


 Cite this: *Chem. Commun.*, 2021, 57, 883

 Received 28th September 2020,  
Accepted 4th December 2020

DOI: 10.1039/d0cc06513g

[rsc.li/chemcomm](https://rsc.li/chemcomm)

# A CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> precatalyst for the oxygen evolution reaction: highlighting the importance of postmortem electrocatalyst characterization†

 Samuel E. Michaud,<sup>ib a</sup> Michael T. Riehs,<sup>ib a</sup> Wei-Jie Feng,<sup>ib b</sup>  
Chia-Cheng Lin<sup>ib \*ac</sup> and Charles C. L. McCrory<sup>ib \*ab</sup>

**Vanadium-doped cobalt oxide materials have emerged as a promising class of catalysts for the oxygen evolution reaction. Previous studies suggest vanadium doping in crystalline Co spinel materials tunes the electronic structure and stabilizes surface intermediates. We report a CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> material that shows good activity for the oxygen evolution reaction. However, postmortem characterization of the catalyst material shows dissolution of vanadium resulting in an amorphous CoO<sub>x</sub> material, suggesting that this vanadium-free material, and not CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, is the active catalyst. This study highlights the importance of postmortem characterization prior to mechanistic and computational analysis for this class of materials.**

The sluggish kinetics of the oxygen evolution reaction (OER) hinders the development of practical water-splitting technologies, and has driven the search for efficient OER electrocatalysts comprised of earth-abundant materials that operate with high current densities at low overpotential with long-term operational stability.<sup>1–4</sup> V-Doped Co oxide materials have recently emerged as a promising class of alkaline OER catalysts. Previous studies of V-doped Co oxide materials show increased activity for the OER at low overpotentials,<sup>5–14</sup> and typically suggest that this increased activity is a result of changes to the catalyst's electronic structure and/or in increased stabilization of adsorbed OER intermediates.<sup>5–8</sup>

In this study, we report a CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> material that shows exceptional specific activity per BET surface area for the OER based on as-synthesized characterization data. However, materials characterization conducted after OER electrolysis shows the CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> precatalyst transforms into a V-free amorphous Co-based material during the OER. This suggests that V ions are not present in the active catalyst material, and rather, CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> serves as a template for the generation of an active amorphous CoO<sub>x</sub> species. Our study highlights the need for careful postmortem characterization of electrocatalytic materials to ensure continued catalyst integrity prior to conducting detailed mechanistic interpretations.

CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> was prepared by solid state synthesis from CoO and V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> metal precursors. A 1 : 1 molar ratio of CoO and V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> was ground and mixed, compressed into a pellet, and heated at 800 °C for 20 h under Ar. Selected characterization parameters of the as-synthesized materials are summarized in Table S2 (ESI†). The powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) pattern of the as-synthesized CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> matches that of the CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> reference with minor contributions from V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> impurities as shown in Fig. 1a. Note that V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> is not OER active (see Fig. S1, ESI†), so we do not expect trace V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> impurities to affect our OER measurements. The sharp diffraction peaks suggest a highly crystalline specimen with a large domain size which might be the product of particle agglomeration due to the high temperatures and long times in the solid-state synthesis preparation. The large grain size is supported both by transmission electron microscopy (TEM) analysis which show particles > 100 nm in size (Fig. 1b) and the catalyst's small surface area of only 0.80 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> as determined by BET gas adsorption analysis – two orders of magnitude smaller than that of Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> (Table S2, ESI†). Elemental mapping experiments with TEM-energy dispersive X-ray analysis (TEM-EDX) show relatively uniform distribution of Co, V, and O in the as-synthesized material (Fig. 1b).


The as-synthesized CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> material was further characterized with X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS). XPS core scans of the as-synthesized CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> material in the Co 2p, V 2p, and O 1s

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA. E-mail: cmccrory@umich.edu

<sup>b</sup> Macromolecular Science and Engineering Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA

<sup>c</sup> Institute of Mineral Resources Engineering, Department of Materials and Mineral Resources Engineering, National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei 10608, Taiwan. E-mail: johnclin@mail.ntut.edu.tw

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Experimental methods and details, additional characterization data for the as-synthesized and post-OER materials, cyclic voltammograms of V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> in alkaline conditions, measured O<sub>2</sub> production using an *in situ* O<sub>2</sub> probe, and comparative table of the OER activities of other nanoparticulate catalysts based on as-synthesized activity metrics. See DOI: 10.1039/d0cc06513g



**Fig. 1** (a) PXRD patterns for as-synthesized  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  along with reference patterns for comparison. The PXRD for  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  after 28-h CCE under OER conditions is also included. (b) Representative TEM images and TEM-EDX maps of as-synthesized  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$ . (c) Representative TEM images and TEM-EDX maps of  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  after 28 h CCE under OER conditions. (d–f) High resolution XPS spectra of  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  both as-synthesized and after 28 h CCE in the (d) Co 2p region, (e) V 2p region, and (f) O 1s region.


regions are shown in Fig. 1d–f, and in the C 1s region in Fig. S2 (ESI<sup>†</sup>). In the Co 2p spectra of the as-synthesized material (Fig. 1d), two peaks centered at 780.8 and 796.6 eV are assigned to Co 2p<sub>3/2</sub> and Co 2p<sub>1/2</sub> respectively, and the two shoulder peaks at 785.3 and 802.5 eV suggest the Co is in a CoO-like ( $\text{Co}^{2+}$ ) environment.<sup>15</sup> In the V 2p spectra (Fig. 1e), there is a peak at 516.5 eV assigned to V 2p<sub>3/2</sub>, which resembles that of reported  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_3$  samples and suggests V is in a 3+ oxidation state.<sup>16,17</sup> There is a complicated O 1s peak at ~531.5 eV (Fig. 1f) consistent with a mixed species of O on the surface (metal oxide/hydroxide/adsorbed water), but due to the convoluted nature, the peak cannot be used in V or Co oxidation state estimations.<sup>18</sup> The Co/V ratio based on XPS analysis was 0.58. This XPS characterization is consistent with other synthesized  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  materials.<sup>5,19</sup>

OER activity measurements were performed using previously reported protocols.<sup>20,21</sup> Catalyst inks were prepared by mixing the as-synthesized catalyst particles and Nafion in a water–isopropanol solution, and the resulting inks were dropcast onto polished glassy carbon electrode surfaces ( $0.196 \text{ cm}^2$ ) resulting in films with mass loadings of  $0.84 \text{ mg cm}^{-2}$ . The putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst shows promising activity for the OER, operating with increased activity per geometric area compared to the parent  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  as shown in Fig. 2a, and dramatically increased specific activity per BET surface area compared to  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  as shown in Fig. 2b. Activity descriptors for the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst compared to other representative OER catalysts are shown in Table S3 (ESI<sup>†</sup>). The long-term performance stability of the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  system was confirmed by rapid potential cycling measurements and long-term controlled-current electrolysis experiments (CCE) which showed minimal change in

activity over 10 000 cycles and 28 h controlled current measurements (Fig. 2c). The faradaic efficiency for the OER was measured as  $90 \pm 5\%$  using an *in situ*  $\text{O}_2$  probe (Fig. S4, ESI<sup>†</sup>).

The activity measurements for the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst suggest it shows remarkable stability and activity, particularly specific activity per BET surface area, for the OER. Sequential cycles of RDEVs at 1600 rpm of the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst in 1 M NaOH are shown in Fig. 2d. In the first cycle, there is a large oxidative feature negative of the OER electrocatalytic onset, and this oxidative feature decreases with subsequent scans before approaching a steady-state peak current after six cycles. RDEVs conducted under identical conditions for  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_3$  show a similar oxidative feature in the first cycle that disappears in subsequent cycles (Fig. S5, ESI<sup>†</sup>), which is consistent with previous studies that show  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_3$  dissolves under oxidation when exposed to alkaline conditions.<sup>22</sup> Our RDEV studies suggest that the large oxidative feature observed for  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  is likely due to oxidative dissolution of V, and the steady-state redox feature after six cycles is assigned to the  $\text{Co}^{2+/3+}$  redox couple of the resulting  $\text{CoO}_x$  material.<sup>23</sup> The stability of the catalytic performance of the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  suggests that dissolution of V has a minimal effect on the OER activity.

To confirm the postulated V dissolution during our experiments, we conducted a series of postmortem characterization studies on the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst. TEM-EDX conducted on a sample after the CCE measurements show a dramatic loss of V consistent with oxidative V dissolution during electrocatalytic studies. Similarly, ICP-MS measurements taken after



**Fig. 2** Cyclic RDEVs of the as-synthesized  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  catalyst compared to previously reported  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  in  $\text{O}_2$ -saturated 1 M NaOH showing (a) the current density per geometric area and (b) the specific current density per the BET surface area of the as-synthesized materials at  $0.01 \text{ V s}^{-1}$  scan rate and 1600 rpm rotation rate. The RDEVs shown are the 2nd cycle for each sample. The  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  data is taken from ref. 20. (c) Stability studies for the putative  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  during OER. The green circles are measured overpotentials at  $10 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$  geometric ( $\eta_j = 10 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$ ) during 28 h CCE measurements plotted vs. the polarization time on the bottom axis. The blue squares are the  $\eta_j = 10 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$  values during 10000 cycle experiments plotted vs. the number of cycles on the top x-axis, and the bottom axis also reflects the time points in the cycling measurements. The  $\eta_j = 10 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$  values were average measurements from at least three independently-prepared samples, and the error bars represent the standard deviations. (d) The first six RDEVs measured for the as-synthesized  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$ . There is a large pre-catalytic peak at  $\eta \approx 0.05 \text{ V}$  that shifts negative and decreases in intensity in subsequent scans.

the CCE stability measurements show almost complete disappearance of V (Table S2, ESI<sup>†</sup>). XPS measurements taken after the CCE measurements show a dramatic decrease of the V 2p peaks consistent with a loss of V from the material (Fig. 1c), and in the Co 2p region the disappearance of the shoulder peaks and the decreased FWHM of the two Co 2p peaks suggest a shift towards a  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  like surrounding (Fig. 1d).<sup>24</sup> The reduced shoulder peak of O 1s (531.5 eV), which is attributed to oxide defect sites or hydroxyl groups,<sup>25</sup> in the post-CCE XPS suggests the loss of defect sites and surface oxyhydroxyl (M-OOH) groups while the loss of the peak at 535 eV represents the loss of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  species. Note that the XPS measured on the post-cycling samples were analogous to the post-CCE samples (Fig. S6, ESI<sup>†</sup>).

PXRD measurements of the post-CCE catalyst material are consistent with an amorphous structure (Fig. 1), and high-resolution TEM measurements of the post-CCE material also show a broadly amorphous structure with a random dispersion of small nanocrystalline domains with  $d = 0.24 \text{ nm}$  lattice spacing consistent with the (311) plane of V-free  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  (Fig. S7, inset, ESI<sup>†</sup>). Selected area diffraction (SAED) measurements also show a decrease in catalyst crystallinity post-electrolysis compared to the as-synthesized material (Fig. S8, ESI<sup>†</sup>).

All electrochemical and post-CCE characterization data suggest that the active OER catalyst is not  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$ , but instead

an amorphous, V-free  $\text{CoO}_x$  material. We postulate that the  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  material undergoes a structural rearrangement under electrocatalytic conditions forming a soluble  $\text{VO}_x$  phase, possibly  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$ , consistent with the Pourbaix diagram for V.<sup>26,27</sup> Upon dissolution of  $\text{VO}_x$ , the  $\text{CoV}_2\text{O}_4$  lattice collapses resulting in an amorphous  $\text{CoO}_x$  material that is presumed to be the active species for the OER. This process is qualitatively similar to electrochemical dealloying previously used to make porous battery materials and catalysts.<sup>28–33</sup> We postulate that the increased observed activity for our catalyst compared to  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$  may be due in part to an increased surface area after V-dissolution. Unfortunately, we were not able to harvest sufficient amounts of material post-CCE for BET gas adsorption measurements. Moreover, we do not use electrochemical double-layer capacitance measurements to estimate surface area for OER materials – we believe such measurements are of questionable utility due to the well-documented fallibility of that approach applied to metal oxide catalysts.<sup>21,34–37</sup> We did estimate average particle sizes based on the TEM images in Fig. 1, and we observe a decrease in the average (and median) particle size post-CCE that is qualitatively consistent with our postulated increase in surface area assuming no loss of material (Table S1, ESI<sup>†</sup>). However, the measured decrease in average particle size does not account for any changes in porosity or mass-loss from V dissolution that would also influence the overall surface area, and so it is reported here only as a qualitative metric.

Previous studies have reported that V-doped Co oxide materials show higher activity for the OER than their parent oxide materials.<sup>5–13</sup> In many cases, this observed higher OER activity compared to the V-free parent materials is attributed to specific changes in the physical and/or electronic structure upon V incorporation resulting in changes to material conductivity, adsorption energy of OER intermediates, and/or the rate determining step in the catalytic mechanism. In the case of V-doped amorphous  $\text{CoO}_x$  films,<sup>7,9</sup> crystalline V-doped  $\text{CoOOH}$ <sup>8</sup> and CoFe-based<sup>12</sup> nanoparticles, and Co-V hydroxide nanostructures,<sup>13</sup> postmortem characterization shows these materials retain significant concentrations of V after OER stability measurements, consistent with the assertion that the continued presence of V is an important component of the OER mechanism for these materials.<sup>7,8,12,13</sup>

However, in previous studies of crystalline V-doped  $\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4$ -based spinel materials, a lack of postmortem characterization introduces ambiguity as to the role of V in the catalytic mechanism. For example, in previous studies of OER by  $\text{CoV}_{2-x}\text{Fe}_x\text{O}_4$  and  $\text{Co}_{3-x}\text{V}_x\text{O}_4$  nanoparticles, comprehensive mechanistic and computational analysis was conducted with the assumption that V was an important component in the active catalyst species.<sup>5,6</sup> However, in these studies, either postmortem analysis was not reported to confirm the presence of V in the material after the OER,<sup>6</sup> or reported postmortem characterization showing the loss of V during the OER was not considered in the mechanistic analysis.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, studies of V-doped CoP materials and Co-Mo-V catalysts both attribute increased catalytic activity to the presence of V in the materials, but did not include postmortem characterization



showing the continued presence of V after the OER.<sup>10,14</sup> This is not to say that the mechanistic arguments in these previous studies are incorrect, but rather suggests that the composition of the post-OER catalyst should be reported and discussed when considering possible catalytic mechanisms.

V-Doped Co oxide materials are an emerging class of promising electrocatalysts for the OER. In our work, we show that a putative CoV<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> spinel catalyst shows remarkable specific activity based on as-synthesized catalyst characterization when compared to Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> and other reported OER catalysts. However, postmortem characterization shows dissolution of V from the material resulting in the formation of amorphous CoO<sub>x</sub> particles, the presumed true active catalysts for the OER. Our findings introduce uncertainty into the mechanistic arguments made in previous studies of V-doped Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>-based spinel materials for the OER that suggest V plays an important role in catalytic mechanism without considering post-mortem materials characterization to confirm the continued presence of V during the OER. Conducting compositional and structural characterization of OER materials after electrocatalytic stability studies is recommended as a minimum requirement in assigning plausible catalytic active species according to recent reviews of best practices for OER measurements.<sup>36–39</sup> We believe our work serves as a case study highlighting the importance of postmortem characterization in determining possible catalytic species prior to in-depth mechanistic analysis.

This work was supported with funding from the University of Michigan and by a Cottrell Scholar award, a program of the Research Corporation for Science Advancement. M. T. R. acknowledges partial support by a May-Walt Summer Research Scholarship by the University of Michigan. C.-C. L. acknowledges partial support by the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan (MOST 109-2113-M-027-001-MY3). XPS and TEM measurements were conducted at the Michigan Center for Materials Characterization with support from the University of Michigan College of Engineering and the National Science Foundation (DMR-0420785, DMR-0723032)

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Notes and references

- W. T. Hong, M. Risch, K. A. Stoerzinger, A. Grimaud, J. Suntivich and Y. Shao-Horn, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2015, **8**, 1404–1427.
- L. Han, S. Dong and E. Wang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2016, **28**, 9266–9291.
- N.-T. Suen, S.-F. Hung, Q. Quan, N. Zhang, Y.-J. Xu and H. M. Chen, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**, 337–365.
- W.-J. Jiang, T. Tang, Y. Zhang and J.-S. Hu, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2020, **53**, 1111–1123.
- R. Wei, X. Bu, W. Gao, R. A. B. Villaos, G. Macam, Z.-Q. Huang, C. Lan, F.-C. Chuang, Y. Qu and J. C. Ho, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2019, **11**, 33012–33021.
- K. Chakrapani, G. Bendt, H. Hajiyani, T. Lunkenbein, M. T. Greiner, L. Masliuk, S. Salamon, J. Landers, R. Schlögl, H. Wende, R. Pentcheva, S. Schulz and M. Behrens, *ACS Catal.*, 2018, **8**, 1259–1267.
- L. Liardet and X. Hu, *ACS Catal.*, 2018, **8**, 644–650.
- Y. Cui, Y. Xue, R. Zhang, J. Zhang, X. A. Li and X. Zhu, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 21911–21917.
- G. Merle, I. Abrahams and J. Barralet, *Mater. Today Energy*, 2018, **9**, 247–253.
- J.-F. Qin, J.-H. Lin, T.-S. Chen, D.-P. Liu, J.-Y. Xie, B.-Y. Guo, L. Wang, Y.-M. Chai and B. Dong, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2019, **39**, 182–187.
- J. M. Gonçalves, M. Ireno da Silva, L. Angnes and K. Araki, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2020, **8**, 2171–2206.
- T. Gao, Z. Jin, M. Liao, J. Xiao, H. Yuan and D. Xiao, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2015, **3**, 17763–17770.
- M. Yang, X. Fu, M. Shao, Z. Wang, L. Cao, S. Gu, M. Li, H. Cheng, Y. Li, H. Pan and Z. Lu, *ChemElectroChem*, 2019, **6**, 2050–2055.
- J. Bao, Z. Wang, J. Xie, L. Xu, F. Lei, M. Guan, Y. Zhao, Y. Huang and H. Li, *Chem. Commun.*, 2019, **55**, 3521–3524.
- P. W. Menezes, A. Indra, D. González-Flores, N. R. Sahaie, I. Zaharieva, M. Schwarze, P. Strasser, H. Dau and M. Driess, *ACS Catal.*, 2015, **5**, 2017–2027.
- N. K. Nag and F. E. Massoth, *J. Catal.*, 1990, **124**, 127–132.
- B. S. Allimi, S. P. Alpay, D. Goberman, T. Huang, J. I. Budnick, D. M. Pease and A. I. Frenkel, *J. Mater. Res.*, 2007, **22**, 2825–2831.
- G. Silversmit, D. Depla, H. Poelman, G. B. Marin and R. De Gryse, *J. Electron. Spectrosc. Relat. Phenom.*, 2004, **135**, 167–175.
- J. S. Lu, I. V. B. Maggay and W. R. Liu, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, **54**, 3094–3097.
- C.-C. Lin and C. C. L. McCrory, *ACS Catal.*, 2017, **7**, 443–451.
- S. Jung, C. C. L. McCrory, I. M. Ferrer, J. C. Peters and T. F. Jaramillo, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2016, **4**, 3068–3076.
- F. M. Al-Kharafi and W. A. Badawy, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1997, **42**, 579–586.
- M. S. Burke, M. G. Kast, L. Trotochaud, A. M. Smith and S. W. Boettcher, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2015, **137**, 3638–3648.
- S. C. Peitto, E. M. Marsh, G. A. Carson and M. A. Langell, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.*, 2008, **281**, 49–58.
- J. Wei, Y. Y. Feng, Y. Liu and Y. Ding, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2015, **3**, 22300–22310.
- K. Post and R. G. Robins, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1976, **21**, 401–405.
- M. Pourbaix, *Atlas of Electrochemical Equilibria in Aqueous Solution*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966, pp. 234–245.
- A. J. Forty, *Nature*, 1979, **282**, 597–598.
- J. Erlebacher, M. J. Aziz, A. Karma, N. Dimitrov and K. Sieradzki, *Nature*, 2001, **410**, 450–453.
- S. Koh and P. Strasser, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2007, **129**, 12624–12625.
- A. Pavlišić, P. Jovanović, V. S. Šelih, M. Šala, M. Bele, G. Dražić, I. Arčon, S. Hočvar, A. Kokalj, N. Hodnik and M. Gaberšček, *ACS Catal.*, 2016, **6**, 5530–5534.
- T. Fujita, H. Abe, T. Tanabe, Y. Ito, T. Tokunaga, S. Arai, Y. Yamamoto, A. Hirata and M. Chen, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2016, **26**, 1609–1616.
- X. Lu, M. Ahmadi, F. J. DiSalvo and H. D. Abruña, *ACS Catal.*, 2020, **10**, 5891–5898.
- R. L. Doyle, I. J. Godwin, M. P. Brandon and M. E. G. Lyons, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **15**, 13737–13783.
- K. Klingan, F. Ringleb, I. Zaharieva, J. Heidkamp, P. Chernev, D. Gonzalez-Flores, M. Risch, A. Fischer and H. Dau, *ChemSusChem*, 2014, **7**, 1301–1310.
- M. B. Stevens, L. J. Enman, A. S. Batchellor, M. R. Cosby, A. E. Vise, C. D. M. Trang and S. W. Boettcher, *Chem. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 120–140.
- C. Wei, R. R. Rao, J. Peng, B. Huang, I. E. L. Stephens, M. Risch, Z. J. Xu and Y. Shao-Horn, *Adv. Mater.*, 2019, **31**, 1806296.
- R. Frydendal, E. A. Paoli, B. P. Knudsen, B. Wickman, P. Malacrida, I. E. L. Stephens and I. Chorkendorff, *ChemElectroChem*, 2014, **1**, 2075–2081.
- S. Geiger, O. Kasian, M. Ledendecker, E. Pizzutilo, A. M. Mingers, W. T. Fu, O. Diaz-Morales, Z. Li, T. Oellers, L. Fruchter, A. Ludwig, K. J. J. Mayrhofer, M. T. M. Koper and S. Cherevko, *Nat. Catal.*, 2018, **1**, 508–515.