# ChemComm

# 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](http://www.rsc.org/Publishing/Journals/guidelines/AuthorGuidelines/JournalPolicy/accepted_manuscripts.asp).

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](http://www.rsc.org/help/termsconditions.asp) and the Ethical quidelines 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.



www.rsc.org/chemcomm

### **Journal Name**

# **COMMUNICATION**



# **Ionic liquids enhance the electrochemical CO<sup>2</sup> reduction catalyzed by MoO<sup>2</sup>**

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

**www.rsc.org/**

**Several imidazolium-based ionic liquids significantly enhance the activity of MoO<sup>2</sup> for electrochemical reduction of CO<sup>2</sup> . The overpotential of CO<sup>2</sup> reduction is as low as 40 mV. The ionic liquids act as both electrolytes and co-catalysts, which not only leads to lower overpotentials, but also alter the product selectivity.** 

Yeonji Oh and Xile Hu<sup>\*</sup>

Recycling of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  to useful products has been considered as an important method towards  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  mitigation and utilizatio[n.](#page-4-0)<sup>1</sup> Over the last several decades, intense research efforts have been invested in electrochemical  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction.<sup>[2-7](#page-4-1)</sup> While significant progress has been made in the development of new catalysts, $8-14$  the number of selective and energy-efficient catalysts remains limited. We earlier reported that  $MoO<sub>2</sub>$  was a new and efficient metal oxide-based catalyst for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction in organic solvents such as acetonitrile (MeCN) or dimethylformate (DMF).<sup>[15](#page-4-3)</sup>

 Room temperature ionic liquids (RTILs) are regarded as an environmental friendly medium for many chemical processes thanks to their negligible volatility, good solvating ability, and high thermal and chemical stability. Their wide potential windows and intrinsic conductivity,  $16, 17$  $16, 17$  as well the high solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> in them,<sup>[18](#page-4-6)</sup> are all beneficial for electrochemical  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction. Recently, some imidazolium-based RTILs are shown to promote electrochemical  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction.<sup>[11,](#page-4-7) [19,](#page-4-8) [20](#page-4-9)</sup> For example, Masel and coworkers reported that 18 mol% of 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium tetrafluoroborate ([EMIM]BF<sub>4</sub>) lowered the overpotential of  $CO_2$ reduction to CO in water on an Ag electrode by about 600 mV. $^{11}$  $^{11}$  $^{11}$ Using Pt as a model substrate, they found that there was a layer of [EMIM] on the electrode, which supressed hydrogen formation and formed a EMIM-CO<sub>2</sub> complex at a mild potential, which could be easily converted to CO.<sup>[19](#page-4-8)</sup> Rosenthal and co-workers found that similar ionic liquids enabled efficient  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction to CO on a Bi

*Laboratory of Inorganic Synthesis and Catalysis, Institute of Chemical Sciences and Engineering, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), EPFL-ISIC-LSCI, BCH 3305, Lausanne, CH 1015, Switzerland, E-mail: xile.hu@epfl.ch; Fax: +41 216939305; Tel: +41 216939781*

*†Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: [details of any supplementary information available should be included here]. See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x*

electrode in MeCN.<sup>[13,](#page-4-10) [14](#page-4-11)</sup> Inspired by these reports, we tested the possibility of using RTILs to enhance  $MoO<sub>2</sub>-cataly<sub>z</sub>$ electrochemical  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction. Here we show that certain ionic liquids indeed improve significantly the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction activity  $MoO<sub>2</sub>$  in MeCN. The formation of CO was promoted and the overpotential of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction was as low as 40 mV. Fig. 1 shows the linear sweep voltammograms (LSVs) of  $CC$ reduction on the MoO<sub>2</sub> (supported on an inert Pb substrate;

labelled as  $MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb)$  measured in MeCN containing



Fig. 1 Linear sweep voltammograms (LSVs) recorded on a MoO<sub>2</sub>/F electrode in a CO<sub>2</sub>-saturated MeCN solution containing varying amounts of [BMIM]PF $_6$  (a) at -20 °C and (b) at RT; scan rate: 50 mV/s.

#### **COMMUNICATION Journal Name**

1-butyl-3- methylimidazolium hexafluorophosphate ([BMIM]PF $_6$ ) as the electrolyte. As described earlier, the lead substrate is preferred over a glassy carbon substrate because it adheres better the  $MoO<sub>2</sub>$ particles.<sup>[15](#page-4-3)</sup> The addition of [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub> results in similar polarization curves at both temperatures. The polarization curves for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ reduction were shifted to more positive potentials when increasing amounts of BMIM PF $_6$  were added into MeCN. At -20 °C, a significant catalytic current for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction was observed at about -2.3 V *vs.* the Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> couple (Fig. 1a). At RT and > -2.5 V, the electrocatalytic activity was even higher than at -20 °C (Fig. 2). The catalytic current was observed already at -2.2 V *vs.* Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> (Fig. 1b). At < -2.5 V, the catalytic current densities are similar at both temperatures, probably because the current densities are limited by diffusion of  $CO_2$ . If  $CO_2$  is replaced by N<sub>2</sub>, the current densities are much lower (Fig. S1, ESI). Without MoO<sub>2</sub>, the current densities are also much lower (Fig. S2, ESI). As [BMIM]<sup>+</sup> itself is reduced only at potentials more negative than -2.8 V vs. Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>,<sup>[14](#page-4-11)</sup> the catalytic currents observed in Fig. 1 correspond to  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction. It is interesting to compare the activity of this system to the analogous system using tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate ([TBA]PF $_6$ ) as the electrolyte (Fig. 2).<sup>[15](#page-4-3)</sup> In the latter system, the catalytic activity is much higher at -20 $^{\circ}$ C than at RT, due to a higher solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> at -20 $^{\circ}$ C. In the current system, however, the activity at RT is even better than at -20 $^{\circ}$ C. This is probably because the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> in [BMIM]PF $_6$  at RT is sufficiently high that it does not limit the catalysis compared to at -20 $^{\circ}$ C.<sup>[18](#page-4-6)</sup> Overall, changing the electrolyte from [TBA]PF<sub>6</sub> to [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub> significantly improved the catalytic activity at RT (Fig. 2), which is a more practical temperature than -  $20^{\circ}$ C.

 Two other imidazolium-based ILs, 1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium chloride and 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium hexafluorophosphate ([BMIM]Cl and [EMIM]PF $_6$ ,) were then used as the electrolytes. Fig. S2 shows the corresponding polarization curves of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on the MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb electrode measured in MeCN. The onset potentials of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction were observed at about -2.2 to -2.3 V *vs.* Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>, similar to when  $[BMIM]PF_6$  was used as the electrolyte. The current densities at < -2.45 V *vs.* Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> followed the order of  $\texttt{[BMIM]PF}_6$  > [EMIM]PF $_6$  > [BMIM]Cl (Fig. 3), while at more negative potentials, the current density was highest when  $[EMIM]PF_6$  was used as the electrolyte. This behaviour should result from the compromise of different factors such as solubility of  $CO_2$ , mass transport, and cocatalytic activity, which vary independently among different ionic liquids.







Fig. 3 Linear sweep voltammograms (LSVs) recorded at RT on a MoO<sub>2</sub> electrode in a CO<sub>2</sub>-saturated MeCN solution containing 0.3 M of differe ionic liquids; scan rate: 50 mV/s.

The results suggest that not only the cations, but also the anions play a role. For the conversion of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  to CO in MeCN, the value  $E^{\circ}$ <sub>CO2</sub>/<sub>CO</sub> can be calculated by equation (1): <sup>[12](#page-4-12)</sup>

$$
E^{\circ}_{CO2/CO} = 0.105 - \frac{RT \times \ln(10)}{F} pKa(HA, \text{MeCN}) \text{ V (vs. SCE)}
$$
 (

The *pKa* values of 1,3-dialkylimidazolium cations are about 32 in MeCN. $^{21}$  $^{21}$  $^{21}$  Therefore, assuming that the proton source is the IL  $E^{\circ}$ <sub>CO2</sub>/<sub>CO</sub> is -1.78 V *vs.* SCE, equivalent to -2.18 V *vs.* Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>.<sup>[22,](#page-4-14) [23](#page-4-15)</sup> The onset potential of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction in the presence of [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub> is around -2.22 V vs. Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> (Fig. 1b), which indicates that  $C(\frac{1}{2})$ reduction occurs at an overpotential as low as 40 mV. The onset overpotential is among the lowest for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction under singlend conditions. As a reference, Bi electrode, a recently reported highly active catalyst for CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in MeCN, has an overpotential  $\sigma^2$ more than 100 mV using [EMIM]PF<sub>6</sub> as the electrolyte and  $cc$ catalyst.<sup>[13,](#page-4-10) [14](#page-4-11)</sup> **Chemen and the strategy of th** 

Fig. S3 shows the time-dependent current response of potentiostatic electrolysis measurements of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on  $MO_{2}/Pb$  electrode in 0.3 M [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub>/MeCN solution at RT. At 2.30 V vs.  $Fc/Fc^*$ , the current density gradually decreased from

**2** | *J. Name*., 2015, **00**, 1-4 This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 20xx

more than -10 mA  $cm<sup>-2</sup>$  to about -7 mA  $cm<sup>-2</sup>$  in 20 min; the initial current density might contain contributions from side processes such as the reduction of PbO in the substrate and other unidentified reactions. However, at -2.45 V vs. Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>, the current density remained constant at about  $-20$  mA cm<sup>-2</sup> during this period, suggesting that the current densities from the side processes were negligible compared to that from  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction at this potential. The stable current densities at both potentials are comparable to those of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on a Bi electrode in combination with a similar ionic liquid.<sup>[13,](#page-4-10) [14](#page-4-11)</sup>

The products of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction were determined after long-term potentiostatic electrolysis experiments. In all cases, CO was the only gaseous product. No significant  $H_2$  formation was detected. Formate and oxalate were detected in the liquid phase. These products (CO, formate and oxalate) were not formed when the electrolysis was carried out in a  $N_2$ -saturated condition, confirming that they are produced from electrocatalytic  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction.

**Table 1.** Potential-dependent Faradaic efficiency of the formation of CO, formate and oxalate from electrocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction; conditions: MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb electrode; 0.3 M [BMIM]PF6 as electrolyte. Data were obtained from -20 °C and at room temperature.



Table 1 presents the product distribution of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction and the corresponding Faradaic efficiency as a function of potential. The selectivity and Faradaic efficiency are similar at RT and -20  $^{\circ}$ C. This result is in contrast to analogous  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction using 0.1 M TBAPF<sub>6</sub> as the electrolyte, $^{15}$  $^{15}$  $^{15}$  where the selectivity depended on the temperature. In the current system, the Faradaic efficiency of CO is higher at more negative potentials and reached 65% at -2.6 V *vs.* Fc/Fc $^{\dagger}$ . On the contrary, the Faradaic efficiency of formate formation was decreased from about 60% at -2.30 V to below 20% at -2.60 V. The total Faradaic efficiency for CO and formate exceeded 80% in all cases. Oxalate was formed only in a low percentage at all potentials. Fig. S4 shows the Faradaic efficiency of carbon monoxide, formate and oxalate for the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on the  $MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb$  electrode using [BMIM]Cl and [EMIM]PF<sub>6</sub> as electrolytes. A similar trend to that in Table 1 was observed.

The mechanism of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction in organic solvents can be described as follows: <sup>[24,](#page-4-16) [25](#page-4-17)</sup>

$$
CO_2 + e^- \rightarrow CO_2
$$
 (2)

$$
2 CO2 \rightarrow 0
$$
 (3)

$$
CO_2^{\bullet+} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow CO + OH^-
$$
 (4)

**Journal Name COMMUNICATION**



 $CO_2$ <sup>\*</sup> + H<sub>2</sub>O  $\rightarrow$  HCO<sub>2</sub><sup>\*</sup> + OH

$$
HCO_2^{\bullet} + e^- \rightarrow HCO_2^-
$$
 (9)

 $HCO_2^{\bullet} + CO_2^{\bullet -} \rightarrow HCO_2 + CO_2$ (10)

The first step is the reduction of  $CO^2$  to give  $CO_2$ <sup>4</sup> radica . Dimerization of CO<sub>2</sub><sup>•</sup> gives oxalate. CO might be produced through two different pathways: one involves the protonation of  $CO_2$ <sup>4</sup>, trace water or a protic solvent (eqn  $(4)$ ), while the other involves the reaction of  $CO_2$ <sup>\*</sup> with  $CO_2$  to give CO and carbonate (eqn  $\overline{(7)}$ ). Formate, on the other hand, can only be produced with a proton source (eqn (8)-(10)).

For  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on MoO<sub>2</sub> using [TBA]PF<sub>6</sub> as the supporting electrolyte in dry MeCN, the predominant product was oxalate.<sup>15</sup> E replacing [TBA]PF<sub>6</sub> with [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub>, the predominant product is changed to CO. A similar result was obtained on [EMIM]-promoted



**Fig. 4** Influence of water concentration on the polarization curves MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb in CO<sub>2</sub>-saturated MeCN at RT. Electrolyte: 0.3 M [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub>; Scan rate: 50 mV/s.

 $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction on Pb in MeCN, where the replacement tetraethylammonium perchlorate  $(TEA)ClO<sub>4</sub>$ ) by [EMIM] bis(trifluoromethylsulfonyl)imide shifted the dominant produc from oxalate to CO as well.<sup>[20](#page-4-9)</sup> It was proposed that  ${CO_2}^{\bullet}$  as stabilized by the absorbed layer of imidazolium cation at the electrode surface,<sup>[19,](#page-4-8) [20](#page-4-9)</sup> which prevented the dimerization of two  ${CO_2}^{\bullet-}$  to form oxalate. A similar mechanism is proposed here. The stabilization of  ${CO_2}^{\bullet-}$  also explains the decrease of the overpotentials of the current system. Because tetraalkylammonium salts were required for electrochemical and photochemic I reduction of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  on certain electrodes, it was proposed that they could be reduced to neutral radicals, which in terms transferre i electrons to  $CO_2$ .<sup>[26](#page-4-18)</sup> A recent study indicates that the reduction or **ChemCommands ChemCommands Chemcommand** 

#### **COMMUNICATION Journal Name**

tetraalkylammonium salts in those systems is not viable, and these salts likely serve to prevent surface passivation of electrodes.<sup>[27](#page-4-19)</sup> The fact that [TBA]PF<sub>6</sub> can be replaced by ILs in  $CO_2$  reduction on MoO<sub>2</sub> further supports the non-catalytic role of tetraalkylammonium salts.

The influence of water in the electrochemical reduction of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in this system was probed by addition of a known concentration of water into the electrolyte solution at RT. Fig. 4 shows that the polarization curves of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction were shifted to more positive potentials when an increasing amount of water was added. Table 2 shows the product distribution of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction under these conditions at -2.45 V vs. Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>. At 0.1 M water concentration, the Faradaic yield of CO was increased from 40% to 60%, at the expense of formate. However, a further increase in water concentration then reduced the Faradaic yields of both CO and formate due to competitive  $H_2$  formation.

Table 2. Faradaic efficiency and the product distribution of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction as a function of water concentration. Potentiostatic electrolysis was measured on a MoO<sub>2</sub>/Pb electrode at -2.45 V *vs.* Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> at RT in 0.3M [BMIM]PF<sub>6</sub>/MeCN.



In conclusion, the electrochemical reduction of  $CO_2$  on MoO<sub>2</sub> in MeCN can be significantly enhanced using several imidazoliumbased ionic liquids, with the best results obtained using  $[BMIM]PF_{6.}$ High activity can be obtained at room temperature instead of -20  $^{\circ}$ C, which was previously required using  $[TBA]PF_6$  as the electrolyte. The overpotential for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  reduction is as low as 40 mV. Replacement of [TBA]PF $_6$  by ILs promoted the formation of CO and suppressed the formation of oxalate. The improvement in catalytic activity and the change of product selectivity suggest that the ILs have a co-catalyst role.

 This work is supported by a European Research Council starting grant (no. 257096).

#### **Notes and references**

<span id="page-4-0"></span>1. A. M. Appel, J. E. Bercaw, A. B. Bocarsly, H. Dobbek, D. L. DuBois, M. Dupuis, J. G. Ferry, E. Fujita, R. Hille, P. J. A. Kenis, C. A. Kerfeld, R. H. Morris, C. H. F. Peden, A. R. Portis, S. W. Ragsdale, T. B. Rauchfuss, J. N. H. Reek, L. C. Seefeldt, R. K. Thauer and G. L. Waldrop, *Chem. Rev.*, 2013, **113**, 6621-6658.

<span id="page-4-1"></span>2. Y. Hori, in *Modern Aspects of Electrochemistry*, eds. C. G. Vayenas, R. E. White and M. E. Gamboa-Aldeco, Springer, New York, 2008, vol. 42, pp. 89-189.

3. E. E. Benson, C. P. Kubiak, A. J. Sathrum and J. M. Smieja, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2009, **38**, 89-99.

4. J. Schneider, H. F. Jia, J. T. Muckerman and E. Fujita, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2012, **41**, 2036-2051.

5. Y. Oh and X. L. Hu, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, **42**, 2253-2261.

- 7. E. B. Cole, P. S. Lakkaraju, D. M. Rampulla, A. J. Morris, I Abelev and A. B. Bocarsly, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 11539- 11551. **ChemComm Accepted Manuscript**
- <span id="page-4-2"></span>8. Y. H. Chen and M. W. Kanan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 1986-1989.
- 9. Y. H. Chen, C. W. Li and M. W. Kanan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2012, **134**, 19969-19972.
- 10. C. W. Li and M. W. Kanan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 7231-7234.
- <span id="page-4-7"></span>11. B. A. Rosen, A. Salehi-Khojin, M. R. Thorson, W. Zhu, D. 1 Whipple, P. J. A. Kenis and R. I. Masel, *Science*, 2011, **334**, 643- 644.
- <span id="page-4-12"></span>12. C. Costentin, S. Drouet, M. Robert and J. M. Saveant, *Science*, 2012, **338**, 90-94.
- <span id="page-4-10"></span>13. J. L. DiMeglio and J. Rosenthal, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2013, **135**, 8798-8801.
- <span id="page-4-11"></span>14. J. Medina-Ramos, J. L. DiMeglio and J. Rosenthal, J. *Chem. Soc.*, 2014, **136**, 8361-8367.
- <span id="page-4-3"></span>15. Y. Oh, H. Vrubel, S. Guidoux and X. Hu, *Chem. Comm.* 2014, **50**, 3878-3881.
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>16. D. S. Silvester and R. G. Compton, *Z. Phys. Chem*, 2006, **220**, 1247-1274.
- <span id="page-4-5"></span>17. J. F. Wishart, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2009, **2**, 956-961.
- <span id="page-4-6"></span>18. C. Cadena, J. L. Anthony, J. K. Shah, T. I. Morrow, J. Brennecke and E. J. Maginn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2004, **126**, 5300- 5308.
- <span id="page-4-8"></span>19. B. A. Rosen, J. L. Haan, P. Mukherjee, B. Braunschweig, W. Zhu, A. Salehi-Khojin, D. D. Dlott and R. I. Masel, J. Phys. Chem. 2012, **116**, 15307-15312.
- <span id="page-4-9"></span>20. L. Y. Sun, G. K. Ramesha, P. V. Kamat and J. F. Brenneck *Langmuir*, 2014, **30**, 6302-6308.
- <span id="page-4-13"></span>21. A. M. Magill, K. J. Cavell and B. F. Yates, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2004, **126**, 8717-8724.
- <span id="page-4-14"></span>22. N. G. Connelly and W. E. Geiger, *Chem. Rev.*, 1996, **96**, 877- 910.
- <span id="page-4-15"></span>23. V. V. Pavlishchuk and A. W. Addison, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2000, **298**, 97-102.
- <span id="page-4-16"></span>24. C. Amatore and J. M. Saveant, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1981, **103**, 5021-5023.

<span id="page-4-17"></span>25. A. Gennaro, A. A. Isse, M. G. Severin, E. Vianello, I. Bhugun and J. M. Saveant, *J. Chem. Soc.- Faraday Trans.*, 1996, **92**, 3963- 3968.

<span id="page-4-18"></span>26. J. O. Bockris and J. C. Wass, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1989, **136**, 2521-2528.

<span id="page-4-19"></span>27. T. C. Berto, L. Zhang, R. J. Hamers and J. F. Berry, *ACS Catal.*, 2015, **5**, 703-707.

<sup>6.</sup> C. Costentin, M. Robert and J. M. Saveant, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, **42**, 2423-2436.