Methanol Synthesis from CO₂ Hydrogenation over a Pd₄/In₂O₃

Model Catalyst: A Combined DFT and Kinetic Study

Jingyun Ye,^{1,2} Chang-jun Liu,¹ Donghai Mei³ and Qingfeng Ge^{*1,2}

¹*School of Chemical Engineering and Technology, Tianjin University, Tianjin, 300072, China.*

²*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL, 62901, USA.*

³*Institute for Integrated Catalysis, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA 99352, USA.*

*Corresponding author: Email: qge@chem.siu.edu (Q. Ge)

ABSTRACT:

Methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation on a model Pd/In₂O₃ catalyst, i.e. Pd₄/In₂O₃, has been investigated using density functional theory (DFT) and microkinetic modeling. Three possible routes in the reaction network of CO₂ + H₂ → CH₃OH + H₂O have been examined. Our DFT results show that the HCOO route competes with the RWGS route whereas a high activation barrier blocked the HCOOH route kinetically. The DFT results also suggest that H₂COO* + H* ↔ H₂CO* + OH* and cis-COOH* + H* ↔ CO* + H₂O* are the rate limiting steps in the HCOO route and the RWGS route, respectively. Microkinetic modeling results demonstrate that the HCOO route is the dominant pathway for forming methanol from CO₂ hydrogenation. Furthermore, the activation of the H adatom on the Pd cluster and the presence of H₂O on the In₂O₃ substrate play important roles in promoting methanol production. The hydroxyl adsorbed at the interface of Pd₄/In₂O₃ induces structural transformation of the supported Pd₄ cluster from a butterfly shape into a tetrahedron one. This structural change not only indicates the dynamical nature of the supported nanocatalysts during the reaction but also causes the final hydrogenation step to change from CH₃O to H₂COH.

Keywords: Methanol synthesis, carbon dioxide, indium oxide, palladium, density functional theory, kinetic modeling

1. Introduction

Hydrogenation of CO₂ into methanol has attracted attention worldwide for its role in chemical sequestration of CO₂ [1-4]. Many catalysts have been exploited for this reaction and among them, supported Pd catalysts including Pd/Ga₂O₃ [5], Pd/CeO₂ [6], Pd/ZnO [7] and Pd/ZrO₂ [8] have shown high activity. For supported Pd catalysts, the supports and promoters (mostly metal oxides) play important roles in the activity and selectivity for methanol production. For example, the effect of metal oxide supports has been found to follow the order of Ga₂O₃ > ZnO > Al₂O₃ > TiO₂ ≈ Cr₂O₃ > SiO₂ ≈ ZrO₂ [5]. Bonivardi et al. showed that the addition of Ga₂O₃ into a Pd/SiO₂ catalyst increases the turnover rate by 500-fold and the selectivity toward methanol to 70% from 17% as compared with those on the clean Pd/SiO₂ [9]. Iwasa and coworkers suggested that the remarkable activity and selectivity of Pd/Ga₂O₃ catalysts for either methanol synthesis or for the methanol stream reforming were a consequence of Pd-Ga alloy formation [10, 11]. The roles of metal oxides are summarized as: (1) the metal oxides help to disperse and stabilize the Pd particles or form bi-metallic particles due to their strong interactions with Pd; (2) the metal oxides (basic or amphoteric) generally have a higher affinity toward CO₂, and are thereby beneficial for CO₂ adsorption and activation; (3) the carbon monoxide ascribed to the reverse water-gas shift (RWGS) mainly proceeds on the metal oxides since Pd has a low activity for the RWGS reaction [5].

In_2O_3 has been well known for its unique physical properties of optical transparency and electrical conductivity [12-16]. However, the interesting catalytic properties of In_2O_3 have not attracted much attention until recently [17-22]. The $\text{Pd}/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$ catalyst showed high selectivity for CO_2 , and correspondingly low CO productivity, in the methanol steam reforming (MSR) for hydrogen production and this was attributed to formation of the Pd-In alloy at low temperatures [10, 22-27]. Iwasa et al. reported that methanol can be produced from CO_2 as a feed gas with H_2 on $\text{Pd}/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$, but not from CO [28]. Since methanol steam reforming is the reversal of methanol synthesis from CO_2 hydrogenation, methanol formation from CO_2 hydrogenation on $\text{Pd}/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$ is expected to go through the direct hydrogenation of CO_2 .

The interfacial sites are unique to the supported metal catalyst and play an important role in heterogeneous catalysis. The synergetic effect of H_2 dissociation on Pd particles and the spillover of the H adatoms to the support where CO_2 is adsorbed play important roles for methanol synthesis from CO_2 hydrogenation [29-31]. Very recently, Kwak, et al. demonstrated that atomically dispersed Pd assisted by oxides, either as support (Al_2O_3) or promoter (La_2O_3), exhibits activity toward CO_2 reduction whereas Pd supported on a carbon nanotube support without oxide does not [32]. In fact, atomically dispersed supported metal catalysts have become an intensely focused area of research in recent years [33-37]. H_2 adsorption and dissociation on the pure Pd surfaces or particles have been studied both experimentally [31, 38] and theoretically

[39-41]. The interaction of H_2 and Pd is closely related to the H_2 pressure and particle size of Pd. The strong interaction between H atoms and the small Pd particles (Pd_n , $n=3, 4$) results in incorporation of the H atoms into the Pd cluster [40], which strongly suppresses the activity of H for CO_2 hydrogenation. Consequently, activation of the strongly bound H atoms needs to be taken into account in CO_2 hydrogenation, especially on a supported Pd nanoparticle. In addition, the dissociation of H_2 , H_2O and other intermediates (i. e. $COOH$, $HCOOH$, H_2COOH) produce a large amount of hydroxyls during the reaction, which are likely to adsorb on the In_2O_3 surface [18, 20, 21]. As a result, the effect of hydroxyls on the reaction mechanism has also to be examined carefully. For example, studies of CO_2 hydrogenation on $Ni_4/\gamma-Al_2O_3$ [42] indicate that the hydroxyls on the $\gamma-Al_2O_3$ support alters the reaction pathway for CO_2 hydrogenation and ultimately affects the distribution of the final products.

Previously, theoretical studies of methanol synthesis from CO_2 were carried out on a pure metal surface (Cu(111) [43-45]), a metal cluster (Cu_{29} [44]), a metal doped Cu surface [46] or a bare metal oxide (ZnO [47]). On the supported metal catalysts, the adsorption and dissociation of H_2 usually occur on the surface of the metal particle. Murray et al. found that carbon monoxide oxidation in ceria-based catalysts is greatly enhanced at the ceria-metal interface sites for a range of group VIII metal catalysts [48]. Heiz et al. reported that a single Pd atom supported on MgO is active for the production of benzene, but a free Pd atom is inert for this reaction [49]. The

activity of Pd/MgO was attributed to the charge transfer from the support to the metal cluster as revealed by the DFT study. In fact, models such as Pd_n/MgO [49] and Ni₄/γ-Al₂O₃ [42] become attractive model systems. These simplified model systems capture key features of the metal-support interaction and provide interfacial sites as active sites for the catalytic transformation whereas quantitative agreement with the experimental system is generally not anticipated. Since CO₂ generally physisorbs on metallic Pd [50-52], the hydrogenation of CO₂ likely utilizes hydrogen adatoms generated on Pd and proceeds at the interface of the metal particle and the support. Herein, a Pd₄ cluster supported on In₂O₃ (Pd₄/In₂O₃) was designed as a model catalyst to elucidate the mechanism of methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation using a combination of density functional theory calculation and microkinetic study. The effects of H adatom activation, water and hydroxyl on the reaction mechanism and kinetics were also examined. The results confirmed that Pd on In₂O₃ would be a good catalyst for methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation.

2. Methodology and Models

All the calculations were performed using the Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP) [53-55], a periodic DFT code with projector augmented wave (PAW) potentials. The nonlocal exchange correlation energy was evaluated using the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof functional [56]. The 5s and 5p states of In were treated explicitly as valence states within the

scalar-relativistic PAW approach [57]. A plane wave basis set with a cutoff energy of 400 eV and a (2×2×1) k-point grid generated with the Monkhorst-Pack scheme were found to give converged results. The atomic structures were relaxed using either the conjugate gradient algorithm or the quasi-Newton scheme as implemented in the VASP code until the forces on all unconstrained atoms were less than 0.03 eV/Å.

The In₂O₃(110) surface is modeled with a (1×√2) supercell, built from the optimized In₂O₃ bulk unit cell with lattice parameters a = b = c = 10.18 Å [19, 20]. The supercell has a dimension of 10.18 Å × 14.40 Å × 17.96 Å. The surface slab consists of 48 O atoms and 32 In atoms distributed in four atomic layers and is separated by a vacuum of 12 Å. The optimized Pd₄ cluster with a tetrahedral structure is supported on the In₂O₃(110) surface to generate the Pd₄/In₂O₃ model catalyst. In all calculations, atoms in the bottom two layers of the In₂O₃(110) slab are frozen at their equilibrium bulk positions whereas those in the top two layers together with the Pd₄ cluster and other species involved in methanol synthesis are allowed to relax. Test calculations by increasing the vacuum space to 15 Å showed that the adsorption energy of CH₃OH is -0.78 eV, almost exactly the same as that from the slab with 12 Å vacuum. The reaction energy and activation barrier for bi-HCOO*+H*→H₂COO*+*, an elementary step in methanol formation, are +0.77 eV and 1.10 eV, respectively, also very close to those (+0.75 eV and 1.09 eV, respectively) from the slab with 12 Å vacuum.

The adsorption energies of intermediates were defined as:

$$\Delta E_{ad}(M) = E_{M/(Pd_4/In_2O_3)} - E_{(Pd_4/In_2O_3)} - E_{(M)}$$

where M represents molecules, intermediates involved in methanol synthesis as well as their corresponding products upon adsorption. $E_{M/(Pd_4/In_2O_3)}$, $E_{(Pd_4/In_2O_3)}$ and $E_{(M)}$ represent the total energies of the Pd₄/In₂O₃ with the adsorbate and the clean Pd₄/In₂O₃, the free molecule or intermediate, respectively. In the case of co-adsorption and reaction on the surface, the relative energies were computed with respect to the sum of the total energies of the corresponding free molecules. According to the above definition, negative values indicate that the process is exothermic whereas positive values indicate that the process is endothermic. Transition states along a reaction pathway were determined in two steps: First, the nudged elastic band method [58], typically with 7 to 9 images was used to locate the likely transition state; Second, the likely transition state was relaxed using the quasi-Newton algorithm with the same force convergence criterion. The relaxed transition state was then confirmed through frequency analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Pd₄ supported on In₂O₃(110)

The side and top views of In₂O₃(110) and Pd₄/In₂O₃(110) are shown in Fig. 1. The structure of In₂O₃(110) has been discussed in our previous papers in detail [19, 20]. In the present study, we focus on Pd₄/In₂O₃(110). The optimized Pd₄ cluster is a tetrahedron in the gas

phase [59]. The initial Pd₄/In₂O₃(110) structure was built by placing the optimized Pd₄ cluster on the In₂O₃(110) surface. After relaxation, the Pd₄ cluster is stabilized on the surface by bridging between the two In-O chains through the Pd-In and the Pd-O bonds (Pd₁-In₂: 2.62 Å, Pd₃-In₄': 2.78 Å, Pd₄-O₂: 2.16 Å, Pd₄-O₄': 2.13 Å, Pd₂-O₃: 2.11 Å, Pd₂-O₅': 2.11 Å). We note that the original tetrahedral structure of Pd₄ was distorted into a butterfly shape after optimization. The average Pd-Pd bond length is shortened from 2.61 Å in a Pd₄ tetrahedron to 2.56 Å. The angles of $\angle \text{Pd}_{1-4-3}$ and $\angle \text{Pd}_{1-2-3}$ are opened from 60° to ~ 85.0°, whereas the dihedral angle between the Pd₁₋₂₋₄ plane and the Pd₃₋₂₋₄ plane is opened from 70.5° to 105.6°. The Pd₄/In₂O₃(110) structure is similar to Pd₄/γ-Al₂O₃(100) and Pd₄/γ-Al₂O₃(110) reported by Valero [60, 61]. The adsorption energy of Pd₄ on In₂O₃ is -4.37 eV. This result indicate that the Pd₄ cluster binds the In₂O₃(110) surface much stronger than it does the γ-Al₂O₃(110) surface and an exothermic process is expected when loading Pd₄ on the In₂O₃ surface. We also note that Pd₄ is a rather small cluster and has a cohesive energy of 1.68 eV/atom. Loading the Pd₄ cluster on In₂O₃(110) increases the cohesive energy by 1.02 eV/atom to 2.70 eV/atom. However, this value is still significantly smaller than either the bulk cohesive energies of Pd (3.99 eV/atom calculated and 3.89 eV/atom experimental [62, 63]) or the averaged bulk cohesive energy of PdIn (3.57 eV/atom). The calculated cohesive energies are summarized in table S1 for comparison. Based on the calculated cohesive energies, the following order of stability can be obtained: Pd bulk > PdIn bulk >

$\text{Pd}_4/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3 > \text{Pd}_4$. The results indicated that the highly dispersed Pd particles, in particular the particles as small as Pd_4 , tend to agglomerate. It may also form bulk PdIn alloy under the highly reducing conditions. In fact, deactivation due to sintering is a common and critical issue that needs to be addressed in the development of new catalysts [64-67]. The development of nanomanufacturing in the past decade is expected to provide a solution to issues such as sintering [33, 68, 69]. The stabilization of Pd_4 due to In_2O_3 makes it a potentially useful model catalyst. In addition, Pd_4 provides both metal-support and pure metal-metal interaction in the 3D arrangement. The interfacial sites will be available for CO_2 adsorption and allow H adatoms produced on the Pd particle to react with the adsorbed CO_2 .

(Fig. 1.)

3.2 CO_2 and H_2 adsorption and dissociation

We first studied the CO_2 adsorption on the $\text{Pd}_4/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3(110)$ surface. Three typical configurations (CO_2_1 , CO_2_2 , CO_2_3) of CO_2 adsorption on $\text{Pd}_4/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$ are shown in Fig. 2. CO_2_1 , CO_2_2 , CO_2_3 , representing CO_2 adsorption at three types of sites: the interface of Pd cluster and In_2O_3 substrate, the top of Pd cluster and the surface of In_2O_3 , respectively. The calculated CO_2 adsorption energies in the three configurations are -0.37 eV, -0.41 eV and +0.03 eV, respectively.

H₂ dissociative adsorption is an important step in CO₂ hydrogenation. On Pd₄/In₂O₃, H₂ dissociates spontaneously and forms two H adatoms on the supported Pd₄ cluster, shown in Fig. 2 (H₂_dis). The dissociative adsorption energy of hydrogen is -1.08 eV. According to our previously definition [20], H₂ dissociates on the Pd cluster into two hydridic H adatoms (Pd-H). Once the spillover of H adatoms from the Pd cluster to the In₂O₃ surface took place, those H adatoms binding the surface O atoms are oxidized to proton-like in the form of hydroxyl (O-H) whereas others binding the surface In atoms (In-H) remain hydridic. The proton-like H adatoms can hydroxylate the adsorbed CO₂ through proton transfer to the O atom of CO₂ whereas hydridic H adatoms will hydrogenate CO₂ by attacking the C atom of the adsorbed CO₂.

The CO₂ dissociation is studied at the interface of Pd/In₂O₃ since CO produced from the dissociation would be the reactant for methanol synthesis. As shown in Fig. 3, R25 and R25' are two reactions for CO₂ dissociation, resulting in different CO adsorption configurations, CO_b* and CO_i*. R25 is endothermic by +0.79 eV with an activation barrier of 1.41 eV whereas R25' is endothermic by +1.40 eV with an activation barrier of 2.71 eV. Due to the high barriers for CO₂ dissociation, direct dissociation of CO₂ is not expected to contribute to methanol formation. CO₂ dissociation had also been studied on other metal oxides. For example, the reported activation barriers are 0.38 eV on Cu/ZrO₂ [70] and 0.39 eV on ZnO [47]. However, the O adatoms produced from CO₂ dissociation on those surfaces are difficult to remove, thereby blocking the

active sites for further reaction [70]. The results indicate that the possibility of a Pd/In₂O₃ catalyst is capable of avoiding deactivation originated from the O adatoms due to CO₂ dissociation.

The adsorbed CO₂ in both CO₂_1 and CO₂_2 are stable for subsequent CO₂ hydrogenation while the adsorbed CO₂ in CO₂_3 prefers to desorb or be transformed to CO₂_1, indicating that the CO₂ molecule prefers to adsorb at the interface or on the supported Pd cluster. On the other hand, the high dissociative adsorption energy of H₂ on the supported Pd₄ cluster not only indicates the strong capability of the Pd₄ cluster for H₂ dissociation but also suggests a possibility of high H coverage on the Pd cluster. Consequently, the dissociative adsorption of H₂ prevails on the Pd cluster, pushing CO₂ to adsorb at the interfacial sites. As such, CO₂ hydrogenation is more likely to occur at the Pd₄/In₂O₃ interface (CO₂_1).

(Fig. 2.)

(Fig. 3.)

3.3 Methanol synthesis at the interface of Pd₄/In₂O₃

The reaction network of methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation shown in Fig. 4 includes the formate (HCOO), reverse water gas shift (RWGS) and formic acid (HCOOH) routes. All the structural parameters and adsorption energies of the reaction intermediates involved in these reaction pathways are summarized in Table 1. The corresponding optimized structures are given in the supporting information (Fig. S1). All the reaction energies and barriers of the

elementary steps are summarized in Table 2. The structural details of initial reactants, transition states and final products are shown in the support information (Fig. S2). The adsorption of CO₂ at the interface of Pd₄/In₂O₃ is exothermic by -0.37 eV with a bent structure, which indicates the interfacial site facilitates not only the CO₂ capturing but also the CO₂ activation. In such a way, the Pd₄ cluster provides a flow of atomic H for CO₂ hydrogenation. The interface of Pd₄/In₂O₃ provides the active site for CO₂ hydrogenation. As a result, the three reaction routes share the same starting point, CO₂_1.

(Fig. 4.)

Table 1

Table 2

3.3.1 Formate route

Fig. 5 shows the potential energy surface of the formate route for methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation. Both pathways share the steps from CO₂ to H₂CO, but branch into different routes before reaching methanol.

The formate route initiates by the direct hydrogenation of adsorbed CO₂ to yield mono-HCOO. This reaction is endothermic by +0.81 eV with an activation barrier of 1.17 eV. The transition state is TS3. The mono-HCOO species is not stable and quickly transforms to a stable bi-HCOO configuration. The transformation is exothermic by -0.68 eV without a barrier [44, 47,

70-73]. The bi-HCOO further reacts with adsorbed H (H^*) on the Pd cluster and produces H_2COO . This reaction is endothermic by +0.75 eV with an activation barrier of 1.09 eV. The transition state of this step is TS5. Hydrogenation of H_2COO is the next step. Since the H adatom is close to the O atom of the H_2COO species, the $H_2COO^*+H^*\rightarrow H_2COOH^*+^*$ step is most likely to happen at the interface. Interestingly, once the H adatom binds to the O atom, the C-O bond of H_2COO breaks simultaneously. This reaction is therefore labeled as $H_2COO^*+H_s^*\rightarrow H_2CO^*+OH^*$ in which H_s^* represents the H adatom on the Pd_4 cluster through a single Pd-H bond. This step is exothermic by -1.15 eV with an activation barrier of 0.89 eV. In fact, the H adatom prefers to bind on the Pd_4 cluster through a Pd-H-Pd (H_b^*) bridging bond, which is 0.91 eV lower than H_s^* . This reveals that activation of H_b^* to H_s^* from the most favorable adsorption configuration is a necessary step for H_2COO hydrogenation. As a result, the reaction barrier increases to 1.80 eV by including the energy of H_b^* activation. The effects of the H adatom activation will be further discussed in the context of hydrogen coverage effect in section 3.4. Subsequent hydrogenation of H_2CO could go through either H_3CO or H_2COH intermediates via the reactions of R20 ($H_2CO^*+H_{In}^*+OH^*\rightarrow H_3CO^*+OH^*+^*$, $\Delta E = -0.18$ eV, $E_a = 1.09$ eV) or R22 ($H_2CO^*+H_O^*+OH^*\rightarrow H_2COH^*+OH^*+^*$, $\Delta E = +0.76$ eV, $E_a = 0.84$ eV), respectively. The above elementary steps show that hydrogenation of H_2CO to produce CH_3O is thermodynamically more favorable than to produce CH_2OH but kinetically less favorable.

CH₃OH can then be produced via H₃CO protonation (R21: H₃CO*+H*+OH*→CH₃OH*+OH*, $\Delta E = +0.25$ eV, $E_a = 0.31$ eV) or H₂COH hydrogenation (R23: H₂COH*+H*+OH* → CH₃OH*+OH*, $\Delta E = +0.20$ eV, $E_a = 1.11$ eV). Both reactions are endothermic, but the barrier for the protonation of H₃CO is much lower than that for the hydrogenation of H₂COH. The final step is H₂O production from the OH*+H*→H₂O*+* reaction. The last step is an exothermic reaction ($\Delta E = -0.65$ eV) with an activation barrier of 0.98 eV. CH₃OH and H₂O proceed to desorb from the catalyst surface with an overall energy cost of 1.36 eV. Comparing those two reaction pathways, the H₂COH pathway is energetically more favorable than the CH₃O pathway. In presence of OH, the tetrahedral structure of Pd₄ cluster is maintained throughout the steps leading to CH₃OH. Thus, the rate-limiting step is the hydrogenation of H₂COO to H₂CO and OH (R6) based on the energetic analysis.

(Fig. 5.)

Previously, we studied CO₂ adsorption and hydrogenation on In₂O₃ and demonstrated that CO₂ could be hydrogenated by the H adatom on the In sites [20]. Furthermore, when the oxygen vacancies were created on the In₂O₃ surface, methanol formation from CO₂ hydrogenation becomes facile [19]. In the present study, we focus on the interfacial sites and examine their role in methanol synthesis. On the basis of calculated potential energy profile, the oxygen vacancy sites are more active for hydrogenation to methanol. On the other hand, H

adatoms are generated on the Pd sites, making the interfacial sites spatially advantages for CO₂ hydrogenation. Consequently, the interfacial sites on a Pd/In₂O₃ catalyst would contribute more significantly to methanol formation.

3.3.2 RWGS route

Fig. 6 shows the potential energy surface of the RWGS route for methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation. The RWGS route initiates by the hydrogenation of adsorbed CO₂ to yield trans-COOH. This reaction is endothermic by +0.21 eV with an activation barrier of 1.01 eV. The trans-COOH is as stable as cis-COOH. As a result, the transformation between trans-COOH and cis-COOH is energetically neutral, and only needs to climb an activation barrier of 0.39 eV. The cleavage of the C-O bond of CO₂ is the key step in RWGS route. There are two possible reactions that lead to the C-O bond breaking: one is the hydrogenation of COOH through R11 ($\text{cis-COOH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CO}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O(g)}$, $\Delta E = +0.26 \text{ eV}$, $E_a = 1.90 \text{ eV}$) and another is the decomposition of COOH to CO and OH ($E_a > 2.40 \text{ eV}$). Obviously, although both reactions are not feasible, the COOH hydrogenation is more favorable than COOH decomposition. CO produced from these reactions adsorbs on Pd₄/In₂O₃ in two forms CO_b* and CO_i*, and the structures are shown in support information (Fig. S1). CO_b* represents a CO molecule adsorbs on the supported Pd₄ cluster at the Pd-Pd bridge site with an adsorption energy of -1.65 eV and CO_i* represents a CO molecule that adsorbs at the interface of Pd₄/In₂O₃ catalyst with an

adsorption energy of -0.88 eV. The hydrogenation of CO to produce HCO goes through either R12 ($\text{CO}_b^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCO}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = +0.89$ eV, $E_a = 1.36$ eV) or R12' ($\text{CO}_i^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCO}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = -0.10$ eV, $E_a = 1.19$ eV) pathway. HCO produced from CO_i^* is both thermodynamically and kinetically more favorable than HCO produced from CO_b^* . However, the strong adsorption of CO_b^* indicates that the probability of finding CO_b^* is much higher than that of finding CO_i^* , and that transformation of CO_i^* to CO_b^* is energetically favorable. In addition, the potential energy profile of CO hydrogenation to HCO through CO_b^* is below that through CO_i^* . As a result, HCO prefers to be produced from hydrogenation of CO_b^* instead of CO_i^* . The following step is hydrogenation of HCO to H_2CO through R15 ($\text{HCO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = +0.21$ eV, $E_a = 0.82$ eV). Further hydrogenation of H_2CO to produce CH_3OH also has two reaction pathways, similar to that in the formate route. The H_3CO pathway is through reactions R16 ($\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{CO}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = +0.03$ eV, $E_a = 0.41$ eV) and R17 ($\text{H}_3\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = +0.24$ eV, $E_a = 1.33$ eV). The H_2COH pathway is via reactions R18 ($\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{COH}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = +1.17$ eV, $E_a = 2.20$ eV) and R19 ($\text{H}_2\text{COH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^{*+}$, $\Delta E = -1.22$ eV, $E_a = 0.26$ eV). The apparent high activation barrier of R18 effectively blocks the H_2COH pathway. Furthermore, the potential energy surface of the CH_3O pathway is always below the H_2COH pathway. Therefore, methanol will mainly be produced through the CH_3O pathway in the RWGS route. Since the OH^* species is removed by H_2O formation in R11, the tetrahedral structure of Pd_4 cluster transforms into a

butterfly shape which is maintained in the subsequent reactions from H_2CO to produce CH_3OH .

In the RWGS route, the rate limiting step is the hydrogenation of COOH to produce CO and H_2O (R11).

(Fig. 6.)

3.3.3 *HCOOH route*

Fig. 7 shows the potential energy surface of the HCOOH route for methanol formation from CO_2 hydrogenation. In fact, this route connects both formate and RWGS routes. HCOOH can be formed from bi- HCOO hydrogenation but not from trans(cis)- COOH hydrogenation due to the steric hindrance (see Fig. S1). In the HCOOH route, CO_2 goes through the same hydrogenation step to bi- HCOO as it did in the formate route. Protonation of bi- HCOO leads to HCOOH formation. This reaction is slightly endothermic by 0.12 eV, with an activation barrier of 0.94 eV. HCOOH binds to the In_2O_3 surface through a single In-O bond with a binding energy of 0.52 eV. To produce methanol, HCOOH needs to dissociate to HCO^* and OH^* . The reaction energy of this step is almost zero, but the activation barrier is 2.68 eV. This activation barrier is significantly higher than the adsorption energy of HCOOH , which will likely result in desorption of the HCOOH species.

(Fig. 7.)

We note that many factors may contribute to the observed reactivity and selectivity of a working catalyst and a Pd₄/In₂O₃ model has its limitations in representing all the aspects of a practical Pd/In₂O₃ catalyst. In order to test the influence of the cluster size, we examined the rate limiting steps in the HCOO and RWGS routes on a Pd₁₃/In₂O₃ model system. In this case, we focused on similar sites to those on Pd₄/In₂O₃ and determined the reaction energies and activation barriers of the corresponding elementary steps. The structural details and reaction energetics are shown in Fig. S3 and Table S2. The activation barriers of both R6' (H₂COO*+H_b*→ H₂CO*+OH*, $\Delta E = -0.73$ eV, $E_a = 1.72$ eV) and R11' (cis-COOH*+H*→CO*+H₂O (g), $\Delta E = -0.41$ eV, $E_a = 1.79$ eV) are slightly lower than those on Pd₄/In₂O₃ (R6: $E_a = 1.80$ eV; R11: $E_a = 1.90$ eV, without taking the pre-activation of H adatoms into account). More importantly, R6' and R11' are still competitive for the interfacial reactions. These results indicate that the interfacial sites of Pd₁₃/In₂O₃ exhibit a similar activity to that of Pd₄/In₂O₃.

3.3.4 Microkinetic model

So far, we analyzed the methanol synthesis on Pd₄/In₂O₃ through the HCOO, RWGS and HCOOH routes based on the energetic data from the DFT calculations. The DFT results indicate that the HCOO and RWGS pathways can be considered as the competing reaction routes for methanol synthesis whereas the HCOOH route is unlikely to result in methanol. In this section, we will use a microkinetic model to analyze the dominant reaction mechanisms (HCOO and RWGS). The details of the analysis are provided in the supporting information. For comparison,

a steady state conversion of 0.0522 is chosen as the lowest equilibrium conversion of the overall reaction at a stoichiometric H_2/CO_2 ratio (3) in the temperature range of 473–573 K and pressure range of 10–100 atm. Fig. 8 shows the turn over frequency (TOF) of the rate limiting step of R6 in the HCOO route and R11 in the RWGS route at different temperatures (473 – 573 K) and pressures (10 – 100 atm). For R6, the TOF varies from 5.0×10^{-6} to $2.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ site}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is consistent with the measured [74] and calculated [75] TOF of methanol. The TOF of R6 increases with the increasing temperature under the same pressure and with the increasing pressure at the same temperature. For R11, the TOF varies from 1.0×10^{-11} to $8.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{ site}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The TOF of R11 increases with the increasing temperatures under the same pressure but decreases with the increasing pressure at the same temperature. Comparing the HCOO route with the RWGS route, the rate of R6 is 4-5 orders of magnitude greater than that of R11, as shown in Fig. 8, which indicates that the methanol produced through HCOO route is significantly more than that from the RWGS route. This result also demonstrates that the dominant reaction mechanism in methanol synthesis is the HCOO route.

(Fig. 8.)

The effects of the H_2/CO_2 ratio on the reaction rate of R6 in the HCOO route and R11 in the RWGS route have also been analyzed. Fig. 9 shows the variation of TOF of R6 in HCOO route and R11 in RWGS route with the H_2/CO_2 ratio at 523K, 50 atm, a CO_2 conversion of

0.1075. The TOF of R6 increases with the increasing H_2/CO_2 ratio. In contrast, the TOF of R11 decreases with the increasing H_2/CO_2 ratio. These results show that increasing the concentration of H_2 results in an increase of the reaction rate of R6 but a decrease of the reaction rate of R11, which suggests that the RWGS route could be suppressed by a high H_2/CO_2 ratio.

(Fig. 9.)

To summarize, the complete reaction pathways for methanol synthesis from CO_2 hydrogenation have been studied both thermodynamically and kinetically. From the thermodynamic perspective, the HCOO and RWGS routes are the most likely reaction mechanisms for methanol synthesis. The HCOOH route is suppressed due to a high activation barrier. In addition, the HCOO and RWGS routes are competitive. From a kinetic perspective, the reaction rate of the rate limiting step in HCOO route is 4-5 orders of magnitude bigger than that of RWGS route, making the HCOO route the primary pathway for forming methanol. In addition, increasing the reaction temperature, pressure, and the H_2/CO_2 ratio can increase the reaction rate.

3.4 Effects of H coverage and H_2O

Hydrogenation of H_2COO to H_2CO through the reaction $H_2COO^* + H_b^* \rightarrow H_2CO^* + OH^*$ has an activation barrier of 1.80 eV. A large portion of the barrier originates from the activation of H_b^* to H_s^* from the most stable adsorption configurations. This model assumes that H atoms

are added onto the Pd₄ cluster one by one for each hydrogenation step, corresponding to the condition of low H coverage throughout the reaction. Under such a condition, H atom prefers to adsorb at the bridge site instead of terminal site. As a result, activation of H from bridge site to terminal site is a necessary step for hydrogenating CO₂. In order to better understand the coverage effect of hydrogen, we introduced four H adatoms onto the Pd₄ cluster at the same time to simulate a high H coverage situation. Since four H adatoms is the minimum coverage which could make the H adatom stably adsorb at the terminal site. In this case, three H adatoms bind the Pd₄ cluster at bridge sites (H_b*) and one at the terminal site (H_s*). Under such a high H coverage, one of the H adatoms is already in the activated state, effectively lowering the barrier for the hydrogenation step to 0.76 eV, as shown by the blue line in Fig. 10. Therefore, increasing the hydrogen partial pressure will increase the H_s* coverage and promote methanol production via the formate route. As the hydrogen coverage is increased, the H* adatoms will be forced to the terminal sites, making them available for hydrogenating the adsorbed CO₂ and intermediates. We note that the energy of the H₂COO*+H_b*+3H_b*(red) state is lower than H₂COO*+H_s*+3H_b*(blue) state in Fig.10. The energy difference corresponds to the upper bound of the energy needed to activate H adatom on Pd₄ at a low coverage (one H adatom on the cluster) since the H₂COO*+H_b*+3H_b*(red) state was calculated by treating all 4 H_b* having the same adsorption energy. The state with all 4 hydrogen adatoms occupying the bridge sites on Pd₄

unlikely exists since H adatoms may be moved from bridge to terminal site at high H adatom coverages. On the other hand, this treatment maintains the mass balance while allows a comparison with the energy of the $\text{H}_2\text{COO}^* + \text{H}_s^* + 3\text{H}_b^*$ (blue) state.

The presence of water in methanol synthesis from CO_2 hydrogenation cannot be avoided since it is the one of the products. The effect of water on methanol synthesis depends strongly on the catalyst and substrates. In this work, H_2O was shown to promote production of H_2CO from H_2COO , which initially went through the $\text{H}_2\text{COO}^* + * \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{O}^*$ reaction ($E_a = 0.52$ eV), followed by the $\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{O}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + 2\text{OH}^*$ reaction ($E_a = 0.21$ eV). As a result, the overall reaction barrier is 0.73 eV with H_2O promotion, as shown by the green line in Fig. 10. Furthermore, the presence of water will also promote methanol production kinetically. As water is produced as the reaction progresses, it will have an autocatalytic effect of methanol formation. However, since water is on the product side of the reaction, excessive amount of water will drive the balance to the reactant side. Consequently, the amount of water in a reactor has to be optimized to achieve best performance toward the methanol production. In fact, the existence of H_2O does not only promote the hydrogenation of H_2COO but also prevents the hydrogenation of COOH to CO and water [20]. Experimental observation suggested that H_2O promotes the hydrogenation of HCOO to methanol [76]. Theoretical studies reported that H_2O facilitates the

formation of trans-COOH, which was considered as a bottleneck step in the hydrocarboxyl mechanism [45].

(Fig. 10.)

3.5 Effect of OH on the structure of supported Pd₄

In the formate route, OH adsorbs at the interface of Pd/In₂O₃ until the last step. It is then combines with H to form H₂O and desorbs. In the entire process, the Pd₄ cluster maintains a tetrahedral structure. On the other hand, the adsorbed OH combines with the H adatom to form H₂O and desorbs once OH is generated in the RWGS route. In this case, the Pd₄ cluster maintains a butterfly shape. These results show that the presence of adsorbed OH at the interface helps to maintain the Pd₄ cluster in the tetrahedron form, whereas the desorption of OH in the form of H₂O caused a structural transformation of the Pd₄ cluster to a butterfly shape. When the Pd₄ cluster is in the tetrahedral shape, the H₂COH pathway is more favorable than H₃CO, as shown in Fig. 5. However, once the Pd₄ cluster is transformed into a butterfly shape, the H₃CO reaction pathway becomes more favorable than H₂COH, as shown in Fig. 6. As a result, the Pd₄ cluster with different structures exhibits different activities for producing CH₃OH from H₂CO. The structural flexibility and responsiveness of the supported metal nanoparticles under reactive environment can ultimately determine the nature and efficacy of the chemical and catalytic processes, as documented in the recent reviews [33, 34, 77].

4. Conclusions

In the present work, we combined DFT calculations and microkinetic modeling to study the reaction mechanism of methanol synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation on a Pd₄/In₂O₃ model catalyst. Our results show that the interface is the most active site for CO₂ adsorption and hydrogenation. Furthermore, a high barrier for CO₂ dissociation on Pd₄/In₂O₃ excludes CO as a key intermediate species for methanol synthesis and prevents the poison of the interfacial sites by O adatoms. Among three possible reaction routes, the HCOO and RWGS routes are competitive pathways for methanol formation from CO₂ hydrogenation whereas the HCOOH route is highly unlikely due to the high activation barrier, according to our DFT results. Microkinetic modeling of the rate limiting steps in HCOO and RWGS routes further identifies that the HCOO route is the dominant pathway.

Key operating parameters influencing the reaction have been proposed through the combined DFT and microkinetic study. The DFT results showed that the presence of activated H adatoms, therefore, high hydrogen partial pressure, and coadsorbed H₂O benefit methanol synthesis by lowering the activation barriers of the rate limiting step in the HCOO route. Kinetic modeling indicated that increasing the reaction temperature, pressure and the H₂/CO₂ ratio increases the overall reaction rate. The study also demonstrated the dynamical nature of the structure of the supported catalyst. The structure of the supported Pd₄ cluster transforms in

response to the presence of OH in the reaction environment, which is accompanied by a switch of the reaction pathway from favoring the H_2COH pathway in HCOO route to the CH_3O pathway in RWGS route.

In summary, the combined DFT and kinetic study demonstrated the importance of the metal/support interface to CO_2 hydrogenation as well as the dynamical nature of the supported metal catalyst during a reaction. The reactivity and selectivity can be optimized by effectively control the size and morphology of the metal particles on the substrates. Furthermore, the knowledge on the operating variables such temperature, pressure and composition of the feed gas will be a useful guide to the experimental study.

Acknowledgement: We gratefully acknowledge the supports from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (#20990223) and from U. S. Department of Energy, Basic Energy Science program (DE-FG02-05ER46231). D. Mei was supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences & Biosciences. The computations were performed in part using the Molecular Science Computing Facility in the William R. Wiley Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory (EMSL), which is a U.S. Department of Energy national scientific user facility located at PNNL in Richland, Washington.

References

- [1] G.A. Olah, G.K.S. Prakash, and A. Goeppert, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 133 (2011) 12881.
- [2] H. Arakawa, M. Aresta, J.N. Armor, M.A. Barteau, E.J. Beckman, A.T. Bell, J.E. Bercaw, C. Creutz, E. Dinjus, D.A. Dixon, K. Domen, D.L. DuBois, J. Eckert, E. Fujita, D.H. Gibson, W.A. Goddard, D.W. Goodman, J. Keller, G.J. Kubas, H.H. Kung, J.E. Lyons, L.E. Manzer, T.J. Marks, K. Morokuma, K.M. Nicholas, R. Periana, L. Que, J. Rostrup-Nielsen, W.M.H. Sachtler, L.D. Schmidt, A. Sen, G.A. Somorjai, P.C. Stair, B.R. Stults, and W. Tumas, *Chem. Rev.* 101 (2001) 953.
- [3] Y. Yang, C.A. Mims, D.H. Mei, C.H.F. Peden, and C.T. Campbell, *J. Catal.* 298 (2013) 10.
- [4] Q. Ge, *Mechanistic Understanding of Catalytic CO₂ Activation from First Principles Theory*, in: "New and Future Developments in Catalysis", S.L. Suib, (Ed.), Elsevier, Amsterdam (2013).
- [5] T. Fujitani, M. Saito, Y. Kanai, T. Watanabe, J. Nakamura, and T. Uchijima, *Appl. Catal. A* 125 (1995) L199.
- [6] S. Imamura, K. Denpo, K. Utani, Y. Matsumura, and H. Kanai, *React. Kinet. Catal. Lett.* 67 (1999) 163.
- [7] X.-L. Liang, X. Dong, G.-D. Lin, and H.-B. Zhang, *Appl. Catal. B* 88 (2009) 315.
- [8] T. Fujitani, and I. Nakamura, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* 75 (2002) 1393.
- [9] A.L. Bonivardi, D.L. Chiavassa, C.A. Querini, and M.A. Baltanása, *Stud. Surf. Sci. Catal.* 130 (2000) 3747.
- [10] N. Iwasa, T. Mayanagi, N. Ogawa, K. Sakata, and N. Takezawa, *Catal. Lett.* 54 (1998) 119.
- [11] N. Iwasa, T. Mayanagi, W. Nomura, M. Arai, and N. Takezawa, *Appl. Catal. A* 248 (2003) 153.
- [12] G. Frank, and H. Köstlin, *Appl. Phys. A* 27 (1982) 197.
- [13] S. Lany, and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 98 (2007) 045501.
- [14] P. Agoston, and K. Albe, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 11 (2009) 3226.
- [15] I. Djerdj, A. Haensch, D. Koziej, S. Pokhrel, N. Barsan, U. Weimar, and M. Niederberger, *Chem. Mater.* 21 (2009) 5375.
- [16] I. Tanaka, F. Oba, K. Tatsumi, M. Kunisu, M. Nakano, and H. Adachi, *Mater. Trans.* 43 (2002) 1426.
- [17] T. Umegaki, K. Kuratani, Y. Yamada, A. Ueda, N. Kuriyama, T. Kobayashi, and Q. Xu, *J. Power Sources* 179 (2008) 566.
- [18] T. Bielz, H. Lorenz, P. Amann, B. Klotzer, and S. Penner, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 115 (2011) 6622.
- [19] J. Ye, C. Liu, D. Mei, and Q. Ge, *ACS Catal.* 3 (2013) 1296.
- [20] J. Ye, C. Liu, and Q. Ge, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 116 (2012) 7817.
- [21] T. Bielz, H. Lorenz, W. Jochum, R. Kaindl, F. Klauser, B. Klötzer, and S. Penner, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 114 (2010) 9022.

- [22] H. Lorenz, W. Jochum, B. Klötzer, M. Stöger-Pollach, S. Schwarz, K. Pfaller, and S. Penner, *Appl. Catal. A* 347 (2008) 34.
- [23] Y. Men, G. Kolb, R. Zapf, M. O'Connell, and A. Ziogas, *Appl. Catal. A* 380 (2010) 15.
- [24] N. Iwasa, and N. Takezawa, *Top. Catal.* 22 (2003) 215.
- [25] H. Lorenz, S. Turner, O.I. Lebedev, G. Van Tendeloo, B. Klötzer, C. Rameshan, K. Pfaller, and S. Penner, *Appl. Catal. A* 374 (2010) 180.
- [26] F.A. Marchesini, S. Irusta, C. Querini, and E. Miró, *Appl. Catal. A* 348 (2008) 60.
- [27] J. Ye, C. Liu, and Q. Ge, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 14 (2012) 16660.
- [28] N. Iwasa, H. Suzuki, M. Terashita, M. Arai, and N. Takezawa, *Catal. Lett.* 96 (2004) 75.
- [29] S.E. Collins, M.A. Baltanás, and A.L. Bonivardi, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 110 (2006) 5498.
- [30] S. Collins, J.J. Delgado, C. Mira, J.J. Calvino, S. Bernal, D.L. Chiavassa, M.A. Baltanása, and A.L. Bonivardi, *J. Catal.* 292 (2012) 90.
- [31] S. Collins, D. Chiavassa, A. Bonivardi, and M. Baltanás, *Catal. Lett.* 103 (2005) 83.
- [32] J.H. Kwak, L. Kovarik, and J. Szanyi, *ACS Catal.* 3 (2013) 2094.
- [33] M. Flytzani-Stephanopoulos, and B.C. Gates, *Ann. Rev. Chem. Biomol. Eng.* 3 (2012) 545.
- [34] A. Kulkarni, R.J. Lobo-Lapidus, and B.C. Gates, *Chem. Commun.* 46 (2010) 5997.
- [35] X.-F. Yang, A. Wang, B. Qiao, J. Li, J. Liu, and T. Zhang, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 46 (2013) 1740.
- [36] G. Kwon, G.A. Ferguson, C.J. Heard, E.C. Tyo, C. Yin, J. DeBartolo, S. Seifert, R.E. Winans, A.J. Kropf, J. Greeley, R.L. Johnston, L.A. Curtiss, M.J. Pellin, and S. Vajda, *ACS Nano* 7 (2013) 5808.
- [37] B. Qiao, A. Wang, X. Yang, L. F. Allard, Z. Jiang, Y. Cui, J. Liu, T. Zhang, *Nature Chem.* 3 (2011) 634.
- [38] S.E. Collins, M.A. Baltanás, J.L. Garcia Fierro, and A.L. Bonivardi, *J. Catal.* 211 (2002) 252.
- [39] R.C. Baetzold, *Surf. Sci.* 51 (1975) 1.
- [40] J. Moc, D.G. Musaev, and K. Morokuma, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 104 (2000) 11606.
- [41] V.A. Matura, N.S. Panina, V.V. Potekhin, V.B. Ukraintsev, K.A. Khokhryakov, V.V. Platonov, O.M. Tatsenko, and A.I. Panin, *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.* 74 (2004) 975.
- [42] Y.-x. Pan, C.-j. Liu, and Q. Ge, *J. Catal.* 272 (2010) 227.
- [43] L.C. Grabow, and M. Mavrikakis, *ACS Catal.* 1 (2011) 365.
- [44] Y. Yang, J. Evans, J.A. Rodriguez, M.G. White, and P. Liu, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 12 (2010) 9909.
- [45] Y.-F. Zhao, Y. Yang, C. Mims, C.H.F. Peden, J. Li, and D. Mei, *J. Catal.* 281 (2011) 199.
- [46] Y. Yang, M.G. White, and P. Liu, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 116 (2011) 248.
- [47] Y.-F. Zhao, R. Rousseau, J. Li, and D. Mei, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 116 (2012) 15952.
- [48] M. Cargnello, V.V.T. Doan-Nguyen, T.R. Gordon, R.E. Diaz, E.A. Stach, R.J. Gorte, P. Fornasiero, and C.B. Murray, *Science* 341 (2013) 771.
- [49] S. Abbet, A. Sanchez, U. Heiz, W.D. Schneider, A.M. Ferrari, G. Pacchioni, and N. Rösch, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 122 (2000) 3453.
- [50] S. Sirois, M. Castro, and D.R. Salahub, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* 52 (1994) 645.

- [51] M.-P. Habas, F. Mele, M. Sodupe, and F. Illas, *Surf. Sci.* 431 (1999) 208.
- [52] J.M. Seminario, A.G. Zacarias, and M. Castro, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* 61 (1997) 515523.
- [53] G. Kresse, and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B* 48 (1993) 13115.
- [54] G. Kresse, and J. Furthmüller *Phys. Rev. B* 54 (1996) 11169.
- [55] G. Kresse, and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B* 59 (1999) 1758.
- [56] J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77 (1996) 3865.
- [57] P.E. Blochl, *Phys. Rev. B* 50 (1994) 17953.
- [58] G. Henkelman, and H. Jónsson, *J. Chem. Phys.* 113 (2000) 9978.
- [59] X. Dong, H.-B. Zhang, G.-D. Lin, Y.-Z. Yuan, and K.R. Tsai, *Catal. Lett.* 85 (2003) 237.
- [60] M.C. Valero, P. Raybaud, and P. Sautet, *J. Catal.* 247 (2007) 339.
- [61] M.C. Valero, P. Raybaud, and P. Sautet, *Phys. Rev. B* 75 (2007) 045427.
- [62] E. Kaxiras, *Atomic and Electronic Structure of Solids*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, 198.
- [63] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, 8th edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2005, 50.
- [64] C.T. Campbell, S.C. Parker, and D.E. Starr, *Science* 298 (2002) 811.
- [65] S.E. Wanke, and P.C. Flynn, *Catal. Rev.* 12 (1975) 93.
- [66] R. Ouyang, J.-X. Liu, and W.-X. Li, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 135 (2013) 1760.
- [67] J.M. Rickard, L. Genovese, A. Moata, and S. Nitsche, *J. Catal.* 121 (1990) 141.
- [68] A.T. Bell, *Science* 299 (2003) 1688.
- [69] Y. Li, and G.A. Somorjai, *Nano Lett.* 10 (2010) 2289.
- [70] Q.L. Tang, Q.J. Hong, and Z.P. Liu, *J. Catal.* 263 (2009) 114.
- [71] A. Sotiropoulos, P.K. Milligan, B.C.C. Cowie, and M. Kadodwala, *Surf. Sci.* 444 (2000) 52.
- [72] G. Peng, S.J. Sibener, G.C. Schatz, S.T. Ceyer, and M. Mavrikakis, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 116 (2012) 3001.
- [73] T. Fujitani, Y. Choi, M. Sano, Y. Kushida, and J. Nakamura, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 104 (2000) 1235.
- [74] G.H. Graaf, E.J. Stamhuis, and A.A.C.M. Beenackers, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 43 (1988) 3185.
- [75] T.S. Askgaard, J.K. Norskov, C.V. Ovesen, and P. Stoltze, *J. Catal.* 156 (1995) 229.
- [76] Y. Yang, C.A. Mims, R.S. Disselkamp, J.-H. Kwak, C.H.F. Peden, and C.T. Campbell, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 114 (2010) 17205.
- [77] M.A. Newton, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 37 (2008) 2644.

Fig. 1. Optimized structure of (a) In_2O_3 (110) surface; (b) Pd_4 supported on In_2O_3 (110).
Red: O atoms; Brown: In atoms; blue: Pd atoms.

Fig. 2. Optimized structures of adsorbed CO_2 and dissociated H_2 on $\text{Pd}_4/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$. Black: C atom; White: H atom.

Fig. 3. Potential energy profile of two pathways for CO₂ dissociation to form CO.

Fig. 4. Reaction network of methanol synthesis from CO_2 and H_2 on $\text{Pd}_4/\text{In}_2\text{O}_3$.

Fig. 5. Potential energy surface of CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol on Pd₄/In₂O₃ through formate route. Red line: H₂COH pathway, blue line: CH₃O pathway.

Fig. 6. Potential energy surface of CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol on Pd₄/In₂O₃ through RWGS route. Red line: H₂COH pathway, blue line: CH₃O pathway.

Fig. 7. Potential energy surface of CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol on Pd₄/In₂O₃ through formic acid route. Red line: H₂COH pathway, blue line: CH₃O pathway.

Fig.8. Temperature dependence of TOF of R6 in HCOO route and R11 in RWGS route under varied pressure, respectively. The CO_2 conversion is $x=0.0522$.

Fig.9. H_2/CO_2 ratio dependence of TOF of R6 in HCOO route and R11 in RWGS route at 523 K, 50 atm. The CO_2 conversion is $x=0.1075$.

Fig. 10. Comparison of different ways for H_2COO hydrogenation to H_2CO .

Table 1. Adsorption energies E_{ad} (eV) and geometric parameters of all reaction intermediates in methanol synthesis on Pd_4/In_2O_3 .

Species	$E_{ad}(eV)$	Bond type and Bond length($\text{\AA}$)
H	-3.04	$d_{(Pd2-H)}=1.74, d_{(Pd3-H)}=1.70$
O	-3.94	$d_{(Pd1-O)}=2.02, d_{(Pd3-O)}=1.91$
OH	-3.45	$d_{(Pd1-O)}=2.09, d_{(In2-O)}=2.19, d_{(O-H)}=0.98$
H₂O	-0.58	$d_{(In1-O)}=2.39, d_{(O-Ha)}=0.98, d_{(O-Hb)}=0.98$
CO_b	-1.65	$d_{(Pd1-C)}=2.02, d_{(Pd2-C)}=1.91, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.19$
CO_i	-0.88	$d_{(Pd3-C)}=2.05, d_{(In3-C)}=2.44, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.18$
CO₂	-0.37	$d_{(Pd2-C)}=2.09, d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.26, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.22, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.26$
HCO	-2.55	$d_{(Pd1-C)}=2.13, d_{(Pd2-C)}=2.01, d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.37, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.26, d_{(C-H1)}=1.12$
mono-HCOO	-2.29	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.18, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.29, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.22, d_{(C-H1)}=1.18$
bi-HCOO	-2.98	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.26, d_{(In2-Ob)}=2.34, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.26, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.29, d_{(C-H1)}=1.11$
trans-COOH	-2.51	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.38, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.26, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.37, d_{(C-H1)}=0.99$
cis-COOH	-2.58	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.35, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.27, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.37, d_{(C-H1)}=0.99$
H₂COO	-4.14	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.14, d_{(In2-Ob)}=2.19, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.35, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.49, d_{(C-H1)}=d_{(C-H2)}=1.11$
HCOOH	-0.52	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.34, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.23, d_{(C-Ob)}=1.35, d_{(C-H1)}=1.10, d_{(O-H2)}=0.99$
H₂CO	-0.90	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.25, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.29, d_{(C-H1)}=d_{(C-H2)}=1.11$
H₃CO	-1.90	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.15, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.35, d_{(C-H1)}=d_{(C-H2)}=1.11, d_{(C-H3)}=1.21$
H₂COH	-1.85	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.45, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.44, d_{(C-H1)}=d_{(C-H2)}=1.10, d_{(O-H3)}=0.98$
CH₃OH	-0.78	$d_{(In3-Oa)}=2.32, d_{(C-Oa)}=1.44, d_{(C-H1)}=d_{(C-H2)}=d_{(C-H3)}=1.10, d_{(O-H4)}=1.01$

Table 2. Reaction energies ΔE (eV) and activation barriers E_a (eV) of each elementary step involved in methanol synthesis on Pd₄/In₂O₃.

No.	Reaction	$\Delta E/\text{eV}$	E_a/eV
R1	$\text{CO}_2(\text{g}) + * \rightarrow \text{CO}_2^*$	-0.37	-
R2	$\text{H}_2(\text{g}) + * + * \rightarrow 2\text{H}^*$	-1.08	0
R3	$\text{CO}_2^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{mono-HCOO}^* + *$	+0.81	1.17
R4	$\text{mono-HCOO}^* \rightarrow \text{bi-HCOO}^*$	-0.68	-
R5	$\text{bi-HCOO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{COO}^* + *$	+0.75	1.09
R6	$\text{H}_2\text{COO}^* + \text{H}_s^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{OH}^*$	-1.15	0.89
R7	$\text{bi-HCOO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCOOH}^* + *$	+0.12	0.94
R8	$\text{HCOOH}^* + * \rightarrow \text{HCO}^* + \text{OH}^*$	-0.05	2.68
R9	$\text{CO}_2^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{trans-COOH}^* + *$	+0.21	1.01
R10	$\text{trans-COOH}^* \rightarrow \text{cis-COOH}^*$	+0.01	0.39
R11	$\text{cis-COOH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CO}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}^*$	+0.26	1.90
R12	$\text{CO}_b^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCO}^* + *$	+0.89	1.36
R12'	$\text{CO}_i^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCO}^* + *$	-0.10	1.19
R13	$\text{HCO}^* + \text{H}^* + \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{OH}^* + *$	+0.67	1.94
R14	$\text{HCO}^* + \text{OH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{HCO}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}^* + *$	-0.19	1.44
R15	$\text{HCO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + *$	+0.21	0.82
R16	$\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{CO}^* + *$	+0.03	0.41
R17	$\text{H}_3\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + *$	+0.24	1.33
R18	$\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{COH}^* + *$	+1.17	2.20
R19	$\text{H}_2\text{COH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + *$	-1.22	0.26
R20	$\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* + \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{CO}^* + \text{OH}^* + *$	-0.18	1.09
R21	$\text{H}_3\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* + \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + \text{OH}^* + *$	+0.25	0.31
R22	$\text{H}_2\text{CO}^* + \text{H}^* + \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{COH}^* + \text{OH}^* + *$	+0.76	0.84
R23	$\text{H}_2\text{COH}^* + \text{H}^* + \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + \text{OH}^* + *$	+0.20	1.11
R24	$\text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + \text{OH}^* + \text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}^* + *$	-0.65	0.98
R25	$\text{CO}_2^* + * \rightarrow \text{CO}_b^* + \text{O}^*$	+0.79	1.41
R25'	$\text{CO}_2^* + * \rightarrow \text{CO}_i^* + \text{O}^*$	+1.40	2.71
R26	$\text{H}_2\text{COO}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{CO} + 2\text{OH}^*$	+0.64	0.72
R27	$\text{CH}_3\text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OH}(\text{g}) + *$	+0.78	-
R28	$\text{H}_2\text{O}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{g}) + *$	+0.58	-