



Faraday Discussions

Volume: 229

Reaction mechanisms in catalysis

PAPER

CO₂ reduction to acetic acid on the greigite Fe₃S₄{111} surface

David Santos-Carballal,  †*^a Alberto Roldan ^a and Nora H. de Leeuw  †*^{ab}

Received 16th December 2019, Accepted 17th February 2020

DOI: 10.1039/c9fd00141g

Acetic acid (CH₃-COOH) is an important commodity chemical widely used in a myriad of industrial processes, whose production still largely depends on homogeneous catalysts based on expensive rare metals. Here, we report a computational study on the formation of CH₃-COOH from carbon dioxide (CO₂) as an alternative chemical feedstock on the {111} surface of the low-cost greigite Fe₃S₄ catalyst. We have used density functional theory calculations with a Hubbard Hamiltonian approach and long-range dispersion corrections (DFT+U-D2) to simulate the various stages of the direct combination of C1 species of different composition to produce glyoxylic acid (CHO-COOH) as a key intermediate in the formation of CH₃-COOH. Three reaction mechanisms are considered: (i) the main pathway where the direct formation of the C-C bond takes place spontaneously, followed by a step-wise reduction of CHO-CHOO to CH₃-COOH; and the competitive pathways for the non-promoted and H-promoted elimination of hydroxy groups (OH) and water (H₂O), respectively from (ii) the carboxyl; and (iii) the carbonyl end of the glyoxylate intermediates. The thermodynamic and kinetic profiles show that the energies for the intermediates on the main pathway are very similar for the two catalytic sites considered, although the activation energies are somewhat larger for the exposed tetrahedral iron (Fe_A) ion. In most cases, the intermediates for the deoxygenation of the carboxylic acid are less stable than the intermediates on the main pathway, which suggests that the molecule prefers to lose the carbonylic oxygen. The suitable surface properties of the Fe₃S₄{111} surface show that this material could be a promising sustainable catalyst in future technologies for the conversion of CO₂ into organic acid molecules of commercial interest.

^aSchool of Chemistry, Cardiff University, Main Building, Park Place, Cardiff CF10 3AT, UK. E-mail: SantosCarballalD@cardiff.ac.uk; deLeeuwN@cardiff.ac.uk; Tel: +44 (0)29 2087 4715; +44 (0)29 2087 0658

^bDepartment of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Princetonplein 8A, 3584 CD Utrecht, The Netherlands

† Present address: School of Chemistry, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK. E-mail: D.Santos-Carballal@leeds.ac.uk; N.H.deLeeuw@leeds.ac.uk; Tel: +44 (0)11 3343 9008.

1 Introduction

Acetic acid ($\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$) is a commodity chemical with a broad spectrum of applications, including the manufacture of vinyl acetate, acetate esters, monochloroacetic acid, acetic anhydride and as a solvent in the production of dimethyl terephthalate and terephthalic acid.^{1,2} Low concentration solutions of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ also have medical uses as an antiseptic in the local treatment of infected wounds^{3–6} and in the food industry as the major solute of vinegar.¹ $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ is important in other miscellaneous applications, such as pesticide derivatives,^{7,8} the control of parasitic mites in beehives,⁹ as a contrast enhancing agent in optical biopsy¹⁰ and confocal microscopy imaging,¹¹ and in its hydrogenation to ethanol.^{12–14} Furthermore, $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ occurs naturally in the rain,^{15–22} in the marine boundary layer air^{23–25} and at diluted concentrations in several animal fluids²⁶ and plant systems, where it plays a key role in all biological energy pathways.^{27,28}

Bacterial fermentation of ethanol ($\text{CH}_3\text{-CH}_2\text{OH}$) is still the preferred method for the production of the $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ used in the pharmaceutical and food industries, given the stringent requirements of these sectors.²⁹ However, several synthetic routes are currently employed for the commercial production of the remaining 90% of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$, which is used for the majority of industrial applications. The largest scale process to produce synthetic $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$, *i.e.* the carbonylation of methanol (CH_3OH), is a strongly exothermic reaction where carbon monoxide (CO) is catalytically inserted into the alcohol.³⁰ The carbonylation of methanol has been made possible largely by the use of homogeneous catalysis, which became the leading technology in $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ production.^{31,32} Despite the excellent selectivity and activity of the iodide-promoted rhodium and iridium complex catalysts, known as Monsanto and Cativa, respectively, hydroiodic acid (HI) is formed by the co-catalyst, which requires the use of expensive corrosion-resistant materials to construct the plant equipment.³⁰ The homogeneous catalysts containing costly rare metals are separated from the products through difficult catalyst recycling stream systems and continuous distillation columns. Alternative heterogeneous catalysts for the carbonylation of methanol have been described, *e.g.* supported metallic mixtures immobilised on silica and zeolites. However, the catalysts based on metallic mixtures still contain rare metals, while the use of zeolites requires a hydrolysis step and the separation of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ from H_2O , which is very energy-intensive and, thus, economically unfeasible.

Thus far, the development of stable, active and selective heterogeneous catalysts for the synthesis of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ remains a challenge, although it has been the subject of many investigations. The $\text{Cu}\{111\}$ surface showed good catalytic performance for the insertion of CO_2 into the CH_4 molecule for the synthesis of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$,³³ but this was not the case for the stepped $\text{Cu}\{211\}$ surface, which instead became active for the dehydrogenation of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ to $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$.³⁴ Greigite (Fe_3S_4) is attracting growing interest as an environmentally acceptable and inexpensive catalyst since it has been shown to convert CO_2 into small amounts of various C1 species, $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ and pyruvic acid (CH_3COCOOH).³⁵ Fe_3S_4 is ubiquitous in ancient soil^{36,37} and marine environments,^{38,39} where it has been linked to the “iron-sulfur world” origin of life theory.^{40,41} This concept

suggests that Fe_3S_4 , amongst other metal sulfides, was instrumental in catalysing the reduction of CO_2 into the first organic molecules following a number of biochemical reactions involving the oxidation of the Fe^{2+} ions. However, the mechanistic pathways for the formation of the C–C bond, or the selective reduction of intermediates, are not yet fully understood. Insight into these processes is critical if we are to exploit Fe_3S_4 as a catalyst, not only for the synthesis of $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$, but also to utilise the greenhouse gas CO_2 as a readily available chemical feedstock.

Given the importance of $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$ as a precursor of industrial polymeric materials of commercial significance and the disadvantages of its current synthesis methods, in this paper we describe a novel approach for the production of this chemical. Inspired by the reported catalytic activity of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface towards the activation of the CO_2 molecule and the interest in reducing its concentration in the atmosphere, we have used density functional theory (DFT) calculations to study the formation of $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$ on the active facet of this spinel-structured iron sulfide. We analyse the interaction and direct combination of several C1 species on the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface and we propose three mechanistic pathways to account for the formation of one C–C bond between two C1 species and deoxygenation of the intermediates. This approach has allowed us to explore the complete thermodynamic and kinetic profiles for the formation of $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$ over the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface using CO_2 as the chemical feedstock.

2 Computational methods

2.1 Calculation details

Periodic plane-wave DFT calculations were carried out to study the production of acetic acid from the hydrogenation of CO_2 on the greigite surface. All calculations were performed using the Vienna *Ab Initio* Simulation Package (VASP).^{42–45} Ion–electron interactions were represented by the projector-augmented wave (PAW) method^{46,47} and the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) with the Perdew–Wang 91 (PW91) functional^{48,49} within the spin interpolation formula of Vosko *et al.*⁵⁰ We have also considered non-spherical contributions from the gradient corrections to the PAW spheres. All calculations include the D2 long-range dispersion correction approach by Grimme,⁵¹ which is an improvement on standard DFT when considering large polarisable atoms.^{52–59} We have used the global scaling factor parameter optimized for the Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof (PBE)^{60,61} functional, ($s_6 = 0.75$). Different long-range dispersion correction approximations and DFT functionals have been tested in the iso-structural spinel violarite FeNi_2S_4 , but these led to only minor differences in the surface energy and adsorption energy for the CO_2 molecule.⁵⁷ The Kohn–Sham valence states were expanded in a plane-waves basis set with a cut off of 600 eV for the kinetic energy. This high value for the cut-off energy ensured that no Pulay stresses occurred within the cell during relaxations.

The initial magnetic moment was described by high-spin distributions in both octahedral and tetrahedral types of Fe, with the antiparallel orientation previously used for the spinel structure,^{52–58} which results in a ferrimagnetic material.^{62–69} The orbital spin-splitting in the valence region results in localized outermost 3d-electrons and in ordered magnetism.^{63,70,71} Good agreement with experimental evidence has been obtained by using the same computational details as listed

above.^{52–58} For an accurate treatment of the electron correlation in the localized d-Fe orbital, we have used the U approximation^{72,73} ($U_{\text{eff}} = 1$ eV),^{52,55–58,69,74,75} which improves the description of localized states in this type of system where standard local density approximation (LDA) and GGA functionals fail.⁷⁶ The choice of the U parameter is rather empirical, which is also a common feature of the computationally expensive hybrid functionals, since the amount of Fock exchange is system-dependent.^{76–79} Calculations were carried out using a Γ -centered Monkhorst–Pack grid of $5 \times 5 \times 1$ k -points, which ensures the electronic and ionic convergence.⁸⁰ The geometry of all stationary points was found with the conjugate-gradient algorithm and considered converged when the force on each ion dropped below 0.03 eV \AA^{-1} . The energy threshold defining self-consistency of the electron density was set to 10^{-5} eV. In order to improve the convergence of the Brillouin-zone integrations, the partial occupancies were determined using the tetrahedron method with Blöch corrections.⁸¹

2.2 Surface models

The Fe_3S_4 unit cell consists of eight formula units with a cubic lattice parameter of ~ 9.8 \AA ,^{82,83} which is close to the value resulting from the cell optimization (9.671 \AA). The inverse thio-spinel arrangement is reflected by the formula AB_2S_4 , where there are two possible locations for the Fe ions: the tetrahedral sites (A), filled by Fe^{3+} ions, and the octahedral sites (B), with equal quantities of both Fe^{3+} and Fe^{2+} ions.^{63,64,66–68,70,74} We have prepared the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface as a slab model by cutting the bulk structure with the METADISE code,⁸⁴ which considers periodicity in the plane direction and provides the atomic layer stacking resulting in non-dipolar reconstructions.⁸⁵ The $\{111\}$ surface slab contains 56 atoms (24 Fe and 32 S) distributed in 9 layers, of which the 5 bottom-most were kept fixed at their bulk positions, and exposes an area of 81.0 \AA^2 per unit cell. Different slab thicknesses and numbers of relaxed layers were tested until convergence within 1 meV per cell was achieved. We added a vacuum width of 12 \AA between the periodic slabs, which is big enough to avoid interaction between them.

2.3 Thermodynamic and kinetic profiles

The initial and final states of the reduction process by hydrogenation and elimination of H_2O or OH and the C–C bond formation are linked by a saddle point in the reaction pathway of minimum energy across the potential surface. The reaction transition states (TS's) are found at these saddle points, leading to the energy barriers that reactants need to overcome before forming the products. The TS's, which determine the kinetics of the process, were identified by means of the dimer method,^{86,87} and characterised by vibrational frequency calculations, in which only one imaginary mode is obtained, corresponding to the reaction coordinate.

The activation energy (E_A) of a certain step is the energy required to surmount the potential barrier characteristic of the transition state. This energy barrier is defined as the difference between the initial and transition state energies for the forward process. The reaction energy (E_R) of each step is calculated as the total energy difference between the final state, *i.e.* product(s), and the initial state, *i.e.* reactant(s). The E_R provides information regarding the thermodynamic feasibility of the process.

3 Results and discussion

Fe_3S_4 , the sulfide counterpart of the spinel-structured iron oxide magnetite (Fe_3O_4), displays different crystal morphologies depending on the synthesis conditions. Notably, the hydrothermal synthesis method leads almost exclusively to the {001} and {111} surfaces in the Fe_3S_4 nano-particles.⁸⁸ Recently, we have shown the conversion of CO_2 into small organic molecules as catalysed by the active termination of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$,³⁵ where the different Fe_A and Fe_B sites were selective towards the formation of specific products. The {111} surface termination has a bulk-like structure consisting of double rows of S ions along the $[0\bar{1}1]$ direction and with rhombohedral packing alternating with a single row of Fe_A cations. The polarity of this surface termination is quenched by a 0.5 monolayer (ML) of three-fold Fe_B atoms sited in the hexagonal close-packed hcp hollow positions with $p(1 \times 2)$ symmetry.

We have considered the formation of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ using CO_2 and H_2 as the source of all the atomic elements required for this process. CO_2 is adsorbed linearly on the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface with a binding energy of -0.62 eV,³⁵ while the H_2 molecule dissociates upon adsorption, releasing -0.63 eV. Given the presence of CO_2 and H ad-atoms at the Fe_3S_4 catalyst, the equilibrium for the reverse water-gas shift reaction allows the evolution of CO and H_2O . The H ad-atoms can subsequently react with both co-adsorbed CO and CO_2 to form CHO and COOH, respectively, which are the precursors to $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$ in our proposed pathways. Table 1 displays the relative energies of the four mono-protonated C1 species, showing that adsorbed CHO and COOH are the most stable, which supports our choice of precursors.

3.1 Direct combination of the CHO and COOH surface species

Fig. 1 displays the process of direct combination between the CHO and COOH species on the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface. The C atom of both reactants sits atop the surface cations at a distance of ~ 2.0 Å, shorter on the Fe_B than on the Fe_A site, which is in agreement with previous works.⁸⁹ Despite the existence of several possibilities for the co-adsorption of CHO and COOH on the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface, we have left them sited on the neighbouring Fe_A and Fe_B atoms, which are the thermodynamically most favourable positions, see Table 1. In a direct concerted step, the two fragments combine to form glyoxylic acid (CHO-COOH) and the

Table 1 Relative energies (ΔE) for the C1 species CHO, COH, CHOO and COOH on the Fe_A and Fe_B sites of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface. The relative energies were calculated for each pair of species with the same stoichiometry

Species	ΔE (eV)	
	Fe_A	Fe_B
CHO	0.00	0.00
COH	1.52	1.74
CHOO	0.25	0.33
COOH	0.00	0.00




Fig. 1 Top and side views of the (a) initial, (b) transition and (c) final states for the direct combination of CHO and COOH on the Fe_A (top panels) and Fe_B (bottom panels) sites of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface. Fe is in light-grey, S is in yellow, O is in red, H is in white and C is in black. Calculated bond distances are shown in Å.

carbonyl end of the molecule detaches from the surface. This is an exothermic process with a reaction energy of -3.08 eV and an activation energy of 2.26 eV. During formation of the C–C bond, CHO–COOH regains 80% of the charge previously transferred to the surface, in agreement with the thermodynamic stability of this molecule. This reaction is not isogyric and it is, thus, spin-forbidden in the gas phase, as the total electron spin is not conserved, *i.e.* the radical reactants exist in spin state $s = 1$ and the diamagnetic product exist in $s = 0$. This difficulty further supports the use of catalysts containing transition metals for the synthesis of $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$, as they can induce spin changes that can overcome the spin-prohibition.^{90,91}

Despite extensive computational and experimental studies of the interaction between $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$ and different types of surfaces, the adsorption of CHO–COOH has so far been overlooked in the literature. The adsorption energy for $\text{CH}_3\text{--COOH}$ has been reported to lie between -0.84 and -0.30 eV on the $\{111\}$ surface of pure Cu and its alloys with other transition metals.⁹² However,

on oxides such as CeO₂, the adsorption energies are -0.95 and -2.50 eV for the stoichiometric material and for a material with oxygen vacancies, respectively,⁹³ indicating that the organic acid prefers the interaction with positive surface sites. We speculate that less ionic materials, such as Fe₃S₄, can interact with C2 organic acids and release adsorption energies between the typical values of metals and metal oxides. This ensures that the reactant adsorbates are anchored to the catalytic sites with enough strength for the reaction to take place, while still allowing the products to leave the surface, thereby freeing up the catalytic site.

3.2 Adsorption of glyoxylate intermediate species

We have simulated the adsorption of a number of glyoxylic acid intermediates in the formation of CH₃-COOH containing an increasing number of H atoms, as shown in Table 2. Apart from CHO-COOH and CH₃-COOH, all surface intermediates have higher energies, although they are never larger than 1.59 eV with respect to the reactants and products. Our calculations also suggest that the C-C bond length undergoes minor changes along the reduction process, which are particularly noticeable in the H₂C(OH)-COOH species. The Fe-C distance as well as the stretching vibrational mode ν_{C-C} are only negligibly affected during the protonation reactions. In this work, the hybridisation of the carbonyl carbon atom changes only from sp² to sp³, which causes the structural properties to change less than the largest change from sp¹ to sp³ seen in our previous report on the conversion of CO into methanol CH₃OH.⁸⁹ The adsorption configuration of CHO-COOH and its protonated species are characterised by the non-protonated carboxyl oxygen coordinating the metal sites of the surface at 2.10 to 2.85 Å, which is on average 0.2 Å longer than the Fe-C distance calculated for the C1 species.

3.3 Elimination of H₂O and OH from the glyoxylate intermediate species

We have studied the deoxygenation of the species on the Fe_A and Fe_B sites, where the products remain at the same adsorption position, *e.g.* the dissociation of the C-OH bond from the carboxylic part of CHO-COOH on Fe_A leads to CHO-CO at the same site, as the coordination to the surface takes place through the non-

Table 2 Relative energies (ΔE), distances (d) and stretching vibrational modes (ν) for the C-C bond of the different glyoxylate intermediate species adsorbed on the Fe_A and Fe_B sites of the Fe₃S₄(111) surface. The energies of the intermediates are relative to adsorbed glyoxylic acid, considering the contribution from the corresponding number of H atoms

Label	Adsorbate	ΔE (eV)		d_{C-C} (Å)		d_{Fe-O} (Å)		ν_{C-C} (cm ⁻¹)	
		Fe _A	Fe _B	Fe _A	Fe _B	Fe _A	Fe _B	Fe _A	Fe _B
a1	CHO-COOH	0.00	0.00	1.491	1.403	2.104	2.252	849	853
a2	CH(OH)-COOH	-0.68	-0.72	1.354	1.431	2.363	2.429	872	848
a3	CH ₂ O-COOH	-1.40	-1.25	1.518	1.314	2.287	2.371	837	887
a4	CH ₂ (OH)-COOH	-2.26	-1.87	1.464	1.441	2.194	2.488	860	829
a5	CH ₂ -COOH	-2.51	-2.15	1.418	1.386	2.371	2.283	826	784
a6	CH ₃ -COOH	-3.36	-3.48	1.392	1.487	2.850	2.580	862	874




Fig. 2 Top and side views of the (a) initial, (b) transition and (c) final states for the elimination of OH from CHO-COOH on the Fe_A (top panels) and Fe_B (bottom panels) sites of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4(111)$ surface. Fe is in light-grey, S is in yellow, O is in red, H is in white and C is in black. Calculated bond distances are shown in Å.

protonated carboxyl oxygen, see Fig. 2. Following the elimination of the OH group, the CHO-CO species moves an average of 0.1 Å closer to surface metal site than before dissociation. The trend in the distance between the deoxygenated species and the surface can be rationalised in terms of the amount of positive charge of the latter. This is induced by the electrophilic co-adsorbed OH groups that have just left the intermediate, which gain electrons from the neighbouring atoms of the catalytic site.

Table 3 displays the activation and reaction energies for the non-promoted dissociation of the C-OH bond from the carboxylic end of the intermediates. On the Fe_A catalytic sites, the reaction energy (E_R) associated with the scission of the C-OH bond are (i) endothermic ($0.15 \text{ eV} < E_R < 2.14 \text{ eV}$) for the R1, R2, R3, R5 and R6 species, and (ii) exothermic ($E_R < 0 \text{ eV}$) for R4. However, the large potential energy of the transition states suggest that these reactions are kinetically unfeasible and that the dissociation of the C-OH bond is unlikely. Moreover, the smallest E_A was calculated for the formation of $\text{CH}_3\text{-COOH}$, although it is still

Table 3 Activation (E_A) and reaction (E_R) energies for the elimination of OH from the glyoxylate intermediate species on the Fe_A and Fe_B sites of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface

Label	Reactants	Products	E_A (eV)		E_R (eV)	
			Fe_A	Fe_B	Fe_A	Fe_B
R1	CHO-COOH	→ CHO-CO + OH	3.83	4.12	2.14	3.06
R2	CH(OH)-COOH	→ CH(OH)-CO + OH	2.58	1.67	1.33	1.38
R3	CH_2O -COOH	→ CH_2O -CO + OH	1.42	2.81	0.20	0.12
R4	$\text{CH}_2(\text{OH})$ -COOH	→ $\text{CH}_2(\text{OH})$ -CO + OH	1.73	2.35	-0.34	0.87
R5	CH_2 -COOH	→ CH_2 -CO + OH	2.31	2.04	0.15	1.53
R6	CH_3 -COOH	→ CH_3 -CO + OH	1.26	2.63	0.26	0.72

larger than 1.25 eV. The different coordination environment of the Fe_B catalytic site dictates a different behaviour, as all non-promoted dissociations of the C-OH bond are endothermic with activation energies larger than 1.5 eV.




Fig. 3 Top and side views of the (a) initial, (b) transition and (c) final states for the H-promoted elimination of H_2O from CHO-COOH on the Fe_A (top panels) and Fe_B (bottom panels) sites of the $\text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4\{111\}$ surface. Fe is in light-grey, S is in yellow, O is in red, H is in white and C is in black. Calculated bond distances are shown in Å.

Table 4 Activation (E_A) and reaction (E_R) energies for the elimination of H_2O from the glyoxylate intermediate species on the Fe_A and Fe_B sites of the $Fe_3S_4\{111\}$ surface

Reaction	Reactants	Products	E_A (eV)		E_R (eV)	
			Fe_A	Fe_B	Fe_A	Fe_B
R7	CHO-COOH + H	→ CHO-CO + H_2O	1.64	2.58	0.73	1.12
R8	CH(OH)-COOH + H	→ CH(OH)-CO + H_2O	0.98	1.72	0.78	0.69
R9	CH ₂ O-COOH + H	→ CH ₂ O-CO + H_2O	1.53	1.96	-0.23	-0.24
R10	CH ₂ (OH)-COOH + H	→ CH ₂ (OH)-CO + H_2O	1.85	1.72	-0.17	-0.21
R11	CH ₂ -COOH + H	→ CH ₂ -CO + H_2O	1.72	1.67	0.61	0.44
R12	CH ₃ -COOH + H	→ CH ₃ -CO + H_2O	1.96	1.82	0.64	0.57

We have also simulated the elimination of the carboxylic OH group promoted by H, which is displayed in Fig. 3. Table 4 shows the calculated E_A and E_R for these reactions, where one H_2O molecule is formed and released. In general, our calculations indicate that E_R are endothermic but that they decrease with the degree of protonation of the intermediate for both the Fe_A and Fe_B catalytic sites. However, the formation of the cyclic acetolactone CH_2O-CO intermediate is slightly exothermic, as one of the O atoms bonds simultaneously to the two C atoms leading to full-coordination of all atoms. Similarly, the reaction energy for $CH_2(OH)-CO$ is $E_R < 0$ given that the hydroxylated C is fully saturated and the molecule rotates to bind to the surface through the carbonyl C. However, notwithstanding the favourable structural changes of some reduced intermediates, their formation processes still have large activation energies, which makes them kinetically unlikely to happen.

3.4 Mechanism and reaction profiles

Fig. 4 illustrates the energy profiles for the main reaction, *i.e.* the reduction of CHO-COOH to CH_3-COOH , alongside the competitive reaction pathways studied for the non-promoted and the H-promoted dissociation of the C-OH bond in the carboxylic end of the molecule. As already discussed, the majority of the elementary steps within these paths are hindered by the large potential energies of the transition states, which makes the alternative pathways particularly difficult to attain. However, the products of the competitive process R4 are more stable than the products of the main reaction, suggesting that the elimination of H_2O and OH from the carboxyl end of the molecule is possible if the system receives enough energy to overcome the transition states.

Although the main pathway involves several glyoxylate intermediate species, the reactions take different courses on the two catalytic sites that we have considered. For example, on the Fe_A site, the main reaction will proceed *via* the intermediates $a1$, $a3$, $a4$, $a5$ and $a6$ because of their stability and the low activation energies of the transition states that connect them. Despite the 0.72 eV energy difference between $a2$ and $a3$, the elementary steps for converting $a3$ into $a5$ requires less energy than the transformation of $a2$ or $a3$ into $a4$. On the other hand, the transition states have the largest barrier for the elimination of H_2O and OH from the intermediates adsorbed on the Fe_B site, implying that these processes are less likely to occur than on the Fe_A site. Notably, the reaction network for the Fe_B site shows less inter-crossing of the transition and final states than that for the Fe_A site.




Fig. 4 Energy profile for (black line) the reduction mechanism of CHO-CHOO to CH₃-COOH on the (a) Fe_A and (b) Fe_B sites of the Fe₃S₄{111} surface; alongside the competitive (red line) non-promoted and (blue line) H-promoted elimination of OH and H₂O, respectively. Intermediates and reaction labels are provided according to Tables 1–3.

4 Conclusions

In this study, we have carried out a comprehensive simulation of the conversion of CO₂ into CH₃-COOH on both adsorption sites Fe_A and Fe_B of the Fe₃S₄{111} surface. We have modelled the formation of CO as a result of the reverse water-gas shift reaction. The two oxygenated C1 species were subsequently protonated

by a H ad-atom leading to CHO and COOH, which are the precursors of CHO-COOH, a key intermediate in the formation of CH₃-COOH. The mechanistic profiles show that the transformation of CHO-COOH into CH₃-COOH is thermodynamically feasible, owing to the large energy of the H₂ molecule and the elimination of H₂O. The reaction barriers for the protonation are smallest for the intermediates where the carbonyl oxygen is protonated, as the carbon atom directly attached is able to easily accept H atoms and to lose one H₂O molecule. We have also investigated the protonation and elimination of one of the oxygen atoms from the carboxylic group during the reduction process of CHO-COOH. In general, the formation processes of glyoxal or ethylene glycol are unfavourable as these products are less stable than the intermediates from the main reduction process, indicating that the Fe₃S₄{111} surface is highly selective towards the reduction of the carbonyl rather than the carboxyl end of the molecule, which ultimately leads to CH₃-COOH.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC grants EP/K009567/2, EP/K035355/2 and EP/K001329/1) for funding. Through our membership of the UK's HEC Materials Chemistry Consortium, which is funded by EPSRC (EP/L000202), this work used the ARCHER UK National Supercomputing Service (<http://www.archer.ac.uk>). This work was performed using the computational facilities of the Advanced Research Computing @ Cardiff (ARCCA) Division, Cardiff University. The authors also acknowledge the use of HPC Wales, Supercomputing Wales, and associated support services in the completion of this work. All data created during this research is openly available from the Cardiff University's Research Portal at <https://doi.org/10.17035/d.2020.0040949136>.

Notes and references

- 1 F. S. Wagner and Updated by Staff, in *Kirk-Othmer Encycl. Chem. Technol.*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2014, pp. 1–21.
- 2 C. Le Berre, P. Serp, P. Kalck and G. P. Torrence, in *Ullmann's Encycl. Ind. Chem.*, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, Germany, 2014, vol. 74, pp. 1–34.
- 3 I. Phillips, A. Lobo, R. Fernandes and N. Gundara, *Lancet*, 1968, **291**, 11–13.
- 4 J. M. Sloss, N. Cumberland and S. M. Milner, *J. R. Army Med. Corps*, 1993, **139**, 49–51.
- 5 H. Ryssel, O. Kloeters, G. Germann, T. Schäfer, G. Wiedemann and M. Oehlbauer, *Burns*, 2009, **35**, 695–700.
- 6 K. Taylor, *J. Am. Med. Assoc.*, 1916, **LXVII**, 1598.
- 7 A. V. Ogram, R. E. Jessup, L. T. Ou and P. S. Rao, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 1985, **49**, 582–587.
- 8 M. Qamar and M. Muneer, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 2005, **120**, 219–227.

- 9 D. Van Engelsdorp, R. M. Underwood and D. L. Cox-foster, *J. Econ. Entomol.*, 2008, **101**, 256–264.
- 10 C. J. Balas, G. C. Themelis, E. P. Prokopakis, I. Orfanudaki, E. Koumantakis and E. S. Helidonis, *J. Photochem. Photobiol., B*, 1999, **53**, 153–157.
- 11 R. A. Drezek, T. Collier, C. K. Brookner, A. Malpica, R. Lotan, R. R. Richards-Kortum and M. Follen, *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.*, 2000, **182**, 1135–1139.
- 12 W. Rachmady and M. A. Vannice, *J. Catal.*, 2000, **192**, 322–334.
- 13 W. Rachmady and M. A. Vannice, *J. Catal.*, 2002, **207**, 317–330.
- 14 V. Pallassana and M. Neurock, *J. Catal.*, 2002, **209**, 289–305.
- 15 J. N. Galloway, G. E. Likens, W. C. Keene and J. M. Miller, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 1982, **87**, 8771.
- 16 W. C. Keene, J. N. Galloway and J. D. Holden, *J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans*, 1983, **88**, 5122–5130.
- 17 S. F. Guiang, S. V. Krupa and G. C. Pratt, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1984, **18**, 1677–1682.
- 18 W. C. Keene and J. N. Galloway, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1984, **18**, 2491–2497.
- 19 R. B. Norton, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 1985, **12**, 769–772.
- 20 W. C. Keene and J. N. Galloway, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 1986, **91**, 14466.
- 21 M. O. Andreae, R. W. Talbot, T. W. Andreae and R. C. Harriss, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 1988, **93**, 1616.
- 22 J. D. Willey and C. A. Wilson, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 1993, **16**, 123–133.
- 23 E. D. Baboukas, M. Kanakidou and N. Mihalopoulos, *J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos.*, 2000, **105**, 14459–14471.
- 24 R. B. Norton, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 1992, **97**, 10389.
- 25 M. Legrand, S. Preunkert, B. Jourdain and B. Aumont, *J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos.*, 2004, **109**, D06313.
- 26 K. Bloch and D. Rittenberg, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 1944, **155**, 243–254.
- 27 C. Bianco, *Microbiology*, 2006, **152**, 2421–2431.
- 28 A. Östin, M. Kowalczyk, R. P. Bhalerao and G. Sandberg, *Plant Physiol.*, 1998, **118**, 285–296.
- 29 R. J. Gomes, M. d. F. Borges, M. d. F. Rosa, R. J. H. Castro-Gómez and W. A. Spinosa, *Food Technol. Biotechnol.*, 2018, **56**, 139–151.
- 30 A. Haynes, in *Adv Catal*, 2010, pp. 1–45.
- 31 D. Forster, in *Adv Organomet Chem*, 1979, pp. 255–267.
- 32 T. W. Dekleva and D. Forster, in *Adv Catal*, 1986, pp. 81–130.
- 33 R. Zhang, L. Song, H. Liu and B. Wang, *Appl. Catal., A*, 2012, **443–444**, 50–58.
- 34 B. Voss, N. C. Schjødt, J. D. Grunwaldt, S. I. Andersen and J. M. Woodley, *Appl. Catal., A*, 2011, **402**, 69–79.
- 35 A. Roldan, N. Hollingsworth, A. Roffey, H.-U. Islam, J. B. M. Goodall, C. R. A. Catlow, J. A. Darr, W. Bras, G. Sankar, K. B. Holt, G. Hogarth and N. H. de Leeuw, *Chem. Commun.*, 2015, **51**, 7501–7504.
- 36 J. W. E. Fassbinder and H. Stanjek, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 1994, **21**, 2349–2352.
- 37 J. W. E. Fassbinder, H. Stanjek and H. Vali, *Nature*, 1990, **343**, 161–163.
- 38 A. P. Roberts and G. M. Turner, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 1993, **115**, 257–273.
- 39 A. Jelinowska, P. Tucholka, F. Guichard, I. Lefevre, F. Gasse, N. Tribovillard, A. Desprairies and F. Chalie, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 1998, **133**, 499–509.
- 40 M. J. Russell and A. J. Hall, *J. Geol. Soc.*, 1997, **154**, 377–402.
- 41 G. Wächtershäuser, *Prog. Biophys. Mol. Biol.*, 1992, **58**, 85–201.
- 42 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1993, **47**, 558–561.

- 43 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **49**, 14251–14269.
- 44 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1996, **54**, 11169–11186.
- 45 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Comput. Mater. Sci.*, 1996, **6**, 15–50.
- 46 P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **50**, 17953–17979.
- 47 G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1999, **59**, 1758–1775.
- 48 J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh and C. Fiolhais, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1992, **46**, 6671–6687.
- 49 J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh and C. Fiolhais, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1993, **48**, 4978.
- 50 S. H. Vosko, L. Wilk and M. Nusair, *Can. J. Phys.*, 1980, **58**, 1200–1211.
- 51 S. Grimme, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2006, **27**, 1787–1799.
- 52 A. Roldan, D. Santos-Carballal and N. H. de Leeuw, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **138**, 204712.
- 53 D. Santos-Carballal, A. Roldan, R. Grau-Crespo and N. H. de Leeuw, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **16**, 21082–21097.
- 54 D. Santos-Carballal, A. Roldan, R. Grau-Crespo and N. H. de Leeuw, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2015, **91**, 195106.
- 55 D. Santos-Carballal, A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2016, **120**, 8616–8629.
- 56 D. Santos-Carballal, A. Roldan, N. Y. Dzade and N. H. de Leeuw, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc., A*, 2018, **376**, 20170065.
- 57 S. Posada-Pérez, D. Santos-Carballal, U. Terranova, A. Roldan, F. Illas and N. H. de Leeuw, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 20439–20446.
- 58 S. N. A. Zakaria, N. Hollingsworth, H. Islam, A. Roffey, D. Santos-Carballal, A. Roldan, W. Bras, G. Sankar, G. Hogarth, K. B. Holt and N. H. de Leeuw, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2018, **10**, 32078–32085.
- 59 M. J. Ungerer, D. Santos-Carballal, A. Cadi-Essadek, C. G. C. E. van Sittert and N. H. de Leeuw, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2019, **123**, 27465–27476.
- 60 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- 61 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1997, **78**, 1396.
- 62 D. Vaughan and M. Ridout, *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.*, 1971, **33**, 741–746.
- 63 D. J. Vaughan and J. A. Tossell, *Am. Mineral.*, 1981, **66**, 1250–1253.
- 64 D. J. Vaughan and J. A. Tossell, *Phys. Chem. Miner.*, 1983, **9**, 253–262.
- 65 M. Braga, S. K. Lie, C. A. Taft and W. A. J. Lester, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1988, **38**, 10837–10851.
- 66 K. K. Surerus, M. C. Kennedy, H. Beinert and E. Münck, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1989, **86**, 9846–9850.
- 67 M. J. Dekkers and M. A. A. Schoonen, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 1996, **126**, 360–368.
- 68 M. J. Dekkers, H. F. Passier and M. A. A. Schoonen, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 2000, **141**, 809–819.
- 69 L. Chang, A. P. Roberts, Y. Tang, B. D. Rainford, A. R. Muxworthy and Q. Chen, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2008, **113**, B06104.
- 70 D. J. Vaughan and J. R. Craig, *Am. Mineral.*, 1985, **70**, 1036–1043.
- 71 D. Rickard and G. W. Luther III, *Chem. Rev.*, 2007, **107**, 514–562.

- 72 V. I. Anisimov, M. A. Korotin, J. Zaanen and O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1992, **68**, 345–348.
- 73 S. L. Dudarev, G. A. Botton, S. Y. Savrasov, C. J. Humphreys and A. P. Sutton, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1998, **57**, 1505–1509.
- 74 L. Chang, B. D. Rainford, J. R. Stewart, C. Ritter, A. P. Roberts, Y. Tang and Q. Chen, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2009, **114**, B07101.
- 75 A. J. Devey, R. Grau-Crespo and N. H. de Leeuw, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2009, **79**, 195126.
- 76 I. d. P. R. Moreira, F. Illas and R. L. Martin, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2002, **65**, 155102.
- 77 I. Ciofini, F. Illas and C. Adamo, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **120**, 3811–3816.
- 78 F. Illas and R. L. Martin, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1998, **108**, 2519–2527.
- 79 D. Muñoz, N. Harrison and F. Illas, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2004, **69**, 085115.
- 80 H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Phys. Rev. B: Solid State*, 1976, **13**, 5188–5192.
- 81 P. E. Blöchl, O. Jepsen and O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **49**, 16223–16233.
- 82 J. Coey, M. Spender and A. Morrish, *Solid State Commun.*, 1970, **8**, 1605–1608.
- 83 M. R. Spender, J. M. D. Coey and A. H. Morrish, *Can. J. Phys.*, 1972, **50**, 2313–2326.
- 84 G. W. Watson, E. T. Kelsey, N. H. de Leeuw, D. J. Harris and S. C. Parker, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.*, 1996, **92**, 433–438.
- 85 P. W. Tasker, *Philos. Mag. A*, 1979, **39**, 119–136.
- 86 G. Henkelman and H. Jónsson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **111**, 7010–7022.
- 87 A. Heyden, A. T. Bell and F. J. Keil, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **123**, 224101.
- 88 N. Hollingsworth, A. Roffey, H.-U. Islam, M. Mercy, A. Roldan, W. Bras, M. Wolthers, C. R. A. Catlow, G. Sankar, G. Hogarth and N. H. de Leeuw, *Chem. Mater.*, 2014, **26**, 6281–6292.
- 89 A. Roldan and N. H. de Leeuw, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2017, **197**, 325–336.
- 90 B. F. Minaev and H. Ågren, *Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun.*, 1995, **60**, 339–371.
- 91 A. L. Buchachenko and V. L. Berdinsky, *Russ. Chem. Rev.*, 2004, **73**, 1033–1039.
- 92 M. Zhang, R. Yao, H. Jiang, G. Li and Y. Chen, *RSC Adv.*, 2017, **7**, 1443–1452.
- 93 F. C. Calaza, T.-L. Chen, D. R. Mullins, Y. Xu and S. H. Overbury, *Catal. Today*, 2015, **253**, 65–76.