



Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science

Investigation of High Oxygen Reduction Reaction Catalytic Performance on Mn-Based Mullite SmMn₂O₅—Supplement

UT Dallas Author(s): Weichao Wang

Rights:

©2017 The Royal Society of Chemistry. This article may not be further made available or distributed.

Citation:

Liu, Jieyu, Meng Yu, Xuewei Wang, Jie Wu, et al. 2017. "Investigation of high oxygen reduction reaction catalytic performance on Mn-based mullite SmMn2O5." Journal of Materials Chemistry A 5(39): 20922-20931.

This document is being made freely available by the Eugene McDermott Library of the University of Texas at Dallas with permission of the copyright owner. All rights are reserved under United States copyright law unless specified otherwise. Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Journal of Materials Chemistry A. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2017

1 2	Supporting Information						
3	Investigation of High Oxygen Reduction						
4	Reaction Catalytic Performance on Mn-based						
5	Mullite SmMn ₂ O ₅						
6 7	Jieyu Liu, ^{a,†} Meng Yu, ^{a,†} Xuewei Wang, ^b Jie Wu, ^c Changhong Wang, ^d Lijun Zheng, ^a Dachi Yang, ^a Hui Liu, ^a Yan Yao, ^e Feng Lu, ^{a*} and Weichao Wang ^{a,f*}						
8	^a College of Electronic Information and Optical Engineering, Nankai University,						
9	Tianjin 300350, China						
10	^b School of Materials Science and Engineering, Tianjin University of Technology,						
11	Tianjin 300384, China						
12	°College of Material Science and Engineering, Shandong University of Science and						
13	Technology, Qingdao 266590, China						
14	^d School of Science, Tianjin University of Technology, Tianjin 300384, China						
15	^e Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Materials Science and						
16	Engineering Program, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, USA						
17	^f Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Texas at Dallas,						
18	Richardson, TX 75080, USA						
19	[†] These authors contributed equally to this work.						
20	*Corresponding authors: weichaowang@nankai.edu.cn, lufeng@nankai.edu.cn						
21 22							
23							
24 25							

1 S1. Bulk SmMn₂O₅ mullite phase diagram deduction

2 Following the computational hydrogen electrode (CHE) method proposed by 3 Norskov,¹⁻³ zero voltage is defined based on the reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE), 4 in which the reaction 5 $H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}H_2$ (1)

6 is defined to be in equilibrium at zero voltage, at all values of pH, at all temperatures,
7 and with H₂ gas pressure at 101325 Pa.

8 Thus, the total chemical potential of the proton-electron pair as a function of 9 applied potential U can be calculated as:

10
$$\mu_{H^+} + \mu_{e^-}(U) = \frac{1}{2}\mu_{H2} - eU$$
 (2)

11 The oxygen chemical potential then can be interpreted as:

12
$$\mu_{0}(U, pH) = \mu_{H_{2}0} - 2(\mu_{H^{+}} + \mu_{e^{-}}(U)) = \mu_{H_{2}0} - \mu_{H2} + 2eU$$
(3)

0.1 M KOH was used as the electrolyte for oxygen reduction reaction (ORR)
activity characterization in our experiment, for simplicity, the corresponding pH in
this work is referred to the experimental condition, i.e. pH = 13

16 The chemical potential of each element in $SmMn_2O_5$ crystal is related by the

17 Gibbs free energy of the bulk oxide:⁴

18
$$\mu_{Sm}^{SmMn_2O_5} + 2\mu_{Mn}^{SmMn_2O_5} + 5\mu_0(U, pH = 13) = E_{SmMn_2O_5}^{bulk}$$
(4)

19 $\mu_{Sm}^{SmMn_2O_5}$, $\mu_{Mn}^{SmMn_2O_5}$ and $\mu_0(U, pH = 13)$ are the chemical potentials of samarium, 20 manganese and oxygen, respectively. $E_{SmMn_2O_5}^{bulk}$ is the total energy of bulk per formula 21 unit SmMn_2O_5. 1 Take $\mu^{\frac{SmMn_2O_5}{Mn}}$ as the independent chemical potential.

2 Rearranging equation (4):

3
$$\mu_{Mn}^{SmMn_2O_5} = \frac{1}{2} \left[E_{SmMn_2O_5}^{bulk} - \mu_{Sm}^{SmMn_2O_5} - 5\mu_0(U, pH = 13) \right]$$
(5)

4 For binary metal oxides, the chemical potential of metals can be written as:

5
$$\mu_{M}^{MO_{n}} = E_{DFT}^{MO_{n}} - n\mu_{0}(U, pH = 13)$$
 (6)

6 where M denotes the metal element (Sm or Mn), and $E_{DFT}^{MO_n}$ is the calculated total 7 energy of the corresponding oxides. To prevent bulk SmMn₂O₅ from decomposing 8 into lower order binary metal oxides, the chemical potential of a metal constituent in 9 the mullite should be smaller than that in the lower order binary metal oxides:

$$10 \qquad \mu^{SmMn_2O_5}_{M} < \mu^{MO_n}_{M} \tag{7}$$

11We then use the chemical potential deviation of samarium from the elementary12crystal to construct the phase diagram.13 $\Delta\mu_{Sm} = \mu_{Sm} \cdot E^{bulk}_{Sm}$ (8)14151516161718192021

1 S2. Passivation of 8-layer (001) MnO₃-2 slab



2

Figure S1. The local density of states (LDOS) of layer-1 to layer-4 of the 8-layer (001)
MnO₃-2 slab. The black line represents the total DOS of the bottom four layers (layer1 to layer-4).

6 S3. Stability of mullite SmMn₂O₅ (001) surfaces

- 7 The relative stability of SmMn₂O₅ (001) surfaces under the given applied potential (U
- 8 = 0.8 V) and pH (pH = 13) were calculated based on the following equation:⁴

9
$$\Gamma_{i} = \frac{1}{A_{s}} \left[E_{total}^{i} - N_{0} \mu_{0} (U = 0.8 \, V, pH = 13) - N_{Mn} \mu_{Mn}^{SmMn_{2}O_{5}} - N_{Sm} \mu_{Sm}^{SmMn_{2}O_{5}} \right]$$
(9)

10 where Γ_i is the surface energy, i donates the type of slab, A_s is the surface area of the 11 (2×1) (001) slab, E_{total}^{i} is the calculated total energy of the slab. N_o , N_{Mn} and N_{Sm} are the 12 numbers of O, Mn and Sm atoms in the slab, respectively. $\mu_0(U = 0.8 V, pH = 13)$ is 13 defined as equation (3). $\mu_{Mn}^{SmMn_2O_5}$ is the chosen independent chemical potential, which 14 is connected with $\mu_{Sm}^{SmMn_2O_5}$ by equation (5).

15

1 S4. Linear relations of binding energies

2 The calculated binding energies of O* ($^{\Delta E}_{o}$), OH* ($^{\Delta E}_{oH}$), OO* ($^{\Delta E}_{oo}$) and

3 OOH* $({}^{\Delta E}_{OOH})$ are defined as the reaction energies of the following reactions:

4
$$H_2 O^{(g)} + * \to O^* + H_2^{(g)}$$
 (10)

5
$$H_2 O^{(g)} + * \rightarrow 0H^* + \frac{1}{2}H^{(g)}_2$$
 (11)

$$6 \qquad {}^{2H_2O^{(g)}} + * \to 00^* + 2H_2^{(g)} \tag{12}$$

7
$$2H_2 O^{(g)} + * \rightarrow 00H^* + \frac{3}{2}H_2^{(g)}$$
 (13)

8 where * donates an adsorption site on the surface. H_2O and H_2 are in the gas phase.

9 Thus:

10
$$\Delta E_{0^{*}} = E_{DFT}^{0^{*}} + E_{H_{2}^{(g)}} - E_{H_{2}^{0}(g)} - E_{*}$$
(14)

$$\Delta E_{OH^*} = E_{DFT}^{OH^*} + \frac{1}{2} E_{H_2^{(g)}} - E_{H_2^{(g)}} - E_*$$
(15)

12
$$\Delta E_{00^*} = E_{DFT}^{00^*} + 2E_{H_2^{(g)}} - 2E_{H_2^{0(g)}} - E_*$$
(16)

13
$$\Delta E_{OOH^*} = E_{DFT}^{OOH^*} + \frac{3}{2}E_{H_2(g)} - 2E_{H_2(g)} - E_*$$
(17)

1 S5. Theoretical activity

2 The free energy change for each step in the main test can be calculated as:¹⁻³

3
$$\Delta G_i = \Delta E_i + \Delta (ZPE)_i - T\Delta S_i + eU + \kappa T \ln 10 \times \Delta pH$$
(18)

4 where i = 1, 2, 3, 4 corresponds to steps from Equation (1) to (4) in the main test, ΔE 5 is the reaction energy, ΔZPE is the change of zero-point energy, T is temperature, ΔS is 6 the difference in entropy, U is the electrode potential vs. standard hydrogen electrode 7 (SHE) and κ is boltzmann constant. All these parameters can be obtained from DFT 8 calculations or standard tables for gas-phase molecules.⁵

10
$$H_2 O_{(l)} + e^- \leftrightarrow 0 H^-_{(aq)} + \frac{1}{2} H_2^{(g)}$$
 (19)

11 has a potential of 0 V vs. RHE.⁶ At this potential, the reaction is at equilibrium, and
12 thus chemical potentials can be written as Equation (20) at any U:

13
$$\mu_{H_2O_{(l)}} + \mu_{e^-}(U) = \frac{1}{2} \mu_{H_2(g)} + \mu_{OH_{(aq)}} - eU$$
(20)

14 Rearranging Equation (20), the chemical potential difference between OH⁻ and e⁻
15 can be found to be:

16
$$\mu_{OH_{(aq)}} - \mu_{e^{-}}(U) = \mu_{H_2O_{(l)}} - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{H_2(g)} + eU$$
(21)

17 The first step of the four-electron pathway is the displacement of OH* by OO*.

18
$$\Delta G_1 = G_{OO^*} + [\mu_{OH_{(aq)}} - \mu_{e^-}(U)] - G_{OH^*} - G_{O_2}$$
(22)

19 where G_{OO*} and G_{OH*} are the free energies of the surface slab with OO* and OH*

20 adsorption repectively and could be written in terms of DFT energies:

21
$$G_{00^*} = E_{DFT}^{00^*} + ZPE_{00^*} - TS_{00^*}^0$$
 (23)

$$G_{OH^{*}} = E_{DFT}^{OH^{*}} + ZPE_{OH^{*}} - TS_{OH^{*}}^{0}$$
(24)

2 Combine Equation (15) and (16), we get the relationship:

3
$$E_{DFT}^{00^{*}} - E_{DFT}^{0H^{*}} = \Delta E_{00^{*}} - \Delta E_{0H^{*}} - \frac{3}{2} E_{H_{2}}^{(g)} + E_{H_{2}0}^{(g)}$$
(25)

4 According to the linear relationship:

5
$$\Delta E_{OH^*} = 0.62 \Delta E_{O^*} - 0.87$$
 (26)

$$6 \qquad \Delta E_{00^*} = 0.86 \Delta E_{0^*} + 2.68 \tag{27}$$

7 Substitute equations
$$(23) - (27)$$
 into (22) , then:

8
$$\Delta G_1 = 0.24 \Delta E_{0^*} - 1.61$$
 (28)

9 Similarly:

 $\Delta G_2 = -0.14 \Delta E_{o^*} - 0.32 \tag{29}$

$$\Delta G_3 = 0.28 \Delta E_{0^*} - 2.47 \tag{30}$$

12
$$\Delta G_4 = -0.38 \Delta E_{o^*} - 0.52 \tag{31}$$

1 S6. Two-electron pathway

We considerd a similar associative mechanism for the less efficient two-electronpathway for hydrogen peroxide production.

$$4 \qquad 0H^* + O_2 + e^- \to 00^* + 0H^- \tag{32}$$

$$5 \qquad 00^* + H_2 0 + e^- \to 00H^* + 0H^- \tag{33}$$

$$6 \qquad 00H^* + H_2O + e^- \to H_2O_2 + OH^- \tag{34}$$

7 In this case, the equilibrium potential is 0.68 V.^7 We ploted the free energy 8 evolution diagram in Figure S2. It is shown that the potential is limited by the 9 protonation from OO^{*} to OOH^{*} on the surface of MnO₃-1 slab. The ORR steps in the 10 two-electron pathway are thermodynamically favorable only under low electrode 11 potential.



12

Figure S2. The free energy diagram of two-electron pathway to produce H₂O₂ on the
surface of MnO₃-1 slab.

15

1 S7. Synthesis of $SmMn_2O_5$, and MnO_x

2 All metal salt precursors were analytical grade and used as received. 0.2777 g 3 Sm(NO₃)₃•6H₂O (Aladdin) was dissolved in 50 ml deionized water (18.25 M Ω) 4 followed by adequate stirring. Then 0.0593 g KMnO₄ and 0.2143 g 5 Mn(CH₃COO)₂•6H₂O (Aladdin) were added to the solution simultaneously and 6 constantly stirred for at least 30 min. The corresponding mole ratio of Sm-to-Mn is approximately 1:2. 5.5 mL NaOH (1 M) was dropwise added to the mixture and 7 8 continued to stir for several minutes. After that, the precursor was transferred into a 100 ml stainless steel Teflon-lined autoclave, followed by a standard hydrothermal 9 10 treatment at 200 °C for 24 h. The final precipitate was washed with nitric acid (5%) 11 and distilled water for several times, and dried at 100 °C for 12 h. MnO_x was prepared 12 via the similar procedure without adding $Sm(NO_3)_3 \cdot 6H_2O$. If we change the ratio of 13 Sm-to-Mn, final products would become a mixture of SmMn₂O₅, MnO_x and even 14 Sm(OH)₃ (Figure S3). Specifically, extra Sm might introduce Sm(OH)₃, while 15 excessive Mn could lead to complicated MnO_x.



Figure S3. XRD spectra of the as-prepared SmMn₂O₅ and the reference samples by
 changing the stoichiometric ratio of metal precursors.

3

4 S8. Electrode preparation

The catalyst inks were prepared by physically mixing 5 mg of catalyst powder and/or 5 6 3 mg of Vulcan X-72 (Carbot Corp.) with 30 µL of Nafion (5 wt. %, Aldrich) and 970 µL of ethanol, followed by at least 40 min ultrasonication to form homogeneous 7 mixtures.8 10 µL of these mixtures were carefully dropped onto glassy-carbon (GC) 8 9 electrodes (5-mm diameter) and dried in a sealed glass beaker which had been presaturated with ethanol vapor in order to slow down drying rate, which was proven to 10 be important for obtaining uniform coatings.9, 10 Finally, all of the electrodes had a 11 composition of 250 μg_{oxide} cm⁻²_{disk} and/or 150 μg_{carbon} cm⁻²_{disk}, except for Pt/C used as 12 a reference. The Pt/C catalyst ink was made by dispersing Pt/C (Johnson Matthey 13

1 Corp.) in a water-isopropanol solution, of which 25 $\mu g_{Pt} \text{ cm}^{-2}_{disk}$ was applied to the 2 electrode. Before each measurement, GC electrodes were polished with 0.3 μm and 3 then 0.05 μm alumina slurry to maintain mirror-like surfaces.¹¹

4 S9. Electrochemical analysis

5 The number of electrons transferred (n) was calculated from the slope of the best
6 fitted lines of Koutecky–Levich plot (J ⁻¹ vs. ω ^{-0.5}) at different potentials. The
7 Koutecky–Levich equation is given as below:

$$\frac{1}{J} = \frac{1}{J_L} + \frac{1}{J_K} = \frac{1}{B\omega^{0.5}} + \frac{1}{J_K}$$
(35)

$$B = 0.62nFC_{0_2} D_{0_2}^{2/3} v^{-1/6}$$
(36)

$$10 \qquad J_K = nFkC_{O_2} \tag{37}$$

11 where J is the measured current density, J_L and J_K are known as the diffusion-limited 12 and kinetic-limited current density of ORR, respectively.¹² F (96485 C mol⁻¹) is the 13 Faraday constant, ${}^{C_{O_2}}(1.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mol cm}^{-3})$ is the bulk concentration of oxygen, ${}^{D_{O_2}}$ 14 $(1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$ is the diffusion constant for oxygen in 0.1 M KOH and v (0.01 15 cm² s⁻¹) is the kinetic viscosity.¹³ The constant 0.62 in B is adopted when the rotating 16 speed ω is expressed in rad/s. The Tafel slope was obtained from Tafel's equation:

$$17 \qquad \eta = a + b lg J_K \tag{38}$$

18 where η represents the overpotential, and J_K is the kinetic current density with mass-19 transport correction by

$$J_K = \frac{J_L \times J}{J_L - J} \tag{39}$$



Figure S4. LSV curves of (a) Pt/C and (b) SmMn₂O₅-NRs/C at various rotating speed,
and the corresponding K-L plots of (c) Pt/C and (d) SmMn₂O₅-NRs/C at different
potentials.

For RRDE analysis, the electron transfer number and proportion of peroxide werecalculated by

 $n = \frac{4I_D}{I_D + (I_R/N_C)}$ (40)

9 %HO₂ = 100
$$\frac{2(I_R/N_C)}{I_D + (I_R/N_C)}$$
 (41)

1 where I_D and I_R are the disk and ring current, respectively. N_C is the calibrated 2 collection efficiency.

The calibration process follows the one reported by previous researchers.¹⁴ Briefly, the collection efficiency (N_C) was calibrated in Ar-saturated electrolyte with 0.1 M KOH and 4 mM K₃Fe(CN)₆, using the same electrodes as those used in ORR measurements. The electrodes were rotated at a certain angular velocity and then chronoamperometric measurement was performed. The disk and ring potential were fix to be 0.1 V and 1.5 V vs. RHE, respectively. The N_C is calculated according to the following equation

$$N_{C} = \frac{I_{R} - I_{R_{0}}}{I_{D}}$$
(42)

11 where I_D and I_R are the disk and ring current averaged over the last 10 s during 60 s 12 measurements. I_{R_0} is the averaged ring current with the disk disconnected.



14 Figure S5. (a) N_C of RRDE loaded with catalysts. (b) Oxygen reduction currents at

15 ring and disk SmMn_2O_5-NRs/C and Pt/C catalysts.

1 S10. Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) analysis

2 EIS measurement of SmMn₂O₅ catalyst (250 μ g cm⁻²_{disk}) was performed at 0.84 V vs. 3 RHE in 0.1 M KOH from 10 kHz to 0.1 Hz. A sinusoidal voltage with an amplitude 4 of 10 mV was applied to the initial voltage. The ohmic resistance of electrolyte 5 between working and reference electrode (R_s) was observed to be ~42 Ω from Figure 6 S6. The corrected potential was calculated by the following equation:



1 S11. ORR acitvity comparation

Catalyst	E _{onset} (V vs. RHE)	E _{1/2} (V vs. RHE)	J _L (mA/cm ²)	n	Structure	Ref.
SmMn ₂ O ₅ /C	0.817	0.746	5.45	3.78	Nanorod	This work
a-MnO ₂ /GC	0.89^{\perp}	0.8^{\perp}	3.4*	3.89	Nanorod	15
β -MnO ₂ /C	0.85	0.7	2.77	2.4	Nanorod	16
σ-MnO ₂ /C	0.7	0.66	2.67	2.4	Microsphere	16
MnO _x	0.83⊥	0.73	5.7	NA	Thin film	17
Mn ₃ O ₄ @NGO	0.83	0.66^{\perp}	3.7	3.81	Ellipsoid	18
MnO@GC	0.77^{\perp}	0.64^{\perp}	4.5⊥	NA	Nanoparticle	19

2 Table S1. The ORR activities of selected manganese-based oxides.

3 * The diameter of GC electrode is 4 mm.

- \perp Estimated form LSV.

1 S12. Supporting data



Figure S7. XRD spectra of Sm₂O₃.





2

Figure S8. Representative TEM images of SmMn₂O₅-NRs

4 Reference

- 5 1. J. K. Nørskov, J. Rossmeisl, A. Logadottir, L. Lindqvist, J. R. Kitchin, T.
- 6 Bligaard and H. Jónsson, J. Phys. Chem. B, 2004, **108**, 17886-17892.
- 7 2. J. Rossmeisl, J. K. Nørskov, C. D. Taylor, M. J. Janik and M. Neurock, J.
- 8 *Phys. Chem. B*, 2006, **110**, 21833-21839.

1 3. A. A. Peterson, F. Abild-Pedersen, F. Studt, J. Rossmeisl and J. K. Norskov, 2 Energy Environ. Sci., 2010, 3, 1311-1315. 3 4. Y.-L. Lee, M. J. Gadre, Y. Shao-Horn and D. Morgan, Phys. Chem. Chem. 4 Phys., 2015, 17, 21643-21663. 5 5. P. W. Atkins, in *Physical Chemistry*, 6th ed., Oxford University Press: Oxford, 6 U. K., 1998, 485, 925-927. 7 6. L. D. Chen, J. K. Nørskov and A. C. Luntz, J. Phys. Chem. Lett., 2015, 6, 175-8 179. 9 7. V. Viswanathan, H. A. Hansen, J. Rossmeisl and J. K. Nørskov, J. Phys. Chem. 10 Lett., 2012, 3, 2948-2951. 11 8. J. Suntivich, H. A. Gasteiger, N. Yabuuchi and Y. Shao-Horn, J. Electrochem. 12 Soc., 2010, 157, B1263. 13 9. R. D. Deegan, O. Bakajin, T. F. Dupont, G. Huber, S. R. Nagel and T. A. 14 Witten, Nature, 1997, 389, 827-829. 15 10. R. D. Deegan, O. Bakajin, T. F. Dupont, G. Huber, S. R. Nagel and T. A. Witten, Phys. Rev. E, 2000, 62, 756-765. 16 17 11. Y. Garsany, O. A. Baturina, K. E. Swider-Lyons and S. S. Kocha, Anal. Chem., 18 2010, 82, 6321-6328. 19 12. Y. Liang, Y. Li, H. Wang, J. Zhou, J. Wang, T. Regier and H. Dai, Nat. Mater., 20 2011, 10, 780-786. 21 13. S. Wang, D. Yu, L. Dai, D. W. Chang and J.-B. Baek, ACS Nano, 2011, 5, 22 6202-6209. 23 14. R. Zhou, Y. Zheng, M. Jaroniec and S.-Z. Qiao, ACS Catal., 2016, 6, 4720-24 4728. W. Xiao, D. Wang and X. W. Lou, J. Phys. Chem. C., 2010, 114, 1694-1700. 25 15. 26 16. Y. Meng, W. Song, H. Huang, Z. Ren, S.-Y. Chen and S. L. Suib, J. Am. 27 Chem. Soc., 2014, 136, 11452-11464. 28 17. Y. Gorlin and T. F. Jaramillo, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2010, 132, 13612-13614. 29 18. J. Duan, S. Chen, S. Dai and S. Z. Qiao, Adv. Funct. Mater., 2014, 24, 2072-30 2078. 31 19. Y. Gorlin, C.-J. Chung, D. Nordlund, B. M. Clemens and T. F. Jaramillo, ACS 32 Catalysis, 2012, 2, 2687-2694.