

Cite this: *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2021, 9, 19346

## Hybrid artificial photosynthetic systems constructed using quantum dots and molecular catalysts for solar fuel production: development and advances

Jing Liu,<sup>†</sup> Ying-Yi Ren,<sup>†</sup> Jin Wu, Wu Xia,<sup>ID</sup> Bo-Yi Deng and Feng Wang<sup>ID</sup>\*

The construction of artificial photosynthetic (AP) systems for the hydrogen evolution reaction (HER) and carbon dioxide reduction reaction (CRR) is one of the hottest topics in the field of energy and sustainability. A typical AP system is composed of three key components, a photosensitizer (PS) for visible light harvesting, a catalyst for redox reactions, and a sacrificial electron donor (SED) for consuming holes generated in the PS. Among these three components, the PS and catalyst affect the photocatalytic performance much. There are two main types of AP systems, heterogeneous systems using inorganic materials and homogeneous systems using molecules. In addition to these, a compromise strategy of using inorganic luminescent nanoparticles as photosensitizers and molecular metal complexes as catalysts to construct hybrid AP systems has been developed. Inorganic luminescent nanoparticles, such as colloidal quantum dots (QDs) and carbon quantum dots (CQDs), have advantages of robust photostability, multiple excitation, and easy preparation. Molecular catalysts feature high activity, modifiable structures, and atom economy. Research on the combination of these two different types of materials to construct hybrid systems for solar fuel production is blooming. In the last decade, a large number of hybrid AP systems have been reported, and various strategies for system construction were developed. Obvious improvements in the photocatalytic efficiency of solar fuel production were witnessed. This review focuses on hybrid AP systems for the HER and CRR. The mechanism, composition, system design, and photocatalytic performances of the reported hybrid AP systems are reviewed. The advances and challenges in this field are discussed.

Received 31st March 2021  
Accepted 27th June 2021

DOI: 10.1039/d1ta02673a

rsc.li/materials-a

Key Laboratory of Materials Chemistry for Energy Conversion and Storage (Huazhong University of Science and Technology) of Ministry of Education, Hubei Key Laboratory of Material Chemistry and Service Failure, Hubei Engineering Research Center for Biomaterials and Medical Protective Materials, School of

Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, 430074, P. R. China. E-mail: wangfengchem@hust.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup> These two authors contributed equally to this review.



Jing Liu received his B.S. degree in Chemical Engineering and Technology from the Wuhan University of Science and Technology. He is currently in his second year as a graduate student in Materials Chemistry under the supervision of Associate Professor Feng Wang in the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. He is currently working

on artificial photosynthetic  $H_2$  production and  $CO_2$  reduction.



Ying-Yi Ren received her B.S. degree in Materials Chemistry from Shanxi University. She is currently in her second year as a graduate student in Materials Chemistry under the supervision of Associate Professor Feng Wang in the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. Her current work focuses on artificial photosynthesis.

## 1. Introduction

Green plants and some bacteria and algae on Earth carry out photosynthetic reactions everyday, and these are the largest scale photochemical reactions occurring around us.<sup>1–4</sup> Photosynthesis not only provides energy for the growth of plants but also balances the concentration of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere. The essence of photosynthesis is that plants store solar energy in chemical bonds *via* solar-to-chemical energy conversion. In the view of human beings, this process is a green, sustainable, and ideal way of solar energy utilization (Scheme 1).<sup>5–7</sup> Inspired by photosynthesis in nature, scientists proposed, as early as in the 1910s,<sup>8</sup> to construct artificial photosynthetic systems to make fuels and chemicals in a green and clean way.<sup>9–13</sup> Giacomo Ciamician, a photochemist in Italy, wrote in an essay titled “The photochemistry of the future” published in 1912 that “On the arid lands there will spring up industrial colonies without smoke and without smokestacks; forests of glass tubes will extend over the plains and glass buildings will rise everywhere; inside of these will take place the photochemical processes that hitherto




Scheme 1 Schematic diagram of artificial photosynthesis.

have been the guarded secret of the plants, but that will have been mastered by human industry which will know how to make them bear even more abundant fruit than nature, for nature is not in a hurry and mankind is. And if in a distant future the supply of coal becomes completely exhausted, civilization will not be checked by that, for life and civilization will continue as long as the sun shines!” The pioneering study on artificial photosynthesis emerged in the 1970s. Fujishima and



*Jin Wu received his B.S. degree in Pharmaceutical Engineering from Hefei Normal University. He is currently in his third year as a graduate student in Materials Chemistry under the supervision of Associate Professor Feng Wang in the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. He focuses on developing self-assembly systems for*

*photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production and CO<sub>2</sub> reduction.*



*Bo-Yi Deng received his B.S. degree in Materials Chemistry from the Nanjing University of Science and Technology. He is currently in his first year as a graduate student in Materials Chemistry under the supervision of Associate Professor Feng Wang in the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. He is working on supramolecular photoluminescence.*



*Wu Xia received his B.S. degree in Chemistry from Hubei Engineering University and M.S. degree in Organic Chemistry from Hubei University. He is currently a PhD candidate in Organic Chemistry under the supervision of Associate Professor Feng Wang in the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. His current work focuses*

*on photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction.*



*Feng Wang received his B.S. degree in Applied Chemistry from the Huazhong University of Science and Technology in 2005 and his Ph.D. from the Technical Institute of Physics and Chemistry, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, under the supervision of Professor Li-Zhu Wu and Professor Chen-Ho Tung in 2013. After postdoctoral research (2013–2016) at the University of Hong Kong,*

*working with Professor Chi-Ming Che, he joined the faculty of Huazhong University of Science and Technology as an Associate Professor. His research interests include artificial photosynthesis, self-assembly of optical-functional materials, and supramolecular photoluminescence.*

Honda reported that water can be photo-electrochemically split into H<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> by irradiation of an electrochemical cell using TiO<sub>2</sub> and platinum black as the anode and cathode, respectively.<sup>14</sup> In recent decade, a research blooming of artificial photosynthesis is witnessed because of the concern on fossil energy depletion and environmental pollution by human society.

The study of artificial photosynthesis focuses mainly on two half-reactions, the HER and CRR. The products of these two reactions, such as H<sub>2</sub>, carbon monoxide (CO), methanol (CH<sub>3</sub>OH), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), *etc.*, are energy-bearing molecules and referred to as solar fuels.<sup>15,16</sup> The HER is a two-electron-reduction reaction involving two protons and one H–H bond formation. In contrast, the CRR is complex. The CRR produces different products depending on the number of electrons participating in it (Scheme 2). In most of the cases, the HER is an inevitable competing reaction in the CRR system.

A typical AP system contains at least three key functional components, a photosensitizer, a catalyst, and a sacrificial electron donor. The PS harvests visible light and generates excited electrons of high potential. Semiconductors,<sup>17–21</sup> organic dyes,<sup>22–24</sup> and noble metal complexes<sup>25–28</sup> are usually used as PSs in AP systems. The catalyst is the active site for the HER or CRR. There are two categories, molecular catalysts (MC)<sup>29–32</sup> and non-molecular catalysts, such as inorganic nanomaterials.<sup>33–35</sup> The molecular catalysts are those molecules and macromolecules having a definite chemical structure, such as transition metal complexes or macromolecules/polymer containing metal complexes as catalytic centers. The SED provides electrons for photocatalysis. Water (H<sub>2</sub>O) is an ideal SED for AP systems. However, in most of the cases, small organic molecules that are easily oxidized, such as ascorbic acid (AA), triethylamine (TEA), triethanolamine (TEOA), and isopropanol (IPA), are used as alternatives due to the high oxidation potential of water.

In the past few decades, various materials have been used to construct AP systems. According to the types of materials, the AP systems can be divided into three types. The first type is a heterogeneous AP system, which is composed of inorganic

materials, such as semiconductors, metal oxides, MOFs, COFs and their composites. The second type is a homogeneous AP system. In this type, both the photosensitizer and catalyst are molecules, and two functional components are physically mixed to construct an intermolecular system or covalently linked/self-assembled together to form an intramolecular system. The third type of AP system is a hybrid system, which is commonly composed of colloidal quantum dots (QDs) as a PS and a transition metal complex as a catalyst. This type of system is developed as an alternative to the homogeneous system. The latter suffered from low turnovers and stability due to fast decomposition of the molecular PS, such as noble-metal complexes and organic dyes, under light irradiation and high efficiency of charge recombination between the molecular PS and MC.<sup>36–38</sup>





There are many excellent reviews on the first two types of AP systems.<sup>39–43</sup> Studies on hybrid AP systems developed rapidly after the first such system described by the Wu group in 2011.<sup>44</sup> In the last decade, a large number of hybrid AP systems had been constructed to successfully realize the HER or CRR. Various strategies for system construction were developed, and an obvious improvement of the photocatalytic efficiency of solar fuel production was witnessed, especially in comparison to that of the homogeneous systems using analogous molecular catalysts.<sup>36–38</sup> After ten-years of development, it is time to provide a comprehensive review in this field. In this review, we focus on the development and advances of hybrid AP systems acquired in the last decade. In the above Section 1, an introduction to artificial photosynthesis is given. In Section 2, the mechanism, composition, and strategies for the system design of hybrid AP systems are discussed. The hybrid AP systems for the HER and CRR are reviewed in Section 3 and 4, respectively. The challenges and outlook of this field are given in Section 5.

## 2. Hybrid artificial photosynthetic systems

### 2.1 Mechanism

At present, two terms, photosynthesis and photocatalysis, have not been differentiated in most of the literature. However, it should be noted that from a thermodynamic point of view, an artificial photosynthetic system performs a thermodynamically unfavorable ( $\Delta G > 0$ ) reaction, such as water splitting, with the aid of solar energy input. The photocatalysis is a thermodynamically favorable ( $\Delta G < 0$ ) process.<sup>45–47</sup> Most of the AP systems carry out in the presence of an SED. The thermodynamics of the overall reaction of such systems should be noticed. If the overall reaction is thermodynamically favorable, it is suggested to be referred to as a photocatalytic system. In this review, the term artificial photosynthesis was used to indicate the system mimicking the mechanism of photosynthesis.

The mechanism of the hybrid AP system is depicted in Scheme 3. By using a typical AP system containing three components, a QD, a MC, and a SED, as an example, there are four steps in a complete photocatalytic cycle: (i) light absorption of QDs, (ii) photoinduced electron transfer (PET) between the



Scheme 2 Electrochemical reaction equations (all potentials vs. NHE at pH 7).



QDs and MC, (iii) reduction reaction of the MC for the production of products, and (iv) oxidation reaction of the SED. First, the QDs are excited *via* absorbing visible light to generate electrons and holes in the conduction band (CB) and valence band (VB) of the QDs, respectively (step i in Scheme 3). The photon energy of the light should be higher than the excitation energy ( $E_a$ ) of the QDs. Second, the photogenerated electrons transfer from the CB of the QDs to the metal center of the MC (step ii in Scheme 3). This is the PET step, one of the most important steps in AP systems.<sup>48–51</sup> The reduced catalyst as an active species binds to the substrate, proton for the HER or CO<sub>2</sub> for the CRR, to fulfill catalytic conversion and finally affords reduction products (step iii in Scheme 3). At the same time, holes in the VB of the QDs are consumed by the SED *via* SED oxidation reactions (step iv in Scheme 3). In a hybrid system, QDs act as a photosensitizer to harvest light and generate electrons of higher potential. A small portion of the HER or CRR may operate at the surface of the QDs; however, the molecular catalyst is the major catalytic center for the catalytic reactions. The conduction band of the QDs should be more negative than the reduction potential of the MC to ensure thermodynamic feasibility of the PET step. Another important parameter is the lifetime of the photogenerated electrons in QDs, and a longer lifetime is kinetically beneficial for PET. However, charge recombination and electron trapping by surface trapping in QDs may decrease the total quantum yield of the system. The kinetic feature of the photogenerated hole consumption is also essential for the stability of the system, and slurry reactions between the SED and holes in QDs lead to self-photocorrosion of the QDs by accumulated holes.


## 2.2 Photosensitizers

Colloidal quantum dots (QDs) are a kind of photoluminescent material explored in the 1980s.<sup>52,53</sup> Typical QDs are quasi-zero-dimensional materials with a diameter of several nanometers (Table 1). A typical semiconductor QD is composed of a semiconductor core and organic surface ligands (Scheme 4). The presence of organic ligands at the surface causes monodispersion of QDs in solvent. This feature makes QDs have solution processability. QDs as a photosensitizer in a hybrid AP

system have the following advantages: (i) the optical properties of QDs can be readily tuned by controlling their size, benefiting from the quantum confinement effect of QDs. The large absorption coefficients and tunable absorption spectra make QDs an excellent light-harvester. (ii) QDs generate multiple excitons under irradiation, which enhance the photon utilization and catalytic efficiency of the hybrid AP system. (iii) The potential of the conduction band of QDs is negative enough, resulting in QDs to generate excited electrons of more reducing ability. (iv) In comparison to noble metal complexes and organic dyes used as PSs in homogeneous systems, QDs have higher photostability, easier synthetic protocol, and lower cost. (v) QDs can be chemically modified on their surface, and this character expands the process of functionalization of QDs. However, some drawbacks of QDs should also be pointed out. The photocorrosion of QDs caused by hole accumulation in photocatalysis is one of main reasons of system inactivation. Most of the QDs used in AP systems contain cadmium, which is considered to be harmful to the environment.

Colloidal II–VI (CdTe, CdSe, CdS, ZnS, and ZnSe), I–III–VI (CuInS<sub>2</sub>) QDs and their composites are commonly used as PSs in the hybrid AP systems. The parameters of QDs used in the hybrid AP systems are summarized in Table 1. Most of the QDs are nanoparticles with a diameter in the range of 1–5 nm. The surface of these QDs is passivated by organic ligands containing thiol groups as a surface anchor (Scheme 4).

Carbon-based materials, such as carbon quantum dots (CQDs), are emerging photoluminescent nanoparticles with a diameter from several to hundred nanometers.<sup>54–58</sup> They are synthesized *via* thermolysis by using small organic molecules, such as citric acid and thiophene, as carbon sources. Their surface is terminated by charged groups, such as carboxylic acid and amino, which enable them to disperse evenly in water. Photoluminescent carbon-based nanoparticles are also referred to as carbon quantum dots due to some similarities to inorganic semiconductor quantum dots in terms of photoluminescence and size. Although the chemical structures and the mechanism of photoluminescence of CQDs are controversial, they have been applied in the research of fluorescent sensors, bioimaging, photodynamic therapy, and so on.



Scheme 3 Mechanism of the hybrid AP system.

Table 1 Physical properties of the QDs used in the hybrid AP systems

Entry	QDs	Ligand	Size/nm	Emission $\lambda_{\text{max}}/\text{nm}$	$E_g^a/\text{eV}$	Ref.
1	CdTe	L1	3.4	625	1.84	44
2	CdTe	L1	2.8	557	2.23	104
3	CdTe	L1	3.8	N. R.	N. R.	129
4	CdTe	L11	2.7	515	2.4	98
5	CdSe	L1	1.8	N. R. <sup>b</sup>	2.64	77
6	CdSe	L1	N. R.	468	2.64	78
7	CdSe	L1	2	N. R.	N. R.	91
8	CdSe	L1	N. R.	N. R.	2.19	94
9	CdSe	L1	1.95	650	2.7	95
10	CdSe	L1	1.9	465	2.7	99
11	CdSe	L2	2.5–2.7	N. R.	N. R.	83
12	CdSe	L2	2.5–5.5	N. R.	N. R.	80
13	CdSe	L3	2.5–2.7	N. R.	2.4	81
14	CdSe	L4	2.5–2.7	N. R.	2.4	81
15	CdSe	L5	2.2	540	2.13	101
16	CdSe	L6	2	474	2.6	102
17	CdSe	L7	3	557	2.09	103
18	CdSe	L9	2.89–3.63	N. R.	N. R.	106
19	CdS	— <sup>c</sup>	50	N. R.	N. R.	86
20	CdS	—	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	89
21	CdS	—	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	90
22	CdS	—	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	130
23	CdS	—	10	N. R.	N. R.	124
24	CdS	—	5–8	N. R.	2.42	131
25	CdS	—	5.3	451	2.74	125
26	CdS	L1	5	630	N. R.	88
27	CdS	L1	7.1	610	2.54	123
28	CdS	L8	50	N. R.	N. R.	105
29	CdS	L10	N. R.	N. R.	2.59	120
30	ZnS	—	50	357	N. R.	87
31	ZnSe	—	3.5–6	N. R.	2.7	126
32	CuInS <sub>2</sub>	L1	6–8	750	N. R.	128
33	(AgIn) <sub>0.5</sub> ZnS <sub>2</sub>	—	2.3–4.1	N. R.	2.34	93
34	Zn <sub>x</sub> Cd <sub>1-x</sub> S	—	N. R.	N. R.	2.46	121
35	(CuGa) <sub>1-x</sub> Zn <sub>2x</sub> S ( $x = 0.7$ )	—	N. R.	N. R.	2.36	127
36	CdSe/ZnS	—	N. R.	540	2.27	96
37	CdS/Bi <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub>	L10	N. R.	N. R.	2.44	119
38	CdS/rGO	—	3.5	N. R.	2.33	113
39	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	—	2.7–3.5	620	N. R.	97
40	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	L1	2.5	610	N. R.	118
41	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	L9	1.9–2.5	638	1.55	92
42	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	L12	2.5	610	N. R.	117
43	CQDs/ZnIn <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub>	—	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	114
44	CQDs	—	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	115
45	CQDs	—	20–60	548	2.49	112
46	CQDs	—	4.5–9.1	464	N. R.	108
47	CQDs	—	7	N. R.	N. R.	109
48	N-CQDs <sup>d</sup>	—	<20	N. R.	3.14	111
49	N-CQDs	—	2–4.2	N. R.	N. R.	110
50	CQDs/g-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	2.3	N. R.	N. R.	122


<sup>a</sup>  $E_g$  is the excitation energy of the QDs. <sup>b</sup> N. R. = not recorded. <sup>c</sup> No ligand existing. <sup>d</sup> N-CQDs: Nitrogen-doped carbon quantum dots.

Recently, CQDs have also been used as a photosensitizer to construct hybrid AP systems.


### 2.3 Catalysts

There are four advantages of using molecular catalysts in hybrid AP systems. (i) Molecular catalysts have a definite chemical structure and are atom economic. (ii) The activity, selectivity, and solubility of molecular catalysts can be tuned through rational


ligand design. (iii) Molecular catalysts are easily attached on the surface of QDs physically, chemically, or by self-assembly to form composite photocatalysts. (iv) Molecular catalysts are good models for the mechanism study. Transition metal (Fe, Co, and Ni) complexes are major molecular catalysts used in hybrid AP systems (Schemes 5–8, Table 2).<sup>59–62</sup> The HER molecular catalysts include hydrogenase mimics, cobaloxime and its derivatives, Ni-bis(diphosphine) complexes, and so on (Schemes 5–7).



Scheme 4 Chemical structures of the QD ligands.



Scheme 5 Chemical structures of the Fe-based molecular catalysts for the HER.



Scheme 6 Chemical structures of the Co-based molecular catalysts for the HER.

Hydrogenase mimics are complexes containing an Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> core. They are named hydrogenase mimics because the structure of Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> is similar to the active site of [FeFe]-hydrogenase in algae, and the latter catalyzes a reversible proton reduction reaction with an exceptional activity.<sup>63</sup> It should be noted that the Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>-based mimics are based on an Fe<sup>I</sup>Fe<sup>I</sup> diiron core, which is different from the natural active site of an Fe<sup>II</sup>Fe<sup>II</sup> core. The Fe<sup>I</sup>Fe<sup>I</sup> mimics had been proved to have catalytic activity for proton reduction in either photocatalytic or electrocatalytic systems. The active species is a one-electron reduced Fe<sup>I</sup>Fe<sup>0</sup>

species, which binds to a proton to form a hydride intermediate for affording H<sub>2</sub>. The Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> mimics can be modified and functionalized at either Fe atoms or S atoms. Given this advantage, various hydrogenase mimics (Scheme 5) were synthesized for the construction of AP systems. Early this century, many Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> complexes were used as molecular catalysts in combination with a molecular PS covalently or intermolecularly, such as [Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, zinc-porphyrins, and organic dyes, for homogeneous photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production. However, most of these systems produced H<sub>2</sub> with a TON (all TONs are based on




Scheme 7 Chemical structures of the Ni-based molecular catalysts for the HER.

molecular catalysts in this review) of no more than 1 to several turnovers.<sup>48</sup>

Cobaloxime had long been known as a molecular catalyst for the HER.<sup>64,65</sup> The catalytic mechanism of cobaloxime for

the HER had been studied extensively. A two-electron reduced  $\text{Co}^{\text{I}}$ -species is the active species for proton binding. Cobaloxime can be functionalized at the axial pyridine ligand, and this facilitates chemists to develop various cobaloxime



Scheme 8 Chemical structures of the molecular catalysts for the CRR.



Table 2 Reductive potentials of the MCs used in the hybrid AP systems

Entry	MC	Reduction couples	$E_{\text{red}}/\text{eV}$	vs. RE	Solvent	Ref.
1	MC1	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.88	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	44
2	MC2	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.43	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	77
3	MC3	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.55	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	78
4	MC4	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-1.07	NHE	DMF	87
5	MC5	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.90	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	91
6	MC6	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-1.05	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	91
7	MC7	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.66	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	99
8	MC8	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.97	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	101
9	MC9	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0a}}$	-1.13	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{IPA}$	102
10	MC9	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-1.09	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{IPA}$	102
11	MC9	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-0.96	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	102
12	MC10	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}/\text{Fe}^{\text{I}}\text{Fe}^{\text{0}}$	-1.16	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	104
13	MC11	$\text{Fe}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.928	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	83
14	MC12	$\text{Fe}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.898	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	83
15	MC13	$\text{Fe}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.764	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	83
16	MC14	$\text{Fe}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.723	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	83
17	MC15	N. R.	-1.38	NHE	N. R.	95
18	MC16	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.35, -0.78	NHE	DMF	86
19	MC17	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.44, -0.79	NHE	DMF	86
20	MC18	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.48, -0.80	NHE	DMF	86
21	MC16	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.36, -0.79	NHE	DMF	88
22	MC16	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.41, -0.85	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	89
23	MC16	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.35, -0.78	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	114
24	MC19	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.77, -1.08	SCE	DMF	96
25	MC20	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.47	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	116
26	MC21	$\text{Co}^{\text{III/II}}, \text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.24, -0.82	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	113
27	MC22	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.70	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	81
28	MC23	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.64	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	81
29	MC24	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.51	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	81
30	MC25	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.40	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	81
31	MC26	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.85	SCE	N. R.	92
32	MC27	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.03	SCE	N. R.	92
33	MC26	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.61	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	111
34	MC28	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.68	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	97
35	MC29	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.68	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	97
36	MC30	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.95	NHE	N. R.	93
37	MC33	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.08	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	98
38	MC34	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.85	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	98
39	MC35	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.47	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	112
40	MC36	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.56	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	82
41	MC37	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.11	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	82
42	MC38	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.89	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	82
43	MC39	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.45	SCE	DMF	82
44	MC40	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.32	SCE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	82
45	MC41	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.558	SCE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	94
46	MC43	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.95	NHE	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$	103
47	$\text{Ni}^{2+}\text{-DHLA}^b$	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.90	NHE	$\text{EtOH}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	80
48	$\text{Ni}^{2+}\text{-EDT}^b$	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.11	RHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	105
49	$\text{Co}^{2+}\text{-GSH}^b$	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.70	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	106
50	MC45	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I/0}}$	-1.80	SCE	DMF	118
51	MC46	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I/0}}$	-1.02	NHE	N. R.	119
52	MC46	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I/0}}$	-1.02	NHE	DMF	120
53	MC46	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I/0}}$	-1.02	NHE	DMF	121
54	MC46	$\text{Fe}^{\text{I/0}}$	-1.02	NHE	DMF	122
55	MC47	$\text{Co}^{\text{II/I}}$	-0.80	NHE	$\text{H}_2\text{O}$	123
56	MC49	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.58	$\text{Fc}/\text{Fc}^+$	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	124
57	MC50	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.70	$\text{Fc}/\text{Fc}^+$	$\text{CH}_3\text{CN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$	125
58	MC53	$\text{Ni}^{\text{II/I}}$	-1.0	NHE	N. R.	126
59	MC55	$\text{Re}^{\text{I/0}}$	-0.93	SCE	DMSO	128

<sup>a</sup> In the presence of  $\beta$ -cyclodextrin. <sup>b</sup> Active sites formed by metal ions and the ligand in the QDs.

derivatives for anchoring or other functions of the catalyst. However, the axial pyridine ligand readily dissociates upon reduction, and this should be noticed by researchers in system construction and mechanism studies.<sup>66</sup> Eisenberg successfully realized homogeneous photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production by using cobaloxime and the derivatives as catalysts in combination with molecular PSs, such as organic dyes and Pt-complexes. The H<sub>2</sub> production activity and stability of these systems are limited, and the H<sub>2</sub> production TON is 55.8 and 181.5 for systems containing a Pt-complex and Eosin Y, respectively.<sup>67–69</sup>

The Ni-bis(diphosphine) complex is also known as the DuBois catalyst or mimic of hydrogenase.<sup>70</sup> In 2011, DuBois *et al.* reported a Ni<sup>II</sup>-complex supported by two bis(diphosphine) ligands having exceptional activity for electrocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production. The complex features four nitrogen atoms as proton relays surrounding the nickel center. This is similar to the function of a –NH– group near the iron center in the active site of hydrogenase. In the same year, Eisenberg and Holland *et al.* reported that the DuBois catalyst in combination with a molecular PS, Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> or eosin Y, in a water/acetonitrile mixed solution produced H<sub>2</sub> under visible light irradiation. A TON of 2700 after 150 hours of photocatalysis was obtained by using Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> as a PS.<sup>71</sup> In addition to these three types of HER molecular catalysts, cobalt complexes of N<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> ligands and polypyridyl ligands and nickel complexes of S<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, and S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ligands were explored as HER molecular catalysts for constructing hybrid AP systems.

The metal complexes used as CRR catalysts in hybrid AP systems are tetraphenylporphyrin iron(III) chloride and its derivatives, dinuclear and mononuclear cobalt complexes, nickel cyclam and [Ni(tpy)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> complexes, and Re<sup>I</sup> and Ru<sup>II</sup> complexes (Scheme 8).<sup>72–74</sup> The Fe<sup>III</sup>-tetraphenylporphyrins are efficient CRR catalysts used in homogeneous electrochemical or photochemical CRR systems. The two-electron


reduced Fe<sup>0</sup>-species is the active site for CO<sub>2</sub> binding. The Co<sup>II</sup> and Ni<sup>II</sup> complexes supported by ligands of tetra- or hexa-nitrogen atoms are active towards CO<sub>2</sub> in their metal-centered one-electron reduced Co<sup>I</sup> and Ni<sup>I</sup> states. Carbonyl Re<sup>I</sup> and Ru<sup>II</sup> complexes are also active towards CO<sub>2</sub> in Re<sup>0</sup> and Ru<sup>I</sup> states.

## 2.4 Sacrificial electron donors

The sacrificial electron donors used in hybrid AP systems are small organic molecules that are easily oxidized (Scheme 9).<sup>75,76</sup> Organic acids and their salts (ascorbic acid or sodium ascorbate), amines (triethylamine and triethanolamine), alcohols (isopropyl alcohol), sulphides (Na<sub>2</sub>S) and sulphites (Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>) are the most commonly used electron donors. The oxidation potential of SEDs and the valence band potential of QDs should match thermodynamically. The solubility of the electron donors in solvent also quite affects the efficiency of the system. To achieve fast removal of holes from QDs, electron donors in the system should have a good solubility and a high concentration. Ascorbic acid (AA), IPA, TEOA, Na<sub>2</sub>S and Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> are soluble in water and can be used in aqueous systems. AA, Na<sub>2</sub>S, and Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> are poorly soluble in organic solvents, and TEA is poorly soluble in water. IPA and TEOA can be used in either water or most commonly used organic solvents.

## 2.5 Solvents

Solvent is the medium and environment for AP reactions. Most of the hybrid AP systems for the HER were constructed in aqueous solution due to kinetically favorable proton reduction in water (Table 3). The concentration of protons can be controlled easily by adjusting the pH of the solution. In contrast, most of the hybrid AP systems for the CRR were constructed in organic solvents or a mixture of organic solvent and water. There are two reasons. First, the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> is



Scheme 9 Oxidation reactions of the organic molecules used as SEDs.

Table 3 Components, conditions, and photocatalytic efficiencies of the hybrid AP systems for the HER

Entry	PS	MC	SED	Solvent	pH	Light source <sup>a</sup>	Irradiation time/h	TON <sup>b</sup>	QY <sup>c</sup> /%	Ref.
1	MPA-CdTe	MC1	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.0–4.1	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	10	505	45.8 (365 nm)	44
2	MPA-CdSe	MC2	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.0	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	8	27 135	5.07 (450 nm)	77
3	MPA-CdSe	MC3	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	6.5	LED ( $\lambda = 410$ nm)	44	10 600	2.1 (470 nm)	78
4	ZnS	MC4	AA	DMF/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.6	Xe	38	2607	2.5 (325 nm)**	87
5	MPA-CdSe	MC5	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	12	26 500	N. R.	91
6	MPA-CdSe	MC6	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	12	18 800	N. R.	91
7	MPA-CdSe	MC7	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.0	LED ( $\lambda = 410$ nm)	82	8781	N. R.	99
8	L5-CdSe	MC8	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	28	2370	3.19 (400 nm)**	101
9	L6-CdSe	MC9	IPA	H <sub>2</sub> O	8.0	LED ( $\lambda = 410$ nm)	48	11 200	N. R.	102
10	MPA-CdTe	MC10	AA	CH <sub>3</sub> OH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 410$ nm)	60	52 800	38.3 (575 nm)	103
11	DHLA-CdSe	MC11	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	80	20 600	N. R.	83
12	DHLA-CdSe	MC12	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	80	29 400	N. R.	83
13	DHLA-CdSe	MC13	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	80	15 200	N. R.	83
14	DHLA-CdSe	MC14	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	80	8000	N. R.	83
15	MPA-CdSe	MC15	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	8	2820*	N. R.	95
16	CdS	MC16	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	7	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	15	171	9.1 (420 nm)	86
17	CdS	MC17	TEOA	DMF/H <sub>2</sub> O	7	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	86
18	CdS	MC18	TEOA	DMF/H <sub>2</sub> O	7	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	86
19	MPA-CdS	MC16	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	88
20	CdS	MC16	CH <sub>3</sub> OH	H <sub>2</sub> O	13.5	Xe ( $\lambda \geq 420$ nm)	4	36*	N. R.	89
21	CdS	MC16	CH <sub>3</sub> OH	H <sub>2</sub> O	4	Xe ( $\lambda \geq 420$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	90
22	CQDs/ZnIn <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub>	MC16	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	7	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	8	567*	N. R.	114
23	CdSe/ZnS	MC19	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	N. R.	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	10	>10 000 <sup>d</sup>	N. R.	96
24	CdS nanorod	MC20	Lactic acid	H <sub>2</sub> O	2.4	Xe ( $\lambda \geq 420$ nm)	200	2000*	N. R.	116
25	CdS/rGO	MC21	Na <sub>2</sub> S/Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>3</sub>	DMF/H <sub>2</sub> O	13.3	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	80	22 464	N. R.	113
26	L4-CdSe	MC22	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	60	>300 000	24 (520 nm)	81
27	L3-CdSe	MC23	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	46	55 238	N. R.	81
28	L3-CdSe	MC24	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	46	26 815	N. R.	81
29	L3-CdSe	MC25	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	46	14 375	N. R.	81
30	GSH-CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC26	NaHA/AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	5.0	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	96	7700	N. R.	92
31	GSH-CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC27	NaHA/AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	5.0	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	22	180	N. R.	92
32	N-CQDs	MC26	TCEP/AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	5	LED ( $\lambda = 375$ nm)	52	859	26	111
33	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC28	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	8	2670	5.84 (420 nm)***	97
34	CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC29	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	8	1360	2.89 (420 nm)***	97
35	(AgIn) <sub>0.5</sub> ZnS <sub>2</sub>	MC30	AA	Toluene/EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	N. R.	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	12	2420	8.2 (450 nm)**	93
36	CQDs	MC31	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	N. R.	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	4	49.9*	14.11 (450 nm)**	115
37	TGA-CdTe	MC33	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	5.5	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	70	23 000	5.32 (400 nm)	88
38	TGA-CdTe	MC34	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	5.5	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	30	4900	1.49 (400 nm)	88
39	CQDs	MC35	NaHA	H <sub>2</sub> O	8.4	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	36	198	N. R.	112
40	L3-CdSe	MC40	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	90	>130 000	N. R.	82
41	MPA-CdSe	MC41	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	3.8	LED ( $\lambda = 505$ nm)	10	511	N. R.	94
42	CQDs	MC42	EDTA	H <sub>2</sub> O	6	Xe ( $\lambda > 300$ nm)	4	64	2.3 (360 nm)***	108
43	CQDs	MC42	TCEP/AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	6	Xe ( $\lambda > 300$ nm)	24	1094	N. R.	109
44	N-CQDs	MC42	EDTA	H <sub>2</sub> O	6	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	4	277	N. R.	110
45	MUA-CdSe	MC43	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	7	LED ( $\lambda = 420$ nm)	3.5	10 667	N. R.	103
46	DHLA-CdSe	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -DHLA	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	360	>600 000	36 ± 10 (520 nm)	80
47	DHLA-CdSe	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -DHLA	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	10	34 600	59 (520 nm)***	107
48	DHLA-CdSe/CdS	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -DHLA	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	10	3390	13 (520 nm)***	107
49	DHLA-CdSe rods	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -DHLA	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	10	7450	5.8 (520 nm)***	107
50	DHLA-CdSe/CdS DIRs <sup>e</sup>	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -DHLA	AA	EtOH/H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 520$ nm)	10	795	1.4 (520 nm)***	107
51	EDT-CdS	Ni <sup>2+</sup> -EDT	Na <sub>2</sub> S/Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> O	N. R.	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	84	>8000	19.4 (460 nm)	105
52	GSH-CdSe	Co <sup>2+</sup> -GSH	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5	LED ( $\lambda = 525$ nm)	48	130 000	28 ± 5 (525 nm)	106

<sup>a</sup> Xe and LED mean Xe lamp and LED lamp. <sup>b</sup> TON is based on the molecular catalyst. \*The value is calculated using the given data in the reference. <sup>c</sup> QY = quantum yield; The wavelength in parentheses represents the wavelength used in QY measurements; \*\*Apparent Quantum yield; \*\*\*Internal Quantum yield. <sup>d</sup> Based on the QDs. <sup>e</sup> DIR: dot-in-rod structure.

higher in organic solvents (DMF, DMSO, CH<sub>3</sub>CN, *etc.*) than that in water. Second, proton reduction is a competing reaction of the CRR, and the former is prone to occur in water. To achieve a higher selectivity and efficiency of the CRR, aprotic organic

solvents, such as DMF, DMSO, and CH<sub>3</sub>CN, were chosen for the CRR. The development of aqueous AP systems for the CRR with high selectivity and efficiency is a challenge faced by researchers.

## 2.6 Strategies of system design

Many strategies had been developed to construct hybrid AP systems (Scheme 10). The simplest way is mixing QDs and molecular catalysts physically. The interaction between a PS and MC is intermolecular. Another strategy is covalently linking MCs to QDs or self-assembling MCs on the surface of QDs to form a **MC@QD** type composite photocatalyst. This strategy is expected to improve the efficiency of PET by shortening the distance between QDs and MCs. To this end, various methods, such as covalent linking, host-guest recognition, electrostatic attraction, *etc.*, have been applied. Several **MC@QD** photocatalysts were fabricated by *in situ* formation of molecular-like species on the surface of QDs. To improve catalytic efficiency and develop biomimic systems, the multi-component integration systems of loading QDs and MCs onto functional materials had been reported.


## 2.7 Catalytic performance parameters

There are several parameters that are commonly used to evaluate the catalytic performance of a hybrid photosynthetic system. The turnover number (TON) is defined as the number of catalytic turnovers of a catalyst in a particular system, which is calculated using eqn (1). The value of the TON reflects the catalytic ability of a catalyst; however, it neither reflects the efficiency of a catalyst nor the efficiency of photon utilization of the system. The turnover number frequency (TOF), calculated using eqn (2), is used to evaluate the catalytic efficiency of a catalyst in a particular system. These two parameters are used

in all kinds of catalytic systems. In the studies of hybrid artificial photosynthetic systems, TONs and TOFs are calculated based on molecular catalysts. One can assess the catalytic performance of a particular molecular catalyst in different systems by comparing these two parameters. For a photocatalytic system, the photon utilization efficiency of a system is also an important parameter. The quantum yield (QY) or apparent quantum yield (AQY) is used to assess the conversion efficiency of the photon-to-product of a system. The QY is defined as the ratio of the number of products produced from the system to the number of absorbed photons by the system, which is calculated using eqn (3). Although QYs were reported in most of the studies in this field, it is not suitable to compare QYs reported by different research groups. This is because of the measurement method of photon absorption varying in different groups. The QY value is highly affected by the measurement method and setup. Herein, a standard method of QY measurement in photocatalysis is needed to be established. The photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction system always produces H<sub>2</sub> as a by-product and more than one CO<sub>2</sub> reduction product, so selectivity is used to evaluate the specificity for the CRR of a particular system. The selectivity is calculated using eqn (4).

$$\text{TON} = \frac{n_{\text{product}}}{n_{\text{catalyst}}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{TOF} = \frac{\text{TON}}{t} \quad (2)$$



Scheme 10 Schematic diagram of the strategies used for the construction of hybrid AP systems.



$$QY = \frac{n_{\text{product}}}{n_{\text{photon}}} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Selectivity} = \frac{n_{\text{product}}}{n_{\text{total products}}} \quad (4)$$

### 3. Hybrid AP systems for the HER

#### 3.1 Physical mixing systems


In 2011, Wu *et al.* used a water soluble [FeFe]-hydrogenase mimic **MC1** as a MC, colloidal MPA-CdTe QDs (MPA = 3-mercaptopropionic acid, **L1**) as a PS, and AA as a SED to construct an aqueous system for photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production (Scheme 11).<sup>44</sup> The H<sub>2</sub> production activity and the stability of the system are far higher than those of homogeneous systems reported previously containing molecular photosensitizers and hydrogenase mimics. A TON of 505 was obtained in aqueous solution at pH 4. The PET from the CB of CdTe QDs to the Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> core of **MC1** occurs resulting in the formation of a Fe<sup>I</sup>Fe<sup>0</sup> species, which is the active species for proton binding and reduction. This is the first hybrid AP system. Followed by this work, a large number of such hybrid AP systems, namely the combination of molecular catalysts and colloid QDs, were developed.

By grafting Fe<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub> active sites onto poly(acrylic acid) (PAA) or polyethylenimine (PEI), two water-soluble polymeric mimics, **MC2** or **MC3**, respectively, were prepared by Wu.<sup>77,78</sup> These two mimics were applied to construct HER systems in combination with MPA-CdSe QDs and AA. The former in acidic aqueous solution produced H<sub>2</sub> with a TON of 27 135.<sup>77</sup> The catalytic activity of the system ceased within 8 hours. In contrast, the latter exhibited high activity and stability in neutral aqueous solution due to buffer properties of PEI, and a TON of 10 600

was obtained by **MC3** at pH 6.5.<sup>78</sup> In another system, the stability of **MC2** could be improved by adding PEI, which forms a secondary coordination sphere around the QDs to accelerate hole transfer from the QDs to AA.<sup>79</sup> Benefiting from the fast H<sub>2</sub> production rate and the improved stability of the system, the TON under such conditions increased to 83 600.


The capping ligands of QDs are usually small hydrophilic molecules of thiol groups, which are easy to dissociate from the surface of QDs in AP system solutions. This results in the aggregation of QDs and may form new catalytic species between dissociated ligands and molecular catalysts. In 2012, Eisenberg *et al.* reported that dihydrolipoic acid (DHLLA, **L2**) dissociated from DHLLA-CdSe QDs is able to bind to Ni<sup>2+</sup> and forms active DHLLA-Ni<sup>2+</sup> species for H<sub>2</sub> production (Scheme 12).<sup>80</sup> The photocatalytic system composed of DHLLA-CdSe QDs as a PS, Ni(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> as a catalyst precursor, and AA as a SED in aqueous solution of pH 4.5 produced H<sub>2</sub> with exceptional activity and stability. A TON exceeding 600 000 and a quantum yield of 36% were obtained. The H<sub>2</sub> production activity was maintained over 360 hours. To prevent ligand dissociation from QDs, they used tripodal S-donor ligand (**L3** and **L4**) capped CdSe QDs as a PS in combination with a series of molecular catalysts based on iron (**MC11–MC14**), cobalt (**MC22–MC25**), and nickel (**MC36–MC40**) for photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production in aqueous solutions in their following studies.<sup>81–83</sup> The highest TON of 300 000 was obtained in 60 hours by using **L4**-CdSe QDs as a PS, **MC22** as a catalyst, and AA as a SED, and the QY of H<sub>2</sub> production was 24% with 520 nm light.<sup>81</sup> **MC22** was also investigated by using [Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> as a PS; however, the activity and stability of the homogeneous system are lower than those of the hybrid system.<sup>84,85</sup> The former produced H<sub>2</sub> with a TON of 2700 and the system is short-lived (<6 h) due to the decomposition of the molecular PS and the catalyst.

Li *et al.* extensively studied the PET process between molecular catalysts (**MC4** and **MC16–MC18**) and nano-



Scheme 11 Schematic diagram of the photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production system based on **MC1** and MPA-CdTe QDs. Reproduced with permission from ref. 44, Copyright 2011, Wiley-VCH.





Scheme 12 Schematic diagram of the photocatalytic  $\text{H}_2$  production by  $\text{Ni}^{2+}$ -DHLA-CdSe QDs. Reproduced with permission from ref. 80, Copyright 2012, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

semiconductors.<sup>86–90</sup> The efficiency of the PET from CdS to cobaloxime catalysts is controlled by the adsorption site of the catalyst at CdS, and the electrostatic interaction between them. The adsorption of cobaloxime at defects on the surface of CdS or the existence of electrostatic attraction between CdS and cobaloxime favors the PET efficiency. Wu revealed that the PET efficiency between the PS and hydrogenase mimics (**MC5** and **MC6**) could be enhanced by using CdSe QDs to replace the molecular photosensitizer  $[\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3]^{2+}$  in aqueous solution.<sup>91</sup> The system using CdSe QDs undergoes oxidative-quenching for the direct transfer of excited electrons from the conduction band of QDs to the catalyst, while the excited  $[\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3]^{2+}$  undergoes reductive-quenching to generate  $\text{Ru}^{\text{I}}$ -species and deliver electrons to the catalyst. Under the same conditions, the TONs of systems using CdSe QDs are 26 500 (for **MC5**) and 18 800 (for **MC6**), which are far higher than those of 178 (for **MC5**) and 114 (for **MC6**) by using  $[\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3]^{2+}$  as a PS.

In addition to the aforementioned molecular catalysts, the  $\text{Co}^{\text{II}}$ -tetraazamacrocyclic (**MC26** and **MC27**) and  $[\text{Co}^{\text{II}}(\text{bpy})_3]^{2+}$  complexes (**MC30**),<sup>92,93</sup> DuBois' type  $\text{Ni}^{\text{II}}$ -catalyst (**MC41**),<sup>94</sup> and Fe-carbonyl cluster (**MC15**)<sup>95</sup> were developed as molecular catalysts in combination with  $\text{CnInS}_2/\text{ZnS}$ ,  $(\text{AgIn})_x\text{Zn}_{2(1-x)}\text{S}_2$ , and CdSe QDs/nano-semiconductors for photocatalytic  $\text{H}_2$  production (Table 3). Among these systems, the combination of  $\text{CnInS}_2/\text{ZnS}$  QDs as a PS, **MC26** as a MC, and AA as a SED in aqueous solution at pH 5.0 shows the highest TON of 7700 under Xe lamp ( $\lambda > 400$  nm) irradiation for 96 hours.

### 3.2 Covalent linking systems

By modification of particular anchoring groups, such as phosphonate, thiol, carboxylate, and pyridine, onto molecular catalysts, the catalysts are able to link on the surface of QDs *via* covalent bonds.<sup>96–100</sup> To this end,  $\text{Fe}_2\text{S}_2(\text{CO})_6$  (**MC7**),<sup>99</sup> phosphonate modified cobaloxime (**MC19**),<sup>96</sup>  $\text{Co}^{\text{II}}\text{-N}_2\text{S}_2$  complexes (**MC33** and **MC34**),<sup>98</sup> and  $\text{Co}^{\text{II}}$ -tetraazabicyclo complexes (**MC28** and **MC29**) were linked to the surface of CdSe QDs,<sup>97</sup> CdSe/ZnS core/shell QDs, CdTe QDs, and  $\text{CuInS}_2/\text{ZnS}$  core/shell QDs, respectively, to form **MC@QD** type hybrid photocatalysts for photocatalytic  $\text{H}_2$  production. The highest  $\text{H}_2$  production TON of 14 400 was obtained by the **MC33@CdTe** system in the presence of ascorbate as a SED in water.<sup>98</sup> Time-resolved transient absorption spectroscopic studies revealed that a faster PET from QDs to MCs and a slower charge recombination process exist in such systems. For example, the PET from CdSe/ZnS core/shell QDs to cobaloxime (**MC19**) takes place with an average time constant of 105 ps, and the charge recombination occurs with a time constant of over 3 ns (Scheme 13).<sup>96</sup>

### 3.3 Non-covalent self-assembling systems

The formation of the **MC@QD** type system can be achieved by non-covalent interactions between MCs and QDs. Wang *et al.* reported that a sulfonate-functionalized  $[\text{FeFe}]$ -hydrogenase mimic **MC8** as a guest molecule can be included into the cavity of the  $\beta$ -cyclodextrin (CDSH, **L5**) host molecule modified on the surface of CdSe QDs.<sup>101</sup> The **MC8@CDSH-CdSe** system exhibited a faster PET and a higher  $\text{H}_2$  production efficiency in water in comparison to the reference non-assembly systems.



**Scheme 13** (a) UV-vis absorption spectra of CdSe/ZnS core/shell QDs with (red) and without MC19, and the schematic structure of MC19@CdSe/ZnS QDs. (b) Energy diagram of CdSe/ZnS core/shell QDs and MC19. Reproduced with permission from ref. 96, Copyright 2012, American Chemical Society.

The TON of the assembly system is 2370, while the TON of the non-assembly system is only 358. Wu *et al.* synthesized an adamantane functionalized [FeFe]-hydrogenase mimic MC9 and per-6-thiol-cyclodextrin (CD6SH, L6) modified CdSe QDs.<sup>102</sup> A MC9@CD6SH-CdSe assembly was formed driven by the strong host-guest interaction between adamantane and cyclodextrin. The H<sub>2</sub> production activity of the MC9@CD6SH-CdSe assembly in acidic aqueous solution is 122-fold higher than that of the corresponding system using QDs without the L6 ligand. The presence of cyclodextrin can not only prevent the aggregation of the QDs under acidic conditions, but also avoid photocorrosion of the QDs by balancing the interfacial charge.

By modification of the 11-mercaptoundecanoic acid ligand (MUA, L7) of a long alkyl chain onto the surface of CdSe QDs, hydrophobic spaces are formed near the surface of MUA-CdSe QDs. Benefiting from this feature, a water insoluble Ni-complex (MC43) is able to stay in the hydrophobic spaces of MUA-CdSe QDs. A self-assembly MC43@MUA-CdSe system produced H<sub>2</sub> with a TON of 10 677 in aqueous solution.<sup>103</sup>

The catalytically active center in natural hydrogenase is protected by proteins. Wu *et al.* confined a [FeFe]-hydrogenase mimic MC10 and CdTe QDs in chitosan to mimic the protein environment of the natural model (Scheme 14).<sup>104</sup> Chitosan was proposed to protect the QDs and the mimic in the course of


photocatalysis. The H<sub>2</sub> production activity (TON = 52 800) and stability of the system were dramatically improved in the presence of chitosan (Table 3).

### 3.4 *In situ* active site formation systems

The *in situ* formation of molecular-like active sites by coordination between metal ions and QDs' surface ligand represents an alternative to construct MC@QD systems.<sup>105–107</sup> In this regard, Isimjan and Takanabe *et al.* reported that 1,2-ethanedithiol (EDT, L8) ligands, capped on the surface of CdS nanocrystals, are able to coordinate with Ni<sup>2+</sup> ions and form Ni(EDT)<sub>2</sub> active species on the CdS surface.<sup>105</sup> In this system, CdS and Ni(EDT)<sub>2</sub> function as a PS and molecular-like catalyst, respectively. It produced H<sub>2</sub> under Xe lamp irradiation in the presence of Na<sub>2</sub>S and Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> as SEDs, and a TON of 7200 based on nickel was obtained. In another study, Krauss *et al.* described that a Co<sup>2+</sup>-GSH-CdSe QD (GSH = glutathione, L9) system, in which the active cobalt catalysts are formed through *in situ* coordination between Co<sup>2+</sup> ions and surface GSH ligands, produced H<sub>2</sub> with a TON of 130 000 under visible light irradiation by using AA as a SED.<sup>106</sup>

### 3.5 CQD-based systems

Several hybrid AP systems for H<sub>2</sub> production by using CQDs as a PS were developed by Reisner's group.<sup>108–110</sup> The CQDs (6.8 ± 2.3 nm) with a terminal carboxylic acid were prepared by thermalolysis of citric acid and were water-soluble. The photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production aqueous system composed of the CQDs as a PS, a nickel bis(diphosphine) complex (MC41) as a catalyst, and ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid (EDTA) as a SED, produced H<sub>2</sub> with a relatively short lifetime. The activity of H<sub>2</sub> production ceased within 4 hours, and a TON of 64 was obtained.<sup>108</sup> The limited stability of the system is attributed to the decomposition of the nickel catalyst caused by radicals generated by EDTA oxidation. By using a new electron donor system consisting of ascorbic acid and tris(carboxyethyl)phosphine (TCEP), the H<sub>2</sub> production activity of the system was improved, and a high TON of 1094 ± 61 was achieved.<sup>109</sup> The two-electron oxidation process of TCEP circumvents the generation of radicals in the system (Scheme 9). Recently, an analogous system composed of



**Scheme 14** Schematic diagram of the chitosan-confined H<sub>2</sub> photogeneration by MPA-CdTe QDs and MC10.


a cobalt complex (**MC26**) and CQDs in TCEP/AA aqueous system was reported. The system produced  $H_2$  with a TON of 264 under sun irradiation for 21 days.<sup>111</sup>

Our group developed an artificial photosynthetic assembly (APA) of a novel hollow-rod structure by using synthetic building blocks, CQDs as a photosensitizer and PEI-Co (**MC35**) as an artificial enzyme, to mimic the structure and function of natural photosynthetic bacteria (Scheme 15).<sup>112</sup> The APA assemblies formed in water by the electrostatic attraction between the negatively charged CQDs and the positively charged PEI-Co (**MC35**). PEI-Co was synthesized by grafting cobalt complexes as molecular catalysts onto branched PEI. The APA features a bacteria-like shape and a hollow structure positioning light harvesting component on the surface to maximize


light absorption (Scheme 16). The APA exhibits enhanced photocatalytic  $H_2$  production within a broad pH range in aqueous solution in comparison to the corresponding non-assembly system.

### 3.6 Integrated ternary systems

Ternary systems are obtained by anchoring light harvesting materials and molecular catalysts onto functional materials.<sup>113–116</sup> We fabricated a ternary **MC21**@CdS/rGO photocatalyst (rGO referred to as reduced graphene oxide) by anchoring CdS nanocrystals and a cobaloxime catalyst **MC21** onto the surface of rGO for photocatalytic  $H_2$  production (Scheme 17).<sup>113</sup> A pyrene modified cobaloxime catalyst **MC21**



Scheme 15 Schematic diagram of photocatalytic  $H_2$  production by the hollow-rod artificial photosynthetic assembly (APA) in water. Reproduced with permission from ref. 112. Copyright 2020, Royal Society of Chemistry.



Scheme 16 (a–c) Confocal microscopy images of the APA; inset: enlarged view of the selected area (red line). The SEM images of **MC35** (d) and **MC35**@CNP (e). (f–i) Confocal microscopy images recorded after adding CNPs into an aqueous solution of **MC35** (ref. 112). Reproduced with permission from ref. 112. Copyright 2020, Royal Society of Chemistry.





Scheme 17 Schematic diagram of the MC21@CdS/rGO hybrid for photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production (top). The chemical and crystal structures of MC21 (bottom). Reproduced with permission from ref. 113, Copyright 2019, Royal Society of Chemistry.

was synthesized to facilitate the attachment of the cobalt catalyst onto the surface of rGO *via* non-covalent  $\pi$ - $\pi$  interactions. The photocatalytic H<sub>2</sub> production rate of the MC21@CdS/rGO photocatalyst is higher than those of the non-assembled system and the pristine CdS/rGO composite under the same conditions. A TON of 22 464 was obtained by the ternary photocatalyst. Femtosecond transient absorption spectroscopic studies revealed that the PET from the excited CdS nanocrystals to cobalt catalysts occurred, and a long-lived charge-separation state formed in the ternary system.

Two CQD-based ternary systems, MC16/CQDs/ZnIn<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> and MC32/CQDs/CN (CN = carbon nitride), were reported, in which CQDs were proposed to function as electron media to shuttle the photogenerated electrons in ZnIn<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> or CN to the cobalt complex MC16 or MC32, respectively.<sup>114,115</sup> The H<sub>2</sub> production efficiency of these two systems, MC16/CQDs/ZnIn<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> and MC32/CQDs/CN, is  $1760 \mu\text{mol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  and  $295.9 \mu\text{mol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ , respectively. The TON based on the cobalt complex is 567 for MC16 and 49.9 for MC32.

## 4. Hybrid AP systems for the CRR

So far, the number of reported hybrid AP systems for the CRR are less than that for the HER.<sup>117–131</sup> One of the main reasons, in

our opinion, is that fewer molecular catalysts having activity for the CRR have been explored. Following the same strategies aforementioned, more than a dozen of hybrid AP systems for the CRR had been developed (Table 4). Molecular catalysts based on Fe<sup>III</sup>, Fe<sup>II</sup>, Co<sup>II</sup>, Ni<sup>II</sup>, Re<sup>I</sup>, and Ru<sup>II</sup>, and semiconductor nanocrystals, such as CuInS<sub>2</sub>, CdS, CdTe, ZnSe, bimetallic sulfides, and CQDs were used in these systems. In this section, the hybrid AP systems for the CRR are divided into four subsections based on the molecular catalysts.

### 4.1 Fe-complexes

Weiss *et al.* constructed a hybrid system by using *meso*-tetraphenylporphyrin iron(III) chloride (MC44) as a catalyst, CuInS<sub>2</sub>/ZnS QDs as a PS, and *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethyl-*p*-phenylenediamine (TMPD) as a SED in CO<sub>2</sub>-saturated DMSO.<sup>117</sup> The system produced CO with a selectivity of 84% and a TON of 58. The Fe<sup>0</sup> species, generated by successively accepting three electrons from the excited QDs, is assigned to the active site for CO<sub>2</sub> binding. Transient absorption spectroscopy revealed that the ultrafast first two electron transfer processes from the QDs to MC44 (Fe<sup>III</sup> → Fe<sup>II</sup> and Fe<sup>II</sup> → Fe<sup>I</sup>) occur within 200 fs, and they are far more efficient than those in the corresponding systems using a molecular PS, Ir(ppy)<sub>3</sub> or 9-cyanoanthracene. Subsequently, they used a positively charged trimethylamine-functionalized

Table 4 Components, conditions, and photocatalytic efficiencies of the hybrid AP systems for the CRR

Entry	PS	MC	SED	Solvent	Light source	Irradiation time/h	Main product	TON	Selectivity/%	QY/%	Ref.
1	MPO-CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC44	TMPD	DMSO	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	10	CO	58*	84	N. R.	117
2	MPA-CuInS <sub>2</sub> /ZnS	MC45	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	LED ( $\lambda = 450$ nm)	30	CO	450	99	N. R.	118
3	CdS/Bi <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub>	MC46	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	4	CO	281*	24	N. R.	119
4	EF-CdS	MC46	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	4	CO	4.23*	97	N. R.	120
5	Zn <sub>x</sub> Cd <sub>1-x</sub> S	MC46	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	12	CO	9.2	93	N. R.	121
6	CQDs/g-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	MC46	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	6	CO	24.9	24.5	N. R.	122
7	MPA-CdS	MC47	TEOA	H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	120	CO	1380	95	N. R.	123
8	CdS	MC48	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN	Xe ( $\lambda \geq 420$ nm)	10	CO	2.24	85	0.65 (420 nm)**	124
9	CdS	MC30	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	8	CO	4.1	87	1 (470 nm)	131
10	CdS	MC49	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	125
11	CdS	MC50	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	125
12	CdS	MC51	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	125
13	CdS	MC52	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	24	CO	20	92.2	N. R.	125
14	ZnSe	MC53	AA	H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 400$ nm)	20	CO	280	33	N. R.	126
15	(CuGa) <sub>1-x</sub> Zn <sub>2x</sub> S ( $x = 0.7$ )	MC54	H <sub>2</sub> O	NaHCO <sub>3</sub>	Xe ( $\lambda > 390$ nm)	16	CO	214	60	N. R.	127
16	MPA-CuInS <sub>2</sub>	MC55	TEOA	DMSO	LED ( $\lambda \geq 420$ nm)	6	CO	16	N. R.	N. R.	128
17	CdS	MC56	TEOA	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/H <sub>2</sub> O	Xe ( $\lambda > 420$ nm)	2	CO	0.52*	>80	1.68 (420 nm)**	130



Scheme 18 Schematic diagram of CdS with different charge characteristics and the photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub>-to-CO conversion. Reproduced with permission from ref. 123. Copyright 2018, American Chemical Society.

tetraphenylporphyrin iron(III) chloride catalyst (MC45) and negatively charged CuInS<sub>2</sub>/ZnS QDs to form an electrostatic self-assembly system in water.<sup>118</sup> The CO production TON was achieved to be 450, and the selectivity increased to 99%.

He and Chen developed a series of hybrid AP systems by using tetra(4-carboxyphenyl)porphyrin iron(III) chloride (MC46)

as a MC.<sup>119–122</sup> In these systems, floccule-like EF-CdS (EF = ethylenediamine functionalization, L10) and rod-like CdS/Bi<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub>, and carbon dot modified g-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> composites were used as PSs. These systems are able to convert CO<sub>2</sub> to CO with a selectivity varying from 24% to 97%. The highest TON of 281 (calculated based on the data given) was obtained by the



**MC46**/CdS/Bi<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> system with a selectivity of 24%,<sup>119</sup> and the highest selectivity of 97% was obtained by the **MC46**/EF-CdS system with only 4 turnovers.<sup>120</sup>

#### 4.2 Co-complexes


Lu *et al.* reported an electrostatic self-assembly system composed of negatively charged CdS QDs and a positively charged dinuclear cobalt complex **MC47** in water (Scheme 18).<sup>123</sup> The system achieved CO<sub>2</sub>-to-CO conversion with a high selectivity of 95% and a TON of 1380, representing the highest TON so far for CO production by a hybrid system. A systematic comparison study demonstrated that the systems using uncharged or positively charged QDs are far less selective and active for CO production.

Han *et al.* developed a novel ternary system CdS/UiO-bpy/Co by the integration of CdS nanocrystals and molecular cobalt


catalyst **MC48** through metal–organic framework (MOF) UiO-bpy (Scheme 19).<sup>124</sup> The molecular cobalt species as catalytic centers are anchored on the framework of the MOF, and the CdS nanocrystals were confined in the cavities of the MOF. The system in CH<sub>3</sub>CN in the presence of TEOA as a SED achieved photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub>-to-CO conversion with a rate of 235 μmol g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> (2 turnovers based on cobalt) and a selectivity of 85%.

#### 4.3 Ni-complexes

A series of nickel complexes **MC49–MC52** containing different anchoring groups (R = H, COOH, PO<sub>3</sub>H<sub>2</sub>, and SH) were used to construct hybrid photocatalysts with CdS QDs.<sup>125</sup> The **MC50–MC52** are able to attach onto the surface of the QDs. The anchoring groups in these nickel complexes play a key role in controlling the selectivity of the photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub>-to-CO conversion in water. The system using **MC49** without an



Scheme 19 Schematic diagram of the structure of the CdS/UiO-bpy/Co hybrid photocatalyst. Reproduced with permission from ref. 124, Copyright 2018, Royal Society of Chemistry.



Scheme 20 Schematic diagram of the Z-schematic system for CO<sub>2</sub> reduction consisting of the **MC55** modified (CuGa)<sub>1-x</sub>Zn<sub>2x</sub>S<sub>2</sub> hybrid photocatalyst, a BiVO<sub>4</sub> photocatalyst, and a [Co(tpy)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>3+/2+</sup> redox shuttle electron mediator. Reproduced with permission from ref. 127, Copyright 2018, Royal Society of Chemistry.

anchoring group produced hydrogen only. The highest CO production selectivity of over 90% and a TON of 20 were obtained by the system using thiol-functionalized complex **MC52**, which has the strongest affinity for QDs. Another hybrid self-assembly photocatalyst by anchoring a Ni-cyclam complex (**MC53**) onto the surface of ZnSe QDs was also fabricated for photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in water.<sup>126</sup> The TON and selectivity for CO production were achieved to be 280 and 33%, respectively. A fast PET process from the trapping state of the QDs to **MC53** occurred within 186 ps.

#### 4.4 Other metal complexes

A Z-schematic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction system containing Ru-complex (**MC54**) modified (CuGa)<sub>1-x</sub>Zn<sub>2x</sub>S<sub>2</sub> as a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction photocatalyst and BiVO<sub>4</sub> as a water oxidation photocatalyst was reported to realize photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by using water as an electron donor (Scheme 20).<sup>127</sup> The system is able to carry out CO<sub>2</sub> reduction and water oxidation simultaneously. The presence of the molecular Ru-catalyst improves the selectivity of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction. The total TON and selectivity of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction products (CO and HCOO<sup>-</sup>) were 240 and 64%, respectively. In addition to the Ru-catalyst, a molecular rhenium complex (**MC55**) was covalently linked to CuInS<sub>2</sub> QDs for photocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction. A TON of 16 for CO production was reported.<sup>128</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, rapid and increasing research on the development of hybrid AP systems has been witnessed in the last decade. In general, an obvious improvement in photocatalytic activity and stability is observed by introducing inorganic colloidal QDs as a PS into the AP systems using molecular catalysts. The combination of colloidal QDs and MCs is one of the successful strategies for AP system construction in the past decade. In this regard, a large number of hybrid AP systems have been reported to realize the photocatalytic HER and CRR successfully. Various strategies, including physical mixing, covalent linking, non-covalent self-assembly, *in situ* active site formation, and multi-component integration, were applied to control and enhance the interaction between the QDs and the MC. On one hand, systems of higher activity, higher stability, and more complexity have been developed. On the other hand, challenges are more prominent. The efficiency and the stability of the hybrid AP systems are far less satisfactory for their applications in industry. In particular, the efficiency and selectivity of the hybrid AP systems for the CRR are low, and systems of high activity and selectivity need to be explored. The coupling of two half-reactions, protons/CO<sub>2</sub> reduction and water oxidation, in one system is still a big challenge. A deeper understanding of the photosynthetic mechanism, the fabrication of novel materials, and the development of a novel strategy for system construction may inspire researchers to resolve problems being faced at present.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (21871102) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (2019kfyRCPY101).

## References

- J. Barber, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2009, **38**, 185–196.
- A. Stirbet, D. Lazár, Y. Guo and G. Govindjee, *Ann. Bot.*, 2020, **126**, 511–537.
- Y. Wang, H. Yang, X. Zhang, F. Han, W. Tu and W. Yang, *Small Methods*, 2020, **4**, 1900514.
- P. C. Hallenbeck and Y. Liu, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2016, **41**, 4446–4454.
- N. Armaroli and V. Balzani, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2007, **46**, 52–66.
- N. S. Lewis, *Science*, 2007, **315**, 798–801.
- Z.-J. Han and R. Eisenberg, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2014, **47**, 2537–2544.
- G. Ciamician, *Science*, 1912, **36**, 385–394.
- M. E. El-Khoulya, E. El-Mohsnawy and S. Fukuzumi, *J. Photochem. Photobiol., C*, 2017, **31**, 36–83.
- D. R. Whang and D. H. Apaydin, *ChemPhotoChem*, 2018, **2**, 148–160.
- S. Berardi, S. Drouet, L. Francàs, C. Gimbert-Suriñach, M. Guttentag, C. Richmond, T. Stolla and A. Llobet, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2014, **43**, 7501–7519.
- D. K. Dogutan and D. G. Nocera, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2019, **52**, 3143–3148.
- Y. Tachibana, L. Vayssieres and J. R. Durrant, *Nat. Photonics*, 2012, **6**, 511–518.
- A. Fujishima and K. Honda, *Nature*, 1972, **238**, 37–38.
- G.-B. Chen, G. I. N. Waterhouse, R. Shi, J.-Q. Zhao, Z.-H. Li, L.-Z. Wu, C.-H. Tung and T.-R. Zhang, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2019, **58**, 17528–17551.
- J. H. Montoya, L. C. Seitz, P. Chakthranont, A. Vojvodic, T. F. Jaramillo and J. K. Nørskov, *Nat. Mater.*, 2017, **16**, 70–81.
- S. Kundu and A. Patra, *Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **117**, 712–757.
- Y. Barak, I. Meir, A. Shapiro, Y. Jang and E. Lifshitz, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1801442.
- J. Z. Zhang and E. Reisner, *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 2020, **4**, 6–21.
- J.-C. Hu, M.-X. Gui, W. Xia, J. Wu, Y.-N. Zhou, N.-D. Feng, J.-W. Xiao, H.-F. Liu, L.-Z. Wu and F. Wang, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 10475–10482.
- Y.-Q. Wang and S.-H. Shen, *Acta Phys.-Chim. Sin.*, 2020, **36**, 1905080.
- J. Bonin, M. Robert and M. Routier, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2014, **136**, 16768–16771.
- X.-Q. Li, M. Wang, L. Chen, X.-N. Wang, J.-F. Dong and L.-C. Sun, *ChemSusChem*, 2012, **5**, 913–919.
- T. Lazarides, T. McCormick, P.-W. Du, G.-G. Luo, B. Lindley and R. Eisenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2009, **131**, 9192–9194.
- H. Rao, L. C. Schmidt, J. Bonin and M. Robert, *Nature*, 2017, **548**, 74–77.

- 26 C.-Y. Zhu, Y.-Q. Zhang, R.-Z. Liao, W. Xia, J.-C. Hu, J. Wu, H.-F. Liu and F. Wang, *Dalton Trans.*, 2018, **47**, 13142–13150.
- 27 F. Wang, B. Cao, W.-P. To, C.-W. Tse, K. Li, X.-Y. Chang, C. Zang, S. L. Chan and C.-M. Che, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2016, **6**, 7408–7420.
- 28 Y.-J. Yuan, Z.-T. Yu, D.-Q. Chen and Z.-G. Zou, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**, 603–631.
- 29 V. Artero, M. Chavrot-Kerlidou and M. Fontecave, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 2–31.
- 30 W.-J. Sun, J.-Q. Lin, X.-M. Liang, J.-Y. Yang, B.-C. Ma and Y. Ding, *Acta Phys.-Chim. Sin.*, 2020, **36**, 1905025.
- 31 J. Bonin, A. Maurin and M. Robert, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **334**, 184–198.
- 32 W. Xia, Ji. Wu, J.-C. Hu, S.-S. Sun, M.-D. Li, H.-F. Liu, M.-H. Lan and F. Wang, *ChemSusChem*, 2019, **12**, 4617–4622.
- 33 J. L. White, M. F. Baruch, J. E. Pander, Y. Hu, I. C. Fortmeyer, J. E. Park, T. Zhang, K. Liao, Ji. Gu, Y. Yan, T. W. Shaw, E. Abelev and A. B. Bocarsly, *Chem. Rev.*, 2015, **115**, 12888–12935.
- 34 K. Li, B. Peng and T.-Y. Peng, *ACS Catal.*, 2016, **6**, 7485–7527.
- 35 S. Cao, C.-J. Wang, W.-F. Fu and Y. Chen, *ChemSusChem*, 2017, **10**, 4306–4323.
- 36 W. T. Eckenhoff and R. Eisenberg, *Dalton Trans.*, 2012, **41**, 13004–13021.
- 37 S. Fukuzumi, Y. Yamada, T. Suenobu, K. Ohkubo and H. Kotan, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2011, **4**, 2754–2766.
- 38 T. R. Simmons, G. Berggren, M. Bacchi and M. Fontecave, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2014, **270**, 127–150.
- 39 K. E. Dalle, J. Warnan, J. J. Leung, B. Reuillard, I. S. Karmel and E. Reisner, *Chem. Rev.*, 2019, **119**, 2752–2875.
- 40 A. Hasani, M. Tekalgne, Q. V. Le, H. W. Jang and S. Y. Kim, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 430–454.
- 41 X.-B. Li, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 2018, **2**, 160–173.
- 42 R. Burke, K. L. Bren and T. D. Krauss, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2021, **154**, 030901.
- 43 Z. Wang, C. Li and K. Domen, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2019, **48**, 2109–2125.
- 44 F. Wang, W.-G. Wang, X.-J. Wang, H.-Y. Wang, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 3193–3197.
- 45 F. E. Osterloh, *ACS Energy Lett.*, 2017, **2**, 445–453.
- 46 A. J. Nozik, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 1977, **30**, 567–569.
- 47 A. J. Bard, *J. Photochem.*, 1979, **10**, 59–75.
- 48 F. Wang, W.-G. Wang, H.-Y. Wang, G. Si, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *ACS Catal.*, 2012, **2**, 407–416.
- 49 S. H. Lee, D. S. Choi, S. K. Kuk and C. B. Park, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2018, **57**, 7958–7985.
- 50 S. Fukuzumi, K. Ohkubo and T. Suenobu, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2014, **47**, 1455–1464.
- 51 Y.-Q. Hou, X. Zhang, K.-P. Chen, D.-Y. Liu, Z.-J. Wang, Q.-Y. Liu, J.-Z. Zhao and A. Barbon, *J. Mater. Chem. C*, 2019, **7**, 12048–12074.
- 52 L. E. Brus, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1984, **80**, 4403–4409.
- 53 C. Burda, X.-B. Chen, R. Narayanan and M. A. El-Sayed, *Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **105**, 1025–1102.
- 54 P. Wu and X.-P. Yan, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, **42**, 5489–5521.
- 55 S. Y. Lim, W. Shen and Z. Gao, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2015, **44**, 362–381.
- 56 C. Hu, M. Li, J. Qiu and Y.-P. Sun, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2019, **48**, 2315–2337.
- 57 M. Lan, S. Zhao, S. Wu, X. Wei, Y. Fu, J. Wu, P. Wang and W. Zhang, *Nano Res.*, 2019, **12**, 2576–2583.
- 58 C. Hu, M.-Y. Li, J.-S. Qiu and Y.-P. Sun, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2019, **48**, 2315–2337.
- 59 L.-J. Chen, G. Chen, C.-F. Leung, S.-M. Yiu, C.-C. Ko, E. Anxolabéhère-Mallart, M. Robert and T.-C. Lau, *ACS Catal.*, 2015, **5**, 356–364.
- 60 Y.-L. Li and T. B. Rauchfuss, *Chem. Rev.*, 2016, **12**, 7043–7077.
- 61 V. Artero, M. Chavarot-Kerlidou and M. Fontecave, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 2–31.
- 62 A. Fihri, V. Artero, M. Razavet, C. Baffert, W. Leibl and M. Fontecave, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2008, **47**, 564–567.
- 63 C. Tard and C. J. Pickett, *Chem. Rev.*, 2009, **109**, 2245–2274.
- 64 N. Kaeffer, M. Chavarot-Kerlidou and V. Artero, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2015, **48**, 1286–1295.
- 65 J. L. Dempsey, B. S. Brunschwig, J. R. Winkler and H. B. Gray, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2009, **42**, 1995–2004.
- 66 T. M. McCormick, Z.-J. Han, D. J. Weinberg, W. W. Brennessel, P. L. Holland and R. Eisenberg, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2011, **50**, 10660–10666.
- 67 P.-W. Du, K. Knowles and R. Eisenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 12576–12577.
- 68 P.-W. Du, J. Schneider, G.-G. Luo, W. W. Brennessel and R. Eisenberg, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2009, **48**, 4952–4962.
- 69 T. Lazarides, T. McCormick, P.-W. Du, G.-G. Luo, B. Lindley and R. Eisenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2009, **131**, 9192–9194.
- 70 M. L. Helm, M. P. Stewart, R. M. Bullock, M. R. DuBois and D. L. DuBois, *Science*, 2011, **333**, 863–866.
- 71 M. P. McLaughlin, T. M. McCormick, R. Eisenberg and P. L. Holland, *Chem. Commun.*, 2011, **47**, 7989–7991.
- 72 F. Wang, *ChemSusChem*, 2017, **10**, 4393–4402.
- 73 H. Rao, C.-H. Lim, J. Bonin, G. M. Miyake and M. Robert, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2018, **140**, 17830–17834.
- 74 J. Bonin, A. Maurin and M. Robert, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **334**, 184–198.
- 75 Y.-N. Wang, K.-C. Lau, W. W. Y. Lam, W.-L. Man, C.-F. Leung and T.-C. Lau, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2009, **48**, 400–406.
- 76 E. D. Cline, S. E. Adamson and S. Bernhard, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, **47**, 10378–10388.
- 77 F. Wang, W.-J. Liang, J.-X. Jian, C.-B. Li, B. Chen, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 8134–8138.
- 78 W.-J. Liang, F. Wang, M. Wen, J.-X. Jian, X.-Z. Wang, B. Chen, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2015, **21**, 3187–3192.
- 79 M. Wen, X.-B. Li, J.-X. Jian, X.-Z. Wang, H.-L. Wu, B. Chen, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, **6**, 29851–29858.
- 80 Z.-J. Han, F. Qiu, R. Eisenberg, P. L. Holland and T. D. Krauss, *Science*, 2012, **338**, 1321–1324.

- 81 A. Das, Z.-J. Han, M. G. Haghghi and R. Eisenberg, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2013, **110**, 16716–16723.
- 82 A. Das, Z.-J. Han, W. W. Brennessel, P. L. Holland and R. Eisenberg, *ACS Catal.*, 2015, **5**, 1397–1406.
- 83 H.-J. Lv, T. P. A. Ruberu, V. E. Fleischauer, W. W. Brennessel, M. L. Neidig and R. Eisenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, **138**, 11654–11663.
- 84 W. R. McNamara, Z.-J. Han, C.-J. Yin, W. W. Brennessel, P. L. Holland and R. Eisenberg, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2012, **109**, 15594–15599.
- 85 W. R. McNamara, Z.-J. Han, P. J. Alperin, W. W. Brennessel, P. L. Holland and R. Eisenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2011, **133**, 15368–15371.
- 86 F.-Y. Wen, J.-H. Yang, X. Zong, B.-J. Ma, D.-G. Wang and C. Li, *J. Catal.*, 2011, **281**, 318–324.
- 87 F.-Y. Wen, X.-L. Wang, L. Huang, G.-J. Ma, J.-H. Yang and C. Li, *ChemSusChem*, 2012, **5**, 849–853.
- 88 Y. Ye, Y.-X. Xu, L. Huang, D.-Y. Fan, Z.-C. Feng, X.-L. Wang and C. Li, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **18**, 17389–17397.
- 89 Y.-X. Xu, Y. Ye, T.-F. Liu, X.-L. Wang, B.-Q. Zhang, M. Wang, H.-X. Han and C. Li, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, **138**, 10726–10729.
- 90 Y.-X. Xu, R.-T. Chen, Z. Li, A.-L. Li, H.-X. Han and C. Li, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2017, **9**, 23230–23237.
- 91 J.-X. Jian, C. Ye, X.-Z. Wang, M. Wen, Z.-J. Li, X.-B. Li, B. Chen, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2016, **9**, 2083–2089.
- 92 M. Sandroni, R. Gueret, K. D. Wegner, P. Reiss, J. Fortage, D. Aldakov and M.-N. Collomb, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2018, **11**, 1752–1761.
- 93 Y.-J. Yuan, D.-Q. Chen, M. Xiong, J.-S. Zhong, Z.-Y. Wan, Y. Zhou, S. Liu, Z.-T. Yub, L.-X. Yang and Z.-G. Zou, *Appl. Catal., B*, 2017, **204**, 58–66.
- 94 Y. Zhou, S. Yang and J. Huang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 7471–7475.
- 95 C.-S. Li, A. Rahaman, W.-H. Lin, H. Mourad, J. Meng, A. Honarfar, M. Abdellah, M.-Y. Guo, M. G. Richmond, K.-B. Zheng and E. Nordlander, *ChemSusChem*, 2020, **13**, 3252–3260.
- 96 J.-E. Huang, K. L. Mulfort, P.-W. Du and L.-X. Chen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 16472–16475.
- 97 C.-M. Nie, W.-J. Ni, L.-L. Gong, J. Jiang, J.-H. Wang and M. Wang, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 27432–27440.
- 98 K. Han, M. Wang, S. Zhang, S.-L. Wu, Y. Yang and L.-C. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2015, **51**, 7008–7011.
- 99 C.-B. Li, Z.-J. Li, S. Yu, G.-X. Wang, F. Wang, Q.-Y. Meng, B. Chen, K. Feng, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, **6**, 2597–2602.
- 100 W.-W. Zhao, Y. Huang, Y. Liu, L.-M. Cao, F. Zhang, Y.-M. Guo and B. Zhang, *Chem.–Eur. J.*, 2016, **22**, 15049–15057.
- 101 M.-L. Cheng, M. Wang, S. Zhang, F.-Y. Liu, Y. Yang, B.-S. Wan and L.-C. Sun, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2017, **198**, 197–209.
- 102 X.-B. Li, J.-X. Jian, X.-Z. Wang, Y. Wang, S.-G. Xia, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Sol. RRL*, 2021, **5**, 2000474.
- 103 Y.-J. Le, S. Liu, G.-L. Hu, R. Hu, R.-T. Yan, Y.-B. Lu and H.-Y. Wang, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2019, **44**, 20079–20084.
- 104 J.-X. Jian, Q. Liu, Z.-J. Li, F. Wang, X.-B. Li, C.-B. Li, B. Liu, Q.-Y. Meng, B. Chen, K. Feng, C.-H. Tung and L.-Z. Wu, *Nat. Commun.*, 2013, **4**, 2695.
- 105 W.-L. Yu, T. Isimjan, S. D. Gobbo, D. H. Anjum, S. Abdel-Azeim, L. Cavallo, A. T. Garcia-Esparza, K. Domen, W. Xu and K. Takanebe, *ChemSusChem*, 2014, **7**, 2575–2583.
- 106 R. Burke, S. Chakraborty, K. P. McClelland, J. Jelusic, E. M. Matson, K. L. Bren and T. D. Krauss, *Chem. Commun.*, 2021, **57**, 2053–2056.
- 107 F. Qiu, Z.-j. Han, J. J. Peterson, M. Y. Odoi, K. L. Sowers and T. D. Krauss, *Nano Lett.*, 2016, **16**, 5347–5352.
- 108 B. C. M. Martindale, G. A. M. Hutton, C. A. Caputo and E. Reisner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2015, **137**, 6018–6025.
- 109 B. C. M. Martindale, E. Joliat, C. Bachmann, R. Alberto and E. Reisner, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2016, **55**, 9402–9406.
- 110 B. C. M. Martindale, G. A. M. Hutton, C. A. Caputo, S. Prantl, R. Godin, J. R. Durrant and E. Reisner, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2017, **56**, 6459–6463.
- 111 K. Ladomenou, G. Landrou, G. Charalambidis, E. Nikoloudakis and A. G. Coutsolelos, *Sustainable Energy Fuels*, 2021, **5**, 449–458.
- 112 J. Wu, W. Xia, M.-H. Lan, X.-J. Xing, J.-C. Hu, L. Huang, J. Liu, Y.-Y. Ren, H.-F. Liu and F. Wang, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2020, **8**, 21690–21699.
- 113 J.-C. Hu, S. Sun, M.-D. Li, W. Xia, J. Wu, H. Liu and F. Wang, *Chem. Commun.*, 2019, **55**, 14490–14493.
- 114 Y. Ding, Y.-H. Gao and Z.-H. Li, *Appl. Surf. Sci.*, 2018, **462**, 255–262.
- 115 Y.-X. Zhang and W.-D. Zhang, *Carbon*, 2019, **145**, 488–500.
- 116 H.-K. Zhao, X.-X. Li, M.-Y. Zheng, X. Zhao, Q. Zhang, Y. Luo and W.-L. Fan, *Nanoscale*, 2020, **12**, 11267–11279.
- 117 S.-C. Lian, M. S. Kodaimati, D. S. Dolzhenkov, R. Calzada and E. A. Weiss, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2017, **139**, 8931–8938.
- 118 S.-C. Lian, M. S. Kodaimati and E. A. Weiss, *ACS Nano*, 2018, **12**, 568–575.
- 119 P. Lia, X.-H. Zhang, C.-C. Hou, Y. Chen and T. He, *Appl. Catal., B*, 2018, **238**, 656–663.
- 120 P. Lia, C.-C. Hou, X.-H. Zhang, Y. Chen and T. He, *Appl. Surf. Sci.*, 2018, **459**, 292–299.
- 121 P. Li, X.-H. Zhang, C.-C. Hou, L. Lin, Y. Chen and T. He, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 16985–16991.
- 122 X.-H. Zhang, L. Lin, D. Qu, J.-G. Yang, Y.-X. Weng, Z. Wang, Z.-C. Sun, Y. Chen and T. He, *Appl. Catal., B*, 2020, **265**, 118595.
- 123 Q.-Q. Bi, J.-W. Wang, J.-X. Lv, J. Wang, W. Zhang and T.-B. Lu, *ACS Catal.*, 2018, **8**, 11815–11821.
- 124 C.-J. Chen, T.-B. Wu, H.-H. Wu, H.-Z. Liu, Q.-L. Qian, Z.-M. Liu, G.-Y. Yang and B.-X. Han, *Chem. Sci.*, 2018, **9**, 8890–8894.
- 125 M. F. Kuehnel, K. L. Orchard, K. E. Dalle and E. Reisner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2017, **139**, 7217–7223.
- 126 M. F. Kuehnel, C. D. Sahn, G. Neri, J. R. Lee, K. L. Orchard, A. J. Cowan and E. Reisner, *Chem. Sci.*, 2018, **9**, 2501–2509.
- 127 T. M. Suzuki, S. Yoshino, T. Takayama, A. Iwase, A. Kudo and T. Morikawa, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, **54**, 10199–10202.

- 128 J. Huang, M. G. Gatty, B. Xu, P. B. Pati, A. S. Etman, L. Tian, J.-L. Sun, L. Hammarströma and H.-N. Tian, *Dalton Trans.*, 2018, **47**, 10775–10783.
- 129 Y.-P. Bao, J. Wang, Q. Wang, X.-F. Cui, R. Long and Z.-Q. Li, *Nanoscale*, 2020, **12**, 2507–2514.
- 130 J.-L. Lin, B. Qin and Z.-X. Fang, *Catal. Lett.*, 2019, **149**, 25–33.
- 131 Z.-G. Chai, Q. Li and D.-S. Xu, *RSC Adv.*, 2014, **4**, 44991–44995.