

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

SO₂ reactivity on the MgO and CaO surfaces: A CW-EPR study of oxo-sulphur radical anions

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/84604> since

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.molcata.2010.02.012

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

This Accepted Author Manuscript (AAM) is copyrighted and published by Elsevier. It is posted here by agreement between Elsevier and the University of Turin. Changes resulting from the publishing process - such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms - may not be reflected in this version of the text. The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in [*Journal of Molecular Catalysis A*, 322, 1-2, 2010, 10.1016/j.molcata.2010.02.012].

You may download, copy and otherwise use the AAM for non-commercial purposes provided that your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this AAM for non-commercial purposes only under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this AAM in the following format: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>), [10.1016/j.molcata.2010.02.012]

SO₂ reactivity on the MgO and CaO Surface: a CW-EPR study of Oxo-sulphur radical anions.

Stefano Livraghi, M Cristina Paganini ¹, Elio Giamello

Dipartimento di Chimica IFM, and NIS (Centre of Excellence) via Giuria 7 -10125 –Torino, Italy

Abstract.

Sulfur contamination of alkaline earth oxide surfaces shows important consequences in many chemistry fields such as surface science and catalysis. We used the Electron Paramagnetic Resonance (EPR) technique to study the interaction of SO₂ molecules with the bare and electron enriched surface of MgO and CaO. Two paramagnetic products were identified via EPR thanks to this interaction, the SO₂^{•-} and S₂O^{•-} radicals whose abundance depends on the surface oxide properties. In particular, higher basicity and higher number of defects in the case of CaO lead to a higher amount of these two radical species.

Keywords: EPR, SO₂, catalysis, surface

¹ Corresponding author. Tel: +39 011 6707576; fax: +39 011 6707855
e-mail address: mariacristina.paganini@unito.it

1. Introduction.

In our industrial society, sulphur oxides, mainly SO₂, are frequently produced as a result of burning sulphur-containing impurities present in coals and oil derived fuels.¹

These impurities have a very negative impact on the processing of oil-derived chemical feedstock (catalyst poisoning, and equipment corrosion) and degrade the air quality in particular forming sulphur dioxide (SO₂). In the chemical and petrochemical industries millions of dollars are lost every year due to catalyst poisoning, and the negative effects of acid rain (main product of the oxidation of SO₂ in the atmosphere) on the environment and the corrosion of monuments or buildings are enormous. This toxic gas can cause severe irritation on the skin, eyes, mucous membranes, and respiratory system. There is a clear need to mitigate the negative effects of SO₂.^{2, 3}

Over the past 30 years several processes have been proposed and developed for the removal of SO₂ from various exhausts (deSO_x operations). There is still no universally accepted solution to this problem. The implementation of new and more stringent regulations for the control of environmental pollution has encouraged the search for more efficient deSO_x processes.

SO₂ adsorption on the surface of metal oxides⁴, a key step in various deSO_x reactions, is a rather complex process and has been the subject of several papers also in recent years⁵⁻⁷. Due to their basicity and high reactivity alkali earth oxides are particularly important in this field.⁸⁻¹¹

Alkali earth oxides can be useful as “throw-away” sorbents or can be combined with metals to generate catalysts for the reduction of sulphur dioxide to elemental sulphur.

It is well known that magnesium oxide and calcium oxide, especially in the presence of an oxidant promoter like CeO₂, show very high potential for SO₂ removal⁹. CaO based sorbents have been the leading materials for several decades in the field of deSO_x,^{3,9,12} and magnesium oxide is a well-known sorbent in industrial processes. The interaction mechanism of these two basic oxides with sulphur oxides has not yet been fully elucidated. Several types of species are formed, in fact, depending on the surface hydroxylation degree and on the acid-base properties of the surface.

In principle, the SO₂ chemistry on a metal oxide can be very complex, because the molecule can either be adsorbed by a metal or interact with oxygen anions with formation of sulphites and sulphates groups^{2,13,14}. S–O bond cleavage and full dissociation of the molecule can occur only on the metal centres. On metallic surfaces,¹⁵⁻¹⁸ the charge transfer between surface metal atom and SO₂ plays a dominant role in the binding and dissociation of SO₂. In general, such a similar charge transfer is difficult on oxide surfaces due to the low electron density on the metal cations.¹⁹⁻²³

Lunsford, years ago, demonstrated that sulphur dioxide reacts with MgO at room temperature to form sulphite and sulphate complexes²⁴⁻²⁶. At higher temperatures, infrared evidence suggests that sulphite ions react with molecular oxygen to form bidentate sulphate complexes in addition to strongly bound SO₃. If trapped electrons are available on the surface of MgO, SO₂ also reacts to form the stable SO₂^{•-} ion²⁷. To summarize, the chemistry of SO₂ on the surface of oxides is extremely complex and still obscure in many details. One possible way to rationalize this blurred picture consists in understanding correlations between chemical reactivity and particular properties of the solid.

The surface reactivity of SO₂, for instance, can be correlated with the basicity of the substrate^{28,29,19}. In the sequence from MgO to BaO of alkaline-earth metal oxides (which all have the rocksalt structure) the lattice constant progressively and strongly increases, with parallel reduction of the Madelung field acting on the oxygen anions. As a consequence the electron-donor property (or the basicity) of the surface progressively increases with increasing the lattice parameter.^{30,31,32}

In the present paper we illustrate a study of SO₂ reactivity with MgO and CaO surface, by means of the Electron Paramagnetic Resonance. Both solids were used in two forms namely: i) the bare, fully dehydroxylated, oxide and ii) the so called “electron rich” oxide containing surface trapped electrons³³⁻³⁶.

The latter type of solid is known for its high electron transfer capability towards adsorbed molecules.^{23,37-41}

EPR is the reference technique to study electron transfer leading to molecules in paramagnetic state and its use to compare the reactivity of the two type of oxides is aimed at a better understanding of the surface chemistry of the oxides and, in particular, to discriminate between redox (electron transfer) and acid-base reactions (electron pair donation).

2. Experimental.

High surface area MgO prepared by *Chemical Vapour Deposition (CVD)* was synthesized in the group of Prof. Diwald (T.U. Wien). Bare MgO was activated under vacuum (10^{-5} mbar at 1073 K for 1h), to obtain a completely dehydrated material. The surface area of the activated oxide was $200 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$. Similarly, bare CaO was obtained via slow thermal decomposition of commercial high-purity CaCO_3 (ex-Aldrich) under dynamic vacuum at 770K for 16 h. The sample activation, to obtain a thoroughly dehydroxylated surface, was performed at 1173 K under a residual pressure of 10^{-5} mbar. The surface area of the resulting oxide is about $80 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$. High purity SO_2 was purchased by Aldrich and purified by the “freeze –thaw” method prior adsorption.

As anticipated in the previous section two distinct types of oxide materials were employed to study SO_2 adsorption on alkali earth oxides: the bare oxides and the corresponding electron rich oxides. Briefly, the latter type of sample was prepared by irradiation of the activated solid with UV light under 100 mbar hydrogen at 77K using a low pressure mercury vapour lamp. After 45 minutes irradiation the excess H_2 was slowly evacuated at 298 K. The electron rich oxides are coloured in blue.

X-band CW-EPR spectra were recorded between 298 K and 77 K on a Bruker EMX spectrometer equipped with a cylindrical cavity operating a 100 kHz field modulation. The EPR computer simulations were obtained using SIM32S program developed by Prof. Sojka, (Jagellonian University, Cracow Poland ⁴²) while double integration of the spectra was produced with the program Win-EPR. Traces of Mn^{2+} ions in the bulk of CaO are practically unavoidable and generate

a weak EPR signal with the typical manganese sextet centred nearby the free electron g value. This signal always appears in the EPR spectra of CaO and has been used as internal standard for g values evaluation.

3. Results and discussion.

3.1 EPR spectra after SO_2 adsorption.

The surface reactivity of bare alkali earth oxides is dominated by the basicity associated to the O^{2-} ions which increases from MgO to CaO.^{33,43}

In the electron rich surface (which contain very reactive $(H^+)(e^-)$ pairs) the basic reactivity does not vanish but is accompanied by the typical electron transfer reactivity associated to trapped electrons^{40,41,44-47}. The two bare oxides are completely EPR silent with the exception of the weak sextet in CaO due to traces of bulk Mn^{2+} ions. As opposite, the two electron rich oxides (hereafter MgO/ $(H^+)(e^-)$ and CaO/ $(H^+)(e^-)$) exhibit the typical EPR signal of surface trapped electrons close to the free electron resonance region which has been thoroughly described in a series of previous papers³³. The EPR signal due to surface trapped electrons is characterized by a hyperfine doublet due to a weak residual interaction of the electron centre with the nearby proton.

Figure 1 reports the EPR spectra obtained upon SO_2 contact with the three oxide samples. In the case of bare MgO the interaction with SO_2 does not produce any signal while intense signals are observed in the case of bare CaO (Fig. 1c) and electron rich MgO (Fig. 1a) and CaO (Fig. 1b). In the two latter cases the new spectrum onset is accompanied by the total (MgO) or partial (CaO) disappearance of the trapped electrons signal.

Spectrum 1c, recorded for bare CaO, is due, as it will be detailed in the next section, to $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ radical ions adsorbed on the surface. In the two spectra related to electron rich materials (1a, 1b) a second species, namely as $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ radical ion, is present beside $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ as documented by the low field feature at around $g = 2.030$ which is the finger print of $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ ²⁴.

This second species becomes more evident at low temperature and, since it shows a different saturation behaviour with respect to $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$, becomes predominant at high microwave power as shown in figure 2 where the spectra recorded at RT from 0.01mW to 20mW for SO_2 on $\text{CaO}/(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ are reported. The fig 2 insert shows the saturation plot for $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ which is linear (no saturation) in the whole range explored.

Another relevant difference in the reactivity between the two electron rich oxides is the abundance of the $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ species generated by the interaction with the starting $(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ centres. On $\text{MgO}(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ (Fig. 1a) after 15 mbar gas adsorption the amount of $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ is roughly equivalent to that of the electrons trapped on the surface before adsorption whereas in the case of electron rich CaO, $(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ centres are still observable also after income of a higher amount (30mbar) of SO_2 (Fig. 3). The sulphur concentration is, for electron rich CaO, less than twice than the starting $(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ signal (Table 1). The Fig. 3 inset reports a magnification of the low field region of the spectrum which shows how the $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ species is formed in substantial amount only upon absorption at high pressure (30mbar). This fact together with the results obtained for bare CaO ($\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ is formed –fig. 1c – by direct contact with the clean surface in absence of trapped electrons) clearly indicates that in the case of this oxide, SO_2 does not simply react with $(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ centres only but undergoes a more complex reactivity.

	Starting materials	SO_2 adsorption
MgO	—	—
$\text{MgO}(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$	1.0	0.95
CaO	—	0.31
$\text{CaO}(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$	1.0	1.42

Table 1: EPR intensity (arbitrary units) obtained by double integration of EPR spectra in fig. 1.

3.2 Simulation of experimental spectra.

The $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ radical anion has been observed in the past on different surfaces. In the case of MgO the presence of two slightly different species, whose abundance strictly depends on oxide surface pre-treatment, was reported ²⁵. In the present work SO_2 adsorption leads to $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ radical stabilization in all samples examined except for bare MgO.

Species	Ab%	$g_1 - \Delta H_1$ (G)	$g_2 - \Delta H_2$ (G)	$g_3 - \Delta H_3$ (G)
$\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ (b')	78	2.008 - 0.6	2.003 - 0.9	2.001 - 1
$\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ (b'')	22	2.007 - 0.9	2.003 - 0.6	2.001 - 0.6

Table 2: EPR parameters for the simulation of $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ species observed after SO_2 adsorption on $\text{MgO}/(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$

In Fig. 4 the experimental trace (a) and the related simulation (b) due to SO_2 adsorption on $\text{MgO}/(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ (also in Fig. 1c) are reported. The parameters employed are listed in Table 2. The $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ species was not introduced in this simulation as present in very low concentration. The spectrum is composed by the superimposition of two signals with a quasi axial g tensor and has the structure expected for 19 electrons three-atomic radicals like $\text{O}_3^{\bullet-}$ or $\text{ClO}_2^{\bullet-}$ whose g tensor is only slightly affected by the surrounding crystal field ²⁴. Figure 5 reports the spectrum experimental trace (a) and the simulation (b) observed after SO_2 adsorption on $\text{CaO}/(\text{H}^+)(\text{e}^-)$ and recorded at 8mW microwave power. The spectrum is quite complex due to the superimposition of several distinct signals individually reported in the second part of fig. 5 (lines from b^I to b^{IV}). The simulation in Fig. 5b (see also Table 3) has been obtained considering (apart the Mn^{2+} impurity, b^{IV}) the presence of both $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ (two similar species like in the previous case both included in line b^I) and $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ (two similar species, b^{II} and b^{III}). The $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ species has been already observed in the past. In particular Lunsford and co-workers reported the same radical species, generated by co-adsorption of H_2S and SO_2 ²⁷ on the surface of MgO. As in the case of $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$, this is a 9 electrons radical species, its g tensor is not much affected by the surrounding crystal field. For this reason the spectral features here observed do not sensibly change moving from CaO to MgO.

Species	Abundance %	$g_1 - \Delta H_1$ (G)	$g_2 - \Delta H_2$ (G)	$g_3 - \Delta H_3$ (G)	Ref.
(b ^I) SO ₂ ^{•-}	61	2.008 - 1.7	2.003 - 1.6	2.001 - 0.7	This work
(b ^{II}) SO ₂ ^{•-}	5	2.007 - 0.9	2.003 - 1.0	2.001 - 1.0	
(b ^{III}) S ₂ O ^{•-}	20.8	2.030 - 2.5	2.009 - 1.2	2.003 - 1.1	
(b ^{IV}) S ₂ O ^{•-}	12.4	2.031 - 3.1	2.011 - 2.7	2.002 - 2.2	
(A) SO ₂ ^{•-} / MgO	-	2.010	2.005	2.003	25
(B) SO ₂ ^{•-} / MgO	-	2.008	2.003	2.001	25
S ₂ O ^{•-} / MgO	-	2.030	2.010	2.001	24

Table 3: EPR parameters (abundance, g value and line-width) of the various species observed after SO₂ adsorption on CaO/(H⁺)(e⁻). In the lower part some literature data for different sulphur radicals on MgO are reported.

3.3 Reaction mechanisms.


The SO₂ interaction with alkali earth oxides was largely studied in the past with various techniques for its importance in heterogeneous catalysis. It is well established that various types of reaction channels exists including those involving diamagnetic species. In particular SO₂ interaction with low coordinated surface oxygen (O_{LC}²⁻) leads to diamagnetic surface species^{48,49}, the main one being SO₃²⁻ formed according to



In particular conditions surface sulphates (SO₄²⁻) and elemental sulphur have been observed also.

In the present paper we explored paramagnetic channels which, as expected, take place on electron rich surfaces but also, in the case of CaO, on bare surfaces. We have basically shown that:

a) On the surface containing reducing centres (H⁺)(e⁻) the direct electron transfer to SO₂ with SO₂^{•-} formation easily occurs



However the two-sulphur S₂O^{•-} species is also formed in the same process indicating a reactions complexity well beyond the direct electron transfer. This consideration applies in particular to the


case of the electron rich CaO ($S_2O^{\bullet-}$ in this case represents one third of the total radical production) while in the case of MgO the amount of $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ formed is very low and the concentration of $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ roughly corresponds to that of trapped electrons.

b) While bare MgO does not produce paramagnetic entities upon contact with SO_2 , the more basic calcium oxide origins $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ surface radical ions even in the absence of surface trapped electrons.

Such a difference between the behaviour of two oxide has been already observed in the past, and the propensity of these two oxides to stabilize different radical species in the case of the same adsorbed molecule has been well documented, in several paper concerning O_2 and NO interaction.^{37,50,51}

The formation of $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ on bare CaO is understood in terms of a disproportionation reaction induced by basic O_{LC}^{2-} sites. Similar reactions, for instance, have been observed for CO on basic oxide⁵² which is reduced to carbon oxoanions (oxidation number lower than 2) and simultaneously oxidized to surface carbonates (ON =4) by interacting with surface basic sites.


$SO_2^{\bullet-}$ formation mechanism (eq .3) can be thus written as follows:



This mechanism can be decomposed in two sub-reactions where released electrons (eq. 4) can react with SO_2 in the same way of $(H^+)(e^-)$ centres forming the paramagnetic $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ species (eq. 5).



The overall reaction 3 should be enough to fully explain the $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ generation on bare CaO but sub-reaction 4 is unable to explain the unexpected $(H^+)(e^-)$ centres presence in the case of the $CaO(H^+)(e^-)$ system (Fig 3). It is well established³³ that $(H^+)(e^-)$ centres are high reactive species but, when reaction 4 occurs in proximity of the bleached colour centre $[(H^+)(-)]$ a fraction of the released electrons, can be trapped again (Scheme 1) regenerating the surface colour centres (Fig. 3) according to:



This last reactions, in the case of bare CaO, cannot take place because of the absence of surface hydroxyl groups. Electrons in fact need the presence of neighbouring OH groups to be stabilized at the alkali earth oxide surfaces. While $\text{SO}_2^{\bullet-}$ formation mechanism, described above, is supported by robust pieces of evidence, the formation of $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ (which occurs abundantly on electron rich CaO) is not clear in all details. The mechanism illustrated in the following remains therefore partially tentative.


Also in this case the CaO surface and in particular the surface defects presence play a crucial role and we can not exclude the presence of parallel reaction mechanisms leading to the same products. To find out a $\text{S}_2\text{O}^{\bullet-}$ formation consistent mechanism we move from a Rodriguez *at al.*² finding who showed that after SO_2 adsorption on MgO(100) films at 300 K an extensive dissociation of the molecule occurs ($\text{SO}_2 \rightarrow \text{S}_{\text{ads}} + 2\text{O}_{\text{ads}}$). On the basis of this and other results the authors suggest that Mg atoms with a low coordination (<5) may be able to dissociate SO_2 . This idea was confirmed working with a defective MgO_{1-x} system prepared by soft sputtering of MgO(100) films with Ar^+ ions. This procedure preferentially removes O atoms from oxide surfaces and the authors showed, for the adsorption of SO_2 on this MgO_{1-x} system, SO_4^{2-} , SO_3^{2-} , and S coexistence on the oxide substrate. All these experiments were carried out on magnesium oxide only, but the conclusion can be easily extended to the CaO system since, it is well known that this oxide has the same structure and a higher reactivity than MgO. The same dissociation effect likely occurs also on the oxides used in the present work because they are prepared in high surface area form and therefore contain a high surface defects number corresponding to low coordination ions⁵¹. If sulphur atoms are present at the oxide surface the following reaction could easily occurs



forming a reduced (S_2O) and an oxidized (SO_3) sulphur oxide. The latter easily reacts on the surface forming sulphates ions:



Independently from the generation mechanism, the diamagnetic S_2O species must be present on the surface. In fact S_2O further reacts with trapped electrons to form the paramagnetic $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ species (reaction 10).



The last step (10) is in full agreement with the fact that $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ formation occurs only on the systems containing surface trapped electrons. On bare CaO and MgO this species, in fact, was not observed. The higher $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ amount formed on $CaO(H^+)(e^-)$ with respect to $MgO(H^+)(e^-)$ is likely due to the higher CaO reactivity leading to an abundant formation of the S_2O precursor (8).

5. Conclusion.

SO_2 is known to react with the surface of basic oxides following different reaction channels. We have described and followed by EPR those channels involving paramagnetic species. The two oxides reactivity with SO_2 , both in bare and in electron-rich form ($CaO(H^+)(e^-)$, $MgO(H^+)(e^-)$), has been monitored and two distinct radical anions ($SO_2^{\bullet-}$ and $S_2O^{\bullet-}$) formation has been put in evidence.

The $SO_2^{\bullet-}$ formation mechanisms are explicitly described (direct electron transfer or surface disproportionation) while that of $S_2O^{\bullet-}$ (which forms an electron rich surface only) was been tentatively proposed.

Reference

- (1) J. A. Rodriguez, T. Jirsak, M. Perez, S. Chaturvedi, M. Kuhn, L. Gonzalez, A. Maiti, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 122 (2000) 12362-12370.
- (2) J.A. Rodriguez , T. Jirsak, A. Freitag, J. Larese, *Z. J. Phys. Chem. B* 104 (2000) 7439-7448.
- (3) Z. Xingying, Z. Guoshun, C. Jianmin, W. Ying, W. Xiao, A. Zhisheng, Z. Peng, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 110 (2006) 12588-12596.
- (4) M. Waqif, A. M. Saad, M. Bensitel, J. Bachelier, O. Saur, J. Lavalley, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.* 88 (1992) 2931-2936.
- (5) J.A. Rodriguez, *Catal. Today* 85 (2003) 177-192.
- (6) I. Hong, H. Jiang, Y.D. Park, J.Y. Kim, B.H. Ha, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 366 (2002) 572-577.
- (7) J.A. Rodriguez, J. García, L. González, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 365 (2002) 380-386.
- (8) R. De Francesco, M. Stener, G. Fronzoni *J. Phys. Chem. C* 111 (2007) 13554-13563.
- (9) E. Sasmaz, J. Wilcox, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 112 (2008) 16484–16490.
- (10) Y. Shi, H. Pan, Y. Zhang, W. Li, *Catal. Commun.* 9 (2008) 796-800.
- (11) L. Oliviero, H. Leclerc, O.V. Manoilova, V. Blasin-Aube, F. Mauge, E.V.Kondratieva, M.S. Poretsky, A.A. Tsyganenko, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 44 (2009) 1237-1241.
- (12) L.S. Jae, H.K. Jun, S.Y. Jung, T.J. Lee, C.K. Ryu, J. C. Kim, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 44 (2005) 9973-9978.
- (13) A. Pieplu, O. Saur, J.C. Lavalley, O. Legendre, C. Nedez, *Catal. Rev. Sci. Eng.* 40 (1998) 409-450.
- (14) V.E. Henrich, P.A. Cox, *The Surface Science of Metal Oxides*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- (15) J.A. Rodriguez, J.M. Ricart, A. Clotet, F. Illas, *J. Chem. Phys.* 115 (2001) 454-465.
- (16) S. Sakaki, H. Sato, Y. Imai, K. Morokuma, K. Ohkubo, *Inorg. Chem.* 24 (1985) 4358-4544.
- (17) H. Sellers, E. Shustorovich, *Surf. Sci.* 346 (1996) 322-336.
- (18) J.A. Rodriguez, T. Jirsak, S. Chaturvedi, J. Hrbek, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 120 (1998) 11149-11157.
- (19) G. Pacchioni, A. Clotet, J. M. Ricart, *Surf. Sci.* 315 (1994) 337-350.
- (20) G. Pacchioni, J.M. Ricart, F. Illas, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 116 (1994) 10152-10158.
- (21) T. Jirsak, J.A. Rodriguez, J. Hrbek, *Surf. Sci.* 426 (1999) 319-335.
- (22) J. A. Rodriguez, T. Jirsak, and J. Hrbek, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 103 (1999) 1966-1976.
- (23) J.H. Lunsford, J.P. Jayne, *J. Phys. Chem.* 69 (1965) 2182-2184.
- (24) M.J. Lin and J. H. Lunsford, *J. Phys. Chem.* 80 (1976) 635-639.

-
- (25) R.A. Schoonheydt, J. H. Lunsford, *J. Catal.* 26 (1972) 261-271.
- (26) Y. Ben Taarit, J.H. Lunsford, *J. Phys. Chem.* 77 (1973) 1365-1367
- (27) R.A. Schoonheydt, J. H. Lunsford, *J. Phys. Chem.* 76 (1972) 323-328.
- (28) E.J. Karlsen, M.A. Nygren, L.G.M. Pettersson, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 107 (2003) 7795-7802.
- (29) W.F. Schneider, J. Li, K.C. Hass, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 105 (2001) 6972-6979.
- (30) M. Nygren, L.G.M. Pettersson, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 230 (1994) 456-462.
- (31) E.J. Karlsen, M.A. Nygren, L.G.M. Pettersson, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 106 (2002) 7868-7875.
- (32) A. Snis, H. Miettinen, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 102 (1998) 2555-2561.
- (33) M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, E. Giamello, D.M. Murphy, C. Di Valentin, G. Pacchioni, *Accounts Chem. Res.* 39 (2006) 861-867.
- (34) M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, G. Spoto, E. Giamello, C.D. Valentin, A.D. Vitto, G. Pacchioni, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 109 (2005) 7314-7322.
- (35) M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, E. Giamello, *ChemPhysChem* 5 (2004) 1897-1900.
- (36) M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, E. Giamello, C. Di Valentin, G. Pacchioni, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 42 (2003) 1759-1761.
- (37) C. Di Valentin, D. Ricci, G. Pacchioni, M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, E. Giamello, *Surf. Sci.* 521 (2002) 104-116.
- (38) M. Chiesa, E. Giamello, D.M. Murphy, G. Pacchioni, M.C. Paganini, R. Soave, Z.J. Sojka, *Phys. Chem. B* 105 (2001) 497-505
- (39) M.C. Paganini, M. Chiesa, P. Martino, E. Giamello, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 106 (2002) 12531-12536.
- (40) P. Meriaudeau, J.C. Vedrine, Y. Ben Taarit, C. Naccache, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.* 71 (1975) 736-748.
- (41) A.J. Tench, P. Holroyd, *Chem. Commun.* (1968) 471-473
- (42) A. Adamski, T. Spalek, Z. Sojka, *Res. Chem. Intermediat.* 29 (2003) 793-804.
- (43) M. Chiesa, M.C. Paganini, G. Spoto, E. Giamello, C. Di Valentin, G. Pacchioni, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 109 (2005) 7314-7322.
- (44) G. Preda, G. Pacchioni, M. Chiesa, E. Giamello, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 112 (2008) 19568-19576.
- (45) E. Giamello, D. Murphy, L. Marchese, G. Martra, A. Zecchina, *J. Am. Soc. Faraday Trans.* 89 (1993) 3715-3722.
- (46) M. Chiesa, E. Giamello, *Chem.-Eur. J.* 13 (2007) 1261-1267.
- (47) S. Livraghi, M.C. Paganini, M. Chiesa, E. Giamello, *Res. Chem. Intermediat.* 32 (2006) 777-786.
- (48) T. Kaljuvee, A. Trikkel, R. Kuusik, V. Bender, *J. Therm. Anal. Calorim.* 80 (2005) 591-597.

-
- (49) A.L. Goodman, P. Li, C.R. Usher, V.H. Grassian, *J. Phys Chem. A* 105 (2001) 6109-6120.
- (40) M.C. Paganini, M. Chiesa, F. Dolci, P. Martino, E. Giamello, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 110 (2006) 11918-11923 2.
- (51) M.C. Paganini, M. Chiesa, P. Martino, S. Livraghi, E. Giamello, *Stud. Surf. Sci. Catal.* 155 (2005) 441-449
- (52) G. Spoto, E.N. Gribov, G. Ricchiardi, A. Damin, D. Scarano, S. Bordiga, C. Lamberti, A. Zecchina, *Prog. Surf. Sci.* 76 (2004) 71-146.