yates, J. T., Jr. J. Chem. Phys. 1995, 103, 9438.
  (8) Dohnálek, Z.; Kim, J.; Bondarchuk, O.; White, J. M.; Kay, B. D. J. Phys.
- Chem. B 2006, 110, 6229.
- (a) Menetrey, M.; Markovits, A.; Minot, C. Surf. Sci. 2003, 524, 49. (b)
- Kobayashi, H.; Yamaguchi, M. Surf. Sci. 1989, 214, 466.
   (10) (a) Reinhardt, P.; Causa, M.; Marian, C. M.; Hess, B. A. Phys. Rev. B 1996, 54, 14812. (b) Pacchioni, G.; Ferrari, A. M.; Bagus, P. S. Swrf. Sci. **1996**, 350, 159. (c) Sorescu, D. C.; Yates, J. T., Jr. J. Phys. Chem. B **1998**, 102, 4556. (d) Casarin, M.; Maccato, C.; Vittadini, A. J. Phys. Chem. B 1998, 102, 10745. (e) Yang, Z. X.; Wu, R. Q.; Zhang, Q. M.; Goodman, D. W. Phys. Rev. B 2001, 63, 045419. (f) Sorescu, D. C.; Yates, J. T., Jr. J. Phys. Chem. B 2002, 106, 6184. (g) Pillay, D.; Hwang, G. S. J. Chem. Phys. 2006, 125, 144706.
- (11) (a) Lee, S. S.; Fan, C. Y.; Wu, T. P.; Anderson, S. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. (a) Let, S. S., Fall, C. T., Wu, T. F., Anderson, S. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2004**, *126*, 5682. (b) Rodriguez, J. A.; Ma, S.; Liu, P.; Hrbek, J.; Evans, J.; Perez, M. Science **2007**, *318*, 1757.
- (12) (a) Esch, F.; Fabris, S.; Zhou, L.; Montini, T.; Africh, C.; Fornasiero, P.; Comelli, G.; Rosei, R. *Science* **2005**, *309*, 752. (b) Campbell, C. T.; Peden, C. H. F. Science 2005, 309, 713.
- (13) (a) Cui, X. F.; Wang, B.; Wang, Z.; Huang, T.; Zhao, Y.; Yang, J. L.; Hou, J. G. J. Chem. Phys. 2008, 129, 044703. (b) Minato, T.; Sainoo, Y.; Kim, Y.; Kato, H. S.; Aika, K.-i.; Kawai, M.; Zhao, J.; Petek, H.; Huang, T.; He, W.; Wang, B.; Wang, Z.; Zhao, Y.; Yang, J.; Hou, J. G. J. Chem. Phys. 2009, 130, 124502. (c) Cui, X. F.; Wang, Z.; Tan, S. J.; Wang, B.; Yang, J. L.; Hou, J. G. J. Phys. Chem. B, submitted. (14) Liu, L.-M.; Crawford, P.; Hu, P. Prog. Surf. Sci. 2009, in press; DOI:
- 10.1016/J.Progsurf.2009.01.002.

JA902259K