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Influence of H- and OH-adsorbates on the ethanol oxidation reaction – A DEMS Study

Antoine Bach Delpeuch\textsuperscript{a,b,}*, Marian Chatenet\textsuperscript{b,c,}#, Maria Sol Rau\textsuperscript{a}, Carsten Cremers\textsuperscript{a}

The ethanol oxidation reaction (EOR) was investigated by potentiodynamic techniques on Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C and Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C by differential electrochemical mass spectrometry (DEMS) in a flow cell system. Prior to the cyclic voltammetries, adsorption of H- and OH-species was carried out by chronocoulometry at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ and 1 V vs. RHE, respectively, in order to examine their influence on the EOR on the different electrocatalysts. For the sake of comparison, another adsorption potential was chosen at $E_{ad} = 0.3$ V vs. RHE, in the double layer region (i.e. in the absence of such adsorbates). For this study, 20 wt.\% electrocatalysts were synthesized by a modified polyol method and were physically characterized by inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry (ICP-AES), X-ray diffraction (XRD) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). When comparing the first and second cycles of the cyclic voltammograms (CVs) on Pt/C and Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C, the H\textsubscript{ad} presence on the electrocatalysts surface seems to hinder the initiation of the ethanol electrooxygenation, whereas the reaction onset potential is shifted negatively with the presence of OH-adsorbates. In contrast to them, the EOR on Rh/C is enhanced when the electrocatalyst surface is covered with H\textsubscript{ad} and is inhibited after adsorption at $E_{ad} = 0.3$ and 1 V vs. RHE. Finally, on Pt-Rh/C and Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C, neither the H- nor OH-adsorbates do impact the EOR initiation. The lowest EOR onset was recorded on Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C and Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C electrocatalysts. The CO\textsubscript{2} currency efficiency (CCE) was also determined for each electrocatalyst and demonstrated higher values on Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C.

Introduction

Direct ethanol fuel cell (DEF) has received growing attention as renewable power source over the past few years\textsuperscript{1–6}. Besides ethanol fuel non toxicity, its facile production by biomass fermentation and its ease of storage, transportation and delivery with the existing infrastructure, ethanol high theoretical energy density makes it highly attractive especially for mobile applications. Nonetheless, the sluggish kinetics of the ethanol oxidation reaction (EOR) and its low selectivity towards its complete oxidation into CO\textsubscript{2} (12 electrons) constitute major obstacles for DEF commercialization\textsuperscript{7–11}. The total electrooxidation of ethanol into CO\textsubscript{2} is compromised by the difficult cleavage of the C-C bond. As a result, ethanol oxidation operates through parallel pathways and may partially yield acetaldehyde (2 electrons) and acetic acid (4 electrons)\textsuperscript{4,12–14}.

The EOR has been largely reviewed so far on bulk Pt and Pt/C\textsuperscript{4,10,15–20}. A relative consensus exists concerning the limited ethanol conversion into CO\textsubscript{2} in acidic medium at room temperature. The so-called CO\textsubscript{2} current efficiency (CCE), which is a quantification of the current generated during the ethanol total oxidation into CO\textsubscript{2} reported to the EOR overall current, is generally found between 5 and 20\% depending on the operating conditions\textsuperscript{10,21–23}. Besides, the EOR on Pt bulk and Pt/C electrocatalysts suffers from a high onset overpotential, which is thought to originate from the difficult ethanol adsorption on the electrocatalyst surface at low potentials\textsuperscript{24,25}, as also observed for methanol\textsuperscript{26,27}.

The development of bi- and tri-metallic Pt-based electrocatalysts has been emphasized during the past decades in order to overcome these issues: Pt-Ru/C\textsuperscript{28–30}, Pt-Rh/C\textsuperscript{11,31,32}, Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsuperscript{1,8,33}, Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsuperscript{34,35}, Pt-Ir-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsuperscript{36}, Pt-Ru-Mo/C\textsuperscript{37}, Pt-Sn-Mo/C\textsuperscript{38}… Differential electrochemical mass spectrometry (DEMS) investigations have shown promising results in the C-C bond breaking by rhodium metal\textsuperscript{39,40}. Nonetheless, EOR studies on Pt-Rh/C bi-metallic electrocatalyst shows some controversies: some of them show a higher CCE on Pt-Rh/C than on Pt/C\textsuperscript{22,41,42}, while others demonstrate similar performances regarding the C-C bond splitting\textsuperscript{21}. The lower EOR onset potential on Pt-Rh/C electrocatalyst compared to Pt/C is however generally admitted\textsuperscript{21,22,23,41–43}. A reason could be the better dehydrogenation of the ethanol molecule at low potentials on Pt-Rh/C than on Pt/C\textsuperscript{21}.

Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C is also a well investigated bi-metallic electrocatalyst for the EOR\textsuperscript{1,8,33,44}. Adding tin to the electrocatalyst material leads to a negative shift of the EOR onset potential and also enhances the selectivity of the ethanol electrooxidation toward
acetic acid formation. This enhanced electroactivity is accounted for by a bi-functional mechanism between Pt and SnO₃ moieties, in which the oxophilic character of tin enables OH⁻-species formation from water dissociation at lower potentials, these species favouring the further oxidation of adsorbed acetaldehyde into acetic acid. However, even with this positive effect, the CO₂ current efficiency recorded on Pt-SnO₂/C does not differ significantly to that on Pt/C.

The EOR on tri-metallic Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C electrocatalyst demonstrated a large negative shift of the onset potential as well as a higher activity compared to Pt/C and Pt-Rh/C. According to one of these studies, while the C-C bond cleavage would be assured by rhodium and the ethanolation hydrogenation by platinum, the OH⁻-species necessary for the further oxidation of the products of the C-C bond cleavage (CO₂) into CO₂ would be provided by SnO₂. This synergetic effect between the three metals/oxides would facilitate the complete ethanol oxidation into CO₂.

In the present study, the influence of pre-adsorbed hydrogen and hydroxide species on the ethanol oxidation reaction (EOR) has been investigated on home-made model EOR electrocatalysts (Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C). The H- and OH-adsorbates were formed by potentiostatic hold at .mm and 1 V vs. RHE respectively, whereas “water adsorbates-free” surfaces were prepared by potentiostatic hold at 0.3 V vs. RHE. The home-made model electrocatalysts were firstly characterized by thermogravimetric analysis (TGA), inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry (ICP-AES), powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) to determine the metal-to-carbon ratio and metal crystallite/nanoparticle size and distribution on the carbon support. The EOR was thoroughly studied by Differential Electrochemical Mass Spectrometry (DEMS) using the mass-to-charge signals m/z 22, m/z 29 and m/z 61, which are representative of CO₂, acetaldehyde and ethyl acetal formation respectively. The latter, product of the esterification of acetic acid with ethanol, is an indirect proof of the formation of acetic acid during the electrochemical reactions. For this reason, the authors have decided to analyse the variations of the signal m/z 61 for the acetic acid production. Finally, the CO₂ current efficiency (CCE) during the electrooxidation reactions was determined after calibration of the mass-to-charge signal m/z 22.

**Experimental**

**Materials preparation**

Carbon-supported Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C, Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C, with 20 wt.% overall metal load, were prepared using a modified polyl method. In a typical procedure, the calculated amount of metal precursors, H₂PtCl₆ (Aldrich), RhCl₃, xH₂O and SnCl₂, was dissolved in a solution containing water and ethylene glycol (EG) (volume ratio 2:1), prior to the addition of carbon black particles (Vulcan XC-72R, Cabot) dispersed in an EG solution by sonication. The pH of the whole solution was subsequently adjusted to 12 using a 0.5 M NaOH solution (diluted in EG) and let under stirring for one hour at ambient temperature. Thereafter the solution was heated up to 160 °C, maintained at this temperature for three hours and cooled down overnight. The pH of the solution was then fixed to 3 using a 0.5 M H₂SO₄ aqueous solution and stirred for 24 h. Finally, the electrocatalyst powder was filtrated, washed copiously with distilled water and dried overnight in an oven at 80 °C.

**Physico-chemical characterizations**

The metal-carbon ratio in the electrocatalysts was checked by thermogravimetric analysis (TGA, Q 5000 from TA Instruments), while the composition of the bi- and tri-electrocatalysts (metal-metal ratio) was determined by ICP-AES (iCAP 6300 Thermo). The crystalline structure and average size of the metal nanoparticles was analyzed by powder X-ray diffraction (XRD, Bruker AXS D8) in the 2θ range from 15° to 90° using Cu Kα radiation with a scan rate of 0.74° min⁻¹. The electrocatalyst morphology was studied by transmission electron microscopy (TEM, Jeol, 2010), and the nanoparticle size distribution (PSD) reconstructed using representative micrographs (ca. 200 nanoparticles being counted in average for the construction of each PSD histogram). The PSD was used to determine the number-averaged dₙ, surface-averaged dₛ and volume-averaged dᵥ diameters of the nanoparticles:

\[ d_N = \sum_n \frac{nN_d}{n_i} \]  (1)
\[ d_S = \sum_n \frac{nN_d^2}{n_i} \]  (2)
\[ d_V = \sum_n \frac{nN_d^3}{n_i} \]  (3)

where nᵢ is the number of particles of diameter dᵢ.

**Electrochemical measurements**

The DEMS measurements were performed in a flow cell system described elsewhere. The working electrode was prepared from a uniform ink of the prepared electrocatalyst and supported on a thin Gore-Tex PTFE membrane (60 µm thickness, 0.02 µm mean pore size, 50% porosity) baring a thin, porous and electrocatalytically inert (with respect to the EOR) sputtered Au layer. The ink was composed of 3 mg of electrocatalyst dispersed by sonication in a 400 µL mixture of isopropanol and water (volume ratio 3:1). The electrocatalyst thin-film was prepared by pipetting 36 µL of the ink onto the sputtered Au/PTFE membrane (1 cm² geometric area), so as to form a uniform layer (87.5 µg cm⁻²). Nafion® was used as ionomer to stabilize the catalytic particles on the electrode surface. The amount of Nafion® was always added on the electrocatalytic particles so that it amounts 50 wt.% of the total electrocatalyst. The counter electrode was a platinum foil and the reference electrode a reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE). The activation of the electrocatalyst, as well as the stripping experiments, was carried out in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ supporting (aqueous) electrolyte while the ethanol oxidation reaction (EOR) was carried out in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH.

The electrochemical tests were run using a Gamry Reference 3000 potentiostat connected to a Balzers QMS 200 mass spectrometer. For the sake of comparison, the electrochemical results presented hereafter are normalized by the metal mass at the working electrode.

CO stripping experiments were preceded by a chronoamperometry (CA) at Eₛₐd = 0.15 V vs. RHE. During the
first 8 min of the CA, the electrolyte flowing through the cell was saturated with CO by bubbling CO in the reservoir in order to saturate the surface of the electrocatalysts with CO\textsubscript{ad}. After that, the solution in the reservoir was purged with Ar during 20 min until the end of the CA to remove remaining dissolved CO from the cell. Finally, the stripping cyclic voltammetry (CV) was applied.

Similarly, prior to the potentiodynamic voltammetry, the mass spectroscopy was carried out after a CA at 0.3 V vs. RHE. The sharpness of Pt/C and Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C electrocatalysts are displayed in Fig. 2. The sharpness of Pt/C and Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C patterns show well crystallized nanoparticles. The diffraction peaks of Pt/C at ca. 40, 46.5, 67.8, 82, 86 are assigned respectively to the (111), (200), (220), (311), (222) planes, characteristic of a face-centered cubic (fcc) structure. Rh/C and Pt-based bi- and tri-metallic electrocatalysts were also found to crystallize in the fcc structure. An evaluation of the average particle size was carried out using the Scherrer’s law on the (220) diffraction peak. The lattice parameters and the average particle sizes are summarized in Table 1.

Pt/C and Rh/C are loaded at 20 wt.% and 21.1 wt.%, respectively, as revealed by TGA. ICP-AES analyses showed the presence of 7.7 wt.% Pt and 7.46 wt.% Rh for Pt-Rh/C (24.5 wt.% Pt, Rb\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}/C), 15.01 wt.% Pt and 2.69 wt.% SnO\textsubscript{2} for Pt-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C (17.7 wt.% Pt, SnO\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}/C and 13.83 wt.% Pt, 4.03 wt.% Rh and 2.73 wt.% SnO\textsubscript{2} for Pt-Rh-SnO\textsubscript{2}/C (20.14 wt.% Pt, Rb\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}/C).

The electrocatalysts morphology and the particle size distribution (PSD) were further characterized by TEM. Fig. 3 displays a uniform dispersion of relatively small nanoparticles on the carbon support for most of the electrocatalysts. Yet, the TEM
investigation on Pt-SnO₂/C revealed the presence of larger nanoparticles. The associated PSD histograms in Fig. 3 reveal a narrow particle size distribution with a very similar mean particle size for the electrocatalysts (from 2.1 to 2.4 nm), except for Pt-SnO₂/C (3.3 nm). The presence of some agglomerates was observed on Pt-Rh/C and to a larger extent on Pt-SnO₂/C.

The surface-averaged diameter $d_s$ estimated from the PSD histograms can be compared to the mean particle size ($d_{\text{XRD}}$) calculated from the electrochemically active surface area ($A_e$) estimated from the charge of CO-stripping. Assuming the cuboctahedral shape of the nanoparticles, $d_{\text{Elec}}$ can be calculated as followed:

$$d_{\text{Elec}} = \frac{6(3+\sqrt{2})W_m}{8A_e\rho_m} \quad (4)$$

with $W_m$ the mass of deposited metal nanoparticles and $\rho_m$ the metals density.

Table 1 points out a good correspondence between the TEM and XRD mean particle diameter, $d_{\text{V}}$ and $d_{\text{XRD}}$, respectively, for Pt/C, Rh/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C whereas the presence of agglomerates on Pt-Rh/C and Pt-SnO₂/C explain the discrepancies. The inconsistency between $d_{\text{Elec}}$ and $d_{\text{V}}$ values for the multi-metallic electrocatalysts may also be explained by an alloy effect that impacts COₐd adsorption/electrooxidation and the resulting electrochemical active surface area (ECSA). More specifically, the ECSA from Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C may be underestimated (and thus $d_{\text{Elec}}$ overestimated) due to COₐd electrooxidation probably occurring during the chronoamperometry at $E_{\text{ad}} = 0.15 \text{ V vs. RHE}$ preceding the CV.

**CV in base electrolyte**

Fig. 4 presents cyclic voltammograms in supporting electrolyte (0.5 M H₂SO₄) on Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C. The usual features of the so-called hydrogen and oxygen regions of Pt-based electrodes can be observed 53,54. On the one hand, the oxide region on Rh- and Sn-based electrocatalysts, *i.e.* on Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C, starts at much lower potentials than on Pt/C ($E = 0.8 \text{ V vs. RHE}$). The lower onset potential for the former electrocatalysts versus Pt/C may be ascribed to rhodium and tin oxophilic character 55–57. Electronic interactions between Pt and the non-noble metals may also modify its electronic structure and, as a consequence, favour its affinity toward water dissociation 58. The oxide reduction also starts at lower potentials on Rh- and Sn-based electrocatalysts showing the higher oxides stability on the electrocatalysts. On the other hand, the hydrogen starts adsorbing at lower potentials on Pt-Rh-based bi- and tri-metallic electrocatalysts than on Pt/C.

### Table 1 Structural properties of Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C electrocatalysts obtained by XRD and TEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electro catalyst</th>
<th>Effective composition by ICP-AES</th>
<th>$a$ / Å</th>
<th>$d_{\text{XRD}}$ / nm</th>
<th>$d_{\text{Elec}}$ / nm</th>
<th>$d_s$ / nm</th>
<th>$d_v$ / nm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh/C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt-Rh/C</td>
<td>Pt/Rh₃/C</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt-SnO₂/C</td>
<td>Pt(SnO₂)₃/C</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C</td>
<td>Pt(Rh₃(SnO₂)₃)₃/C</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a$: lattice parameter; $d_{\text{XRD}}$: mean nanoparticle size (XRD); $d_{\text{Elec}}$: electrochemical mean particle size; $d_s$: number-averaged diameter (TEM); $d_v$: surface-averaged diameter (TEM).

Fig. 3 Typical TEM images at (a) 200 000 magnification and associated particle size distribution of the (a) Pt/C, (b) Rh/C, (c) Pt-Rh/C, (d) Pt-SnO₂/C and (e) Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C electrocatalysts.
Fig. 4 CV in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ on Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C electrocatalysts; ν = 10 mV s⁻¹; T = 25 °C.

Fig. 5 (a) CO-stripping CV in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ in and (b) corresponding MSCV for mass-to-charge ratio m/z 22 on Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C; ν = 10 mV s⁻¹; T = 25 °C.

CO stripping

Fig. 5a displays CO-stripping voltammograms recorded on Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C, and Fig. 5b the corresponding MSCVs for the mass-to-charge ratio m/z 22. A first comparison between Pt/C and Rh/C shows that the CO-stripping (CO₂ formation) initiates at lower potentials on the latter than on the former: the supply in OH adsorbates on Rh/C at lower potential than on Pt/C (see Fig. 4) may ease CO_ad oxidation into CO₂. The electrooxidation of CO adsorbates on Rh/C (E = 0.56 V vs. RHE), Pt-Rh/C (E = 0.58 V vs. RHE), Pt-SnO₂/C (E = 0.25 V vs. RHE) and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C (E = 0.30 V vs. RHE) initiates at lower potentials than on Pt/C (E = 0.65 V vs. RHE). These values correspond well with the MSCVs illustrating the CO₂ formation efficient at low potential) supply in OH_ads species that helps the oxidation of adsorbed CO (bi-functional mechanism, often mentioned for CO and methanol oxidation reactions. Besides, their presence possibly induces a ligand effect operated on Pt electronic structure. This is in agreement with the fact that water dissociation into adsorbed OH-species starts at lower potentials on Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh/C than on Pt/C. Besides, alloying Rh and Sn with Pt presumably leads to a down-shift of the Pt 5d band centre caused by the interactions in the lattice between Pt and Rh atoms. This phenomenon would result in a weaker adsorption of CO on Pt atoms of the alloy and thus in the acceleration of the kinetics on Pt-Rh/C.

Potentiodynamic ethanol oxidation reaction

On Pt/C

Fig. 6 presents a comparative study of the first scan of the potentiodynamic voltammograms obtained after a CA at E_ad = 0.05, 0.3 and 1 V vs. RHE. Apparent faster EOR kinetics can be observed during the CV recorded after the CA at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE compared to the CV run after the CA at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE. Also, the associated ionic signals m/z 29 (Fig. 6b), m/z 22 (Fig. 6c) and m/z 61 (Fig. 6d) present a shift toward negative potentials after the CA at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE. Clearly, the OH_ads species adsorption during the chronoamperometry at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE enhanced ethanol oxidation to acetaldehyde at lower potentials. On the contrary, H_adsorbates formed at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE do inhibit the reaction. Similarly, CO₂ (Fig. 6c) and
acetic acid (Fig. 6d) production are also shifted negatively with the presence of OH-adsorbates. Moreover, it seems that ethanol complete electrooxidation into CO$_2$ is slightly hindered and that the mechanism leading to acetic acid as end product is favoured. The result is not surprising as the OH$_{ad}$ species required for the EOR and in particular for acetic acid production are provided during the CA at $E_{ad} = 1$ V vs. RHE; in that sense the electrode pre-oxidation facilitates acetic acid formation at lower potentials. These results are in agreement with the literature, as it was demonstrated that Pt-SnO$_2$/C electrocatalysts do not favour ethanol complete oxidation into CO$_2$, although tin oxide brings hydroxide species at the electrocatalyst surface at lower potentials. Interestingly, it can also be seen that the acetic acid formation starts at potentials as low as the acetaldehyde production which could signify that adsorbed acetaldehyde is not required as reaction intermediate to generate acetic acid as it is proposed in the literature. Finally, the backward scans are in all cases superposed, demonstrating that the pre-formation of such adsorbates cannot maintain durable EOR performance alteration. In all cases, the behaviour monitored at $E_{ad} = 0.3$ V vs. RHE is intermediate between the other two, suggesting that H$_{ad}$ species do inhibit the EOR whereas OH$_{ad}$ species do favour the reaction.

This observation is further confirmed in Fig. 7 which displays the two first cycles of a representative potentiodynamic ethanol electrooxidation on Pt/C and their associated mass-to-charge signals $m/z$ 29, $m/z$ 22 and $m/z$ 61 obtained after a chronoamperometry at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ (Fig. 7a) and 1 V vs. RHE (Fig. 7b). Although ethanol electrooxidation initiates at the same potential (ca. $E = 0.4$ V vs. RHE) during the first and second scan, the ethanol oxidation reaction kinetics during the first positive scan is faster than during the following one (Fig. 7b), after OH-adsorption during the CA at $E_{ad} = 1$ V vs. RHE in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$. On the contrary, the hydrogen adsorption during the chronoamperometry at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ V vs. RHE seems to hinder ethanol electrooxidation kinetics, as the first scan is delayed compared to the second one (Fig. 7a). According to the literature, the presence of adsorbed hydrogen hinders ethanol adsorption on the electrocatalyst surface, thereby explaining the slower reaction rate during the first scan of the cyclic voltammetry in Fig. 7a. On the opposite, OH$_{ad}$ could enhance the adsorption/oxidation of organic molecules.

On Rh/C

Fig. 8 compares cyclic voltammograms in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ + 0.1 M EtOH on Rh/C preceded by chronoamperometries carried out at $E_{ad} = 0.05, 0.3$ and 1 V vs. RHE. The EOR activity is intensified
after hydrogen adsorption on the electrocatalyst surface (seen for $E_{ad} = 0.05$ V vs. RHE), although it remains very low in comparison to Pt/C. The EOR CVs for the two other adsorption potential values are inhibited by OH adsorption, OH$_{ad}$ being very stable on rhodium surface (the OH reduction peak is located at ca. $E = 0.33$ V vs. RHE versus $E = 0.75$ V vs. RHE on Pt/C – see Fig. 4). This observation is confirmed by the weak signals reported after $E_{ad} = 0.3$ and 1 V vs. RHE for the mass-to-charge signal m/z 29 and m/z 22 in Fig. 8b and Fig. 8c respectively. It can be noticed from the CV preceded by the CA at $E_{ad} = 1$ V vs. RHE that, although rhodium provides OH-species at low potentials, the EOR insignificantly proceeds to the generation of acetaldehyde ($m/z$ 29) and CO$_2$ ($m/z$ 22) and does not yield to acetic acid ($m/z$ 61 - not shown here). This behaviour is contradictory with that of Pt/C. One assumption could be that ethanol can hardly displace OH-adsorbates on Rh/C surfaces (similarly to sulphate adsorbates), conversely to what occurs on Pt/C and, as a consequence, cannot benefit from the electrocatalyst surface composition a priori favourable to acetic acid formation. Moreover, ethanol dissociative adsorption leading to CO$_2$ formation requires free electrocatalytic sites, which is, in our set of experiments, only encountered after the chronoamperometry carried out at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ V vs. RHE (surface pre-reduction).

Further information can be obtained in Fig. 9 by comparing the first and second cycle of the potentiodynamic ethanol oxidation reaction on Rh/C preceded by hydrogen adsorption at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ V vs. RHE. As shown in Fig. 9a, the second cycle is very similar to the CV obtained after adsorption at $E_{ad} = 1$ V vs. RHE (shown in Fig. 8a). In Fig. 9b, the mass-to-charge signal $m/z$ 22 discloses a high CO$_2$ production (starting at ca. $E = 0.56$ V vs. RHE) during the first cycle compared to the second one where almost no CO$_2$ was detected.

The mass-to-charge signal $m/z$ 29 gives further information on the mechanism that operates during the two cycles. During the first cycle, quasi no acetaldehyde is detected (Fig. 9c) while, during the second one, a small but noticeable amount of acetaldehyde emerged during the cyclic voltammetry. Regarding these results, it seems that, during the first cycle, the EOR proceeds almost solely through its complete oxidation pathway leading to CO$_2$ formation and produces neither acetaldehyde nor acetic acid. On the contrary, a small amount of acetaldehyde and near-zero CO$_2$ were to be detected during the second scan, similarly to the first scan of the CVs preceded by a chronoamperometry at $E_{ad} = 0.3$ and 1 V vs. RHE (Fig. 8). It can therefore be assumed that the presence of OH adsorbates on the
Rh/C surface inhibits considerably the complete EOR leading to CO₂ (by impeding ethanol adsorption) and even slightly encourages acetaldehyde formation (ethanol dissociative adsorption is no longer possible due to the overwhelming OH-adsorbates on rhodium surface). Finally, a large rise of the signal m/z 29 is observed at high potentials (E > 1.2 V vs. RHE, Fig. 9c) which can only correspond to acetaldehyde formation (a similar increase was obtained with signal m/z 15 ([CH₃CH₂]⁺ not shown here). This acetaldehyde formation is expected to come from the oxidation of C₂-species that only oxidize at high potentials.⁵⁰

On Pt based bi- and tri-metallic electrocatalysts

In Fig. 10, a particular attention is paid to the influence of the different chronoamperometries achieved prior to the cyclic voltammetries in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH on Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C. On Pt-Rh/C, they obviously do not impact much the reaction initiation (Fig. 10a). As platinum and rhodium have opposite behaviours regarding the strength of H- and OH-adsorbates, the lack of adsorbate effect could be imputed to a combined effect of Pt and Rh metals lowering the stability of OH_ads and H_ads on Pt-Rh/C and thus easing their displacement by ethanol molecules. Similarly, the EOR on Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C (Fig. 10c) does not seem much influenced by the adsorbates. However, as for Pt/C, the EOR kinetics on Pt-SnO₂/C (Fig. 10b) is hindered by hydrogen adsorbates. This is an indirect evidence that tin oxide does not help the surface dehydrogenation, and that such composite electrocatalyst likely operates through a bifunctional mechanism: Pt adsorbs ethanol and dehydrogenates it, whereas SnO₂ “only” provides OH_ads species (at lower potential than Pt).

During the negative scan, the initiation of the ethanol electrooxidation on Pt-Rh/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C occurs at a lower potential and at a lower extent after the CA at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE compared to the CVs obtained after E_ad = 0.05 and 0.3 V vs. RHE. This phenomenon is attributed to the higher stability of the hydroxide adsorbates which reduce on rhodium at a lower potential than on platinum (see Fig. 4) and which prevent ethanol from adsorbing/oxidizing on the rhodium surface. On the contrary, the EOR on Pt-SnO₂/C remains unchanged, even though hydroxide adsorbates are more stable on tin oxide. This is interpreted by the fact that ethanol does not adsorb on SnO₂, the role of which is only to provide OH_ads species at lower potential.

EOR comparative study between the electrocatalysts

Fig. 11 compares the EOR after a chronoamperometry at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE on Pt/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C. The ethanol electrooxidation on Rh/C was ignored as the reaction electroactivity was too low in comparison to the other electrocatalysts. As shown in the inset of Fig. 11, the EOR initiates on all electrocatalysts at ca. E = 0.35 V vs. RHE. Nonetheless, a higher reaction electroactivity (normalized by the total metal mass) was recorded on Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C and on Pt-SnO₂/C compared to Pt/C until E = 0.62 V vs. RHE. A faster current increase during the EOR at very low potential values can be explained by faster ethanol dehydrogenation kinetics (2e⁻) or by an enhanced ethanol electrooxidation toward acetic acid (4e⁻) or CO₂ (12 e⁻).

Conversely, Pt/C clearly surpasses all the multi-metallic electrocatalysts at E > 0.62 V vs. RHE. Pt lower metal content in Pt-SnO₂/C (see Table 1) and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C compared to Pt/C (which is the most electroactive pure metal in acid medium) could explain the larger peak current at E = 0.88 V vs. RHE on the latter (the current is normalized to the total mass of metal). However, this explanation does not work for Pt-Rh/C, the Pt:Rh ratio of which is almost 1:1. Although the EOR activity is not very large on Rh alone (Fig. 8) compared to Pt (Fig. 6), the EOR on Pt-Rh/C exhibits currents as high as on Pt/C. This could be...
due to an alloy effect between the two metals and to a facilitation of the C-C bond breaking in the presence of Rh.

Regarding the mass-to-charge signals m/z 22, m/z 29 and m/z 61 (Fig. 12), acetaldehyde formation (m/z 29) starts at ca. $E = 0.27$ V vs. RHE on Pt-Rh/C and $E = 0.24$ V vs. RHE on Pt-SnO$_2$/C and Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C versus $E = 0.31$ V vs. RHE on Pt/C. This observation agrees with the higher dehydrogenation on Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO$_2$/C and Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C highlighted in Fig. 4. These values are slightly lower than those depicting the faraday current onset, due to the non-quantitative formation of acetaldehyde generating a too low current to be observable in Fig. 11. Acetic acid formation starts shortly after ca. $E = 0.35$ V vs. RHE on Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C and $E = 0.32$ V vs. RHE on Pt-Rh/C and Pt/C. Pt-SnO$_2$/C seems to ease acetic acid formation better than the other electrocatalysts at low potential (onset at ca. $E = 0.28$ V vs. RHE), because the SnO$_2$ moiety is capable to easily provide OH$_{ad}$-species to the acetaldehyde adsorbed at the Pt moiety. However, at higher potential, acetic acid formation seems more enhanced on Pt-Rh/C electrocatalyst. Conversely to the literature, our synthesized Pt-SnO$_2$/C electrocatalyst does not seem to favour the pathway leading to acetic acid formation compared to Pt/C. PtSnO$_2$/C peculiar physical structure (presence of larger nanoparticles and agglomerates) could explain these divergent results. Unfortunately, the few existing studies focused on the nanoparticles size effect do not give evidence of an influence of the nanoparticles size on the EOR pathway. Finally, CO$_2$ generation seems slightly shifted on Pt-based bi- and tri-metallic electrocatalysts compared to Pt/C. Indeed, CO$_2$ could be detected at potentials as low as $E = 0.54$ V vs. RHE on Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C versus $E = 0.58$ V vs. RHE on Pt-Rh/C and $E = 0.61$ V vs. RHE on Pt/C. CO$_2$ was also generated during the negative scan on Pt-SnO$_2$/C. Ionic (m/z 22, m/z 29 and m/z 61) current onsets of all studied electrocatalysts (comprised Rh/C) are summarized in Table 2.

**CO$_2$ current efficiency**

The CO$_2$ current efficiency (CCE) was determined from potentiodynamic voltammetries and the corresponding mass-to-charge signal m/z 22 between $E = 0.5$ and 0.9 V vs. RHE (0.1 V step) on Pt/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO$_2$/C and Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C. Regarding the previous results of Fig. 12, the chronoamperometries at $E_{ad} = 0.05$, 0.3 and 1 V vs. RHE do impact the EOR and more specifically the CO$_2$ production. Consequently, the CCE variation versus the potential was evaluated after chronoamperometries at $E_{ad} = 0.05$, 0.3 and 1 V vs. RHE. It can be noticed in Fig. 13 that the CCE evolution can be separated in two steps for all electrocatalysts: a first ascending phase between $E = 0.5$ and ca. 0.7 - 0.8 V vs. RHE (depending on the previous CA), where the CCE increases against the potential; a second one at $E > 0.7$ - 0.8 V vs. RHE where the CCE shrinks. The CCE rise in the first potential region can reasonably be explained by OH growing adsorption permitting the oxidation of
adsorbed CO. A second reason could be the improved C-C bond breaking ability gained by the electrocatalyst with the potential increase (although previous studies reported ethanol dissociative adsorption at potentials as low as $E = 0.05 \text{ V vs. RHE}$). On the contrary, in the second potential region ($E > 0.7 - 0.8 \text{ V vs. RHE}$), CO$_2$ generation is more and more hindered as the potential increases. It is believed that above a certain potential, the presence of adsorbates on the electrocatalyst surface prevents ethanol dissociative adsorption and a fortiori CO$_2$ generation. These adsorbates are supposedly OH$_{ads}$ and ethanol intermediates and are believed to sterically impede the ethanol dissociative adsorption. Fig. 13c shows the relative lower CCE values obtained when the potentiodynamic voltammetry is preceded by the CA at $E_{ad} = 1 \text{ V vs. RHE}$ in comparison to the CVs preceded by the CA at $E_{ad} = 0.05$ and $0.3 \text{ V vs. RHE}$. It is supposed that adsorbed hydroxide species did not have time to desorb completely from the electrocatalyst surface at the beginning of the CV and that the remaining OH$_{ads}$ species hinder ethanol dissociative adsorption and thus CO$_2$ generation. An accumulation of ethanol adsorbates on the electrocatalyst surface could also prevent ethanol dissociative adsorption (which likely requires more than two free neighbouring electrocatalytic sites). This explanation is supported by the oxidation of CH$_x$ and C$_2$- adsorbates only at potentials as high as $E = 0.9 \text{ V vs. RHE}$. Identifying these ethanol adsorbates would require a thorough IR analysis and is beyond the scope of this study.

Among the studied electrocatalysts, Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C demonstrates the highest CO$_2$ current efficiency in all three protocols while Pt/C and Pt-SnO$_2$/C displayed the lowest values. A higher CO$_2$ generation on Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C than on Pt-SnO$_2$/C evaluated by infrared techniques is also reported in the literature. Low CCE values on Pt/C and Pt-SnO$_2$/C are also supported in the literature in other DEMS studies. According to the authors, the larger CCE values obtained on Rh-containing electrocatalysts (Pt-Rh/C and Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C) are attributed to the stronger adsorption of the ethanol adsorbates on the electrocatalyst surface which enhances the C-C bond cleavage. On Pt/C, the strength of the bond is believed to be too weak which results into two negative consequences for the complete EOR: the desorption of the ethanol adsorbates (more precisely the acetyl ones, as proposed by Iwasita and Pastor) soon after ethanol dehydrogenation, which leads to the production of acetaldehyde or acetic acid; the slower kinetics of the C-C bond cleavage compared to rhodium. The larger CCE values on Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C compared to Pt-Rh/C are attributed both to the OH-supply at low potential via SnO$_2$ and to the freeing of the rhodium sites from hydroxide adsorbates by the same tin oxide.

The influence of the chronoamperometries at $E_{ad} = 0.05$, 0.3 and 1 V vs. RHE in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ run before the potentiodynamic voltammetries on the CO$_2$ current efficiency is compared in Fig. 13a, Fig. 13b and Fig. 13c respectively. For each Pt-based electrocatalysts, the CCE values are generally lower after the chronoamperometry at $E_{ad} = 1 \text{ V vs. RHE}$ illustrating the observation done with Fig. 12. Although adsorbed OH-species are necessary to oxidize CO$_{ad}$, a large coverage of the electrocatalyst surface by the OH-adsorbates may hinder CO$_2$ formation coming from adsorbed acetaldehyde or direct ethanol dissociative adsorption. The CA at $E_{ad} = 0.3 \text{ V vs. RHE}$ seems to enhance CO$_2$ production during the following cyclic voltammetry. Although the original goal of this chronoamperometry was to start the cyclic voltammetry without any adsorbates at the electrocatalyst surface, the mandatory change of solution during the last four minutes of the CA may have, on the contrary, provoked ethanol dissociative adsorption into CO$_{ad}$ before the beginning of the CV. These CO$_{ad}$-species then likely oxidized as soon as hydroxide molecules started adsorbing on the electrocatalyst surface. That could explain the higher CCE values in Fig. 13b and also why CO$_2$ generation starts at potentials as low as $E = 0.5 \text{ V vs. RHE}$ on Pt-Rh-SnO$_2$/C, which also corresponds to the beginning of OH$_{ad}$ formation on the tri-metallic electrocatalyst (see Fig. 4).
ethanol adsorbates coming from a previous CV in 0.5 M H₂ to clean the electrocatalyst surface from potential residual from
Rh/C, the second step differs significantly on the two
cycles: (A) hydrogen adsorption in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE, (B) the solution change in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH and (C) the potentiodynamic ethanol oxidation reaction starting at E = 0.2 V vs. RHE.

The aim of this section is to demonstrate the difficulty for ethanol to displace adsorbed hydrogen species on Pt/C conversely to Rh/C. To that purpose, the presented figures show the evolution of the potential (left y-axis) and of the mass-to-charge signals (right y-axis) m/z 29 ([CHO⁺]) and m/z 2 ([H₂⁺]) against the time during the chronocoulometry carried out at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE, followed by the voltamperogram in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH (similarly to Fig. 1, but with the additional evolution of the MSCVs m/z 2 and m/z 29). The particularly interesting information here relies in the behaviour of signal m/z 2 after the solution switch from 0.5 M H₂SO₄ to 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH after the first eight minutes of the CA. The mass-to-charge signal m/z 29 is used to solution switch (to a solution containing ethanol) after the first eight minutes of CA. As observed in Fig. 14a and Fig. 14b, the appearance of this signal is slightly delayed (which explains the non-superposition of the vertical dashed line with the signal m/z 29). This delay corresponds to the time required by the solution to flow in the capillaries, reach the electrochemical cell and be pumped inside the mass spectrometer.

First and foremost, the first decrease of the mass-to-charge signal m/z 2 during the first eight minutes of the CA corresponds to a "normal" hydrogen generation response to the potential step from E_ad = 1 to 0.05 V vs. RHE (a first CA not shown in Fig. 14 was carried out at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ during 30 s to clean the electrocatalyst surface from potentially residual ethanol adsorbates coming from a previous CV in 0.5 M H₂SO₄ + 0.1 M EtOH). Contrary to the first step of the CA similar on Pt/C and Rh/C, the second step differs significantly on the two
electrocatalysts: on Pt/C (Fig. 14a), the initial drop of the ionic (m/z 2) current during the first eight minutes of the CA is followed by its slight rise/stabilization appearing simultaneously to the increase of the signal m/z 29 (corresponding here to the progressive presence of 0.1 M ethanol in the electrolyte) and may sign a low formation of H₂ as by-product of the ethanol dehydrogenation. However, this hypothesis cannot be proved with the mass-to-charge signal m/z 29, biased by the ethanol concentration variation which prevents from detecting the possible low acetaldehyde formation. As far as the authors are concerned, the high constant ionic (m/z 2) current recorded on Pt/C is more believed to illustrate H₂ steady formation and thus ethanol difficulty to adsorb on the electrocatalyst, as evidenced in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. On the contrary, a further shrinkage of the ionic (m/z 2) current is recorded on Rh/C (Fig. 14b). This phenomenon can be explained by the ethanol adsorption taking place quantitatively on the electrocatalyst surface, which blocks rhodium electroactive sites and hinders dramatically the hydrogen generation. This result is in agreement with the larger currents generated during the EOR after the CA at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE (Fig. 8 and Fig. 9).

Conclusions

The influence of the presence of H- and OH-adsorbates on the potentiodynamic ethanol electrooxidation was studied on home-made Pt/C, Rh/C, Pt-Rh/C, Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C by differential electrochemical mass spectrometry (DEMS) in a flow cell system. Prior to the cyclic voltametries, a chronocoulometry at E_ad = 0.05 and 1 V vs. RHE was applied in order to adsorb these adsorbates. For the sake of comparison, another adsorption potential was chosen at E_ad = 0.3 V vs. RHE in the double layer region. The three main products of the ethanol oxidation reaction (EOR), acetaldehyde, acetic acid and CO₂, were detected using the mass-to-charge signals m/z 29, m/z 22 and m/z 61, respectively.

The physical investigation of the electrocatalysts revealed crystallized round-shaped metal nanoparticles well-dispersed on the carbon support. The presence of some agglomerates and large nanoparticles were however observed by TEM on Pt-Rh/C and to a larger extent on Pt-SnO₂/C.

The comparison of the first and second cycle of the CVs on Pt/C revealed a kinetics slow-down during the first scan following the CA at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE, whereas a shift toward negative potentials was observed after the CA at E_ad = 1 V vs. RHE. These results were interpreted by the hindrance of the ethanol adsorption/electrooxidation due to H₂ and by an easier replacement of OH-adsorbates by ethanol molecules. Results on Rh/C were opposite to platinum. The EOR proceeded almost entirely through its complete pathway toward CO₂ after hydrogen adsorption, while the activity was highly lowered during the second scan of the CV preceded by the CA at E_ad = 0.05 V vs. RHE. A low EOR activity was also reported after the CA at E_ad = 0.3 and 1 V vs. RHE. The high OH- stability on Rh/C likely prevents their displacement by bulk ethanol molecules and thus their electrooxidation.

Similarly to Pt/C, the EOR on Pt-SnO₂/C was hindered by H-adsorbates while the EOR on Pt-Rh/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C did not show much influence of the adsorbates. The last result was
explained by Pt and Rh opposite behaviours. The comparison between the electrocatalysts revealed a slightly lower EOR onset potential on Pt-SnO₂/C and Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C than on Pt/C, which was corresponding to ethanol better dehydrogenation into acetaldehyde. CO₂ generation was detected at lower potentials on Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C than on the other electrocatalysts. The CO₂ currency efficiency (CCE) was finally determined for each electrocatalyst and demonstrated higher values on Pt-Rh-SnO₂/C, regardless of the adsorption process preceding the cyclic voltammetries. The last result was explained by a stronger adsorption of the ethanol adsorbates on the rhodium surface than on platinum favouring the C-C bond cleavage.

Finally, The representation versus time of the mass-to-charge ratio m/z 2 gives further insight on ethanol ability to displace the hydrogen adsorbates: ethanol is unable to dislodge H₂d significantly on Pt/C (but may partially dehydrogenize and form H₂ as by-product), whereas this operation is successfully performed on Rh/C.
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