



HAL
open science

Efficient Promoters and Reaction Paths in the CO₂ Hydrogenation to Light Olefins over Zirconia-Supported Iron Catalysts

Alan Barrios, Deizi Peron, Anoop Chakkingal, Achim Iulian Dugulan, Simona Moldovan, Kalthoum Nakouri, Joëlle Thuriot-Roukos, Robert Wojcieszak, Joris Thybaut, Mirella Virginie, et al.

► To cite this version:

Alan Barrios, Deizi Peron, Anoop Chakkingal, Achim Iulian Dugulan, Simona Moldovan, et al.. Efficient Promoters and Reaction Paths in the CO₂ Hydrogenation to Light Olefins over Zirconia-Supported Iron Catalysts. *ACS Catalysis*, 2022, 12 (5), pp.3211-3225. 10.1021/acscatal.1c05648 . hal-03863289

HAL Id: hal-03863289

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-03863289v1>

Submitted on 25 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

This document is confidential and is proprietary to the American Chemical Society and its authors. Do not copy or disclose without written permission. If you have received this item in error, notify the sender and delete all copies.

Efficient promoters and reaction paths in the CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins over zirconia supported iron catalysts

Journal:	<i>ACS Catalysis</i>
Manuscript ID	cs-2021-05648p.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Barrios, Alan; Unité de Catalyse et Chimie du Solide Peron, Deizi; Unité de Catalyse et Chimie du Solide Chakkingal, Anoop; University of Ghent Dugulan, Achim Iulian; Technische Universiteit Delft, R3 Reactor Institute Delft Moldovan, Simona; Groupe de Physique des Matériaux Nakouri, Kalthoum; Groupe de Physique des Matériaux Thuriot-Roukos, Joëlle; Université de Lille Faculté des Sciences et Technologies, UCCS-CNRS Wojcieszak, Robert; Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Chemistry Thybaut, Joris; Universiteit Gent, Chemical Engineering Virginie, Mirella; Unité de Catalyse et Chimie du Solide Khodakov, Andrei; CNRS, Unité de catalyse et chimie du solide

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 January 19th, 2022
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Efficient promoters and reaction paths in the CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins over zirconia**
13 **supported iron catalysts**
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *Alan J. Barrios^{a, b}, Deizi V. Peron^a, Anoop Chakkingal^{a, b}, Iulian Dugulan^c, Simona Moldovan^d,*
21 *Kalthoum Nakouri^d, Joëlle Thuriot-Roukos^a, Robert Wojcieszak^a, Joris W. Thybaut^b, Mirella*
22 *Virginie^a and Andrei Y. Khodakov^{a*}*
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *^aUniv. Lille, CNRS, Centrale Lille, Univ. Artois, UMR 8181 – UCCS – Unité de Catalyse et Chimie*
32 *du Solide, F-59000 Lille, France*
33
34

35 *^bLaboratory for Chemical Technology (LCT), Department of Materials, Textiles and Chemical*
36 *Engineering, Ghent University, Technologiepark 125, B-9052 Ghent, Belgium*
37
38

39 *^cFundamental Aspects of Materials and Energy Group, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg*
40 *15, Delft, 2629 JB, Netherlands*
41
42
43

44 *^dGroupe de Physique des Matériaux, CNRS, Université Normandie & INSA Rouen Avenue de*
45 *l'Université - BP12, 76801 St Etienne du Rouvray, France*
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Hydrogenation into light olefins is an attractive strategy for CO₂ fixation into chemicals. In this paper, high throughput experimentation and extended characterization were employed to identify the most efficient promoters and to elucidate structure-performance correlations and reaction paths in the CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins over zirconia supported iron catalysts.

K, Cs, Ba, Ce, Nb, Mo, Mn, Cu, Zn, Ga, In, Sn, Sb, Bi, and V added in the same molar concentrations to zirconia supported iron catalyst were evaluated as promoters. The CO₂ hydrogenation proceeds via intermediate formation of CO followed by surface polymerization. Over the iron catalysts containing alkaline promoters, initially higher selectivity to light olefins shows a significant decrease with the CO₂ conversion, because of further surface polymerization and formation of longer chain hydrocarbons. A relatively low selectivity to light olefins over the promoted catalysts, without potassium, is not much affected by the CO₂ conversion.

Essential characteristics of iron catalysts in order to obtain higher yield of light olefins seem to be higher iron dispersion, higher extent of carbidization and optimized basicity. The strongest promoting effect is reported for alkaline metals. A further increase in the light olefin selectivity is observed after simultaneous addition of potassium with copper, molybdenum, gallium or cerium.



Keywords: CO₂ mitigation; hydrogenation; light olefins; iron catalysts; high throughput

1. Introduction

The growing concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere is the major reason of climate changes. There are currently two strategies for dealing with the ever-increasing levels of CO₂: Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS)¹ and Carbon Capture and Utilization (CCU)². CCS is based on the capture of CO₂ from power plants and industrial facilities including its separation, compression and transport, for permanent storage in a geological layer. CCU involves either direct technological use of CO₂ or its chemical and biological conversion into high value-added products²⁻⁴.

The CO₂ fixation into chemicals is an essential CCU strategy. In this strategy, CO₂ can be considered not only the major pollutant but also a feedstock for synthesis of valuable chemicals and fuels^{5,6}. Nevertheless, CO₂ chemical utilization is challenging, because of its thermodynamic stability, resulting in low conversion⁷. With sustainable hydrogen as co-reagent, CO₂ can be hydrogenated⁷ to methanol⁸⁻¹⁰, dimethyl ether¹¹⁻¹⁴, formic acid^{15,16}, higher alcohols¹⁷, liquid hydrocarbon fuels^{18,19}, aromatics²⁰ and light olefins^{7,21-24}. The light olefin synthesis from CO₂ has attracted particular attention in recent years from both academia and companies, since ethylene, propylene and butylenes are major building blocks in the chemical industry. These compounds are widely used in manufacturing polymers, chemical intermediates and solvents. Currently, light olefins are mainly produced by naphtha thermal cracking²⁵, dehydrogenation of light alkanes²⁶ and methanol to olefins (MTO) conversion²⁷⁻²⁹. Recently, novel bifunctional or multifunctional catalysts, which are composed of metal oxide nanoparticles and zeolites have been proposed^{22,30-32} for hydrogenation of CO₂ into light olefins via so called "methanol-mediated route". Lower catalytic activity, higher selectivity to coproduced CO (>60-80%) and insufficient olefin yield (usually less than 7%^{31,32}) represent major drawbacks of this approach.

1
2
3 The CO₂ Fischer-Tropsch (CO₂-FT) synthesis, which allows achieving a higher single-pass
4 yield, is a promising route to transform CO₂ into light olefins³³. The CO₂ conversion into olefins
5 proceeds via a combination of reverse water gas shift reaction (RWGS) and Fischer-Tropsch (FT)
6 synthesis:
7
8
9
10
11
12



20 Due to their high activity in both RWGS and FT reactions, iron-based catalysts remain the
21 principal option for the CO₂-FT synthesis. Nonetheless, iron employment by itself does not
22 necessarily result in a sufficiently high light olefin selectivity. The optimization of catalyst
23 chemical composition and structure is therefore required to attain high and selective yield of these
24 products. Most commonly, iron catalysts for CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins have been
25 supported by oxides or carbon materials. In particular, SiO₂, TiO₂, Al₂O₃, ZrO₂ and carbon
26 materials have been evaluated³⁴ as supports. Strong hydrophilicity and instability of alumina
27 support could be detrimental for the CO₂ hydrogenation, which may generate larger amounts of
28 water than the CO hydrogenation. Relatively weak hydrophilic character of the support could be
29 one of the required characteristics for the CO₂ hydrogenation catalysts. Among the investigated
30 supports, the ZrO₂-supported catalysts have shown the highest selectivity and yield of light
31 olefins³⁴. Recent results suggest^{35,36} that higher selectivity to light olefins can be achieved using
32 carbon materials as supports of iron catalysts. Note however, that the stability of carbon-based
33 catalysts can be a problem for industrial applications, since the activation and regeneration of the
34 catalysts usually involve oxidative treatments with air.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The iron CO₂-FT catalysts are most commonly promoted with potassium^{34,37-46}, Co⁴⁷⁻⁵¹,
4 Cu^{52,53}, Mn^{45,46,54} and/or Zn^{31,44,55,56}. Much less information is available on promotion with other
5 elements. Note that unambiguous identification of the most efficient promoters for iron CO₂
6 hydrogenation catalysts seems challenging. First, the iron catalysts prepared and investigated by
7 different research groups may have different contents of promoters. Second, different catalyst
8 activation and reaction procedures even with the same catalyst employed by different groups may
9 lead to different catalytic performance. In this work, we used three groups of promoters for zirconia
10 supported iron catalysts. First, we selected alkali metals, which bring strong basicity^{57,58}. Second,
11 we promoted iron catalysts with transition metals which can have multiple oxidation states favoring
12 carbon dioxide activation. Finally, “soldering” metals^{59,60} like Bi, Sn and Sb were used for the
13 promotion. They have low melting point that could give them higher mobility⁶¹ on the catalyst
14 surface.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 High-throughput experimentation (HTE)⁶²⁻⁶⁵ is a fast, reliable and powerful technique
32 generating a tremendous amount of data and is effective for discovering new catalysts. Recently,
33 the HTE strategy⁶⁶ uncovered novel highly efficient promoters such as “soldering metals” (Bi, Pb,
34 Sn and Sb) for high temperature FT synthesis using syngas over iron catalysts.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41 This paper focuses on the one hand, on the selection of most efficient new promoters for
42 iron catalysts, identification of structure-performance-correlations and on the other hand, on the
43 elucidation of reaction paths in CO₂ hydrogenation over promoted iron catalysts. The promoters
44 were added in the same molar concentrations; the catalysts were activated and tested under the
45 same conditions. The effects of 15 different elements (K, Cs, Ba, Ce, Nb, Mo, Mn, Cu, Zn, Ga, In,
46 Sn, Sb, Bi, and V) on the Fe/ZrO₂ catalyst structure and CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins were
47 investigated over zirconia supported iron catalysts using HTE catalytic measurements and a large
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 combination of characterization techniques: XRF, nitrogen adsorption, XRD, TPR, TPD,
4
5 TGA/DSC, *in-situ* Mössbauer spectrometry, STEM-HAADF and STEM-EDS.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **2. Experimental**

12 13 *2.1. Catalyst preparation*

14
15 Commercial zirconia (Alpha Aesar) was used as catalytic support. Distilled water was used as
16 solvent. In the case of Nb, Sn and Sb, ethanol (Verbiese) was applied, because of the insolubility
17 of those salts in water. The following precursors were used for the promotion of zirconia supported
18 iron catalysts: KNO₃ (Sigma-Aldrich), CsNO₃ (Sigma-Aldrich), Ba(NO₃)₂ (Sigma-Aldrich),
19 Ce(NO₃)₃·6H₂O (Fluka), NbCl₅ (Alfa Aesar), (NH₄)₆Mo₇O₂₄·4H₂O (Sigma-Aldrich),
20 Mn(NO₃)₂·4H₂O (Sigma-Aldrich), Cu(NO₃)₂·3H₂O (Acros Organics), Zn(NO₃)₂·6H₂O (Sigma-
21 Aldrich), Ga(NO₃)₃·xH₂O (Sigma-Aldrich), In(NO₃)₃·xH₂O (Sigma-Aldrich), SnCl₂·2H₂O
22 (Sigma-Aldrich), SbCl₃ (Sigma-Aldrich), Bi(NO₃)₃·5H₂O (Sigma-Aldrich), NH₄VO₃ (Sigma-
23 Aldrich).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Apart from the Sb-promoted iron catalyst, all the other promoted catalysts were synthesized by
37 single-step co-impregnation method. During the co-impregnation, the precursors of potassium and
38 second promoter are added at the same time. In the case of Sb promoted catalysts, we added first
39 Sb and then potassium. A 0.2 M solution of Fe(NO₃)₃·9H₂O along with the promoter salt was added
40 dropwise to the zirconia support. The concentrations of the impregnating solutions were calculated
41 in order to obtain about 10 wt. % iron in the final catalysts; the atomic ratio of Fe to promoter (M)
42 was 50:1. The nominal concentration of potassium in the catalysts was 1 wt.%. After adding the
43 impregnating solution to ZrO₂, the mixture was stirred for 8 h at room temperature. Next, the
44 solvent was evaporated at 80 °C. Then, the catalysts were dried overnight in an oven at 120 °C.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, they were calcined in air at 500 °C for 5 h with a 1 °C/min temperature ramp. Two different
4 sets of catalysts without and with potassium denominated respectively as FeM/ZrO₂ and
5 FeKM/ZrO₂ were synthesized, where M represents Cs, Ba, Ce, Nb, Mo, Mn, Cu, Zn, Ga, In, Sn,
6 Sb, Bi, or V. The chlorine contents in the catalysts prepared using chlorine-containing precursors
7 (SbCl₃ and NbCl₅) were measured by FRX. The chlorine contents were relatively low (0.007 wt. %)
8 in FeSb/ZrO₂ and 0.63 wt. % in FeNb/ZrO₂.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *2.2. Catalyst characterization*

21
22 The low temperature N₂ physisorption measurements were carried out on a Micromeritics Tristar
23 II PLUS Surface Area and Porosimetry analyzer. The samples were degassed under vacuum at 120
24 °C for 3 h. The nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherms were measured at -196 °C. The specific
25 surface area of the samples was calculated by the BET method.
26
27
28

29
30 The relative promoter content was determined using an energy dispersive micro-X-ray
31 Fluorescence spectrometer M4 TORNADO (Bruker). The sample irradiation was made using a
32 Rhodium X-ray tube (50 kV/200 mA, 10 W). This X-rays source is equipped with a polycapillary
33 lens enabling excitation of an area of 200 μm. For each sample, 36 points (of 200 μm) were
34 analyzed covering the entire sample surface. The detector used was a Silicon-Drift-Detector Si(Li)
35 with (<145 eV resolution at 100000 cps (Mn Kα)) and cooled with a Peltier cooling (-20 °C). The
36 measurement was done under vacuum (20 mbar). Quantitative analysis was done using
37 fundamental parameters (FP) (standardless). The quantification was made based on the identified
38 element.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 For the CO₂ temperature programmed desorption (TPD) experiments, the samples were
53 pretreated at 500°C in He for 1 h, cooled down to 40°C, and exposed to CO₂ for 30 min. Then, the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 samples were heated up with the ramping rate of 10°C/min to reach 700°C in He flow. The CO₂
4
5 desorption was measured by a TCD detector.
6

7
8 The reduction behavior of the catalysts was evaluated by hydrogen temperature-
9
10 programmed reduction (TPR) using an AutoChem II 2920 apparatus (Micromeritics). The samples
11
12 (~0.05 g) were reduced in a flow of 5% H₂/Ar flow (50 mL/min) and heated up to 1000 °C with
13
14 the temperature ramp rate of 10 °C/min.
15

16
17 The samples were characterized by X-ray powder diffraction (XRD) using a Bruker AXS
18
19 D8 diffractometer with a monochromatic Cu K α radiation (λ =0.1538 nm). The XRD patterns were
20
21 collected with the 2 θ range between 10 to 90°, using a step size of 0.02° and with an acquisition
22
23 time of 0.5 s. The identification of crystalline phases present in the catalysts was carried out by
24
25 comparison with the JCPDS standard software.
26

27
28 To determine the carbon deposition on the catalysts, the thermogravimetric analysis was
29
30 performed using an SDT Q600 V20.9 Build 20 Thermogravimetric Analyzer (TGA) & Differential
31
32 Scanning Calorimeter (DSC) with ~10 mg sample, with a temperature ramp of 5 °C/min up to 600
33
34 °C under air.
35

36
37 The catalysts activated in a flow of CO at 350°C and then passivated in a flow of nitrogen
38
39 at room temperature were characterized using Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy
40
41 (STEM), under the High-Angle Annular Dark- Field imaging (STEM-HAADF) and Energy-
42
43 Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (STEM-EDS) modes. The powder specimens were dispersed in
44
45 ethanol by ultrasounds, a drop of suspension was deposited on a holey carbon film previously
46
47 deposited on a 300 mesh TEM Cu grid. The catalysts were analyzed using STEM with a high
48
49 energy beam of 200 kV and a beam size of <1 Å for the imaging purposes, whereas the chemical
50
51 maps were carried out by a probe with a diameter of about 1 Å. STEM-HAADF with Z-contrast
52
53 enabled identification of atoms and atom agglomerations of species associated with heavy
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 elements. More specific, the heavier is the element, the higher the contrast is. The STEM-EDS
4 mapping allowed the analysis of elemental composition within the samples. The Analytical TEM
5 Jeol-ARM200 Cold FEG microscope with Objective and Probe correctors was used for these
6 investigations. The STEM-EDS maps were acquired on a Jeol Centurio 100 mm² detector mounted
7 on the TEM. A scanning speed of 20 μsec/px was employed for imaging within the Digital
8 Micrograph software and 0.05 μs/px for STEM-EDS elemental mapping using the Analysis Station
9 software, respectively. The maps size was fixed at 256x256 px with a spatial drift correction every
10 60 sec. In order to gather maps with high signal to noise ratios, long duration chemical mapping
11 were carried out for durations between 80 and 180 minutes. The elemental maps were used in a
12 first approach to assess qualitatively the presence, distribution and location of the elements of
13 interest and to quantitatively estimate the size of the Fe NPs, in a second time. The size distribution
14 histogram of each sample was conducted based on more than 100 nanoparticles taken from
15 different micrographs acquired in the Digital Micrograph software, whilst the elemental maps
16 acquired in the Analysis Station were employed to asses for the size of Fe particles (measured in
17 the longer direction).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 The transmission ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer spectra were collected at -153°C with a sinusoidal
38 velocity spectrometer using a ⁵⁷Co(Rh) source. The velocity calibration was carried out using an
39 α-Fe foil at room temperature. The source and absorbing samples were kept at the same temperature
40 during the measurements. The Mössbauer spectra were fitted using the Mosswin 4.0 program ⁶⁷.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The experiments were performed at pressures up to 10 bar, in a state-of-the-art high-pressure
Mössbauer *in-situ* cell, which was recently developed at the Reactor Institute of Delft ⁶⁸. The high-
pressure beryllium windows used in this cell contain 0.08% Fe impurity, whose spectral
contribution was fitted and removed from the final spectra.

2.3. Catalytic tests

The catalytic screening tests were performed both in the high throughput experimentation unit (HTE, Flowrence, Avantium) and in a laboratory fixed bed reactor. Further information about the HTE unit is available in Ref. ⁶⁵. In the HTE unit, the feed gas is homogeneously split via previously calibrated high pressure-drop capillaries into 16 reactors. One of them filled with the inert support serves as reference. Each four reactors form an independent block, maintained at the same temperature. Any liquid phase (if produced) can be collected at 60 °C, while the remaining gas was subsequently sampled on-line for GC analysis. The catalysts were loaded in a stainless-steel tube with inner diameter of 2.0 mm, length of 15 cm. Both ends (height of 3.5 cm) of the reactor tube were filled with inert SiC (size of 0.105 mm and 0.210 mm), where the catalyst (grain size: 50-100 μm) was loaded in between. Prior to the CO₂ hydrogenation reaction, all catalysts were activated in CO (10 mL/min) under atmospheric pressure at 350 °C for 10 h and cooled to 180 °C. At this temperature, the system was pressurized in H₂/CO₂ (3:1) to 10 bar, temperature was step-wisely (1 °C/min) increased to 350 °C. The catalytic performance was measured under different WHSV (4.67-18.19 L/ g.h) staying for at least 12 h at each space velocity. The gaseous products were analyzed online using gas chromatography (GC). Permanent gases (He, H₂, O₂, N₂, CH₄, and CO) were separated by a Hayesep Q/Molecular Sieve column and determined by a thermal conductivity detector (TCD). CO₂ and C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons were separated and measured by a PPQ/PPQ column and TCD, while the C₅-C₁₂ hydrocarbons by a CP-Sil5/CP-Sil5 column and a flame ionization detector (FID), respectively. The HTE unit is equipped with a 16 ways-valve system that allows the injection of the gases coming from each reactor one by one in a sequence mode. Also, the program used for gas analysis with GC was optimized and lasts a total of 12 min. The conversion and selectivity calculations are given in **Supporting Information (SI)**. The carbon balance was better than 92%.

1
2
3 In addition to HTE tests, the catalytic behavior of several promoted ZrO₂-supported iron
4 catalysts was also measured in a laboratory fixed-bed reactor with the 2 mm internal diameter,
5 length 15 cm. Both ends of the reactor tube were filled with inert SiC (size of 0.500 mm), where
6 ~110 mg of fresh catalyst (grain size: 50-100 μm) has been loaded into the reactor. The catalysts
7 were activated in CO under atmospheric pressure with a heating ramp of 2 °C/min until reaching
8 the reaction temperature of 350 °C and dwelling at that temperature for 10 h under CO flow (10
9 mL/min). After cooling down to 180 °C, a gas mixture composed of H₂/CO₂ = 3 was fed into the
10 reactor. Nitrogen with a flow of 1 cm³/min was used as internal standard for the calculation of CO₂
11 conversion. After the flow rates and the pressure have been stabilized, the temperature was
12 increased up to 350 °C with a heating ramp of 1 °C/min to start the reaction. For the analysis of
13 reagents and reaction products, a Varian CP-3800 chromatograph equipped with a TCD and a FID
14 detectors was used. Two columns were used for this analysis, the first is a packed CTR-1 column
15 connected to the TCD detector, and the second one is an Rt-Q-PLOT capillary column connected
16 to the FID detector. There was no production of liquid phase.

17
18
19 Iron time yields (FTY) were expressed as moles of CO₂ converted per gram of iron
20 (determined from XRF) per second. The Turnover Frequency (TOF) values were calculated⁶⁹ using
21 the density of Hägg iron carbide Fe₅C₂ (ρ = 7.57 g/cm³) and assuming 14 Fe atoms/nm². The CO-
22 free hydrocarbon selectivities on carbon basis were calculated taking into account only
23 hydrocarbon production in the CO₂ hydrogenation.




Figure 1. Carbon dioxide conversions and iron time yields (FTY) measured over the promoted zirconia supported iron catalysts T=350 °C, H₂/CO=3, p=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.


3. Results

3.1. HTE evaluation of the promoted iron catalysts

3.1.1. Catalyst activity and iron time yield

Carbon dioxide hydrogenation reaction (H₂/CO₂=3, P=10 bar, T=350 °C) yielded CO, methane, C₂-C₄ paraffins, olefins and C₅₊ hydrocarbons (until C₁₂). There was no evidence of oxygenated compounds or long-chain liquid hydrocarbons. The CO₂ conversions in the range from 25 to 45 % were obtained by adjusting the gas-space velocity. This conversion range allowed accurate measurements of the overall CO₂ hydrogenation rates and product selectivities. The catalytic activity is expressed as iron time yield for each catalyst (**Figure 1**). Note that the promotion with Sb, Bi, and Mo seems to have a slightly negative effect on the catalyst activity. All other promoted

1
2
3 catalysts exhibited higher activities than the reference unpromoted Fe/ZrO₂. The most pronounced
4
5 increase in the reaction rate was observed over the potassium and cesium promoted catalysts. The
6
7 iron time yield almost doubled after addition of 1.5 wt. % of potassium. Interestingly, the combined
8
9 promotion with potassium and a second element generally led to higher reaction rates, compared
10
11 to the promotion without potassium.
12
13



36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 **Figure 2.** CO selectivity versus carbon dioxide conversion for the Fe/ZrO₂ promoted catalysts. T=350°C,
45 H₂/CO=3, WHSV=4.67-18.19 L/ g.h, P=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.

46 47 48 49 3.1.2. Product selectivity at different conversions

50
51 The selectivities of CO₂ hydrogenation to carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons measured at
52
53 different WHSV are shown in **Figures 2-6**. At lower CO₂ conversions, the selectivity to CO is very
54
55 high; the extrapolation of CO selectivity to the zero CO₂ conversion yields almost 100%. The CO
56
57

selectivity decreases as a function of CO₂ conversion (**Figure 2**). The CO selectivity drops to 10% at the CO₂ conversions exceeding 40%. Carbon monoxide seems to be produced by RWGS. Extremely high CO selectivity (>90%) at low CO₂ conversion and extrapolation to 100% at zero CO₂ conversion suggest that CO is the primary product of CO₂ hydrogenation over iron catalysts. Thus, the CO₂-FT synthesis proceeds *via* intermediate formation of carbon monoxide.




Figure 3. Methane selectivity versus carbon dioxide conversion for Fe/ZrO₂ promoted catalysts. T=350°C, H₂/CO=3, WHSV=4.67-18.19 L/ g.h, P=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.

Note that the CO selectivity at the same conversion varies for different catalysts. The CO selectivity was particularly high over the antimony and molybdenum promoted catalysts, while a somewhat lower CO selectivity was observed over the niobium promoted samples. Interestingly, the promoted iron catalysts containing potassium show higher CO selectivity at the same conversion (except for

the catalyst promoted with Nb), compared to the promoted iron catalysts without potassium

(Figure 2).




Figure 4. Light olefin selectivity versus carbon dioxide conversion for Fe/ZrO₂ promoted catalysts. T=350°C, H₂/CO=3, WHSV=4.67-18.19 L/ g.h, P=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.

A similar trend was observed for the CH₄ selectivity (Figure 3). The methane selectivity (excluding carbon monoxide) was relatively high at low CO₂ conversion on all catalysts approaching 80% at zero conversion. An increase in the CO₂ conversion results in a drop in the methane selectivity and production of higher C₂₊ hydrocarbons. Similar behavior for methane selectivity was previously reported⁶⁶ in FT synthesis with syngas over promoted iron catalysts. Higher methane selectivity was observed over the FeMo/ZrO₂, FeBi/ZrO₂, FeIn/ZrO₂ and

FeSb/ZrO₂ samples (**Figure 3**). Addition of potassium with the second promoter results in a decrease in the methane selectivity over all promoted iron catalysts.




Figure 5. C₂-C₄ paraffins selectivity versus carbon dioxide conversion for Fe/ZrO₂ promoted catalysts. T=350°C, H₂/CO=3, WHSV=4.67-18.19 L/ g.h, P=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.

The light olefin selectivity data are displayed in **Figure 4**. Dependence of light olefin selectivity (**Figure 4**) on the CO₂ conversion shows two different behaviors. The first trend is observed for the promoted iron catalysts, which do not contain alkaline metals (potassium or cesium). The light olefin selectivity varies between 5 and 15% and is not, to any noticeable extent, affected by the CO₂ conversion level. The second trend is seen for the promoted iron catalysts containing potassium or cesium. The alkaline containing catalysts show higher light olefin

selectivities. The light olefin selectivity shows some decrease, when the CO₂ conversion increases.

Figure 4 has allowed identification of the most efficient promoters for iron catalysts. Clearly, the presence of potassium is essential to obtain higher light olefin selectivity. In addition to potassium, Mo, Cu, Cs, Ce and Ga seem to be efficient promoters, further increasing the selectivity of CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins. The phenomenon is more pronounced for the FeKM_x/ZrO₂ catalyst.




Figure 6. C₅₊ selectivity versus carbon dioxide conversion for Fe/ZrO₂ promoted catalysts. T=350°C, H₂/CO=3, WHSV=4.67-18.19 L/ g.h, P=10 bar, TOS = 50 h.

Table 1. Properties of selected supported Fe catalysts.

Sample	Fe content ^a (wt%)	K content ^a (wt%)	Promoter content ^a (wt%)	Total H ₂ consum ^b (mmol/g)	S _{BET} ^c (m ² /g)	V _{tot} ^d (cm ³ /g)	CO ₂ ads. from TPD (μmol/g)	TOF, s ⁻¹
ZrO ₂	-	-	-	-	95.6	0.286	197.5	-
Fe/ZrO ₂	10.09	-	-	1.81	70.0	0.212	46.9	0.13
FeK/ZrO ₂	10.35	1.51	-	2.01	57.6	0.171	388.2	0.26
FeKCs/ZrO ₂	9.66	1.11	1.05	2.45	58.4	0.173	474.4	-
FeKCu/ZrO ₂	10.22	1.56	0.77	2.16	66.8	0.200	342.0	-
FeKGa/ZrO ₂	10.38	1.46	0.33	2.62	47.6	0.174	312.9	0.50
FeKMo/ZrO ₂	10.36	1.53	2.87	2.86	64.3	0.185	102.3	0.15
FeKCe/ZrO ₂	11.01	1.47	0.97	2.70	65.4	0.176	246.0	-

^aFe and promoter content from XRF.

^bThe total H₂ consumption from TPR analysis.

^cBET surface area.

^dSingle point desorption total pore volume of pores, $P/P_0=0.975$

^eTOF was calculated⁶⁹ from average size of iron carbide nanoparticles in the activated catalysts using the density of Hägg iron carbide Fe₅C₂ ($\rho = 7.57 \text{ g/cm}^3$) and assuming 14 Fe atoms/nm².


Let us now consider variation of light paraffin and C₅₊ hydrocarbon selectivities with the CO₂ conversion over the promoted iron catalysts. The FeM/ZrO₂ catalysts, which do not contain alkaline metals, show a noticeable increase in the C₂-C₄ paraffin selectivity with the CO₂ conversion (**Figure 5**). The light paraffin selectivity increases from 0 to 35%, as the CO₂ conversion rises from 10 to 40%. This suggests that on the one hand, the C₂-C₄ paraffins seem to

1
2
3 be secondary products over iron catalysts. They probably originate from hydrogenation of light
4 olefins or C_nH_m surface species, which can be common precursors of both light olefins or paraffins.
5
6
7 On the other hand, the FeKM/ZrO₂ catalysts, i.e., with potassium, present a much smaller variation
8
9
10 of the C₂-C₄ paraffin selectivity with the CO₂ conversion (**Figure 5**). This suggests that secondary
11
12 hydrogenation of light olefins or common surface precursors would be less significant in the
13
14 presence of alkaline promoters. Instead, over the latter catalysts, higher CO₂ conversion results in
15
16 the increase in the selectivity to the C₅₊ hydrocarbons (**Figure 6**). Finally, in contrast to FeKM/ZrO₂,
17
18 over the FeM/ZrO₂ catalysts, the C₅₊ selectivity seems to be less dependent on the CO₂ conversion,
19
20 which varies between 5 and 20%.
21
22

23
24 The catalyst stability is another important characteristic of CO₂ hydrogenation to light
25
26 olefins. The stability was further tested in a fixed bed reactor. The catalyst results obtained with
27
28 the laboratory fixed bed reactor show similar trends compared to the results measured in the HTE
29
30 tests. **Figure S1, Supporting Information (SI)** shows the CO₂ conversion as a function of time-
31
32 on-stream during 48 h of reaction. It is clear that the Fe/ZrO₂ reference catalyst deactivates with
33
34 the reaction time, the CO₂ conversion drops from 20 to 8%. All the studied promoted catalysts
35
36 showed higher activity than the reference catalyst (up to 7 times higher). In the case of the catalysts
37
38 promoted only with K, the activity increases up to 4 times compared to the reference Fe/ZrO₂
39
40 catalyst, while the addition of a second promoter can further enhance the activity compared to the
41
42 catalysts promoted solely with an alkaline metal. Note that not only the activity but also the stability
43
44 was also enhanced in the presence of these promoters. The light olefin selectivity did not
45
46 significantly change during the reaction with the exception of FeKMo/ZrO₂, which shows a steady
47
48 increase in the light olefin selectivity with the reaction time.
49
50
51
52

53
54 In order to provide further insights into the enhancement of the catalytic performance on
55
56 the promotion, the Fe/ZrO₂ (reference), FeK/ZrO₂, FeKMo/ZrO₂, FeKCu/ZrO₂, FeKCs/ZrO₂,
57
58

1
2
3 FeKCe/ZrO₂ and FeKGa/ZrO₂ catalysts have been investigated by a combination of
4
5 characterization techniques.
6
7



24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Figure 7. XRD patterns of the catalysts after calcination (a) and after reaction (b).

3.2 Catalyst characterization

The XRF elemental analysis data for selected promoted iron catalysts are displayed in **Table 1**. All the catalysts have similar iron contents close to nominal value (around 10 wt. %). At the same

1
2
3 time, the potassium content was slightly higher than expected (around 1.5 wt. %), while the amount
4 of Cs, Ce, Cu, and Ga was as expected, 50:1 in molar ratio relative to iron. Only the Mo promoted
5 catalyst shows a higher Fe/Mo ratio. The calcined catalysts display the characteristic XRD peaks
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(**Figure 7a**) attributed to the zirconia support^{70,71}. The XRD peaks located at 28.2 and 31.5° are assigned to monoclinic zirconia (JCPDS 37-1484), while the peak at 50.3° reveals the presence of tetragonal zirconia (JCPDS 17-0923). Even though some broad hematite (Fe₂O₃, JCPDS13-0534) peaks were detected, the intensity of them was rather low. Significant broadening of these peaks indicates small size of iron oxide nanoparticles (below 5 nm). No diffraction peaks assignable to the crystalline phases of promoters were observed. This was is attributed to their low content in the catalysts.

We also performed XRD measurements (**Figure 7b**) for reference and promoted catalysts after conducting the CO₂ hydrogenation reaction. The spent FeKCs/ZrO₂, FeKCu/ZrO₂, FeKGa/ZrO₂, and FeKGa/ZrO₂ catalysts exhibit diffraction peaks at 2θ angle of 43.4 and 44.1° that can be attributed to the iron carbide phases such as Hägg iron carbide (Fe₅C₂, JCPDS20-0509) formed during the reaction. Because of similarity of XRD patterns attributed to different iron carbide, identification of individual iron carbide phases by means of XRD analysis is challenging.

Figure 8 shows the CO₂ TPD curves for promoted iron catalysts, the amount of CO₂ adsorbed over the catalysts is shown in **Table 1** and **Table S1, SI**. The profiles exhibit three peaks: the first one located at 80-100°C, corresponding to weak basic sites, the second one at 150-200°C assigned to medium basic sites and the third one at 350 °C attributed to strong basic sites. The deconvolution of the CO₂-TPD profiles is illustrated by **Figure S2, SI**. ZrO₂ is a basic oxide and the TPD profile of pure zirconia is similar to that previously reported in the literature^{72,73}. The deconvolution (**Figure S2, SI**) displays two broad CO₂ TPD peaks at 100°C and 220°C. This suggests the presence of a wide range of relatively weak and medium basic sites. Addition of iron to ZrO₂ reduces the

CO₂-TPD peak intensity. It seems that some medium basic sites of zirconia are neutralized by interaction with the added iron oxides. The promotion with potassium and cesium leads to an increase in the number of adsorbed CO₂ and results in two distinct peaks, the first at 120°C corresponding to the weak basicity and the second at 300-420°C corresponding to stronger basicity. The intensity of these peaks correlates with the amount of alkaline metals in the catalysts. Addition of the second promoter (except for Cs) results in a decreasing concentration of basic sites, indicating some interaction of the promoter with potassium and zirconia. Such a lower concentration of basic sites has been observed in the iron catalyst simultaneously promoted with potassium and molybdenum (Figure 8).




Figure 8. CO₂ TPD profiles adsorbed over ZrO₂ and iron catalysts.

The TPR profiles of the reference Fe/ZrO₂, FeK/ZrO₂, FeKCs/ZrO₂, FeKCe/ZrO₂ and FeKGa/ZrO₂ catalysts are displayed in **Figure 9**. The amount of hydrogen consumed for catalyst reduction is given in **Table 1**. The first reduction peak at ~380 °C can be attributed to the hematite reduction to magnetite, Fe₂O₃→Fe₃O₄,⁷⁴ and the second broader peak related to the successive reduction of iron oxides, Fe₃O₄→FeO→Fe.⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ This second peak is centered at ~500 °C for the reference Fe/ZrO₂ and FeK/ZrO₂ catalysts.

For the FeKCs/ZrO₂, FeKCe/ZrO₂ and FeKGa/ZrO₂ catalysts, this peak shifts toward higher temperatures. Addition of Cs, Ga, Ce seems to give place to a strong interaction of iron oxide with the promoters⁷⁸ and hinders reduction of the magnetite phase. Note that these promoters do not affect the first reduction step (Fe₂O₃ to Fe₃O₄). On the other hand, the H₂-TPR profile of FeKMo/ZrO₂ shows a shift to higher temperatures for both peaks.




Figure 9. H₂-TPR profiles of reference catalysts and catalysts promoted with K, Cs, Ce, Ga, Mo, and Cu.




Figure 10. STEM-HAADF, SEM-EDX mapping and histograms of iron nanoparticle sizes for the activated Fe/ZrO₂ (a), FeK/ZrO₂ (b), FeKGa/ZrO₂ (c) and FeKMo/ZrO₂ (d) catalysts.


So, the molybdenum presence clearly affects the different iron oxide reduction steps. Finally, the H₂-TPR profile of FeKCu/ZrO₂ displays two reduction peaks at ~250 and 298 °C, which shift to lower temperatures compared to the reference Fe/ZrO₂ sample, in agreement with the literature⁷⁴. The intensity of peak at 250°C can also contribute from the reduction of copper⁷⁹. Indeed, the

1
2
3 presence of copper in the catalyst may facilitate iron oxide reduction. Remarkably, addition of
4 promoters results in a higher amount of consumed hydrogen (**Table 1**). It seems that the promotion
5 slows down interaction of iron with zirconia and increases the amount of reducible iron. Note that
6 the amounts of incorporated promoters compared to iron are rather small to significantly contribute
7 to the intensity of TPR peaks.
8
9

10 The information about dispersion of iron and localization of promoters was extracted from the
11 STEM-HAADF and STEM-EDS analyses of activated iron catalysts. The high-resolution STEM
12 images of the reference Fe/ZrO₂ catalyst, FeK/ZrO₂, FeKGa/ZrO₂ and FeKMo/ZrO₂ are shown in
13 **Figure S3, SI**. The catalysts show agglomerated nanoparticles with mainly oval shape and narrow
14 size distribution from 6 to 27 nm. The average catalyst particle size was around 14 nm for all
15 studied catalysts. No clear signature of Ga and K was observed in the images, because of their
16 small amounts and their Z number relatively close to the one of Fe and Zr. At the same time,
17 because of noticeable Z-contrast in STEM-HAADF mode, atoms and atomic clusters of Mo are
18 visible as light spots and agglomerates in FeKMo/ZrO₂ (**Figure S4, SI**).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34


35 The STEM-HAADF and STEM-EDS images have provided further information about iron
36 particle sizes and promoter localization in the supported catalysts (**Figure 10**). The histograms of
37 iron nanoparticle sizes were estimated from the STEM-EDS Fe elemental maps. In the reference
38 Fe/ZrO₂ sample, iron nanoparticles of 20 nm mean diameter were homogeneously dispersed in the
39 ZrO₂ matrix. Local agglomeration of iron nanoparticles was also observed. This is most probably
40 due to the fact that TEM acquire a projection of the volume and therefore, the superposition of
41 nanoparticles in the projection within the analyzed volume leads to a certain agglomeration of
42 nanoparticles. Interestingly, relatively low concentration of oxygen was found in the iron-rich areas
43 compared to the iron-poor ones (**Figure S5, SM**). This could be indicative of lower fraction of iron
44 oxides and higher extent of iron carbidization in the activated catalysts. Since the specimens were
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deposited onto carbon supports and the analyses were carried out for long time, it is difficult to
4 estimate the carbon content in the samples. This is due to the superposition of the carbon signal
5 from the membrane and occurrence of carbon contamination during the long duration scanning.
6
7
8
9
10 The promoted FeK/ZrO₂, FeKGa/ZrO₂ and FeKMo/ZrO₂ catalysts exhibited much smaller iron
11 nanoparticles of 11-14 nm homogeneously dispersed within the ZrO₂ matrix, without any Fe
12 nanoparticles agglomeration (**Figure 10**). The promoters (K, Ga and Mo) appear to be
13 homogeneously distributed in very small amounts. EDS also confirmed nearly atomic Mo
14 distribution over zirconia (**Figures S4, SI**).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22



23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 **Figure 11.** Mössbauer spectra after activation measured at -153 °C.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In order to get a deeper understanding of the catalytic performance, the reference and promoted
4 iron catalysts were characterized using *in-situ* Mössbauer spectrometry under the flow of CO and
5 reaction mixture ($\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$). After the CO activation at 350 °C (**Figure 11**), iron Hägg carbide and
6 wüstite (FeO) were observed in all samples. The promotion of Fe/ZrO_2 catalyst with K and Mo
7 results in a higher fraction of iron carbide (**Table 2**). A noticeable concentration of metastable (ϵ' -
8 $\text{Fe}_{2.2}\text{C}$) carbide [63] was observed in the $\text{FeKMnO}/\text{ZrO}_2$ catalyst after the activation.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17



50
51
52 **Figure 12.** Mössbauer spectra after reaction measured at -153 °C.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 12** shows the *in-situ* Mössbauer spectra after catalyst exposure to the reaction conditions
4 (H₂/CO₂ = 3, 350 °C and 10 bar). Two types of Mössbauer spectra modification were observed.
5
6 On the one hand, there is a slight improvement in the crystallinity of the Hägg iron carbide species.
7
8 In the Mössbauer spectroscopy, the crystallinity was reflected by the linewidth of measured signal.
9
10 The reference Fe/ZrO₂ catalyst after the 24 h of reaction exhibits better defined Hägg structures.
11
12 The linewidth of Mössbauer signals decreased from 0.45 to 0.42 mm/s (**Table 2**).
13
14
15

16
17 The same tendency was observed for all promoted catalysts. On the other hand, the fraction of
18 iron carbide seems to further increase after conducting the CO₂ hydrogenation. This is shown by
19 the lower amount of unreduced wüstite species in the spent catalysts compared to that in the
20 counterparts activated in CO. In contrast to other catalysts, FeKGa/ZrO₂ after reaction did not show
21 any increase in the iron carbide content, indicating a smaller effect of Ga addition on iron
22 carbidisation. Only the slightly smaller linewidth values indicate the presence of better defined
23 Hägg carbide species in FeKGa/ZrO₂ compared to FeK/ZrO₂. Note that the FeKMo/ZrO₂ catalyst
24 showed the higher fraction of iron carbide among all studied promoted iron catalysts after
25 conducting CO₂ hydrogenation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Carbon deposition could be a limitation of CO₂ hydrogenation resulting in a loss of catalytic
39 activity. **Figure S6, SI** shows the thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) data for the spent
40 ZrO₂-supported catalysts. The first small loss around 150 °C is normally generated by the water
41 elimination and possible dehydration of iron oxyhydroxide (FeOOH).⁶⁰ Above 300 °C, significant
42 weight losses produced by the combustion of carbon deposits and carbides can be observed.
43
44 Interestingly, the reference catalyst presents a smaller weight loss. So, the enhancement of stability
45 observed during the CO₂ hydrogenation reaction over the promoted catalysts (**Figure S1, SI**) seems
46 not to be related to the catalyst ability to avoid carbon deposition and can possibly be assigned to
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

other phenomena. One possible reason for the better stability of the catalysts could be related to less sintering of the iron carbide nanoparticles after the addition of the promoters.

Table 2. Mössbauer fitted parameters of the ZrO₂-based catalysts, obtained at -153 °C.

Sample/ Treatment	IS (mm·s ⁻¹)	QS (mm·s ⁻¹)	Hyperfine field (T)	Γ (mm·s ⁻¹)	Phase	Spectral contribution (%)
Fe/ZrO ₂ CO, 350 C	0.28	-	23.7	0.45	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	36
	0.16	-	19.7	0.45	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	25
	0.24	-	13.2	0.45	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	13
	0.98	2.32	-	0.45	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM ^a)	26
Fe/ZrO ₂ H ₂ /CO ₂ =3 350 C, 10 bar	0.28	-	23.7	0.42	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	37
	0.15	-	19.8	0.42	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	27
	0.17	-	13.6	0.42	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	12
	1.00	2.35	-	0.47	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	24
FeK/ZrO ₂ CO, 350 C	0.26	-	23.7	0.54	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	37
	0.18	-	19.3	0.54	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	26
	0.24	-	12.6	0.54	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	14
	0.96	2.28	-	0.65	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	23
FeK/ZrO ₂ H ₂ /CO ₂ =3 350 C, 10 bar	0.27	-	23.8	0.47	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	36
	0.17	-	19.9	0.47	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	29
	0.24	-	12.8	0.47	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	16
	1.00	2.31	-	0.58	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	19
FeKMo/ZrO ₂ CO, 350 C	0.28	-	23.5	0.53	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	20
	0.23	-	19.2	0.53	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	18
	0.20	-	11.2	0.53	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	10
	0.17	-	16.1	0.53	ε'-Fe _{2.2} C	13
	0.17	0.74	-	0.45	Fe _x C (SPM)	20
	0.90	2.15	-	0.77	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	19
FeKMo/ZrO ₂ H ₂ /CO ₂ =3 350 C, 10 bar	0.27	-	23.7	0.49	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	25
	0.21	-	19.6	0.49	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	24
	0.20	-	10.9	0.49	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	11
	0.22	-	16.6	0.49	ε'-Fe _{2.2} C	14
	0.14	0.70	-	0.28	Fe _x C (SPM)	10
	1.02	2.35	-	0.61	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	16
FeKGa/ZrO ₂ CO, 350 C	0.26	-	23.8	0.50	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	35
	0.19	-	19.3	0.50	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	24
	0.22	-	12.3	0.50	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	14
	0.95	2.24	-	0.67	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	27
FeKGa/ZrO ₂ H ₂ /CO ₂ =3 350 C, 10 bar	0.28	-	23.9	0.43	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (I)	36
	0.19	-	20.0	0.43	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (II)	29
	0.26	-	12.7	0.43	χ-Fe ₅ C ₂ (III)	17
	0.99	2.38	-	0.57	Fe _{1-x} O (SPM)	18

Experimental uncertainties: Isomer shift: I.S. ± 0.02 mm s⁻¹; Quadrupole splitting: Q.S. ± 0.02 mm s⁻¹; Line width: Γ ± 0.03 mm s⁻¹; Hyperfine field: ± 0.1 T; Spectral contribution: ± 3%; ^aVery small, superparamagnetic (SPM)

4. Discussion

CO₂-FT synthesis occurs at 300-350°C and is focused on the production of light olefins. Compared to the “methanol-mediated” processes occurring over metal-oxide/zeolite catalysts, CO₂-FT synthesis exhibits higher yields of olefins and lower selectivity to CO^{31,32}. Iron catalysts are the catalysts of choice for light olefin synthesis from CO₂ via the FT route. The selection of efficient promoters for iron catalysts seems to be the key for the selectivity control of this reaction. Alkaline metals^{34,37-46}, copper^{52,53}, manganese^{45,46,54}, zinc^{31,44,55,56} and cobalt⁴⁷⁻⁵¹ have been the most investigated promoters for iron CO₂-FT catalysts. At the same time, very limited attention has been paid to the promotion of iron CO₂-FT catalysts with other elements. In this work, HTE combined with catalyst characterization have allowed identification of new efficient promoters and also provided important information about the influence of these promoters on different reaction elementary steps.

CO₂-FT synthesis is a complex multi-stage reaction^{23,24,42,80}. It can be therefore suggested that different reaction stages can be affected to a different extent by the promotion. The experimental results shown in **Figures 2-6** illustrate the effects of added promoters on different reactions steps. **Figure 2** shows the CO selectivity close to 100% at the CO₂ conversion approaching zero. CO seems indeed, to be the primary product of CO₂ hydrogenation over iron catalysts. Important, the experimental results obtained for numerous promoted iron catalysts exhibit a similar trend. RWGS is a fast reaction and is readily catalyzed by iron oxides (e. g. Fe₃O₄)^{31,42}. The presence of noticeable concentrations of iron oxide species in the working catalysts has been identified by Mössbauer spectrometry. This explains similar behavior of all promoted catalysts in RWGS. Interestingly, almost all promoted catalysts showed much higher CO selectivity at the same CO₂ conversion compared to the reference Fe/ZrO₂ catalyst. The added promoters could therefore

contribute to RWGS. This also coincides with higher overall activity (FTY) of the promoted catalysts compared to the reference one (**Figure 1**).




Figure 13. Reaction paths in CO₂ hydrogenation over promoted iron catalysts with (a) and without (b) potassium.

The methane selectivity versus conversion curve (**Figure 3**) also agrees with the suggested reaction sequence (**Figure 13**). Higher methane selectivity is observed at lower CO₂ conversion, then the methane selectivity drops at higher conversion. At low conversion, hydrogenation of C₁ monomer seems to prevail over its oligomerization. At higher CO₂ conversion and higher surface concentration of C₁ monomers, their oligomerization becomes more favorable and leads to adsorbed C₂-C₄ species. This trend has been seen for all catalysts, with somewhat lower methane selectivity at the same conversions observed for FeMo/ZrO₂, FeKM/ZrO₂ and FeKSb/ZrO₂.

Very different correlations between light olefin selectivity and conversion have been observed for the catalysts with and without alkaline metals (**Figure 4**). The light olefin selectivity over FeM/ZrO₂ (without alkaline metals) was much lower compared to the FeKM/ZrO₂ catalysts promoted with potassium and it does not noticeably vary as a function of CO₂ conversion. The

1
2
3 higher selectivity to light olefins over the FeKM/ZrO₂ catalysts decreases as a function of CO₂
4 conversion. For the catalysts without alkaline promoters, increased CO₂ conversion results in
5
6 conversion. For the catalysts without alkaline promoters, increased CO₂ conversion results in
7
8 higher selectivity to C₂-C₄ hydrocarbons, while for the catalysts containing alkaline metals, higher
9
10 selectivity to the C₅₊ hydrocarbons was measured at higher CO₂ conversions. Higher conversion
11
12 leads therefore to a higher selectivity to the C₅₊ hydrocarbons, which can be attributed to enhanced
13
14 surface oligomerization of C₁ monomeric species and readsorption of light olefins^{81,82}, which may
15
16 reinitialize oligomerization on iron catalysis, both phenomena favoring production of longer chain
17
18 hydrocarbons.
19
20

21
22 The possible reaction paths of CO₂-FT synthesis over iron catalysts have been summarized
23
24 in **Figure 13**. The first step in CO₂-FT synthesis over iron catalysts is CO₂ hydrogenation to CO
25
26 followed by formation of C₁ adsorbed monomers. Then, the adsorbed C₁ monomers can be either
27
28 hydrogenated to yield methane or to undergo oligomerization to different C_n adsorbed species.
29
30 Desorption of C₂-C₄ adsorbed species should produce light olefins (ethylene, propylene or
31
32 butylene), while their hydrogenation leads to light paraffins, the latter also possibly be produced
33
34 via olefin re-adsorption (and subsequent hydrogenation)⁸³⁻⁸⁵. Further reactions of adsorbed C₂-C₄
35
36 species with C₁ monomer produce longer-chain hydrocarbons.
37
38

39
40 The rates of hydrogenation of adsorbed C₂-C₄ species and rates of oligomerization seem to
41
42 be different over the catalysts with (**Figure 13a**) and without potassium (**Figure 13b**). These
43
44 phenomena also explain the role of alkaline promoters. The promotion with alkaline metals results
45
46 in a decrease in the catalyst hydrogenation ability and at the same time, increases the rate of
47
48 oligomerization of C₁ surface monomers. Thus, over the catalysts containing alkaline metals, the
49
50 oligomerization limits the light olefin selectivity, while the contribution of hydrogenation of
51
52 adsorbed C₂-C₄ species or secondary hydrogenation of light olefins is not significant. This suggests
53
54 that, in order to boost the light olefin selectivity over the catalysts promoted with alkaline metals,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the surface oligomerization should be hindered after the formation of the C₄ surface fragments.
4
5 Similar effects were previously observed in the CO hydrogenation over iron catalysts⁶⁶. The
6
7 second promoter should therefore, slow down chain growth in particular for C₅₊ hydrocarbon
8
9 fragments, without any major enhancement of hydrogenation.
10
11

12 The key issue in the catalyst design for CO₂-FT synthesis is therefore light olefin selectivity.
13
14 **Figure 4** shows the light olefin selectivity versus conversion, and it enables identification of the
15
16 most efficient second promoters such as Mo, Cs, Ga, Ce and Cu. Note that in order to reach higher
17
18 selectivity to light olefins, these promoters should be used in combination with potassium.
19
20

21 The catalyst promoters are usually divided into two types: structural promoters, which
22
23 might generate an enhanced iron dispersion and carbidization and give better mechanical
24
25 resistance and electronic promoters, which could enhance the intrinsic activity of active sites (TOF).
26
27

28 Several phenomena can be responsible for the observed increase in the light olefin selectivity over
29
30 the catalysts promoted simultaneously with potassium and other elements. First, the STEM-
31
32 HAADF and STEM-EDS observations of the promoted catalysts (**Figure 10**) showed noticeable
33
34 increase in the iron dispersion in the activated catalysts compared to the reference Fe/ZrO₂
35
36 counterpart. Consequently, higher iron dispersion can contribute to the increase in FT reaction rate
37
38 and light olefin selectivity. Second, the addition of promoters can modify the extent of iron
39
40 carbidization and reduction. The *in-situ* Mössbauer data (**Table 2**) show that the presence of the
41
42 promoters such as Mo, K and Ga results in a higher fraction of iron carbide. For the FeKMo/ZrO₂
43
44 catalyst promoted with potassium and molybdenum, the increase in iron carbidization during the
45
46 reaction coincides with the continuous increase in light olefin selectivity. The TPR results (**Figure**
47
48 **9**) show easier iron reduction in the copper-promoted catalysts. Third, the promotion enhances the
49
50 RWGS reaction, which is an important step in CO₂-FT synthesis and often affects the overall
51
52 activity. Indeed, most of the promoted catalysts showed higher CO selectivity at a given CO₂
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conversion compared to reference Fe/ZrO₂. Four, the promotion affects the catalyst basicity and,
4 hence, adsorption of CO₂, which is an acid molecule. The promotion with potassium principally
5 results in the buildup of strong basic sites (**Figure 8, Figure S2 and Table S1, SI**). Note that
6 extremely strong or weak basicity does not seem to be optimal for obtaining high concentrations
7 of reactive CO₂ adsorbed molecules. Addition of the second promoter mediates the basicity of
8 FeK/ZrO₂ catalysts (**Table S1, SM**) and thus, favors the CO₂ activation. **Five, TOF calculated from**
9 **the iron carbide particle size (Table 1) measured by TEM images shows 2–4 times higher values**
10 **in the presence of K and K-Ga-promoters, while there is a slightly effect on TOF when Mo is added**
11 **simultaneously with K.**

22 23 24 25 26 **5. Conclusion**

27
28 HTE tests allowed the identification of new suitable promoters and structure-performance-
29 correlations over zirconia supported iron catalysts for CO₂ hydrogenation to light olefins. The
30 presence of alkaline promoters seems to be indispensable for the selectivity enhancement towards
31 light olefins over iron catalysts. Complementary to potassium, the promotion of ZrO₂-supported
32 catalysts with Cs, Mo, Cu, Ga, and Ce resulted in further increase in the light olefin selectivity.
33 Better iron dispersion, higher extent of iron carbidization and optimized basicity coincide with the
34 enhanced light olefin selectivity in the promoted catalysts. The catalyst basicity required for CO₂
35 adsorption is enhanced by the promotion with alkaline metals and mediated by the second promoter.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 CO₂-FT synthesis proceeds *via* intermediate production of carbon monoxide. The
48 dependence of light olefin selectivity on the CO₂ conversion exhibits two different trends,
49 depending on potassium promotion. Without potassium as promoter, the relatively low selectivity
50 to light olefins is practically independent of the CO₂ conversion. The second trend is identified for
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the iron catalysts containing simultaneously alkaline and second promoter. Over those catalysts
4 much higher selectivity to light olefins shows a noticeable decrease with the increase in CO₂
5 conversion. Over the catalysts without alkaline metals, higher CO₂ conversion favors production
6 of light paraffins, while the presence of potassium leads to higher selectivity towards longer chain
7 hydrocarbons at higher conversion level. The second promoter, complementary to an alkaline
8 metal, should hinder chain growth rates without any increase in the hydrogenation rate of surface
9 intermediate species.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Acknowledgements**

21
22 The authors acknowledge financial support from European Union (Interreg V project PSYCHE).
23 The REALCAT platform is benefiting from a Governmental subvention administrated by the
24 French National Research Agency (ANR) within the frame of the ‘Future Investments’ program
25 (PIA), with contractual reference ‘ANR-11-EQPX-0037’. GENESIS is supported by the Region
26 Haute-Normandie, the Metropole Rouen Normandie, the CNRS via LABEX EMC and French
27 National Research Agency as a part of the program “Future Investments” with the reference ANR-
28 11-EQPX-0020.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference

- (1) D'Alessandro, D. M.; Smit, B.; Long, J. R. Carbon Dioxide Capture: Prospects for New Materials. *Angew. Chemie - Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49* (35), 6058–6082.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201000431>.
- (2) Aresta, M.; Dibenedetto, A.; Angelini, A. Catalysis for the Valorization of Exhaust Carbon: From CO₂ to Chemicals, Materials, and Fuels. Technological Use of CO₂. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114* (3), 1709–1742. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr4002758>.
- (3) Goeppert, A.; Czaun, M.; Jones, J. P.; Surya Prakash, G. K.; Olah, G. A. Recycling of Carbon Dioxide to Methanol and Derived Products-Closing the Loop. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, *43* (23), 7995–8048. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c4cs00122b>.
- (4) Ordonsky, V. V.; Dros, A.-B.; Schwiedernoch, R.; Khodakov, A. Y. Challenges and Role of Catalysis in CO₂ Conversion to Chemicals and Fuels. In *Nanotechnology in Catalysis*; Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: Weinheim, Germany, 2017; pp 803–850.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527699827.ch30>.
- (5) Porosoff, M. D.; Yan, B.; Chen, J. G. Catalytic Reduction of CO₂ by H₂ for Synthesis of CO, Methanol and Hydrocarbons: Challenges and Opportunities. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2016**, *9* (1), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c5ee02657a>.
- (6) Posada-Pérez, S.; Ramírez, P. J.; Evans, J.; Viñes, F.; Liu, P.; Illas, F.; Rodriguez, J. A. Highly Active Au/ δ -MoC and Cu/ δ -MoC Catalysts for the Conversion of CO₂: The Metal/C Ratio as a Key Factor Defining Activity, Selectivity, and Stability. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, *138* (26), 8269–8278. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.6b04529>.
- (7) Ye, R. P.; Ding, J.; Gong, W.; Argyle, M. D.; Zhong, Q.; Wang, Y.; Russell, C. K.; Xu, Z.;

- 1
2
3 Russell, A. G.; Li, Q.; Fan, M.; Yao, Y. G. CO₂ Hydrogenation to High-Value Products via
4 Heterogeneous Catalysis. *Nat. Commun.* **2019**, *10* (1). [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13638-9)
5
6 13638-9.
7
8
9
10 (8) Navarro-Jaén, S.; Virginie, M.; Bonin, J.; Robert, M.; Wojcieszak, R.; Khodakov, A. Y.
11 Highlights and Challenges in the Selective Reduction of Carbon Dioxide to Methanol. *Nat.*
12
13 *Rev. Chem.* **2021**, *0123456789*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41570-021-00289-y>.
14
15
16
17
18 (9) Graciani, J.; Mudiyansele, K.; Xu, F.; Baber, A. E.; Evans, J.; Senanayake, S. D.;
19 Stacchiola, D. J.; Liu, P.; Hrbek, J.; Fernández Sanz, J.; Rodriguez, J. A. Highly Active
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- (10) Rodriguez, J. A.; Liu, P.; Stacchiola, D. J.; Senanayake, S. D.; White, M. G.; Chen, J. G.
Hydrogenation of CO₂ to Methanol: Importance of Metal-Oxide and Metal-Carbide
Interfaces in the Activation of CO₂. *ACS Catal.* **2015**, *5* (11), 6696–6706.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.5b01755>.
- (11) Frusteri, F.; Cordaro, M.; Cannilla, C.; Bonura, G. Multifunctionality of Cu-ZnO-ZrO₂/H-
ZSM5 Catalysts for the One-Step CO₂-to-DME Hydrogenation Reaction. *Appl. Catal. B*
Environ. **2015**, *162*, 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2014.06.035>.
- (12) Bonura, G.; Cordaro, M.; Cannilla, C.; Mezzapica, A.; Spadaro, L.; Arena, F.; Frusteri, F.
Catalytic Behaviour of a Bifunctional System for the One Step Synthesis of DME by CO₂
Hydrogenation. *Catal. Today* **2014**, *228*, 51–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2013.11.017>.
- (13) Navarro-Jaén, S.; Virginie, M.; Morin, J.-C.; Thuriot, J. R.; Wojcieszak, R.; Khodakov, A.

1
2
3 Hybrid Monometallic and Bimetallic Copper-Palladium Zeolite Catalysts for Direct
4 Synthesis of Dimethyl Ether from CO₂. *New J. Chem.* **2022**.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1NJ05734K>.
7
8
9

- 10 (14) Navarro-Jaén, S.; Virginie, M.; Thuriot-Roukos, J.; Wojcieszak, R.; Khodakov, A. Y.
11 Structure-Performance Correlations in the Hybrid Oxide-Supported Copper-Zinc SAPO-
12 34 Catalysts for Direct Synthesis of Dimethyl Ether from CO₂. *J. Mater. Sci.* **2022**.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-022-06890-w>.
15
16
17
18
19
20 (15) Mori, K.; Taga, T.; Yamashita, H. Isolated Single-Atomic Ru Catalyst Bound on a Layered
21 Double Hydroxide for Hydrogenation of CO₂ to Formic Acid. *ACS Catal.* **2017**, *7* (5),
22 3147–3151. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.7b00312>.
23
24
25
26
27
28 (16) Xu, Z.; Mcnamara, N. D.; Neumann, G. T.; Schneider, W. F.; Hicks, J. C. Catalytic
29 Hydrogenation of CO₂ to Formic Acid with Silica-Tethered Iridium Catalysts.
30
31 *ChemCatChem* **2013**, *5* (7), 1769–1771. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201200839>.
32
33
34
35
36 (17) Luk, H. T.; Novak, G.; Safonova, O. V.; Siol, S.; Stewart, J. A.; Curulla Ferré, D.;
37 Mondelli, C.; Pérez-Ramírez, J. CO₂-Promoted Catalytic Process Forming Higher
38 Alcohols with Tunable Nature at Record Productivity. *ChemCatChem* **2020**, *12* (10),
39 2732–2744. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.202000059>.
40
41
42
43
44
45 (18) Dorner, R. W.; Hardy, D. R.; Williams, F. W.; Willauer, H. D. Heterogeneous Catalytic
46 CO₂ Conversion to Value-Added Hydrocarbons. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2010**, *3* (7), 884–
47 890. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c001514h>.
48
49
50
51
52
53 (19) Rodemerck, U.; Holeňa, M.; Wagner, E.; Smejkal, Q.; Barkschat, A.; Baerns, M. Catalyst
54 Development for CO₂ Hydrogenation to Fuels. *ChemCatChem* **2013**, *5* (7), 1948–1955.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201200879>.

- 4
5
6 (20) Wang, Y.; Gao, W.; Kazumi, S.; Li, H.; Yang, G.; Tsubaki, N. Direct and Oriented
7 Conversion of CO₂ into Value-Added Aromatics. *Chem. - A Eur. J.* **2019**, *25* (20), 5149–
8 5153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.201806165>.
9
10
11
12
13 (21) Li, Z.; Wang, J.; Qu, Y.; Liu, H.; Tang, C.; Miao, S.; Feng, Z.; An, H.; Li, C. Highly
14 Selective Conversion of Carbon Dioxide to Lower Olefins. *ACS Catal.* **2017**, *7* (12), 8544–
15 8548. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.7b03251>.
16
17
18
19
20
21 (22) Gao, P.; Dang, S.; Li, S.; Bu, X.; Liu, Z.; Qiu, M.; Yang, C.; Wang, H.; Zhong, L.; Han,
22 Y.; Liu, Q.; Wei, W.; Sun, Y. Direct Production of Lower Olefins from CO₂ Conversion
23 via Bifunctional Catalysis. *ACS Catal.* **2018**, *8* (1), 571–578.
24
25
26
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.7b02649>.
29
30
31 (23) Li, W.; Wang, H.; Jiang, X.; Zhu, J.; Liu, Z.; Guo, X.; Song, C. A Short Review of Recent
32 Advances in CO₂ Hydrogenation to Hydrocarbons over Heterogeneous Catalysts. *RSC*
33 *Adv.* **2018**, *8* (14), 7651–7669. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c7ra13546g>.
34
35
36
37
38 (24) Ojelade, O. A.; Zaman, S. F. A Review on CO₂ Hydrogenation to Lower Olefins:
39 Understanding the Structure-Property Relationships in Heterogeneous Catalytic Systems.
40 *J. CO₂ Util.* **2021**, *47*, 101506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcou.2021.101506>.
41
42
43
44
45 (25) Corma, A.; Melo, F. V.; Sauvanaud, L.; Ortega, F. Light Cracked Naphtha Processing:
46 Controlling Chemistry for Maximum Propylene Production. *Catal. Today* **2005**, *107–108*,
47 699–706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2005.07.109>.
48
49
50
51
52 (26) Sattler, J. J. H. B.; Ruiz-Martinez, J.; Santillan-Jimenez, E.; Weckhuysen, B. M. Catalytic
53 Dehydrogenation of Light Alkanes on Metals and Metal Oxides. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (20), 10613–10653. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr5002436>.
- 4
5
6 (27) Tian, P.; Wei, Y.; Ye, M.; Liu, Z. Methanol to Olefins (MTO): From Fundamentals to
7
8 Commercialization. *ACS Catal.* **2015**, *5* (3), 1922–1938.
9
10 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.5b00007>.
- 11
12
13 (28) Stöcker, M. Methanol-to-Hydrocarbons: Catalytic Materials and Their Behavior.
14
15 *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.* **1999**, *29* (1–2), 3–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S1387->
16
17 1811(98)00319-9.
- 18
19
20 (29) Goud, D.; Gupta, R.; Maligal-Ganesh, R.; Peter, S. C. Review of Catalyst Design and
21
22 Mechanistic Studies for the Production of Olefins from Anthropogenic CO₂. *ACS Catal.*
23
24 **2020**, *10* (23), 14258–14282. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.0c03799>.
- 25
26
27 (30) Zhou, W.; Cheng, K.; Kang, J.; Zhou, C.; Subramanian, V.; Zhang, Q.; Wang, Y. New
28
29 Horizon in C₁ Chemistry: Breaking the Selectivity Limitation in Transformation of Syngas
30
31 and Hydrogenation of CO₂ into Hydrocarbon Chemicals and Fuels. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2019**,
32
33 *48* (12), 3193–3228. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C8CS00502H>.
- 34
35
36 (31) Zhang, Z.; Yin, H.; Yu, G.; He, S.; Kang, J.; Liu, Z.; Cheng, K.; Zhang, Q.; Wang, Y.
37
38 Selective Hydrogenation of CO₂ and CO into Olefins over Sodium- and Zinc-Promoted
39
40 Iron Carbide Catalysts. *J. Catal.* **2021**, *395*, 350–361.
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2021.01.036>.
- 43
44
45 (32) Ronda-Lloret, M.; Rothenberg, G.; Shiju, N. R. A Critical Look at Direct Catalytic
46
47 Hydrogenation of Carbon Dioxide to Olefins. *ChemSusChem* **2019**, *12* (17), 3896–3914.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cssc.201900915>.
- 50
51
52 (33) Liu, R.; Leshchev, D.; Stavitski, E.; Juneau, M.; Agwara, J. N.; Porosoff, M. D. Selective
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hydrogenation of CO₂ and CO over Potassium Promoted Co/ZSM-5. *Appl. Catal. B*
4
5 *Environ.* **2021**, *284*, 119787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2020.119787>.
6
7
- 8 (34) Wang, J.; You, Z.; Zhang, Q.; Deng, W.; Wang, Y. Synthesis of Lower Olefins by
9
10 Hydrogenation of Carbon Dioxide over Supported Iron Catalysts. *Catal. Today* **2013**, *215*,
11
12 186–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2013.03.031>.
13
14
15
- 16 (35) Zhang, P.; Han, F.; Yan, J.; Qiao, X.; Guan, Q.; Li, W. N-Doped Ordered Mesoporous
17
18 Carbon (N-OMC) Confined Fe₃O₄-FeC_x Heterojunction for Efficient Conversion of CO₂ to
19
20 Light Olefins. *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* **2021**, *299* (July), 120639.
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2021.120639>.
23
24
25
- 26 (36) Wu, T.; Lin, J.; Cheng, Y.; Tian, J.; Wang, S.; Xie, S.; Pei, Y.; Yan, S.; Qiao, M.; Xu, H.;
27
28 Zong, B. Porous Graphene-Confined Fe-K as Highly Efficient Catalyst for CO₂ Direct
29
30 Hydrogenation to Light Olefins. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **2018**, *10* (28), 23439–23443.
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsami.8b05411>.
33
34
35
- 36 (37) Ramirez, A.; Ould-Chikh, S.; Gevers, L.; Chowdhury, A. D.; Abou-Hamad, E.;
37
38 Aguilar-Tapia, A.; Hazemann, J.; Wehbe, N.; Al Abdulghani, A. J.; Kozlov, S. M.;
39
40 Cavallo, L.; Gascon, J. Tandem Conversion of CO₂ to Valuable Hydrocarbons in Highly
41
42 Concentrated Potassium Iron Catalysts. *ChemCatChem* **2019**, *11* (12), 2879–2886.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201900762>.
45
46
47
- 48 (38) Dorner, R. W.; Hardy, D. R.; Williams, F. W.; Willauer, H. D. K and Mn Doped Iron-
49
50 Based CO₂ Hydrogenation Catalysts: Detection of KAlH₄ as Part of the Catalyst's Active
51
52 Phase. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **2010**, *373* (1–2), 112–121.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2009.11.005>.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (39) Wang, X.; Wu, D.; Zhang, J.; Gao, X.; Ma, Q.; Fan, S.; Zhao, T.-S. Highly Selective
4 Conversion of CO₂ to Light Olefins via Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis over Stable Layered K–
5 Fe–Ti Catalysts. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **2019**, *573*, 32–40.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2019.01.005>.
8
9
10
11
12
13 (40) Liu, B.; Geng, S.; Zheng, J.; Jia, X.; Jiang, F.; Liu, X. Unravelling the New Roles of Na
14 and Mn Promoter in CO₂ Hydrogenation over Fe₃O₄ -Based Catalysts for Enhanced
15 Selectivity to Light α -Olefins. *ChemCatChem* **2018**, *10* (20), 4718–4732.
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201800782>.
18
19
20
21
22
23 (41) Cheng, Y.; Lin, J.; Wu, T.; Wang, H.; Xie, S.; Pei, Y.; Yan, S.; Qiao, M.; Zong, B. Mg and
24 K Dual-Decorated Fe-on-Reduced Graphene Oxide for Selective Catalyzing CO
25 Hydrogenation to Light Olefins with Mitigated CO₂ Emission and Enhanced Activity.
26
27 *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* **2017**, *204*, 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2016.11.058>.
28
29
30
31
32
33 (42) Visconti, C. G.; Martinelli, M.; Falbo, L.; Infantes-Molina, A.; Lietti, L.; Forzatti, P.;
34 Iaquaniello, G.; Palo, E.; Picutti, B.; Brignoli, F. CO₂ Hydrogenation to Lower Olefins on
35 a High Surface Area K-Promoted Bulk Fe-Catalyst. *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* **2017**, *200*,
36
37 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2016.07.047>.
38
39
40
41
42
43 (43) Visconti, C. G.; Martinelli, M.; Falbo, L.; Fratolocchi, L.; Lietti, L. CO₂ Hydrogenation to
44 Hydrocarbons over Co and Fe-Based Fischer-Tropsch Catalysts. *Catal. Today* **2016**, *277*,
45
46 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2016.04.010>.
47
48
49
50
51 (44) Zhang, J.; Lu, S.; Su, X.; Fan, S.; Ma, Q.; Zhao, T. Selective Formation of Light Olefins
52 from CO₂ Hydrogenation over Fe–Zn–K Catalysts. *J. CO₂ Util.* **2015**, *12*, 95–100.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcou.2015.05.004>.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (45) Hu, B.; Frueh, S.; Garces, H. F.; Zhang, L.; Aindow, M.; Brooks, C.; Kreidler, E.; Suib, S.
4
5 L. Selective Hydrogenation of CO₂ and CO to Useful Light Olefins over Octahedral
6
7 Molecular Sieve Manganese Oxide Supported Iron Catalysts. *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*
8
9 **2013**, *132–133*, 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2012.11.003>.
10
11
12
13 (46) Xu, L.; Wang, Q.; Liang, D.; Wang, X.; Lin, L.; Cui, W.; Xu, Y. The Promotions of MnO
14
15 and K₂O to Fe/Silicalite-2 Catalyst for the Production of Light Alkenes from CO₂
16
17 Hydrogenation. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **1998**, *173* (1), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926->
18
19 [860X\(98\)00141-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X(98)00141-0).
20
21
22
23 (47) Xu, Q.; Xu, X.; Fan, G.; Yang, L.; Li, F. Unveiling the Roles of Fe-Co Interactions over
24
25 Ternary Spinel-Type ZnCo_xFe_{2-x}O₄ Catalysts for Highly Efficient CO₂ Hydrogenation to
26
27 Produce Light Olefins. *J. Catal.* **2021**, *400*, 355–366.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2021.07.002>.
30
31
32
33 (48) Yuan, F.; Zhang, G.; Zhu, J.; Ding, F.; Zhang, A.; Song, C.; Guo, X. Boosting Light Olefin
34
35 Selectivity in CO₂ Hydrogenation by Adding Co to Fe Catalysts within Close Proximity.
36
37 *Catal. Today* **2021**, *371* (August 2020), 142–149.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2020.07.072>.
40
41
42
43 (49) Numpilai, T.; Chanlek, N.; Poo-Arporn, Y.; Cheng, C. K.; Siri-Nguan, N.; Sornchamni, T.;
44
45 Chareonpanich, M.; Kongkachuichay, P.; Yigit, N.; Rupprechter, G.; Limtrakul, J.;
46
47 Witoon, T. Tuning Interactions of Surface-adsorbed Species over Fe–Co/K–Al₂O₃
48
49 Catalyst by Different K Contents: Selective CO₂ Hydrogenation to Light Olefins.
50
51 *ChemCatChem* **2020**, *12* (12), 3306–3320. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.202000347>.
52
53
54
55 (50) Sathawong, R.; Koizumi, N.; Song, C.; Prasassarakich, P. Light Olefin Synthesis from
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 CO₂ Hydrogenation over K-Promoted Fe–Co Bimetallic Catalysts. *Catal. Today* **2015**,
4 251, 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2015.01.011>.
5
6
7
8 (51) Guo, L.; Cui, Y.; Li, H.; Fang, Y.; Prasert, R.; Wu, J.; Yang, G.; Yoneyama, Y.; Tsubaki,
9 N. Selective Formation of Linear-Alpha Olefins (LAOs) by CO₂ Hydrogenation over
10 Bimetallic Fe/Co-Y Catalyst. *Catal. Commun.* **2019**, 130, 105759.
11
12
13
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catcom.2019.105759>.
16
17
18 (52) Gong, W.; Ye, R.-P.; Ding, J.; Wang, T.; Shi, X.; Russell, C. K.; Tang, J.; Eddings, E. G.;
19 Zhang, Y.; Fan, M. Effect of Copper on Highly Effective Fe-Mn Based Catalysts during
20 Production of Light Olefins via Fischer-Tropsch Process with Low CO₂ Emission. *Appl.*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 (53) Choi, Y. H.; Jang, Y. J.; Park, H.; Kim, W. Y.; Lee, Y. H.; Choi, S. H.; Lee, J. S. Carbon
29 Dioxide Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis: A New Path to Carbon-Neutral Fuels. *Appl. Catal. B*
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 (54) Xu, Y.; Li, X.; Gao, J.; Wang, J.; Ma, G.; Wen, X.; Yang, Y.; Li, Y.; Ding, M. A
37 Hydrophobic FeMn@Si Catalyst Increases Olefins from Syngas by Suppressing C₁ By-
38 Products. *Science (80-.)*. **2021**, 371 (6529), 610–613.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 (55) Zhao, M.; Yan, C.; Jinchang, S.; Qianwen, Z. Modified Iron Catalyst for Direct Synthesis
46 of Light Olefin from Syngas. *Catal. Today* **2018**, 316, 142–148.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 (56) Li, S.; Li, A.; Krishnamoorthy, S.; Iglesia, E. Effects of Zn, Cu, and K Promoters on the
54 Structure and on the Reduction, Carburization, and Catalytic Behavior of Iron-Based
55
56
57
58
59
60

Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis Catalysts. *Catal. Letters* **2001**, *77* (4), 197–205.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013284217689>.

- (57) Gnanamani, M. K.; Hamdeh, H. H.; Shafer, W. D.; Hopps, S. D.; Davis, B. H. Hydrogenation of Carbon Dioxide over Iron Carbide Prepared from Alkali Metal Promoted Iron Oxalate. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **2018**, *564*, 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2018.07.034>.
- (58) Shafer, W. D.; Jacobs, G.; Graham, U. M.; Hamdeh, H. H.; Davis, B. H. Increased CO₂ Hydrogenation to Liquid Products Using Promoted Iron Catalysts. *J. Catal.* **2019**, *369*, 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2018.11.001>.
- (59) Ordonsky, V. V.; Luo, Y.; Gu, B.; Carvalho, A.; Chernavskii, P. A.; Cheng, K.; Khodakov, A. Y. Soldering of Iron Catalysts for Direct Synthesis of Light Olefins from Syngas under Mild Reaction Conditions. *ACS Catal.* **2017**, *7* (10), 6445–6452. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.7b01307>.
- (60) Peron, D. V.; Barrios, A. J.; Taschin, A.; Dugulan, I.; Marini, C.; Gorni, G.; Moldovan, S.; Koneti, S.; Wojcieszak, R.; Thybaut, J. W.; Virginie, M.; Khodakov, A. Y. Active Phases for High Temperature Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis in the Silica Supported Iron Catalysts Promoted with Antimony and Tin. *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* **2021**, *292*, 120141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2021.120141>.
- (61) Gu, B.; Peron, D. V.; Barrios, A. J.; Bahri, M.; Ersen, O.; Vorokhta, M.; Šmíd, B.; Banerjee, D.; Virginie, M.; Marceau, E.; Wojcieszak, R.; Ordonsky, V. V.; Khodakov, A. Y. Mobility and Versatility of the Liquid Bismuth Promoter in the Working Iron Catalysts for Light Olefin Synthesis from Syngas. *Chem. Sci.* **2020**, *11* (24), 6167–6182.

1
2
3 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0SC01600D>.

- 4
5
6 (62) Farrusseng, D. High-Throughput Heterogeneous Catalysis. *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **2008**, *63* (11),
7
8 487–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surfrep.2008.09.001>.
9
10
11 (63) Senkan, S. Combinatorial Heterogeneous Catalysis—A New Path in an Old Field. *Angew.*
12
13 *Chemie Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40* (2), 312–329. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1521->
14
15 3773(20010119)40:2<312::AID-ANIE312>3.0.CO;2-I.
16
17
18 (64) Senkan, S. M. High-Throughput Screening of Solid-State Catalyst Libraries. *Nature* **1998**,
19
20 *394* (6691), 350–353. <https://doi.org/10.1038/28575>.
21
22
23
24 (65) Paul, S.; Heyte, S.; Katryniok, B.; Garcia-Sancho, C.; Maireles-Torres, P.; Dumeignil, F.
25
26 REALCAT: A New Platform to Bring Catalysis to the Lightspeed. *Oil Gas Sci. Technol. –*
27
28 *Rev. d'IFP Energies Nouv.* **2015**, *70* (3), 455–462. <https://doi.org/10.2516/ogst/2014052>.
29
30
31
32 (66) Barrios, A. J.; Gu, B.; Luo, Y.; Peron, D. V.; Chernavskii, P. A.; Virginie, M.; Wojcieszak,
33
34 R.; Thybaut, J. W.; Ordonsky, V. V.; Khodakov, A. Y. Identification of Efficient
35
36 Promoters and Selectivity Trends in High Temperature Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis over
37
38 Supported Iron Catalysts. *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* **2020**, *273*, 119028.
39
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2020.119028>.
42
43
44 (67) Klencsár, Z. Mössbauer Spectrum Analysis by Evolution Algorithm. *Nucl. Instruments*
45
46 *Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms* **1997**, *129* (4), 527–533.
47
48 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-583X\(97\)00314-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-583X(97)00314-5).
49
50
51 (68) Wezendonk, T. A.; Santos, V. P.; Nasalevich, M. A.; Warringa, Q. S. E.; Dugulan, A. I.;
52
53 Chojecki, A.; Koeken, A. C. J.; Ruitenbeek, M.; Meima, G.; Islam, H. U.; Sankar, G.;
54
55 Makkee, M.; Kapteijn, F.; Gascon, J. Elucidating the Nature of Fe Species during
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Pyrolysis of the Fe-BTC MOF into Highly Active and Stable Fischer-Tropsch Catalysts.

4
5 *ACS Catal.* **2016**, *6* (5), 3236–3247. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.6b00426>.

6
7
8 (69) Torres Galvis, H. M.; Bitter, J. H.; Davidian, T.; Ruitenbeek, M.; Dugulan, A. I.; de Jong,
9
10 K. P. Iron Particle Size Effects for Direct Production of Lower Olefins from Synthesis
11
12 Gas. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134* (39), 16207–16215. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja304958u>.

13
14
15 (70) Wang, S.; Zhai, Y.; Li, X.; Li, Y.; Wang, K. Coprecipitation Synthesis of MgO-Doped
16
17 ZrO₂ Nano Powder. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **2006**, *89* (11), 3577–3581.

18
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2006.01244.x>.

21
22
23 (71) Gusain, D.; Singh, P. K.; Sharma, Y. C. Kinetic and Equilibrium Modelling of Adsorption
24
25 of Cadmium on Nano Crystalline Zirconia Using Response Surface Methodology.

26
27
28 *Environ. Nanotechnology, Monit. Manag.* **2016**, *6*, 99–107.

29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enmm.2016.07.002>.

32
33 (72) Su, C.; Li, J.; He, D.; Cheng, Z.; Zhu, Q. Synthesis of Isobutene from Synthesis Gas over
34
35 Nanosize Zirconia Catalysts. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **2000**, *202* (1), 81–89.

36
37
38 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X\(00\)00461-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X(00)00461-0).

39
40
41 (73) Zhang, Z.; Zhang, L.; Hülsey, M. J.; Yan, N. Zirconia Phase Effect in Pd/ZrO₂ Catalyzed
42
43 CO₂ Hydrogenation into Formate. *Mol. Catal.* **2019**, *475* (May).

44
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcat.2019.110461>.

47
48 (74) Chernavskii, P. A.; Kazak, V. O.; Pankina, G. V.; Perfiliev, Y. D.; Li, T.; Virginie, M.;
49
50 Khodakov, A. Y. Influence of Copper and Potassium on the Structure and Carbidisation of
51
52 Supported Iron Catalysts for Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis. *Catal. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *7* (11),

53
54
55 2325–2334. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c6cy02676a>.

- 1
2
3 (75) Subramanian, V.; Ordonsky, V. V.; Legras, B.; Cheng, K.; Cordier, C.; Chernavskii, P.
4 A.; Khodakov, A. Y. Design of Iron Catalysts Supported on Carbon-Silica Composites
5 with Enhanced Catalytic Performance in High-Temperature Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis.
6 *Catal. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *6* (13), 4953–4961. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c6cy00060f>.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 (76) Mai, K.; Elder, T.; Groom, L. H.; Spivey, J. J. Fe-Based Fischer Tropsch Synthesis of
14 Biomass-Derived Syngas: Effect of Synthesis Method. *Catal. Commun.* **2015**, *65*, 76–80.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catcom.2015.02.027>.
16
17
18
19
20
21 (77) Yu, G.; Sun, B.; Pei, Y.; Xie, S.; Yan, S.; Qiao, M.; Fan, K.; Zhang, X.; Zong, B. Fe_xO_y
22 @C Spheres as an Excellent Catalyst for Fischer–Tropsch Synthesis. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*
23 **2010**, *132* (3), 935–937. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja906370b>.
24
25
26
27
28 (78) Beasley, C.; Gnanamani, M. K.; Hamdeh, H. H.; Martinelli, M.; Davis, B. H. Effect of
29 Gallium Additions on Reduction, Carburization and Fischer–Tropsch Activity of Iron
30 Catalysts. *Catal. Letters* **2018**, *148* (7), 1920–1928. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10562-018-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10562-018-2398-0)
31 [2398-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10562-018-2398-0).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 (79) Fellenberg, A. K.; Addad, A.; Hong, J.; Simon, P.; Kosto, Y.; Šmíd, B.; Ji, G.; Khodakov,
39 A. Y. Iron and Copper Nanoparticles inside and Outside Carbon Nanotubes:
40 Nanoconfinement, Migration, Interaction and Catalytic Performance in Fischer-Tropsch
41 Synthesis. *J. Catal.* **2021**, *404*, 306–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2021.09.034>.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 (80) Ding, J.; Huang, L.; Gong, W.; Fan, M.; Zhong, Q.; Russell, A. G.; Gu, H.; Zhang, H.;
49 Zhang, Y.; Ye, R. P. CO₂ Hydrogenation to Light Olefins with High-Performance
50 Fe_{0.30}Co_{0.15}Zr_{0.45}K_{0.10}O_{1.63}. *J. Catal.* **2019**, *377*, 224–232.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2019.07.036>.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (81) Dwyer, D.; Somorjai, G. A. The Role of Readsorption in Determining the Product
4 Distribution during CO Hydrogenation over Fe Single Crystals. *J. Catal.* **1979**, *56* (2),
5 249–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9517\(79\)90111-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9517(79)90111-8).
6
7
8
9
10 (82) Schulz, H.; Claeys, M. Kinetic Modelling of Fischer–Tropsch Product Distributions. *Appl.*
11 *Catal. A Gen.* **1999**, *186* (1–2), 91–107. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X\(99\)00166-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X(99)00166-0).
12
13
14
15 (83) Yang, J.; Ma, W.; Chen, D.; Holmen, A.; Davis, B. H. Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis: A
16 Review of the Effect of CO Conversion on Methane Selectivity. *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* **2014**,
17 *470*, 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2013.10.061>.
18
19
20
21
22 (84) Govender, N. S.; Botes, F. G.; de Croon, M. H. J. M.; Schouten, J. C. Mechanistic
23 Pathway for C₂₊ Hydrocarbons over an Fe/K Catalyst. *J. Catal.* **2014**, *312*, 98–107.
24
25
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcat.2014.01.012>.
28
29
30 (85) Olewski, T.; Todic, B.; Nowicki, L.; Nikacevic, N.; Bukur, D. B. Hydrocarbon Selectivity
31 Models for Iron-Based Fischer–Tropsch Catalyst. *Chem. Eng. Res. Des.* **2015**, *95*, 1–11.
32
33
34
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2014.12.015>.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60