

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/101242/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Tafreshi, Saeedeh S., Roldan Martinez, Alberto and De Leeuw, Nora H. 2017. Micro-kinetic simulations of the catalytic decomposition of hydrazine on the Cu(111) surface. *Faraday Discussions* 197 , pp. 41-57. 10.1039/C6FD00186F

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C6FD00186F>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



# Micro-kinetic simulations of the catalytic decomposition of hydrazine on the Cu(111) surface†

Saeedeh S. Tafreshi,<sup>a</sup> Alberto Roldan<sup>b</sup> and Nora H. de Leeuw<sup>\*ab</sup>

Hydrazine (N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>) is produced at industrial scale from the partial oxidation of ammonia or urea. The hydrogen content (12.5 wt%) and price of hydrazine make it a good source of hydrogen fuel, which is also easily transportable in the hydrate form, thus enabling the production of H<sub>2</sub> in situ. N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> is currently used as a monopropellant thruster to control and adjust the orbits and altitudes of spacecrafts and satellites; with similar procedures applicable in new carbon-free technologies for power generators, e.g. proton-exchange membrane fuel cells. The N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> decomposition is usually catalysed by the expensive Ir/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> material, but a more affordable catalyst is needed to scale-up the process whilst retaining reaction control. Using a complementary range of computational tools, including newly developed micro-kinetic simulations, we have derived and analysed the N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> decomposition mechanism on the Cu(111) surface, where the energetic terms of all states have been corrected by entropic terms. The simulated temperature-programmed reactions have shown how the pre-adsorbed N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> coverage and heating rate affect the evolution of products, including NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>. The batch reactor simulations have revealed that for the scenario of an ideal Cu terrace, a slow but constant production of H<sub>2</sub> occurs, 5.4% at a temperature of 350 K, while the discharged NH<sub>3</sub> can be recycled into N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>. These results show that Cu(111) is not suitable for hydrogen production from hydrazine. However, real catalysts are multi-faceted and present defects, where previous work has shown a more favourable N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> decomposition mechanism, and, perhaps, the decomposition of NH<sub>3</sub> improves the production of hydrogen. As such, further investigation is needed to develop a general picture.

## 1. Introduction

Hydrazine (N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>) decomposition by heterogeneous catalysis is employed in a proton-exchange membrane fuel cell (PEMFC), due to its hydrogen content of 12.5 wt%. Moreover, since hydrazine hydrate is liquid under mild conditions and its

---

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemistry, University College London, 20 Gordon Street, London, WC1H 0AJ, UK

<sup>b</sup>School of Chemistry, Cardiff University, Main Building, Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, UK. E-mail: DeLeeuwN@cardiff.ac.uk; Tel: +44 (0)2920870658

decomposition over catalysts at room temperature is exothermic without the need for added energy, it is ideal for portable applications such as space vehicles and satellites.<sup>1–5</sup> Hydrazine is also used in a monopropellant thruster to control and adjust the orbits and altitudes of spacecrafts and satellites, based on the production of much larger volumes of nitrogen, hydrogen and ammonia gases from hydrazine.<sup>2</sup> The most important catalyst used in the hydrazine decomposition reaction is Ir/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> with a very high loading of iridium (20–40%).<sup>2,6–8</sup> However, owing to the high price and limited resources of iridium, considerable research has been focused on the development of active but cheaper and readily available alternative catalysts for hydrazine decomposition. Al-Haydari et al. showed that hydrazine molecules adsorb molecularly on a Cu(111) surface at 243 K with 20% of the adsorption being reversible; further dissociative adsorption continues above 303 K, producing mainly NH<sub>3</sub> with N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> gaseous by-products.<sup>9</sup> As for the production of hydrogen, we aim to investigate the catalytic activity of Cu towards hydrazine decomposition for the production of hydrogen, and hinder the use of hydrocarbon steam reforming at industrial scale.<sup>10</sup>

Micro-kinetic simulations are convenient tools to approach a catalytic process from the atomic level to reactor conditions. In recent years, there has been increasing interest in the development of micro-kinetic models for various industrially relevant processes, such as ammonia synthesis,<sup>11–14</sup> oxidation,<sup>15,16</sup> and decomposition,<sup>14,17</sup> methanol synthesis<sup>18</sup> and decomposition,<sup>19–21</sup> ethylene oxidation<sup>22</sup>, and the water gas shift reaction.<sup>23–25</sup> To construct a reliable micro-kinetic model, it is necessary to investigate all the relevant processes involved, such as adsorption, desorption, and surface reactions. Density functional theory (DFT) is commonly used to determine the energy profile along the reaction pathway that will be employed in the micro-kinetic modelling.<sup>26,27</sup>

We have successfully investigated the dissociative adsorption of hydrazine (N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>) on the planar and stepped Cu(111) surfaces by first-principles calculations,<sup>28</sup> where the thermodynamic and kinetic potential energy surface (PES) showed that intermolecular dehydrogenation of hydrazine to produce NH<sub>3</sub> and N<sub>2</sub> is the favoured route among the explored reaction network.<sup>28</sup> Based on the identified mechanism, we have established a micro-kinetic model to simulate a batch reactor where hydrazine is in contact with the planar Cu(111) surface, using 52 elementary reactions including adsorption, desorption, and reactions on the surface. We have evaluated the effects of temperature, initial N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> coverage and heating rate on a temperature-programmed reaction (TPR), as well as the selectivity towards the formation of NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>, and H<sub>2</sub>, resulting in an excellent agreement with the experimental results.

## 2. Computational methods

In the heterogeneous catalytic system, the constant rate of each surface elementary step is commonly computed using the transition-state theory (TST) approximations of Eyring<sup>29</sup> and Evans and Polanyi.<sup>30</sup> Although TST is widely applicable and provides a useful description of the chemical reaction rates, it has limitations. For example, rather than surmount the reaction energy barrier, the reactants could quantum mechanically tunnel across the barrier, even though their energy is considerably less than the energy needed to go over the barrier. This could be important where the energy barrier is low, as the probability of tunnelling increases with a decreasing energy barrier.<sup>31</sup> TST also fails in its

description of reactions at high temperature, where the motion of molecules becomes more complex and collisions may lead to transition states far away from the lowest energy saddle point on the potential energy surface.<sup>32</sup> TST assumes that each intermediate is long-lived in each elementary step to reach a Boltzmann distribution of energy, and it thus fails in situations where intermediates are very short-lived.<sup>33</sup> TST also assumes that the transition states can evolve only to products, while in some cases they may return to the reactants. However, this theory still remains very useful in calculating the thermodynamic properties of the transition state and the reaction rates. More information about TST and rate constants is supplied in the ESI.†

Based on the mechanisms investigated in our previous work on the decomposition of N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> on the Cu(111) surface, the micro-kinetic model constitutes the 52 reactions summarized in Table 1. Following the approach of a previous study,<sup>33</sup> in this model, the lateral adsorbate–adsorbate interactions are negligible. Surface diffusion is also neglected, assuming that its energy barrier is much smaller than any reaction barrier in the decomposition process. Non-limiting mass transfer is also assumed.

Upon defining the rate equations, we used numerical methods to solve the set of differential equations, which describe the relationship between the species coverages and time.

All of the thermodynamic and kinetic parameters were extracted from calculations based on density functional theory (DFT)<sup>34–36</sup> using the VASP code.<sup>37–40</sup> The total energy calculations were performed using the Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE)<sup>41</sup> form of the generalized gradient approximation (GGA), whereas the projector augmented wave (PAW) method was used to consider the effect of the inner cores on the valence density.<sup>42,43</sup> To improve the description of the long-range interactions, and following our previous work on the Cu–hydrazine system,<sup>27</sup> we employed the DFT-D2 method of Grimme as implemented in VASP,<sup>44</sup> which has been shown to improve accuracy on several systems.<sup>27,34,45</sup> Plane wave basis sets were used with an energy cut-off at 600 eV, which gave bulk energies converged to within 0.001 eV per atom. This high value for the cut-off energy ensured that no Pulay stresses occurred within the cell during relaxations. A 5 5 1 Monkhorst–Pack grid<sup>46</sup> of K-points was used to sample the Brillouin zone for surfaces. The slabs were

modelled with a 2 × 2 supercell, p(4 × 4), with an area of 88.37 Å<sup>2</sup> and a vacuum layer of 20 Å between slabs. The adsorbate and the top three out of four layers of the slabs were allowed to relax during structural optimisation, in line with previous studies.<sup>47,48</sup> Different slab thicknesses were tested until convergence was achieved.

A combination of two techniques were used to identify transition state (TS) structures: the climbing image nudged elastic band (NEB) method<sup>49,50</sup> and the improved dimer method (IDM),<sup>51</sup> which we verified by a single imaginary frequency associated with the reaction coordinate.

We have calculated the adsorption (E<sub>ads</sub>) and desorption (E<sub>des</sub> = 1/4 E<sub>ads</sub>) energies for the species using eqn (1);

$$E_{\text{ads}} = \frac{1}{4} E_{\text{molecule}}^{\text{surf}} - (E^{\text{surf}} + E_{\text{molecule}}^{\text{gas}}) \quad (1)$$

where E<sup>surf</sup><sub>molecule</sub> is the total energy of the species adsorbed on a relaxed Cu(111) surface, and E<sup>surf</sup> and E<sup>gas</sup><sub>molecule</sub> are the energies of the naked surface and isolated gas-phase molecules, respectively. Within this definition, a negative E<sub>ads</sub> value

Table 1 Calculated ZPE corrected reaction ( $E_r^{ZPE}$ ) and barrier ( $E_a^{ZPE}$ ) energies for the reaction pathways considered. The pre-exponential factors ( $A_0$ ) and reaction rate constants ( $k$ ) at 300 and 650 K are also included. The  $E_r^{ZPE}$  of the adsorption and desorption processes are the corresponding  $E_{ads}^{ZPE}$  and  $E_{des}^{ZPE}$ , which for each species were calculated relative to the gas-phase species. Note that "\*" and (X\*) indicate a free site and the adsorbed species on the surface, respectively. The units of  $A_0$  and  $k$  for first order and second order reactions are  $s^{-1}$  and  $ML^{-1} s^{-1}$ , respectively

Reactions	$E_r^{ZPE}$ (eV)	$E_a^{ZPE}$ (eV)	$A_0$ 300 K	$A_0$ 650 K	k 300 K	k 650 K
Adsorption–desorption						
R0 $N_2H_4 p^*/N_2H_4^*$	0.94	—	$1.04 \times 10^4$	$7.06 \times 10^3$	$1.21 \times 10^2$	4.91
$*/$	0.94	—	2.31	1.75	5.33	$10^4$ 2.71
R1 $N_2H_4 N_2H_4 p$			$10^{11}$	$10^{10}$	$10^4$	$\frac{11}{10}$
$*/$	0.78	—	4.98	9.19	2.01	9.10
R2 $NH_3 NH_3 p$			$10^{11}$	$10^{10}$	$10^8$	$\frac{11}{10}$
$*/$	—	—	1.43	9.69	2.68	7.15
R3 $NH_3 p NH_3$	0.78		$10^4$	$10^3$		
$*/$	0.11	—	6.72	6.93	8.26	$10^2$ 8.10
R4 $N_2 N_2 p$			$10^{10}$	$10^9$	$10^{12}$	$\frac{13}{10}$
R5 $N_2 p^*/N_2^*$	0.11	—	$1.11 \times 10^4$	$7.55 \times 10^3$	$6.10 \times 10^1$	8.83
R6 $H^* + H^* / H + 2^*$	0.45	1.08	5.81	6.01	1.04	$10^2$ 1.02
$2$			$10^{12}$	$10^{12}$	$10^8$	$\frac{14}{10}$
R7 $H + 2^* / H^* + H^*$	0.45	0.65	4.16	2.82	9.83	1.42
$2$			$10^4$	$10^4$	$10^2$	$10^2$
$N_2H_x$ ( $x = 1-4$ ) dehydrogenation						
R8 $N_2H_4^*/N_2H_3^* p H^*$	0.16	1.30	$8.33 \times 10^{12}$	2.14	1.30	2.54
R9 $N_2H_3^* p H^*/N_2H_4^*$	0.16	1.14	3.12	$1.06 \times 10^6$	6.13	9.15
R10 $N_2H_3^*/NNH_2^* p H^*$	0.55	1.26	$2.54 \times 10^{13}$	1.14	8.37	1.78
R11 $NNH^* H^*/N H^*$	0.55	0.71	1.45	6.00	1.23	2.84
$2 p$			$10^{13}$	$10^{13}$	$10^7$	$\frac{11}{10}$
R12 $N_2H_3^*/NHNH^* p H^*$	0.64	1.35	1.47	4.26	7.84	4.75
R13 $NHNH^* H^*/N H^*$	0.64	0.71	$5.52 \times 10^{13}$	$9.61 \times 10^{10}$	4.74	$10^3$ 1.95
$p$			$10^{12}$	$10^{12}$		$10^7$
R14 $NNH_2^*/NNH^* p H^*$	0.45	1.12	9.77	2.12	2.46	7.04
R15 $NNH^* H^*/NNH^*$	0.45	0.67	$10^{12}$	$10^{13}$	$10^6$	$10^4$ 2.35
$p$			$10^{13}$	$10^{13}$	$10^4$	$\frac{10}{10}$
R16 $NHNH^* / NNH^* + H^*$	0.46	1.47	2.03	4.88	3.3	6.33
R17 $NNH^* + H^* / NHNH^*$	0.46	1.01	$10^{13}$	$10^{13}$	$10^5$	$10^5$ 4.60
			$10^{13}$	$10^{13}$	$10^3$	$10^9$

Table 1 (Contd. )

Reactions	$E_{fZPE}$	$E_{aZPE}$			k 300	k 650
	(eV)	(eV)	A <sub>0</sub> 300 K	A <sub>0</sub> 650 K	K	K
R18 NNH*/N H*	1.62	0.17	1.54	4.16	4.64	5.81
2 p			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>10</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>
R19 N <sub>2</sub> * p H*/NNH*	1.62	1.79	2.13	3.51	9.17	1.44
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>19</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>
N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>x</sub> (x ¼ 1–4) N–N decoupling						
R20 N H*/NH* NH*	0.98	0.69	1.68	5.74	1.22	1.11
2 4 2 p 2			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>9</sup>
R21 NH <sub>2</sub> * p NH <sub>2</sub> */N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub> *	0.98	1.67	3.72	8.93	1.90	6.54
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>14</sup>	10
R22 N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> */NH <sub>2</sub> * p NH*	0.39	0.90	1.10	3.54	9.1	7.86
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>
R23 NH <sub>2</sub> * p NH*/N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> *	0.39	1.29	1.17	2.59	3.68	4.40
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>9</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>
R24 NNH <sub>2</sub> */NH <sub>2</sub> * p N*	0.12	1.35	2.87	4.42	3.58	5.54
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>11</sup>	10
R25 NH <sub>2</sub> * p N*/NNH <sub>2</sub> *	0.12	1.23	1.40	3.64	1.07	3.48
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>7</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>
R26 NHNH*/NH* + NH*	0.38	0.79	2.42	3.05	9.97	7.09
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>
R27 NH* + NH*/NHNH*	0.38	1.17	8.86	1.43	6.14	1.86
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>7</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>
R28 NNH*/NH* + N*	0.15	1.42	1.47	1.62	4.48	1.83
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	
R29 NH* + N*/NNH*	0.15	1.27	7.53	1.28	4.08	1.69
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>9</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>
NH <sub>x</sub> (x ¼ 1–3) dehydrogenation						
R30 NH <sub>3</sub> */NH <sub>2</sub> * p H*	0.60	1.41	3.26	9.05	3.27	6.85
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10
R31 NH <sub>2</sub> * p H*/NH <sub>3</sub> *	0.60	0.81	1.04	2.57	6.00	2.99
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>1</sup>	10 <sup>7</sup>
R32 NH <sub>2</sub> */NH* p H*	0.56	1.40	3.12	4.64	6.60	1.52
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>
R33 NH* p H*/NH <sub>2</sub> *	0.56	0.84	1.08	2.99	2.14	2.43
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>1</sup>	10 <sup>7</sup>
R34 NH*/N* + H*	1.34	1.79	6.31	1.22	5.16	1.70
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>20</sup>	
R35 N* + H*/NH*	1.34	0.45	6.89	1.44	2.62	10 <sup>2</sup>
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>8</sup>
Interaction of NH <sub>2</sub> molecules						
R36 2NH*/NH* NH*	0.00	0.45	1.54	2.58	1.08	4.69
2 p 3			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>7</sup>	10 <sup>10</sup>
R37 NH* NH*/2NH*	0.00	0.45	1.19	2.88	6.20	1.97
p 3 2			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>	10 <sup>10</sup>

Table 1 (Contd. )

Reactions	$E_{rZPE}$	$E_{aZPE}$	k		$k$ 650
	(eV)	(eV)	A <sub>0</sub> 300 K	A <sub>0</sub> 650 K	K
Interaction of NH <sub>2</sub> with N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>x</sub> (x ¼ 1–4)					
R38 N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub> N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> p NH <sub>3</sub>	0.36	0.42	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup> 2.38
R39 N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> * p NH <sub>3</sub> */N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub> * p NH <sub>2</sub> *	0.36	0.78	2.72	4.52	3.17 8.22
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup> 10 <sup>5</sup>
R40 N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub> NHNH p NH <sub>3</sub>	0.08	0.64	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	1.10 7.79
			1.04	8.98	3.73 2.06
R41 NHNH p NH <sub>3</sub> N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub>	0.08	0.56	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>11</sup>	10 10 <sup>6</sup>
			1.37	3.14	5.58 2.35
R42 N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub> NNH <sub>2</sub> p NH <sub>3</sub>	0.13	0.53	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup> 10 <sup>9</sup>
			1.98	2.46	5.18 3.44
R43 NNH <sub>2</sub> p NH <sub>3</sub> N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub>	0.13	0.66	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>
			1.53	2.39	2.11 4.60
R44 NHNH p NH <sub>2</sub> NNH p NH <sub>3</sub>	0.23	0.25	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>9</sup>
R45 NNH* NH*/NHNH* NH*			4.44	5.50	2.41 4.00
R46 NNH* p NH <sub>3</sub> */NNH* p NH <sub>2</sub> *	0.23	0.48	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup> 10 <sup>8</sup>
			2.55	5.38	1.05 1.06
R47 NNH* p NH <sub>3</sub> NNH <sub>2</sub> p NH <sub>2</sub>	0.12	0.30	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>9</sup>
			7.72	1.60	1.21 8.63
R48 NNH* NH*/N* NH*	0.12	0.18	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>10</sup>
			1.60	3.11	4.38 2.54
R49 N <sub>2</sub> * p NH <sub>3</sub> */NNH* p NH <sub>2</sub> *	2.09	0.08	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>
			2.09	2.17	1.00 3.26
			10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>12</sup>	10 <sup>25</sup>
					10 <sup>6</sup>
N <sub>2</sub> dissociation					
R50 N <sub>2</sub> */N* p N*	3.20	4.69	6.71	7.03	1.09 1.53
			10 <sup>11</sup>	10 <sup>11</sup>	10 <sup>68</sup>
R51 N* p N*/N <sub>2</sub> *	3.20	1.49	3.01	9.02	1.08 1.51
			10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>13</sup>	10 <sup>26</sup>
					10 <sup>11</sup> 10 <sup>3</sup>

means a release of energy during adsorption. The reaction energies ( $E_r$ ) were estimated by the difference in energy between the nal and initial states; hence, a negative  $E_r$  indicates an exothermic process. The forward activation barrier ( $E_a$ ) was defined as the energy difference between the transition state (TS) and the initial state. We have also considered the effect of temperature on  $E_{ads}$ ,  $E_r$  and  $E_a$ ; see the ESI for details.†

### 3. Results and discussion

The 52 elementary steps for hydrazine decomposition summarised in Table 1 include the adsorption and desorption of reactants and products, N–N

decoupling, dehydrogenation of  $N_2H_x$  ( $x = 1-4$ ) and  $NH_x$  ( $x = 1-3$ ), and inter-molecular interactions on the surface. We have also included in Table 1 the reaction ( $E_{r}^{ZPE}$ ) and barrier ( $E_{a}^{ZPE}$ ) corrected with the zero-point energy, the pre-exponential factors ( $A_0$ ), and the reaction rate constants ( $k$ ) of each elementary step at 300 and 650 K. We have represented the reaction rate constants as a function of the temperature in Fig. S3 of the ESI.† Calculation of the reaction rate constants help us to determine the reaction rate as a function of the temperature, from which we can conclude which step is the rate-limiting reaction. The adsorption sticking coefficients ( $S_0$ ) of  $N_2H_4$ ,  $NH_3$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $H_2$  on the Cu(111) surface at 300 and 650 K are also provided in Table 2, where similar results have been reported for  $NH_3$  on Ru(0001),<sup>52</sup>  $N_2$  on Fe(100) and Fe(111)<sup>53</sup>, and  $H_2$  on low-index Cu surfaces.<sup>54</sup> We have calculated two different micro-kinetic models. In the first part of our work, we have modelled a temperature-programmed reaction (TPR) where, starting from pre-adsorbed  $N_2H_4$ , the temperature increased at different rates from 100 to 500 K, while any gas was extracted to avoid the re-adsorption of gases (R0, R3, R5 and R7). In the second section, we have explored the catalytic activity of copper surfaces towards  $N_2H_4$  dissociation in a batch reactor under varying conditions, starting from a situation where the naked Cu surface is in contact with a given pressure of  $N_2H_4$ . The rate equations of the elementary reactions and corresponding differential equations are listed in the ESI.†

### 3.1. Temperature programmed reaction simulation

Fig. 1 shows the simulated TPR spectra of  $N_2H_4$ ,  $NH_3$ ,  $N_2$  and  $H_2$  gases from different initial  $N_2H_4$  coverages. The TPR plots show desorption of species from the surface as the temperature increases. The desorption peaks therefore show the temperature at which the molecules have the highest desorption rate. As Fig. 1 shows, different initial  $N_2H_4$  coverages do not change the temperature of the maximum desorption rate. Fig. 1 in conjunction with Fig. 2 relates the pressures of desorbed gases and the coverages of the most abundant species on the surface, i.e.  $N_2H_4$ ,  $N_2H_3$  and  $NH$ , as a function of temperature. Fig. 1a indicates that  $N_2H_4$  desorption takes place at around 213 K, similarly to the desorption peak on a Rh foil surface.<sup>55</sup> As Fig. 2b shows,  $N_2H_4$  disappears completely from the surface at around 220 K by desorbing or converting to species such as  $N_2H_3$  and  $NH_3$ , which

Table 2 Calculated sticking coefficients ( $S_0$ ) of  $N_2H_4$ ,  $NH_3$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $H_2$  adsorption on the Cu(111) surface at 300 and 650 K. Note that “\*” and (X\*) indicate a free site and the adsorbed species on the surface, respectively

Reactions	$S_0$ this work,	$S_0$ this work,	$S_0$ other works
	300 K	650 K	
R0 $N_2H_4 \text{ p}^*/N_2H_4^*$	$1.17 \cdot 10^6$	$6.96 \cdot 10^8$	—
R3 $NH_3 \text{ p}^*/NH_3^*$	$1.88 \cdot 10^4$	$7.38 \cdot 10^6$	#2 $10^4$ , 300–500 K (ref. 52)
R5 $N_2 \text{ p}^*/N_2^*$	$5.5 \cdot 10^5$	$1.2 \cdot 10^5$	$1.0 \cdot 10^6$ to $1.0 \cdot 10^7$ , 500 K (ref. 53)
R7 $H_2 +^*/2H^*$	$2.36 \cdot 10^2$	$5.03 \cdot 10^3$	$1.0 \cdot 10^5$ to $5.0 \cdot 10^2$ , 190 K (ref. 54)






Fig. 1 Simulated TPR spectra for  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$ , and  $\text{H}_2$  desorption from the Cu(111) surface, starting from adsorbed  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  at different initial coverages at a reaction time of 1 s with a  $1 \text{ K min}^{-1}$  heating rate.

desorb quickly from the surface ( $k_2 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).  $\text{NH}_3$  starts to desorb at around 190 K which agrees well with the results of the thermal desorption spectroscopy (TDS) study of  $\text{NH}_3$  adsorption on Cu(100), where it desorbs at 185 K.<sup>56</sup> The high amount of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  on the surface between 200–300 K (Fig. 2b) and  $\text{NH}_3$  desorbed from the surface, i.e. the first peak of the  $\text{NH}_3$  TPR at 211 K (Fig. 1b), indicate that an inter-molecular dehydrogenation mechanism is taking place.  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  produces  $\text{NH}_2$  from N–N decoupling (R38), which, at this low temperature, is feasible from kinetic and thermodynamic points of view. This reaction is the most favoured step in the temperature range of 200–265 K, where the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  coverage increases.




Fig. 2 (a) The partial pressure of desorbed  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  gases and (b) surface coverage of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  and  $\text{NH}$  as a function of temperature with an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  full coverage in the TPR simulation at a reaction time of 1 s with a  $1 \text{ K min}^{-1}$  heating rate.

However, at higher temperatures, the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  coverage decreases by reacting with  $\text{NH}_2$  intermediates, losing hydrogen atoms (R40, R42, R44, R46 and R48) and resulting in the formation of other species, i.e. the  $\text{NH}_3$  peak at 284 K (Fig. 1b).

The  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  have three desorption peaks, two smaller peaks at around 219 and 440 K and a maximum desorption peak at 284 K. The  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  desorption peaks at 219 K are due to the recombination of H and N ad-atoms on the surface, produced by the decomposition of intermediates. The produced  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  desorb from the surface due to the small desorption energies of 0.11 and 0.45 eV, respectively, which are in agreement with measurements on single crystals and polycrystalline Cu, where the heat of adsorption of  $\text{N}_2$  on Cu(110) was determined to be 0.088 eV using helium scattering,<sup>57</sup> while the adsorption energy of  $\text{H}_2$  lies between 0.39 and 0.48 eV on various forms of unsupported Cu.<sup>54,58-64</sup> The maximum  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  desorption peaks at around 284 K, which appear at the same temperature as the second  $\text{NH}_3$  desorption peak, are due to reactions of inter-molecular dehydrogenation, resulting in the production of NNH. This leads to the reaction between NNH and  $\text{NH}_2$  (R48), as well as NNH decomposition (R18). The smaller peaks at higher temperatures correspond to the recombination of atomic H and N following the decomposition reactions of NH to N and H on the surface (R34). NH is stable on the surface until 450 K, as shown in Fig. 2b, in line with other studies of hydrazine dissociation on Ni<sup>65</sup> and Rh.<sup>66</sup>

Fig. 3 shows the spectra of the gases produced during the TPR, at an initial condition of full coverage of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ , for a temperature range from 100 to 600 K and with three heating rates of 1, 5 and 8 K  $\text{min}^{-1}$ . As the heating rate increases, so does the temperature at which the desorption rate is at its maximum (peak




Fig. 3 Simulated TPR curves for  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  desorption from the Cu(111) surface, starting from an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  coverage of 1 ML (full coverage) at a reaction time of 1 s for different heating rates.

temperature), whereas the intensity of the peak increases as well, in agreement with an experimental TPR study of hydrazine decomposition on an  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ -sup-ported Ir catalyst.<sup>67</sup> These changes in peak temperature and intensity are related to a sudden variation of the pressures and the derivative slope. The higher the heating rate, the more abrupt are the changes in pressure and the higher the slope

of  $\frac{dP}{dT}$ . Note that the abrupt desorption of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  reduces the time for further

reaction on the surface to produce  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$ , indicating that a slower heating rate helps to increase the yield of  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$ , Fig. 4.

The composition of the exhaled gas resulting from the hydrazine interaction with the Cu(111) surface at different temperatures is given in Table 3 and is in agreement with the experimental report by Al-Haydari et al.<sup>9</sup>  $\text{NH}_3$  is the main gaseous product of hydrazine decomposition, whereas  $\text{H}_2$  is the least present. According to the experiment, the temperature at which hydrazine starts to decompose is 303 K when  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and some  $\text{H}_2$  desorb from the Cu lm.<sup>9</sup> In our simulation, as shown in Fig. 3, hydrazine starts to decompose at 190 K, when the rst  $\text{NH}_3$  can be observed, while  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  desorb at a higher temperature of 219 K. This discrepancy between the experiment and simulation may be due to the adsorption of gases into the liquid hydrazine, as well as the use of a Cu lm without a well-de ned Cu structure, which may include defects. Our previous works have shown that the introduction of defects on the surface provides more favourable sites for stronger hydrazine adsorption, resulting in higher temperatures for decomposition and desorption.<sup>34,35</sup> Moreover, the heating rate and the reaction time of the experimental study were not reported.




Fig. 4  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  evolution from Cu(111) surface as a function of temperature for an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  coverage of 1 ML (full coverage) in the TPR simulation at a reaction time of 1 s for different heating rates.

Table 3 Percentage composition of gaseous products throughout hydrazine decomposition on the Cu(111) surface from the initial N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> full coverage in the TPR simulation at a reaction time of 1 s with a 1 K min<sup>-1</sup> heating rate at different temperatures, in comparison with experimental reports<sup>9</sup>

T (K)	NH <sub>3</sub> (%)		N <sub>2</sub> (%)		H <sub>2</sub> (%)	
	This work	Ref. 9	This work	Ref. 9	This work	Ref. 9
303	77.28	75.60	15.33	18.75	7.38	5.62
333	77.28	72.63	15.34	22.93	7.39	4.58
363	77.23	69.49	15.36	27.23	7.41	3.25
393	75.25	69.56	16.37	27.34	8.38	3.10

### 3.2. Batch reactor simulation

The micro-kinetic simulation of a batch reactor, discussed in this section, considers all elementary steps in Table 1 and starts from a situation where the naked Cu surface is exposed to N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> gas. We have carried out the micro-kinetic simulations of hydrazine decomposition at a small initial N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> pressure of 6 Pa in




Fig. 5 N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> evolution from the Cu(111) surface as a function of temperature and time for an initial N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> pressure of 6 Pa with a 1 K min<sup>-1</sup> heating rate in the batch reactor simulation.

the temperature range of 100–800 K. The corresponding differential equations are listed in the ESI.†

We have represented the pressure of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  as a function of the temperature and the reaction time in 3D plots (Fig. 5). They show that at 100 K  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  reaches full coverage of the exposed surface. The decomposition of the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  molecules on the surface starts at around 200 K and the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  molecules still in the gas phase can occupy the resulting empty sites on the surface.  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure reaches an equilibrium state at around 300 K, when its pressure decreases below 0.1 Pa. The  $\text{NH}_3$  starts to desorb from the Cu(111) surface at around 200 K, while  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  appear in the gas phase at the higher temperature of 220 K.  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{N}_2$  desorption reach equilibrium at around 300 K, with pressures of 7.5 and 2.1 Pa respectively, and any increase in the temperature does not further affect their desorption. The  $\text{H}_2$  pressure increases with increasing temperature up to 300 K (0.38 Pa), and then decreases to 0.33 Pa at 370 K, due to the adsorption and reaction with N ad-atoms producing  $\text{NH}_3$ .

To understand the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  overall decomposition mechanisms, the coverage of some prominent intermediates is plotted in Fig. 6 showing how the coverages of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$ , H and NH change with temperature at 1 s after the surface was covered fully with adsorbed  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ .

The observed trends for the coverages of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  and NH in the batch reactor simulation are the same as those in the TPR simulation, although the coverages of the species are different owing to the adsorption of species on the surface. The hydrazine N–N decoupling (R20) is again the most preferred reaction mechanism among the ones studied due to a relatively low energy barrier. The produced  $\text{NH}_2$  intermediate subtracts one of the hydrogens of a co-adsorbed hydrazine molecule, resulting in the production of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  molecules on the Cu(111) surface (R38), which is an exothermic reaction ( $E_r$  ¼ 0.36 eV) with a relatively low energy barrier of 0.42 eV. Fig. 6a shows that as soon as the coverage of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  molecules on the surface starts to decrease, the coverage of the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  intermediate increases until all  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  is converted to  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  and  $\text{NH}_3$  at 230 K, when almost the entire surface is covered with  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  and some  $\text{NH}_3$  molecules. The coverage of  $\text{NH}_3$ , Fig. 6b, decreases quickly when the temperature reaches 215 K due to a relatively small desorption energy of 0.78 eV, which compares well with the experimental desorption energy on Cu(001) of 0.72–0.07 eV.<sup>56</sup>  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  is stable




Fig. 6 The surface coverage of (a)  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$ , (b)  $\text{NH}_3$ , H and NH as a function of temperature with an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure of 6 Pa, in the batch reactor simulation at a reaction time of 1 s with a  $1 \text{ K min}^{-1}$  heating rate.

on the surface in the temperature range of 190–265 K and  $\text{NH}_3$  has obtained enough energy to desorb from the surface. The  $\text{NH}_2$  present on the surface, obtained from the  $\text{H}_2\text{N}-\text{NH}_2$  bond breaking, reacts with  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  (R40 and R42) in an intermolecular dehydrogenation mechanism, causing a decrease in the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  coverage at around 230 K and also leading to other species on the surface.

The existence of H atoms on the surface in the temperature range of 200–350 K (Fig. 6b) indicates the dehydrogenation of adsorbed species with energy barriers higher than 1.2 eV (R8, R10, R12, R14 and R16). The production of NH from the dehydrogenation of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{NH}_2$  on the surface (R30 and R32) takes place at temperatures higher than 270 K, because of an even higher energy barrier of 1.40 eV, which results in the observed NH peak in Fig. 6b centred at 315 K. From here, the NH coverage starts to decrease via decomposition to N and H atoms on the surface (R34), with an energy barrier of 1.79 eV. The fact that NH is stable in the temperature range of 270–370 K is in line with the experimental work by Gland et al., where they showed that NH is stable during hydrazine decomposition until 365 K on Ni(111)<sup>65</sup> as well as on Ru,<sup>68</sup> Rh,<sup>66,69</sup> Ir,<sup>70</sup> W,<sup>71</sup> and Mo<sup>72</sup> surfaces.

The associative desorption of hydrogen, produced by dehydrogenation, results in the peak centred at 300 K, shown in Fig. 5. The highly endothermic reaction between  $\text{N}_2$  and H on the surface (R19), with an energy barrier of 1.79 eV, could only occur at high temperatures, and leads to a decrease of  $\text{H}_2$  pressure at around 300 K, shown in Fig. 5, due to dissociative adsorption of  $\text{H}_2$  in order to provide enough H atoms on the surface.

We have also examined the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion and  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities at a fixed temperature of 350 K as a function of the initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure, varied from  $10^{-6}$  to 100 Pa, shown in Fig. 7a. The system reaches the highest  $\text{NH}_3$  selectivity of 81.9% for an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure of 0.1 Pa, the  $\text{N}_2$  selectivity reaches its maximum (36.3%) at  $P_{\text{N}_2\text{H}_4} = 1/10$  Pa, and the maximum  $\text{H}_2$  selectivity (5.4%) occurs for an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure of 0.001 Pa.  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion is complete for  $P_{\text{N}_2\text{H}_4} \geq 10$  Pa.

Fig. 7b plots the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion and  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities with temperature. The  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion reaches its maximum at 330 K (98.5%), while  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities converge to 64.5%, 35.1% and 2.6%, respectively, at 265 K.




Fig. 7  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion and  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities as a function of (a) initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure at 350 K, (b) temperature with an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure of 6 Pa in the batch reactor simulation at a reaction time of 1 s with a  $1 \text{ K min}^{-1}$  heating rate.

## 4. Conclusions

A micro-kinetic model based on results from density functional theory calculations was established, taking into account adsorption, desorption and reaction processes of reactants, intermediates and products, involved in the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  decomposition on the Cu(111) surface. Two simulation models have been considered; the first model started from a situation of pre-adsorbed  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  and considered the constant removal of gases from the reactor, i.e. simulating TPR spectra. In the second model, we have considered the naked Cu(111) surface in contact with  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$ , where all the gaseous products from the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  decomposition are allowed to adsorb and desorb freely until the system reaches equilibrium in the batch reactor. The simulated TPR shows gas desorption peaks depending on the heating rate and the initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  coverage. The simulations of the batch reactor show  $\text{NH}_3$  being the major gaseous product on the extended surfaces, in agreement with experiments. The representation of the coverages of the intermediates with temperature shows that  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  and  $\text{NH}$  are the most stable intermediates on the surface during  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  decomposition in the 190–265 and 270–370 K temperature ranges, respectively. Temperature and initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressures affect the  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  conversion and the  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities. The highest  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities obtained in the simulation at 350 K are 81.9%, 36.3% and 5.4%, respectively, while an initial  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  pressure of 6 Pa gives a conversion of 98.5% at 330 K with  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2$  selectivities of 64.5%, 35.1% and 2.6%, respectively. These results show that Cu(111) is not suitable for hydrogen production from hydrazine, as the dominant product is ammonia. It is known, however, that low coordinated metals are more active and may stabilise intermediates favouring the  $\text{NH}_3$  decomposition pathway and therefore increase the production of  $\text{H}_2$ . Future studies of  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_4$  decomposition processes on surfaces such as the (001) and (011), and on common defects, e.g. steps, will provide a general picture of the feasible production of  $\text{H}_2$  from a cheap compound such as  $\text{N}_2\text{H}_3$  on an abundant Cu catalyst. This study, whose findings are in line with available experiments, validates the proposed mechanisms and shows that micro-kinetic simulations are an effective tool to predict yields and selectivities from DFT results under a wide range of temperature and pressure conditions. This method can now be further rolled out to alternative systems, including metal and non-metal systems.

## Acknowledgements

S. S. T acknowledges University College London and the UCL Industrial Doctorate Centre in Molecular Modelling and Material Science for an Overseas Research Scholarship. N. H. d. L. acknowledges the Royal Society for an Industry Fellowship and A. R. is grateful to the Ramsay Memorial Trust and University College London for the award of a Ramsay Fellowship. Via our membership of the UK's HPC Materials Chemistry Consortium, which is funded by EPSRC (EP/L000202), this work made use of the facilities of HECToR and ARCHER, the UK's national high-performance computing service, which is funded by the Office of Science and Technology through EPSRC's High End Computing Programme, as well as the UCL Legion High Performance Computing facility (Legion@UCL), and associated support services.

## References

- 1 M. Y. Zheng, R. H. Cheng, X. W. Chen, N. Li, L. Li, X. D. Wang and T. Zhang, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2005, **30**, 1081–1089.
- 2 E. W. Schmidt, *Hydrazine and Its Derivatives: Preparation, Properties, Applications*, Wiley, New York, 2nd edn, 2001.
- 3 S. G. Pakdehi, M. Salimi and M. Rasoolzadeh, *Researches and Applications in Mechanical Engineering*, 2014, **3**, 21–25.
- 4 J. Block and G. Schulzek, *J. Catal.*, 1973, **30**, 327–329.
- 5 M. Grunze, *Surf. Sci.*, 1979, **81**, 603–625.
- 6 S. Mary, C. Kappenstein, S. Balcon, S. Rossignol and E. Gengembre, *Appl. Catal., A*, 1999, **182**, 317–325.
- 7 S. Balcon, S. Mary, C. Kappenstein and E. Gengembre, *Appl. Catal., A*, 2000, **196**, 179–190.
- 8 J. P. Contour and G. Pannetie, *J. Catal.*, 1972, **24**, 434–445.
- 9 Y. K. Alhaydari, J. M. Saleh and M. H. Matloob, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1985, **89**, 3286–3290.
- 10 A. Haryanto, S. Fernando, N. Murali and S. Adhikari, *Energy Fuels*, 2005, **19**, 2098–2106.
- 11 P. Stoltze, *Phys. Scr.*, 1987, **36**, 824–864.
- 12 K. Honkala, A. Hellman, I. N. Remediakis, A. Logadottir, A. Carlsson, S. Dahl, C. H. Christensen and J. K. Nørskov, *Science*, 2005, **307**, 555–558.
- 13 A. Hellman, K. Honkala, I. N. Remediakis, A. Logadottir, A. Carlsson, S. Dahl, C. H. Christensen and J. K. Nørskov, *Surf. Sci.*, 2006, **600**, 4264–4268.
- 14 A. Hellman, K. Honkala, I. N. Remediakis, A. Logadottir, A. Carlsson, S. Dahl, C. H. Christensen and J. K. Nørskov, *Surf. Sci.*, 2009, **603**, 1731–1739.
- 15 C. C. Wang, J. Y. Wu, T. L. M. Pham and J. C. Jiang, *ACS Catal.*, 2014, **4**, 639–648.
- 16 G. Novell-Leruth, J. M. Ricart and J. Perez-Ramirez, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2008, **112**, 13554–13562.
- 17 K. Rasim, M. Bobeth, W. Pompe and N. Seriani, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.*, 2010, **325**, 15–24.
- 18 T. S. Askgaard, J. K. Nørskov, C. V. Ovesen and P. Stoltze, *J. Catal.*, 1995, **156**, 229–242.
- 19 J. Greeley and M. Mavrikakis, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2004, **126**, 3910–3919.
- 20 S. Kandoi, J. Greeley, M. A. Sanchez-Castillo, S. T. Evans, A. A. Gokhale, J. A. Dumesic and M. Mavrikakis, *Top. Catal.*, 2006, **37**, 17–28.
- 21 A. A. Gokhale, S. Kandoi, J. P. Greeley, M. Mavrikakis and J. A. Dumesic, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 2004, **59**, 4679–4691.
- 22 C. Stegelmann, N. C. Schiodt, C. T. Campbell and P. Stoltze, *J. Catal.*, 2004, **221**, 630–649.
- 23 A. A. Gokhale, J. A. Dumesic and M. Mavrikakis, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 1402–1414.
- 24 L. C. Grabow, A. A. Gokhale, S. T. Evans, J. A. Dumesic and M. Mavrikakis, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2008, **112**, 4608–4617.
- 25 R. J. Madon, D. Braden, S. Kandoi, P. Nagel, M. Mavrikakis and J. A. Dumesic, *J. Catal.*, 2011, **281**, 1–11.



- 26 A. Roldán, G. Novell, J. M. Ricart and F. Illas, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2010, **114**, 5101–5106.
- 27 N. Y. Dzade, A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **139**, 124708–124708.
- 28 S. S. Tafreshi, A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **17**, 21533–21546.
- 29 H. Eyring, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1935, **3**, 107–115.
- 30 M. G. Evans and M. Polanyi, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1935, **31**, 0875–0893.  
32 J. Pineda and S. D. Schwartz, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 2006, **361**, 1433–1438.
- 31 D. S. Sholl and J. A. Steckel, *Density functional theory: a practical introduction*, Wiley, Hoboken, N.J., 2009.
- 33 E. V. Anslyn and D. A. Dougherty, *Transition State Theory and Related Topics, Modern Physical Organic Chemistry*, University Science Books, 2006.
- 34 S. S. Tafreshi, A. Roldan, N. Y. Dzade and N. H. de Leeuw, *Surf. Sci.*, 2014, **622**, 1–8.
- 35 S. S. Tafreshi, A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2014, **118**, 26103–26114.
- 36 S. S. Tafreshi, A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *Surf. Sci.*, 2015, **637–638**, 140–148.
- 37 G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1996, **54**, 11169–11186.
- 38 G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, *Comput. Mater. Sci.*, 1996, **6**, 15–50.
- 39 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1993, **47**, 558–561.  
42 G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1999, **59**, 1758–1775.
- 40 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1994, **49**, 14251–14269.
- 41 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- 43 P. E. Blochl, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1994, **50**, 17953–17979.
- 44 S. Grimme, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2006, **27**, 1787–1799.  
117, 3949–3957.
- 45 S. Irrera, A. Roldan, G. Portalone and N. H. De Leeuw, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2013,
- 46 H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1976, **13**, 5188–5192.
- 47 R. Koitz, A. P. Seitsonen, M. Iannuzzi and J. Hutter, *Nanoscale*, 2013, **5**, 5589–5595.
- 48 M. Gajdos and J. Hafner, *Surf. Sci.*, 2005, **590**, 117–126.
- 49 G. Mills and H. Jonsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1994, **72**, 1124–1127.
- 50 G. Mills, H. Jonsson and G. K. Schenter, *Surf. Sci.*, 1995, **324**, 305–337.
- 51 A. Heyden, A. T. Bell and F. J. Keil, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **123**, 224101–224115.
- 52 L. R. Danielson, M. J. Dresser, E. E. Donaldson and J. T. Dickinson, *Surf. Sci.*, 1978, **71**, 599–614.
- 53 F. Bozso, G. Ertl, M. Grunze and M. Weiss, *J. Catal.*, 1977, **49**, 18–41.
- 54 G. Anger, A. Winkler and K. D. Rendulic, *Surf. Sci.*, 1989, **220**, 1–17.
- 55 J. Prasad and J. L. Gland, *Langmuir*, 1991, **7**, 722–726.
- 56 I. Hussla, H. Seki, T. J. Chuang, Z. W. Gortel, H. J. Kreuzer and P. Piercy, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1985, **32**, 3489–3501.
- 57 A. Marmier, C. Ramseyer, P. N. M. Hoang, C. Girardet, J. Goerge, P. Zeppenfeld, M. Buchel, R. David and G. Comsa, *Surf. Sci.*, 1997, **383**, 321–339.
- 58 M. J. Sandoval and A. T. Bell, *J. Catal.*, 1993, **144**, 227–237.
- 59 P. B. Rasmussen, P. M. Holmblad, H. Christoffersen, P. A. Taylor and I. Chorkendorff, *Surf. Sci.*, 1993, **287**, 79–83.
- 60 J. M. Campbell and C. T. Campbell, *Surf. Sci.*, 1991, **259**, 1–17.

07/06/2001 09:28:58  
7

on

- 61 C. T. Rettner, D. J. Auerbach and H. A. Michelsen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1992, **68**, 2547–2550.
- 62 B. E. Hayden, D. Lackey and J. Schott, *Surf. Sci.*, 1990, **239**, 119–126.
- 63 C. Astaldi, A. Bianco, S. Modesti and E. Tosatti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1992, **68**, 90–93.
- 64 J. Harris, *Surf. Sci.*, 1989, **221**, 335–345.
- 65 J. L. Gland, G. B. Fisher and G. E. Mitchell, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1985, **119**, 89–92.
- 66 J. Prasad and J. L. Gland, *Langmuir*, 1991, **7**, 722–726.
- 67 J. L. Falconer and H. Wise, *J. Catal.*, 1976, **43**, 220–233.  
70 B. J. Wood and H. Wise, *J. Catal.*, 1975, **39**, 471–480.
- 68 H. Rauscher, K. L. Kostov and D. Menzel, *Chem. Phys.*, 1993, **177**, 473–496.
- 69 W. M. Daniel and J. M. White, *Surf. Sci.*, 1986, **171**, 289–302.
  
- 71 R. C. Cosser and F. C. Tompkins, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1971, **67**, 526–544.
- 72 R. C. A. Contaminard and F. C. Tompkins, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1971, **67**, 545–555.