

Immobilizing Highly Catalytically Active Noble Metal Nanoparticles on Reduced Graphene Oxide: A Non-Noble Metal Sacrificial Approach

Yao Chen,[†] Qi-Long Zhu,[†] Nobuko Tsumori,^{†,‡} and Qiang Xu^{*,†}

[†]National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Ikeda, Osaka 563-8577, Japan

[‡]Toyama National College of Technology, 13, Hongo-machi, Toyama, 939-8630, Japan

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: In this work, we have developed a non-noble metal sacrificial approach for the first time to successfully immobilize highly dispersed AgPd nanoparticles on reduced graphene oxide (RGO). The $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ co-precipitated with AgPd nanoparticles and subsequently sacrificed by acid etching effectively prevents the primary AgPd particles from aggregation. The resulted ultrafine AgPd nanoparticles exhibit the highest activity (turnover frequency, 2739 h^{-1} at 323 K) among all the heterogeneous catalysts for the dehydrogenation of formic acid to generate hydrogen without CO impurity. The sacrificial approach opens up a new avenue for the development of high-performance metal nanocatalysts.

Supported noble metal nanoparticles (NPs) have attracted great attention in catalysis due to their high activity in chemical reactions. Surface atoms often function as active sites, and thus the control of NP size can tailor the catalytic activity. Unfortunately, primary particles have high surface energies, rendering severe Oswald ripening or grain growth during the synthesis.¹ An efficient approach is to immobilize the NPs on special supports.² Among all the available support materials, reduced graphene oxide (RGO) consisting of chemically converted monolayer carbon atoms has emerged as one of the most promising supports for catalysts because the unique advantage of hydrophilicity and large specific surface area of its precursor, graphene oxide (GO), makes it possible to anchor well-dispersed metal NPs in the solution-based controlled reduction.³ However, it is still a major obstacle to obtain monodispersed metal particles with very small sizes on unfunctionalized RGO, where the aggregation of NPs cannot be perfectly overcome.⁴ Hence, immobilizing highly dispersed noble metal NPs with high catalytic activity on RGO remains a critical challenge in the heterogeneous catalysis.

On the other hand, formic acid (FA) has been proposed as a suitable liquid carrier for hydrogen,⁵ which can be formed by a biomass processing⁶ and reduction of carbon dioxide.⁷ Hydrogen generation from FA holds great potential for application to hydrogen powered fuel cells (FCs),⁸ and hence downsized metal NPs as high-performance nanocatalysts are highly desirable for this reaction.⁹ Herein, for the first time, we report the immobilization of ultrafine AgPd NPs on RGO by a new non-noble metal sacrificial approach (NNMSA), in which

a cobalt compound co-precipitated during the reduction of precursors and subsequently sacrificed by acid etching prevents the noble metal NPs from aggregation. The resulted catalyst exhibits the highest activity for the dehydrogenation of formic acid in the heterogeneous catalytic system.

Cobalt was chosen as the sacrificial agent for the NNMSA. The reaction between $\text{Co}(\text{CH}_3\text{COOH})_2$ and NaBH_4 in a molar ratio of 1:3.7 under an ambient condition for 2 h results in the formation of a black precipitation, which exhibits very broad X-ray diffractions (XRD) (Figure 1a), characteristic of an




Figure 1. XRD patterns of the precipitations of the reaction between $\text{Co}(\text{CH}_3\text{COOH})_2$ and NaBH_4 (a) before and (b) after annealing (823 K, 3 h, Ar), (c) JCPDS: 25-0102 ($\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$), (d) $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$, (e) $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$, (f) $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, and (g) $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$.

amorphous phase. The sample crystallizes by annealing in Ar atmosphere at 823 K for 3 h, displaying the XRD peaks (Figure 1b) corresponding to $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ (JCPDS: 25-0102, Figure 1c).¹⁰ The precipitation $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ can be readily dissolved in H_3PO_4 (Figure S1). The reaction between NaBH_4 and the mixed solution of $\text{Co}(\text{CH}_3\text{COOH})_2$, AgNO_3 , and K_2PdCl_4 in a molar ratio of 6:0.1:0.9 also produces a black precipitation

Received: November 9, 2014

Published: December 28, 2014

$\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$, giving an additional XRD peak at 39.9° for Pd (Figure 1d). Etching $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$ with H_3PO_4 (2 h, room temperature) gives the sample $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$, for which the broad XRD band due to $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ disappears while the characteristic Pd peaks are clearly observed (Figure 1e). In the presence of GO, the reaction between NaBH_4 and the mixed solution of $\text{Co}(\text{CH}_3\text{COOH})_2$, AgNO_3 , and K_2PdCl_4 in the same molar ratio (6:0.1:0.9) yields $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, which is followed by the H_3PO_4 etching to form $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$. Both of $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ and $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ exhibit another broad XRD shoulder at 24° arising from RGO (Figure 1 f and g).¹¹

The inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectroscopic analysis reveals that the molar ratio of Co:Ag:Pd in $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ is 0.08:0.1:0.9, indicating that almost all the co-precipitated $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ can be removed by H_3PO_4 . In the X-ray photoelectron spectroscopic (XPS) measurements, no Co 2p signals are observed for $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ before and after Ar sputtering (Figure S2a). The Ag 3d and Pd 3d spectra reveal that $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ is composed of metallic Ag and Pd covered by a thin oxidized layer¹² which can be easily removed by Ar sputtering (Figure S2b,c).

The morphologies of $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ and $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ are investigated by transmission electron microscopy (TEM). $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ exhibits severe aggregation of primary AgPd particles on RGO (Figure 2a).




Figure 2. TEM images of (a) $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, (b) $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, and (c, d) $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$.

More severe aggregation is observed for $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ in Figures 2b and S3a. In contrast, $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ shows highly dispersed NPs (2–4.5 nm) on RGO in Figures 2c,d and S3b. Combining with the XRD and ICP results, it can be concluded that the well-dispersed AgPd NPs are immobilized on RGO by NNMSA, illustrating that the sacrificial $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ prevents the primary AgPd particles from aggregation as shown in Scheme 1.

Figure 3 shows the nitrogen sorption isotherms of $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, and $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$. When AgPd NPs are loaded on RGO by direct deposition, the restacking of RGO is partially avoided. As a result, $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ yields a type-IV curve with a hysteresis loop and a Brunauer–Emmett–Teller specific surface area of $183 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$,

Scheme 1. Schematic Illustration of Immobilization of AgPd NPs on RGO by (a) direct deposition and (b) NNMSA





Figure 3. Nitrogen adsorption–desorption isotherms of $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$, and $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ at 77 K.

indicative of mesopores between the RGO layers. $\text{Co}_6\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ shows a very low N_2 uptake with a specific surface area as low as $6 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$, implying that the surface of separated RGO is completely occupied by a large amount of $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ with AgPd, which is consistent with the TEM observations. It is worth noting that a drastically increased N_2 uptake is observed for $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ ($310 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$), illustrating that the elimination of $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ by the H_3PO_4 etching endows $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ with high porosity, which would facilitate the diffusion of reactants to the metal NPs in catalysis.

Dehydrogenation of FA was selected as a probe reaction to investigate the catalytic performance of highly dispersed AgPd NPs on RGO. A series of $(\text{Co}_x)\text{Ag}_y\text{Pd}_{1-y}/\text{RGO}$ catalysts (x represents the molar ratio of Co/(Ag + Pd) and y is the molar percentage of Ag in AgPd) are tested for hydrogen generation from FA in a FA–sodium formate (SF) system. At $y = 0.1$, the catalytic activity for the dehydrogenation of FA increases with increasing the amount of sacrificial $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ until x reaches 6 (Figures 4 and S4), illuminating that the non-noble metal sacrificial agent plays a decisive role in giving rise to high catalytic activity by decreasing the size of AgPd NPs. It is found that the molar ratio of SF to FA has an obvious effect on the performance of the $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ catalyst. The activity of the catalyst for decomposition of FA increases with the molar ratio of SF to FA until the value reaches 2.5, after which further increase in the ratio of SF to FA does not give more positive effect on the decomposition of FA (Figure S5). The




Figure 4. Volume of the generated gas ($\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$) versus time for the dehydrogenation of FA over $(\text{Co}_x)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ at 323 K ($n_{\text{AgPd}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 0.02$, $n_{\text{SF}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 2.5$).

decomposition of FA catalyzed by $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ ($n_{\text{AgPd}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 0.02$, $n_{\text{SF}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 2.5$) is completed within 1.1 min with the generation of 146 mL gas ($\text{H}_2 + \text{CO}_2$). Gas chromatography measurements demonstrate that no CO can be detected from the evolved gas ($\text{H}_2 + \text{CO}_2$) at the level of 1 ppm (Figure S6). It is noted that the activity of $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ is much higher than that of $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Pd}/\text{RGO}$ though monometallic Ag NPs on RGO is inactive for this reaction (Figure S7), indicating that Ag is an excellent promoter for Pd-catalyzed FA decomposition.¹³ Additionally, both $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ and $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ show much better catalytic properties than the support-free $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$ and $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}$ catalysts (Figure S8), suggesting that RGO as a support to immobilize the metal NPs is essential and effective for avoiding their aggregation. $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ gives an average TOF of $2756 \pm 180 \text{ h}^{-1}$ at 323 K based on a full conversion of FA catalyzed by AgPd (Figure S4a), indicating that $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ is the most active catalyst as the highest TOF record (2623 h^{-1}) was reported with the Pd/MSC-30 catalyst for the heterogeneous dehydrogenation of formic acid at 323 K.¹⁴ It is worth noting that TOF of $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ at 298 K (453 h^{-1}) is lower than that of Pd/MSC-30 (750 h^{-1}), opposite to the results at 323 K, for which the higher apparent activation energy of $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ (43.1 kJ mol^{-1}) than that of Pd/MSC-30 (38.6 kJ mol^{-1})¹⁴ accounts (Figure 5). For the durability test, the $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ catalyst was recycled by washing with water after each cycle, of which the activity kept almost unchanged under the same reaction condition over 5 cycles (Figure S9), in agreement with the retained particle size of AgPd on RGO (Figure S10). The strong anchoring effect between the AgPd NPs and the RGO surface in $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ makes NNMSA an efficient approach toward the development of high-performance heterogeneous metal nanocatalysts.

In summary, we have developed a NNMSA, in which $\text{Co}_3(\text{BO}_3)_2$ co-precipitated with AgPd NPs and subsequently sacrificed by acid etching plays an important role in immobilizing highly dispersed AgPd NPs on RGO. The particle size of AgPd in $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ prepared by NNMSA is much smaller than that in $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ prepared by the direct deposition method. The $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ catalyst shows much higher activity than $\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ for the FA dehydrogenation. The present strategy opens up a new




Figure 5. (a) Volume of the generated gas ($\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$) versus time for the dehydrogenation of FA over $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ at different temperatures, (b) Arrhenius plot and TOF values of the dehydrogenation of FA over $(\text{Co}_6)\text{Ag}_{0.1}\text{Pd}_{0.9}/\text{RGO}$ ($n_{\text{AgPd}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 0.02$, $n_{\text{SF}}/n_{\text{FA}} = 2.5$).

avenue for the development of high-performance metal nanoparticle catalysts.

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

📄 Supporting Information

Experimental details, additional material characterization and catalytic performance. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

q.xu@aist.go.jp

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the reviewers for valuable suggestions, Ms. Jun Li for XPS, and Dr. Takeyuki Uchida for TEM measurements and AIST and METI for financial support.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) (a) Zaera, F. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2013**, *42*, 2746–2762. (b) Zhang, S.; Nguyen, L.; Zhu, Y.; Zhan, S.; Tsung, C.-K.; Tao, F. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2013**, *46*, 1731–1739. (c) Thanh, N. T. K.; Maclean, N.; Mahiddine, S. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 7610–7630.
- (2) (a) Li, P.-Z.; Aijaz, A.; Xu, Q. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 6753–6756. (b) Aijaz, A.; Karkamkar, A.; Choi, Y. J.; Tsumori, N.; Rönnebro, E.; Autrey, T.; Shioyama, H.; Xu, Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 13926–13929. (c) Yin, H.; Tang, H.; Wang, D.; Gao, Y.;

Tang, Z. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 8288–8297. (d) Kuo, C.-H.; Tang, Y.; Chou, L.-Y.; Sneed, B. T.; Brodsky, C. N.; Zhao, Z.; Tsung, C.-K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 14345–14348. (e) Guo, Z.; Xiao, C.; Maligal-Ganesh, R. V.; Zhou, L.; Goh, T. W.; Li, X.; Tesfagaber, D.; Thiel, A.; Huang, W. *ACS Catal.* **2014**, *4*, 1340–1348.

(3) (a) Tan, C.; Huang, X.; Zhang, H. *Mater. Today* **2013**, *16*, 29–36. (b) Liu, M.; Zhang, R.; Chen, W. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 5117–5160.

(4) (a) Guo, S.; Dong, S.; Wang, E. *ACS Nano* **2009**, *4*, 547–555. (b) Parvez, K.; Yang, S.; Hernandez, Y.; Winter, A.; Turchanin, A.; Feng, X.; Müllen, K. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 9541–9550. (c) Tiwari, J. N.; Nath, K.; Kumar, S.; Tiwari, R. N.; Kemp, K. C.; Le, N. H.; Youn, D. H.; Lee, J. S.; Kim, K. S. *Nat. Commun.* **2013**, *4*, 2221. (d) Shin, S. I.; Go, A.; Kim, I. Y.; Lee, J. M.; Lee, Y.; Hwang, S.-J. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2013**, *6*, 608–617. (e) Shang, L.; Bian, T.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, D.; Wu, L.-Z.; Tung, C.-H.; Yin, Y.; Zhang, T. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 250–254.

(5) (a) Fellay, C.; Dyson, P. J.; Laurenczy, G. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 3966–3968. (b) Ojeda, M.; Iglesia, E. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 4800–4803. (c) Boddien, A.; Mellmann, D.; Gärtner, F.; Jackstell, R.; Junge, H.; Dyson, P. J.; Laurenczy, G.; Ludwig, R.; Beller, M. *Science* **2011**, *333*, 1733–1736. (d) Yadav, M.; Singh, A. K.; Tsumori, N.; Xu, Q. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2012**, *22*, 19146–19150. (e) Martis, M.; Mori, K.; Fujiwara, K.; Ahn, W.-S.; Yamashita, H. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2013**, *117*, 22805–22810. (f) Mori, K.; Dojo, M.; Yamashita, H. *ACS Catal.* **2013**, *3*, 1114–1119. (g) Jiang, K.; Xu, K.; Zou, S.; Cai, W.-B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 4861–4864. (h) Zhu, Q.-L.; Xu, Q. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2015**, DOI: 10.1039/C4EE03690E.

(6) (a) Jin, F.; Yun, J.; Li, G.; Kishita, A.; Tohji, K.; Enomoto, H. *Green Chem.* **2008**, *10*, 612–615. (b) Wang, W.; Niu, M.; Hou, Y.; Wu, W.; Liu, Z.; Liu, Q.; Ren, S.; Marsh, K. N. *Green Chem.* **2014**, *16*, 2614–2618.

(7) (a) Grasemann, M.; Laurenczy, G. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2012**, *5*, 8171–8181. (b) Hull, J. F.; Himeda, Y.; Wang, W.-H.; Hashiguchi, B.; Periana, R.; Szalda, D. J.; Muckerman, J. T.; Fujita, E. *Nat. Chem.* **2012**, *4*, 383–388. (c) Centi, G.; Quadrelli, E. A.; Perathoner, S. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2013**, *6*, 1711–1731. (d) Moret, S.; Dyson, P. J.; Laurenczy, G. *Nat. Commun.* **2014**, *5*, 4017.

(8) (a) Boddien, A.; Loges, B.; Junge, H.; Beller, M. *ChemSusChem* **2008**, *1*, 751–758. (b) Boddien, A.; Federsel, C.; Sponholz, P.; Mellmann, D.; Jackstell, R.; Junge, H.; Laurenczy, G.; Beller, M. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2012**, *5*, 8907–8911. (c) Yadav, M.; Xu, Q. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2012**, *5*, 9698–9725.

(9) (a) Gu, X.; Lu, Z.-H.; Jiang, H.-L.; Akita, T.; Xu, Q. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 11822–11825. (b) Bi, Q.-Y.; Du, X.-L.; Liu, Y.-M.; Cao, Y.; He, H.-Y.; Fan, K.-N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 8926–8933. (c) Wang, Z.-L.; Yan, J.-M.; Ping, Y.; Wang, H.-L.; Zheng, W.-T.; Jiang, Q. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 4406–4409. (d) Hu, C.; Pulleri, J. K.; Ting, S.-W.; Chan, K.-Y. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* **2014**, *39*, 381–390.

(10) Glavee, G. N.; Klabunde, K. J.; Sorensen, C. M.; Hadjapanayis, G. C. *Langmuir* **1992**, *8*, 771–773.

(11) Chen, Y.; Zhang, X.; Zhang, D.; Yu, P.; Ma, Y. *Carbon* **2011**, *49*, 573–580.

(12) Chen, L.; Yelon, A.; Sacher, E. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2011**, *115*, 7896–7905.

(13) (a) Tedsree, K.; Li, T.; Jones, S.; Chan, C. W. A.; Yu, K. M. K.; Bagot, P. A. J.; Marquis, E. A.; Smith, G. D. W.; Tsang, S. C. E. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **2011**, *6*, 302–307. (b) Zhang, S.; Metin, Ö.; Su, D.; Sun, S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 3681–3684. (c) Dai, H.; Cao, N.; Yang, L.; Su, J.; Luo, W.; Cheng, G. *J. Mater. Chem. A* **2014**, *2*, 11060–11064.

(14) Zhu, Q.-L.; Tsumori, N.; Xu, Q. *Chem. Sci.* **2014**, *5*, 195–199.