

PCCP

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Electrocatalytic Oxygen Reduction Kinetics on Fe-center of Nitrogen-doped Graphene

Jing Sun^a, Ya-Hui Fang^{a,b} and Zhi-Pan Liu^{a*}

^aShanghai Key Laboratory of Molecular Catalysis and Innovative Materials, Key Laboratory of Computational Physical Science (Ministry of Education), Department of Chemistry, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China

^bSchool of Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Shanghai Institute of Technology, Shanghai 201418, China

*E-mail address: zpliu@fudan.edu.cn (Z.-P. Liu).

Abstract

The Fe/N/C catalysts emerged recently as a representative class of non-Pt catalysts for oxygen electrocatalytic reduction, which could have a competitive catalytic performance as Pt. However, the nature of the catalyst remains elusive, especially on the active site structure and the electrocatalytic kinetics. Here we examine two kinds of Fe/N active sites for Fe/N/C catalysts, namely, the four-coordinated FeN₄ and the five-coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ centers embedded in graphene layer. By using large-scale first principles calculations with periodic continuum solvation model based on Modified-Poisson-Boltzmann equation (CM-MPB), we identify the four (4e) and two electron (2e) oxygen reduction pathways under acidic conditions. We find that both 4e and 2e pathways involves the formation of OOH intermediate, which breaks its O-OH bond in the 4e pathway but is reduced to H₂O₂ in the 2e pathway. We show that at 0.8 V vs. SHE, the 4e pathway is preferred at both FeN₄ and Fe(CN)N₄ centers, but the 2e pathway is kinetically also likely on the Fe(CN)N₄ center. The O-OH bond breaking of OOH is the key kinetics step, which has similar free energy barrier as the OH reduction on the FeN₄ center, and is the rate-determining step on the Fe(CN)N₄ center. Due to the high adsorption energy of Fe towards the fifth ligand, such as OH and CN,

we expect that the active site of the real Fe/N/C catalyst is the five coordinated Fe center. We found that the barrier of the O-OH bond breaking step is not sensitive to potential and a Tafel slop of 60 mV is predicted for the ORR on the Fe(CN)N₄ center, which is consistent with the observation in the experiments.

1. Introduction

Oxygen reduction reaction (ORR, $\text{O}_2 + 4\text{H}^+ + 4\text{e}^- \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) is a key electrocatalytic reaction for fuel cell applications, which converts O₂ to water using proton and electrons at cathode. To date, the most widely used catalysts for ORR are still the high cost Pt and Pt-based alloys¹⁻³ and great efforts have been devoted to search for non-Pt catalysts aiming to overcome the high overpotential and the long-term stability problems of traditional catalysts. Since Jasinski and the coworkers found that metal phthalocyanine featuring with metal-N₄ center is able to catalyze ORR under acid conditions⁴, recent years have seen encouraging progress to immobilize the metal-N complex (mainly Fe-N⁵⁻⁸) and also to improve the catalytic performance. For example, such active catalysts can be synthesized by simply heating common nitrogen containing chemicals, Fe inorganic salts and carbon black.⁹⁻¹¹ Due to the complex nature of the catalysts, the atomic structure of the active site and the catalytic mechanism of these metal/N/C catalysts remain largely elusive.

Because the Fe macrocycles such as porphyrin and phthalocyanine are catalytically active for the ORR¹²⁻¹⁷, the basic structural motif, i.e. Fe-N₄, has been regarded to be the active center in the heterogeneous environment as well. The presence of Metal-N₄ such as FeN₄, CoN₄ moiety was indeed detected by various experimental techniques.¹⁸⁻²³ For example, Dodelet et al. using Time of Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry detected FeN₄ species in the catalyst prepared using Fe acetate, Fe porphyrin and NH₃ as the precursor.^{24, 25} Koslowski related the current density of ORR to the amount of in-plane FeN₄ centers using Mössbauer spectra and a linear correlation was identified.¹⁸ Thermodynamics analysis using first principles calculations also indicated that the FeN₄ embedded in graphene could be

active for ORR.^{26, 27} On the other hand, newly emerged evidences suggest that the Metal-N₄ might not be exactly the active site: the chemical environment around this center could also affect significantly the ORR activity. It was demonstrated that the presence of the porosity in the pristine carbon black during the pyrolysis (e.g. using disordered carbon) is important for achieving high catalytic activity^{28, 29}. This implies that the active site forms at/near the micropores of the nitrogenized graphite. Instead of the four-coordinated Fe center, the five-coordinated Fe center was also suggested by Jain et al.,³⁰ the structure of which mimics the Fe-porphyrin complex in biological systems for O₂ activation^{31, 32}.

In this work, we aim to understand the mechanism and the kinetics of the Fe center catalyzed ORR on the nitrogen-doped graphite by using first principles calculations. Two different models for the Fe center, namely, a four-coordinated FeN₄ center and a five coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ center on graphene have been considered as the possible active sites. The CN ligand is chosen as the fifth ligand because the CN ions has been well detected in the synthesis of Fe/N/C catalysts at high temperature⁹. The structures of these two models are as shown in Figure 1.

2. Calculation methods and Models

All DFT calculations were performed using the SIESTA package with numerical atomic orbital basis sets and Troullier-Martins norm conserving pseudopotentials.³³⁻³⁵ The exchange-correlation functional utilized was at the generalized gradient approximation level, known as GGA-PBE.³⁶ A double- ξ plus polarization basis (DZP) set was employed. The orbital-confining cutoff was determined from an energy shift of 0.010eV. The energy cutoff for the real space grid used to represent the density was set as 250 Ry. The Quasi-Newton Broyden method was employed for geometry relaxation until the maximal forces on each relaxed atom were less than 0.1 eV/Å. To correct the zero-point energy (ZPE), the vibrational frequency calculations were performed via the finite-difference approach. Transition states (TSs) of the catalytic reaction were located using the Constrained-Broyden based methods developed

recently in the group and were verified using the vibrational frequency calculation.^{37, 38}. The convergence of the key results with respect to the force criterion have been checked by reducing the criterion to be as low as 0.02 eV/Å, and the calculated adsorption energy (e.g. O₂ adsorption) and the barrier (e.g. O₂H* dissociation) are found to be different by less than 0.05 eV.

The solid/liquid interface is modeled using the periodic continuum solvation model based on the modified Poisson-Boltzmann equation (CM-MPB), which can take into account the long-range electrostatic interaction due to solvation. The short-range solvation effect has been considered by adding the explicit water molecules as the first solvation shell. The periodic DFT/CM-MPB method has been utilized in our previous work on electro-/photocatalysis, where the detail of the implementation of the method is described.^{39,40}

To derive the free energy reaction profile, we first obtain the reaction energy of each step (strictly speaking, Helmholtz free energy change (ΔF) at 0 K, 0 bar) that is directly available from DFT total energy (ΔE) after the ZPE correction. For elementary surface reactions without involving the adsorption/desorption of gaseous or liquid molecules, ΔF at 0 K, 0 bar is a good approximation to the Gibbs free energy (ΔG) as the temperature T and pressure p contributions at the solid phase are small. To compute the free energy change ΔG of elementary reactions involving gaseous or liquid molecules, such as oxygen, hydrogen, and water, the large entropy term at 298 K is essential to take into account. We utilize the standard thermodynamic data⁴¹ to obtain the temperature and pressure contributions for the G of the aqueous H₂O and gaseous H₂, which are -0.57 eV (the entropy contribution is -0.22 eV in solution) and -0.31 eV compared to the total energy of the corresponding free molecule (E , 0 K), respectively.⁴² The G of O₂ is derived as $G[\text{O}_2]=4.92(\text{eV})+2G[\text{H}_2\text{O}]-2G[\text{H}_2]$ by utilizing OER equilibrium at the standard conditions; the G of H₂O₂ is derived similarly considering that the H₂O₂/O₂ standard equilibrium potential is 0.682 V vs. SHE. For reactions involving the release of proton and electron, the reaction energy can be computed by referencing to the normal hydrogen electrode (SHE) in a manner proposed by the groups of Bockris⁴³ and Nørskov.⁴⁴ This is governed by

$G_{\text{proton+electron}}=G(1/2\text{H}_2)-neU$, where e presents the transfer electron, n means the number of electrons, and U is the electrochemical potential vs SHE. The other detail for computing the reaction kinetics of ORR under electrochemical conditions is as described in our previous work for ORR on Pt surfaces.⁴⁵

To study the ORR mechanism on the Fe/N/C catalysts, here we propose two possible types of active centers, namely, the four coordinated planar FeN_4 center (pyridine-like structure for each N), and the five-coordinated square-pyramidal $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$, as shown in Figure 1. The planar FeN_4 is embedded in the graphene plane, which can be considered by substituting six C atoms of the graphene by one Fe and four N atoms. It should be mentioned that the exact structure of the active site for ORR in Fe/N/C catalysts is not known. Due to the high temperature condition in the synthesis (e.g. typically 900°C ⁴⁶), HCN and CN ions has been detected in experiment by reacting NH_3 with carbon⁴⁷ and it is thus possible that the CN ion²¹ acts as a ligand coordinated to the FeN_4 center. It should be emphasized that the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ center cannot be hold inside the graphite due to the large steric repulsion between the CN group and the neighboring layer of the graphite, but it may well be present at/near the micropores in real catalysts.

The FeN_4 and the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ catalyst are modelled by embedding the active center in a graphene sheet with each unit cell containing 58 carbon atoms and a FeN_4 or $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ center. The unit cell utilized in this work is 17.04×9.84 Å with the vacuum region large than 30 Å. In this theoretical model, the Fe concentration is about 7 wt%, higher than that in the Fe/N/C catalysts reported in experiment with the best performance, e.g. from 0.02 wt% to 2 wt%²¹, but lower than that in the porphyrin molecule (15.38 wt.%) that is known to be active for ORR in solution. The low Fe concentration of the Fe/N/C catalysts in experiment could be due to the difficulty of dispersing/incorporating single Fe ions into the graphite layers. Experimentally, the Fe concentration as the active site is limited by the microporous surface area, which is equivalent to Fe loading of ~ 1 wt%.¹⁰







Figure 1. Two possible active sites embedded in the graphene sheet modeled in the work. **Left:** the four-coordinated planar FeN₄ center; **Right:** the five-coordinate square-pyramidal Fe(CN)N₄ center. The grey, blue and purple balls represent C, N and Fe, respectively.

3. Results and discussion

For ORR on Fe/N/C catalyst at the acidic condition, the number of electron transfer measured with Koutecky–Levich experiment is generally less than 4⁴⁸, indicating that both 4e and 2e reduction occur simultaneously in ORR. It was believed that the 4e reduction involves sequentially the O₂*, OOH*, OH* and O* intermediates^{23, 26, 27} (* indicates the adsorbed species) as every elementary step of the reaction is exothermic at 0 V vs. SHE as shown by thermodynamics calculations²³. For the 2e reduction, it could involve OOH* and HOOH* intermediates (without O-O bond breaking) and H₂O₂ is as the final product.⁴⁹ The proposed mechanisms from literatures can be summarized as Eq. 1-8. Eq. 1-6 are the 4e reduction pathway and Eq. 7-8 are the 2e pathway. The OOH* intermediate appears in both pathways and thus is the key species determining the selectivity. The main purpose of the current work is to evaluate the potential-dependent reaction thermodynamics and kinetics of the 4e and 2e reduction pathways quantitatively on the graphene-embedded FeN₄ and Fe(CN)N₄ models in order to provide new insights into the working mechanism and the nature of the active site of the Fe/N/C catalyst.





3.1 Structure of the FeN center

The geometrical structure of the active sites has been first investigated in vacuum (without the applied electrochemical potential and the solvation). In the optimized structure for the FeN₄ embedded in the graphene sheet, the Fe is found to locate at the plane of graphene and the Fe-N bond distance is 1.875 Å. The result is consistent with the previous calculations (the Fe-N distance is around 1.87~1.89 Å^{27,50}). It is noticed that the Fe-N distance of the embedded FeN₄ is generally shorter compared to that in metalmacrocylic molecules with the FeN₄ center. e.g. the distance is 1.981 Å in Fe-porphyrin and 1.923 Å in Fe-phthalocyanine.⁵¹ From the electronic structure analysis, we found that the oxidation state of Fe is Fe(II) with two net spins in the 3d orbitals of Fe. For the five coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ center, the structure is similar with the Fe being still in the plane of graphene. The Fe-N distance is still 1.876 Å and the Fe-CN distance is 1.846 Å.

Next, we calculated the active site structures under electrochemical conditions using the DFT/CM-MPB method, where the solvation due to the aqueous solution and the surface charging due to the increase of potential are taken into account. Because the electrocatalytic ORR is sensitive to potential, we will focus on the 0.8 V vs. SHE condition, which is utilized practically for ORR. At 0.8 V vs. SHE, the Fe-N distance is calculated to be 1.895 Å for FeN₄ and 1.883 Å for Fe(CN)N₄, which are slightly lengthened compared to those calculated in vacuum. Obviously, the presence of the electrochemical conditions does not alter much the structure of the active site, implying the high stability of the central FeN₄ unit.




Figure 2. The free energy profiles for the 4e ORR pathway on the embedded FeN₄ (red) and Fe(CN)N₄ (blue) centers at 0.8 V vs. SHE. **1:** O₂*; **2:** OOH*; **3:** O*; **4:** OH*; **5:** H₂O*. The free energy zero is set as that of O₂ in the gas phase (ambient condition) and the clean surface. Selected intermediate structures on the FeN₄ are also shown (the states corresponding to Fe(CN)N₄ are similar). The grey, blue, purple, red and white balls represent C, N, Fe, O and H, respectively.

3.2 4e reduction pathway

By using the DFT/CM-MPB method, we have first investigated the reaction channels the 4e reduction pathway following Eq. 1-6. The free energy reaction profiles for ORR on the FeN₄ and Fe(CN)N₄ centers at 0.8 V vs. SHE have been determined, as shown in Figure 2 and the decomposed energetics in each step is listed in Table 1.

ORR initiates by molecular O₂ adsorption on the central Fe metal (state **1**, see Figure 2). The adsorption of O₂ on the nearby carbon and nitrogen atom sites is very weak and is thus unlikely. For the O₂ adsorption on Fe, two possible O₂ configurations were examined, namely, the end-on and the side-on configurations⁵². The end-on configuration has only one oxygen atom directly bonded with the Fe with the O-O

axis tilted away from the Fe-N plane, while the side-on configuration have both O atoms bonded with the Fe with the O-O axis in parallel with the Fe-N plane. We found that on both FeN₄ and Fe(CN)N₄ catalysts, the end-on configuration is preferred energetically, which is different from O₂ adsorption on Pt surface where the side-on configuration is generally preferred⁴⁵. The O₂ adsorption free energy is 0.68 eV on the FeN₄, and drops to 0.28 eV on the Fe(CN)N₄ (see Table 1). Our Mulliken charge analysis showed that the adsorbed O₂ on both Fe centers accumulates electron to form superoxo O₂ ion, also evident from the lengthened O-O distance (1.28 Å) compared to the gas phase O₂ molecule. The charge depletion occurs not only at the Fe center, but also at the nearby carbon sites of the graphene, indicating the transfer of the Fermi electron of the graphene to the antibonding states of O₂ molecule.

Table 1. The free energy (ΔG) change of the elementary steps involved in the 4e reduction on the embedded FeN₄ (red) and Fe(CN)N₄ centers. All energies are in eV.

elementary steps	ΔE	$\Delta H(0 \rightarrow 298K)$	ZPE	-TS	- e U	ΔG
FeN₄ at 0.8V						
O ₂ → O ₂ *	-1.33	-0.09	0.10	0.64	0.00	-0.68
O ₂ * + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → OOH*	-1.02	-0.05	0.22	0.20	0.80	0.15
OOH* → [O--OH]*(TS)	0.11	0.00	-0.07	0.15	0.00	0.19
OOH* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → O* + H ₂ O	-1.51	0.06	-0.01	-0.47	0.80	-1.13
O* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → OH*	-1.58	-0.05	0.21	0.20	0.80	-0.42
OH* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → H ₂ O*	-1.01	-0.05	0.20	0.20	0.80	0.14
H ₂ O* → H ₂ O	1.02	0.10	-0.22	-0.67	0.00	0.23
Fe(CN)N₄ at 0.8V						
O ₂ → O ₂ *	-0.93	-0.09	0.10	0.64	0.00	-0.28
O ₂ * + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → OOH*	-1.03	-0.05	0.22	0.20	0.80	0.14
OOH* → [O--OH]*(TS)	0.19	0.00	-0.07	0.15	0.00	0.27
OOH* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → O* + H ₂ O	-1.36	0.06	-0.01	-0.47	0.80	-0.98
O* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → OH*	-1.43	-0.05	0.21	0.20	0.80	-0.27
OH* + H ⁺ + e ⁻ → H ₂ O*	-0.87	-0.05	0.20	0.20	0.80	-0.28
H ₂ O* → H ₂ O	0.84	0.10	-0.22	-0.67	0.00	0.05

We noted that the O₂ adsorption on the similar FeN₄ structures have been reported in the previous theoretical calculations. For example, on the iron phthalocyanine molecule, O₂ adsorbs with the end-on configuration and has the adsorption energy of 1.16 eV⁵³; on the FeN₄ embedded in the carbon nanotube (18, 0), the O₂ adsorption

energy is calculated to be 1.06 eV.²³ Considering that these calculations have different catalyst model from this work and generally did not include the solvation environment, the calculated adsorption energy on FeN₄ ($\Delta E=1.33$ eV including the solvation) here agree reasonably with the previous data. This also indicates that the electronic structure of the FeN₄ center at different chemical environment is quite similar (e.g. Fe²⁺).

The lower adsorption energy of O₂ on the Fe(CN)N₄ center is interesting, suggesting that the increased coordination of Fe will reduce the adsorption energy of O₂. Due to the strong coordination ability of the CN ligand (CN⁻), we found that the oxidation state of the center Fe in Fe(CN)N₄ is lifted to 3⁺ (Fe(III)). Compared to Fe(II), the Fe(III) has a low ability to donate electrons to the antibonding 2 π^* orbitals of O₂ and thus the bonding of Fe-O₂ is weakened, as also evident from the calculated Fe-O₂ distances: 1.871 Å in FeN₄ and 2.152 Å in Fe(CN)N₄.

The adsorbed O₂ can be facily hydrogenated at 0.8 V to the adsorbed OOH, O₂*+H⁺+e⁻→OOH*, once a solvated proton approaching to the adsorbed O₂, shown in Figure 2. This step is slightly uphill in the energy profile by ~0.15 eV on both catalysts and the calculated free energy barrier are also ~0.15 eV (after ZPE correction, see supporting information Figure S1 for the located IS, TS and FS structures). The O-O bond of OOH* is lengthened to 1.439 Å and 1.451 Å on the FeN₄ and Fe(CN)N₄ centers, respectively, which is already similar to that in the free H₂O₂ molecule (1.470 Å).

The key step in the 4e reduction pathway is the O-O bond breaking as written in Eq. 3, which occurs by breaking the O-O bond of the adsorbed OOH (state **2**). In this step, a solvated proton above the OOH helps to accept the dissociated OH. Overall, the reaction involves the coupled proton/electron transfer to form H₂O and the breaking of the O-O bond, OOH*+H⁺+e⁻→O*+H₂O. The located initial state (IS), the TS and the final state (FS) of this step on both Fe catalysts are depicted in Fig. 3. At the IS, the presence of solvated proton H₃O⁺(H₂O) helps to increase the O-O bond of OOH, 1.502 Å for FeN₄ and 1.488 Å for Fe(CN)N₄. At the TS, the O-O bond of OOH is further lengthened, 1.591 Å for FeN₄ and 1.819 Å for Fe(CN)N₄, and the leaving

OH group starts to evolve bonding with the H of the solvated proton. It is noticed that the solvated proton is still quite far away from the OH of the [O-OH] TS complex ($>1.5 \text{ \AA}$), indicating the weak interaction of the [O-OH] TS complex with the solvated proton. After the TS, the solvated proton quickly approaches to the OH that forms a H_2O molecule in the solution and leaves a terminal O on the Fe center. From Figure 2, it is clear that the TS of O-O bond breaking dictates the highest free energy position along the whole 4e reduction pathway and thus this reaction is a key kinetic step in the 4e reduction. The calculated free energy barrier is 0.34 eV on FeN_4 with respect to the adsorbed O_2 molecule (state **1**), which is 0.07 eV lower than that on $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$.




Figure 3. The IS, TS and FS structures of the O-O bond breaking step ($\text{OOH}^* + \text{H}^+ + \text{e}^- \rightarrow \text{O}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}$) on FeN_4 (top panel) and $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ (bottom panel). The labeled distances are in angstroms.

It should be emphasized that the O-O bond breaking mechanism for ORR on the FeN catalysts are different from those identified for ORR on extended Pt surfaces^{45,52}. On Pt surfaces, the O-O bond breaking follows either the O-O direct dissociation or the O-OH dissociation, involving at least two surface Pt atoms. In particular, the solvated proton is not required to act as a reactant to accept the O or OH after the O-O bond breaking. By contrast, the O-O bond breaking on the Fe centers follows only the O-OH dissociation and the solvated proton reacts with the dissociated OH to form

water. Obviously, the difference is due to the nature of the reaction sites: for the reaction on the Fe center, there is no extra metal site for the adsorption of the dissociated O or OH, unlike the reaction occurring on Pt surfaces. Indeed, for O₂ direct dissociation, we found that the dissociated O atoms on FeN₄ is 0.87 eV less stable than the initial O₂ adsorption state and this data is 2.01 eV on Fe(CN)N₄ (the structures of the dissociated O atoms are shown in supporting information Figure S2). The large endothermic reaction energies indicate that O₂ direct dissociation is unlikely on these mono-Fe center sites.

Next, the adsorbed terminal O* can be stepwisely hydrogenated to OH and to H₂O via the coupled proton and electron transfer. We have searched for the TSs of these two steps and found that the barriers are less than 0.1 eV on both Fe catalysts. On the FeN₄ center, the free energy change from the adsorbed OH* to H₂O in solution is 0.37 eV, which is comparable to the barrier of the O-OH bond breaking (0.34 eV). This indicates that the presence of an additional OH on the FeN₄ center is highly likely at the 0.8 V condition, both thermodynamically and kinetically. The presence of OH should not poison the FeN₄ center, i.e. Fe(OH)N₄ center, since the ORR can also occur on the five coordinated Fe(CN)N₄, as shown in Figure 2. On the Fe(CN)N₄ center, the reduction of O to OH and to H₂O is downhill energetically, suggesting the five coordinated Fe center is thermodynamically more stable at the 0.8 V condition.

3.3 2e reduction pathway

In parallel with the 4e reduction pathway, the 2e reduction leading to H₂O₂ may also occur, which is a bifurcated route from the 4e reduction at the stage of the adsorbed OOH (see Eq. 7-8). The O-end of the OOH is hydrogenated to H₂O₂, which then desorbs to solution to complete the 2e reduction. Using DFT/CM-MPB method, we have investigated this 2e reduction pathway on both Fe catalysts and the free energy profile is shown in Figure 4.

The overall mechanism of the 2e reduction pathway is summarized as follows. At the 0.8 V condition, the adsorbed OOH can first interact with a coming solvated

proton to form a metastable $[\text{H}_2\text{OH}-\text{OOH}]$ complex, as shown in the state **6** of Figure 4. Next, the adsorbed H_2O_2 (state **7**) is formed by the coupled proton and electron transfer from the $[\text{H}_2\text{OH}-\text{OOH}]$ complex. The TSs for the hydrogenation (**6**→**7**) have been located (see supporting information Figure S3) and the free energy barriers are calculated to be 0.15 eV on FeN_4 and ~ 0 eV (after ZPE correction) on $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$. The adsorbed H_2O_2 is found to interact strongly with the nearby H_2O molecules, indicating that the first solvation shell is critical for the stability of H_2O_2 on the Fe centers. The $2e$ reduction ends when the adsorbed H_2O_2 is released to solution.




Figure 4. Free energy profile for the $2e$ reduction pathway from O_2 to H_2O_2 on the embedded FeN_4 (red) and $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ (blue) centers at 0.8 V vs. SHE. **1**: O_2^* ; **2**: OOH^* ; **6**: OOH^* with solvated proton; **7**: H_2O_2^* with H_2O (the first solvation shell). The labeled distances are in angstroms.

From the free energy profile in Fig. 4, we can conclude that the desorption of the adsorbed H_2O_2 is the rate-determining step in the $2e$ reduction. The overall barrier from the adsorbed O_2 to the H_2O_2 in solution is 0.92 eV on the FeN_4 , and it is 0.58 eV on the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$. Comparing with the energetics of the $4e$ reduction pathways

(Fig. 2), we found that the 2e reduction is kinetically unlikely on the FeN₄ center (the overall barrier is more than 0.5 eV higher than that in the 4e reduction), while it is likely with the 4e reduction on the Fe(CN)N₄ with the difference of the overall barriers of the two routes being around 0.17 eV (see the overall mechanism summarized in supporting information Fig. S4).

It might be mentioned that H₂O₂ dissociation into two OH groups has also been considered on FeN₄ site, which, if occurs, will revert the reaction back to the 4e reduction (on the Fe(CN)N₄ site it is not possible for H₂O₂ dissociation because two OH groups on the Fe site will spontaneously combine to form H₂O₂ after optimization). We found that the solvation plays important role to stabilize the adsorbed H₂O₂ molecule on the FeN₄ center. Without the explicit solvation ((H₂O)₃ nearby the H₂O₂ molecule), the adsorbed H₂O₂ can spontaneously dissociate into two OH groups on FeN₄. Previously, Chen et al. also found that for H₂O₂ adsorption on Fe-Phthalocyanine in vacuum, H₂O₂ will dissociate and the O-O distance of the product is 2.368 Å⁴⁹. By contrast, with the explicit solvation, the O-O bond breaking of H₂O₂ on FeN₄ requires to overcome a barrier of 0.42 eV. Therefore, the overall barrier for the 4e pathway via H₂O₂ dissociation is 0.63 eV with respect to the adsorbed O₂ molecule (state **1**), which is also much higher than the pathway via OOH dissociation (0.37 eV, Figure 2). Therefore, the ORR pathways via H₂O₂ intermediate are kinetically unfavorable on the FeN₄ site (see the overall mechanism summarized in supporting information Fig. S4).

4. Discussion on the kinetics




Figure 5. The plot of free energy barrier ΔG_a (eV) of the O-OH bond breaking against the potential on $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$.

Our results show that the one-electron reduction from OH to H_2O on the FeN_4 center has the similar as or even higher barrier than that of the O-OH bond breaking. The adsorption of OH on the four-coordinated Fe is thermodynamically favored at the working potentials, which can be produced readily by water dissociation in the aqueous environment of ORR. Since the Fe/N/C catalysts are generally prepared at high temperatures, we expect that the four-coordinated Fe as the active site is highly unlikely, both thermodynamically and kinetically: the standalone FeN_4 structure can be readily terminated by a fifth ligand in the experimental conditions, such as CN in the catalyst preparation stage, or OH in the ORR conditions. We therefore will mainly focus on the results obtained on the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ structure and compare its kinetics with the experimental findings.

We are now at the position to discuss the potential dependent ORR kinetics on the $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ centers. Fig. 2 shows that the TS of the O-OH bond breaking in the 4e reduction pathway dictates the highest energy position in the free energy profile. The overall barrier height for the O-OH bond breaking at 0.8 V is constituted by two parts, (i) the free energy change from O_2 to OOH, $\text{O}_2^* + \text{H}^+ + \text{e}^- \rightarrow \text{OOH}^*$; and (ii) the free energy barrier of the OOH dissociation, $\text{OOH}^* + \text{H}^+ + \text{e}^- \rightarrow \text{O}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}$. The step (i) can be treated as a fast equilibrium with the ΔG being 0.14 eV at 0.8 V for $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})\text{N}_4$ (see Table 1). Because this step involves explicitly one electron transfer, ΔG should vary upon the change of potential according to $\Delta G = \Delta G|_{0.8\text{V}} + |e|(U - 0.8)$. Therefore, 0.66 V is the equilibrium potential between the adsorbed O_2 and the adsorbed OOH. Below 0.66 V, the overall barrier of O-OH bond breaking should be only determined by the free energy barrier of the (ii) step, the OOH dissociation.

For the step (ii), a TS to break O-OH bond is present and therefore whether the OOH dissociation is potential dependent is related to the nature of the TS. From the optimized TS structure shown in Figure 3, we noticed that the TS is in fact IS-like and the solvated proton links with the dissociating O-OH complex via the hydrogen

bonding. This implies that the solvated proton acts largely as a spectator to stabilize the TS and the electron is not transferred yet at the TS. If so, the OOH dissociation step on the Fe centers is not sensitive to the potential condition. Indeed, we have checked the potential dependency of the OOH dissociation over the Fe(CN)₄ using the constant-charge DFT/CM-MPB method⁵⁴ (our previous work shows that the PBE functional of DFT is able to describe reasonably the potential dependent activity for reactions on metallic surfaces³⁹). Our results show that the barrier remains quite constant over the potential range investigated, as shown in Fig. 5.

By summing the two steps from the adsorbed O₂ to dissociated O, we can deduce that the kinetics of the O-O bond breaking on the Fe centers are potential dependent ($\Delta G_a = \Delta G_a^0 - \alpha F \eta$) with the apparent charge transfer coefficient, α , being 1 above 0.66 V, which is owing to the one-electron reduction from O₂ to OOH. The theoretical Tafel slope ($b = 2.3RT/\alpha F$) can thus be computed to be around 60 mV decade⁻¹. It is interesting to compare our theoretical Tafel slope for the O-OH bond breaking with the experimental data on ORR kinetics. Jaouen et al. have investigated nine non-noble-metal catalysts for ORR in the acidic medium and the measured Tafel slopes are generally within the range of 54~65 mV decade⁻¹ at the interval 0.9~0.75 V vs. RHE⁵⁵. Chlistunoff et al. investigated the Tafel behavior on Fe/N/C catalyst prepared by the pyrolysis of Fe/polyaniline and carbon black. They found that the Tafel slope switches from 60 mV at the low overpotentials to more than 240 mV at the high overpotentials⁵⁶ and the change of the Tafel slope occurs around 0.65 V. From our results, the increase of the Tafel slope at high overpotentials could be understood as the consequence of the O₂/OOH equilibrium favoring the OOH and the overall barrier is only contributed from the O-OH bond breaking of OOH that is not a potential sensitive reaction. It is also likely that at the high overpotential conditions the diffusion of the reactants might turn out to be kinetically important.

From the obtained reaction network, we can utilize microkinetics to estimate the reaction rate of the 4e and the 2e reduction pathways on the five-coordinated Fe(CN)₄. Our results show that both 4e and 2e reduction pathways are likely: the H₂O is the major product and the H₂O₂ is the by-product. Because the reaction

channel to H₂O has an overall barrier of 0.41 eV, which is 0.17 eV lower than that of the H₂O₂ formation, one can estimate that the 2e reduction pathway contributes only 0.1% in the total O₂ reduction assuming the reaction temperature is 300 K and the two channels have the same pre-exponential factor.

Our results suggest that the five-coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ are good catalysts for ORR with a high selectivity to the 4e reduction pathway. The calculated barrier at 0.8 V is around 0.4 eV, which is about 0.2 eV lower than those determined on the Pt(111) surface within the same theoretical framework⁴⁵. This indicates that the non-Pt catalyst could have a higher catalytic activity per active site. Therefore, the major concern in practice should be the efficient implantation of the FeN₄ center into the graphene plane to achieve a high concentration of the active centers in the Fe/N/C catalysts.

5. Conclusion

This work represents a theoretical survey on the reaction mechanism of the electrocatalytic ORR over two possible non-Pt catalyst model, namely the four coordinated FeN₄ and five coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ structures that are embedded inside the graphene plane. These two theoretical models in heterogeneous environment mimic those in the Fe-containing complex in homogeneous catalysis. Both the 4e and 2e reduction over the FeN centers have been investigated at the working potential conditions. Theoretical results show that both the FeN₄ center and the Fe(CN)N₄ center can be good catalyst for ORR with a low activation barrier and a good selectivity to 4e reduction. The presence of five coordinated Fe(X)N₄ (X=CN or OH) is more likely thermodynamically due to strong bonding of Fe towards the fifth ligand. The major challenge in practice is the creation of such active centers with a high concentration. Our major results are outlined as follows.

- (i) The four-coordinated FeN₄ center can bond the reaction intermediates, such as the O₂, OOH, OH species more strongly compared to the five-coordinated Fe(CN)N₄ center. The Fe center is Fe(II) in the FeN₄ and is Fe(III) in the Fe(CN)N₄.

- (ii) The 4e reduction pathway follows the $O_2 \rightarrow OOH \rightarrow O \rightarrow OH \rightarrow H_2O$ mechanism. On the FeN_4 center, the O-OH bond breaking and the OH reduction at 0.8 V have the similar overall free energy barrier, being 0.34 and 0.37 eV, respectively. On the $Fe(CN)N_4$ center, the O-OH bond breaking is the rate-determining step with the free energy barrier being 0.41 eV.
- (iii) The 2e reduction pathway follows the $O_2 \rightarrow OOH \rightarrow H_2O_2$ mechanism. On the FeN_4 center, due to the high adsorption energy of O_2 , the 2e reduction channel is unlikely with a high overall barrier, 0.92 eV. On the $Fe(CN)N_4$ center, the 2e reduction is possible with the overall barrier being 0.58 eV.
- (iv) The ORR kinetics on the $Fe(CN)N_4$ centers are potential dependent with the theoretical Tafel slope being 60 mV above ~ 0.66 V, involving the coupled proton/electron transfer from O_2 to OOH. The O-O bond breaking of OOH is not potential dependent with the solvated proton nearby being like a spectator at the TS at the potentials investigated.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the National Science Foundation of China (21173051, 21361130019, 21103110), 973 program (2011CB808500, 2013CB834603), Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality (08DZ2270500), and Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institute of Higher Learning, China and Shanghai Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2012M520040, 2013T60413, 12R21411200) and Innovation Program of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission (13YZ120) for financial support.

Reference

1. Y. Dai, L. Ou, W. Liang, F. Yang, Y. Liu and S. Chen, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2011, **115**, 2162-2168.
2. H. A. Gasteiger and N. M. Marković, *Science*, 2009, **324**, 48-49.
3. J. Greeley and J. K. Nørskov, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2009, **113**, 4932-4939.
4. R. Jasinski, *Nature*, 1964, **201**, 1212-1213.
5. G. Wu, C. M. Johnston, N. H. Mack, K. Artyushkova, M. Ferrandon, M. Nelson, J. S. Lezama-Pacheco, S. D. Conradson, K. L. More, D. J. Myers and P. Zelenay, *J. Mater. Chem.*,

- 2011, **21**, 11392-11405.
6. H. Xiao, Z. G. Shao, G. Zhang, Y. Gao, W. T. Lu and B. L. Yi, *Carbon*, 2013, **57**, 443-451.
 7. E. Proietti, F. Jaouen, M. Lefèvre, N. Larouche, J. Tian, J. Herranz and J.-P. Dodelet, *Nat Commun*, 2011, **2**, 416.
 8. M. Lefevre, E. Proietti, F. Jaouen and J. P. Dodelet, *Science*, 2009, **324**, 71-74.
 9. F. Jaouen, F. Charretier and J. P. Dodelet, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 2006, **153**, A689-A698.
 10. F. Jaouen and J.-P. Dodelet, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2007, **52**, 5975-5984.
 11. G. Faubert, R. Côté, D. Guay, J. P. Dodelet, G. Dénès, C. Poleunis and P. Bertrand, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1998, **43**, 1969-1984.
 12. H. Schulenburg, S. Stankov, V. Schünemann, J. Radnik, I. Dorbandt, S. Fiechter, P. Bogdanoff and H. Tributsch, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2003, **107**, 9034-9041.
 13. S. Baranton, C. Coutanceau, C. Roux, F. Hahn and J. M. Léger, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 2005, **577**, 223-234.
 14. R. Baker, D. P. Wilkinson and J. Zhang, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2008, **53**, 6906-6919.
 15. E. Yeager, *J. Mol. Catal.*, 1986, **38**, 5-25.
 16. J. P. Collman, P. Denisevich, Y. Konai, M. Marrocco, C. Koval and F. C. Anson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1980, **102**, 6027-6036.
 17. E. Yeager, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1984, **29**, 1527-1537.
 18. U. I. Koslowski, I. Abs-Wurmbach, S. Fiechter and P. Bogdanoff, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2008, **112**, 15356-15366.
 19. A. L. Bouwkamp-Wijnoltz, W. Visscher, J. A. R. van Veen, E. Boellaard, A. M. van der Kraan and S. C. Tang, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2002, **106**, 12993-13001.
 20. R. W. Joyner, J. A. R. van Veen and W. M. H. Sachtler, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 1*, 1982, **78**, 1021-1028.
 21. M. Lefèvre, J. P. Dodelet and P. Bertrand, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2000, **104**, 11238-11247.
 22. J. Yang, D.-J. Liu, N. N. Kariuki and L. X. Chen, *Chem. Commun.*, 2008, **44**, 329-331.
 23. D. H. Lee, W. J. Lee, W. J. Lee, S. O. Kim and Y.-H. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2011, **106**, 175502.
 24. M. Lefèvre, J. P. Dodelet and P. Bertrand, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2002, **106**, 8705-8713.
 25. U. I. Kramm, J. Herranz, N. Larouche, T. M. Arruda, M. Lefevre, F. Jaouen, P. Bogdanoff, S. Fiechter, I. Abs-Wurmbach, S. Mukerjee and J. P. Dodelet, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **14**, 11673-11688.
 26. F. Calle-Vallejo, J. I. Martinez and J. Rossmeisl, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 15639-15643.
 27. S. Kattel and G. Wang, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2013, **1**, 10790-10797.
 28. J. Herranz, M. Lefèvre, N. Larouche, B. Stansfield and J.-P. Dodelet, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2007, **111**, 19033-19042.
 29. G. Wu, K. L. More, C. M. Johnston and P. Zelenay, *Science*, 2011, **332**, 443-447.
 30. M. Jain, S.-h. Chou and A. Siedle, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2006, **110**, 4179-4185.
 31. S. Chatterjee, K. Sengupta, S. Samanta, P. K. Das and A. Dey, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, **52**, 9897-9907.
 32. L. Capece, M. A. Marti, A. Crespo, F. Doctorovich and D. A. Estrin, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2006, **128**, 12455-12461.
 33. J. M. Soler, E. Artacho, J. D. Gale, A. Garcia, J. Junquera, P. Ordejon and D. Sanchez-Portal, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 2002, **14**, 2745-2779.

34. J. Junquera, Ó. Paz, D. Sánchez-Portal and E. Artacho, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2001, **64**, 235111.
35. N. Troullier and J. L. Martins, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1991, **43**, 1993-2006.
36. J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865-3868.
37. H.-F. Wang and Z.-P. Liu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 10996-11004.
38. C. Shang and Z.-P. Liu, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2010, **6**, 1136-1144.
39. Y.-H. Fang and Z.-P. Liu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 18214-18222.
40. Y.-F. Li, Z.-P. Liu, L. Liu and W. Gao, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 13008-13015.
41. D. R. LIDE, ed., *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*; , CRC press, 2003-2004.
42. Z.-P. Liu, S. J. Jenkins and D. A. King, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2004, **126**, 10746-10756.
43. J. O. M. K. Bockris, S. U. M., *Surface Electrochemistry: A Molecular Level Approach*, Plenum Press, New York, 1993.
44. J. Rossmeisl, A. Logadottir and J. K. Nørskov, *Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **319**, 178-184.
45. G.-F. Wei, Y.-H. Fang and Z.-P. Liu, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2012, **116**, 12696-12705.
46. S. Gupta, D. Tryk, I. Bae, W. Aldred and E. Yeager, *J. Appl. Electrochem.*, 1989, **19**, 19-27.
47. S. Gupta, C. Fierro and E. Yeager, *J. Electroanal. Chem. and Interfac. Chem.*, 1991, **306**, 239-250.
48. C.-W. Tsai, H. M. Chen, R.-S. Liu, K. Asakura, L. Zhang, J. Zhang, M.-Y. Lo and Y.-M. Peng, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2011, **56**, 8734-8738.
49. R. Chen, H. Li, D. Chu and G. Wang, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2009, **113**, 20689-20697.
50. A. Titov, P. Zapol, P. Král, D.-J. Liu, H. Iddir, K. Baishya and L. A. Curtiss, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2009, **113**, 21629-21634.
51. Z. Shi and J. Zhang, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2007, **111**, 7084-7090.
52. Z. Shi, H. Liu, K. Lee, E. Dy, J. Chlistunoff, M. Blair, P. Zelenay, J. Zhang and Z.-S. Liu, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2011, **115**, 16672-16680.
53. G. F. Wang, N. Ramesh, A. Hsu, D. Chu and R. R. Chen, *Mol. Simul.*, 2008, **34**, 1051-1056.
54. Y.-H. Fang, G.-F. Wei and Z.-P. Liu, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2014, DOI: 10.1021/jp411531f.
55. F. d. r. Jaouen, J. Herranz, M. Lefèvre, J.-P. Dodelet, U. I. Kramm, I. Herrmann, P. Bogdanoff, J. Maruyama, T. Nagaoka, A. Garsuch, J. R. Dahn, T. Olson, S. Pylypenko, P. Atanassov and E. A. Ustinov, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2009, **1**, 1623-1639.
56. J. Chlistunoff, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2011, **115**, 6496-6507.