Two-dimensional atomically thin Pt layers on MXenes: The role of electronic effects during catalytic dehydrogenation of ethane and propane

Zhe Li^{1,§}, Tobias K. Misicko ^{2,§}, Fan Yang^{1,§}, Xiaopeng Liu¹, Zhenwei Wu³, Xiaoyang Gao², Tao Ma⁴, Jeffrey T. Miller³, Daniela S. Mainardi², Collin D. Wick⁵, Zhenhua Zeng³ (🖂), Yang Xiao² (🖂), and Yue Wu¹ (🖂)

⁵ College of Engineering and Science, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA 71272, USA

[§] Zhe Li, Tobias K. Misicko, Fan Yang contributed equally to the work.

Supporting information to https://doi.org/10.1007/s12274-023-6022-2

¹ Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Iowa State University, 618 Bissell Road, Ames, IA 50011, USA

² Institute for Micromanufacturing, Louisiana Tech University, 505 Tech Drive, Ruston, LA 71272, USA

³ Davidson School of Chemical Engineering, Purdue University, 480 Stadium Mall Drive, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

⁴ Michigan Center for Materials Characterization, University of Michigan, 2800 Plymouth Rd, Ann Arbor MI 48109, USA



Figure S1. The magnitude (solid) and imaginary (dash) part of the Fourier transform of the k^2 weighted EXAFS and corresponding first shell fit for (a) Pt/Mo₂TiC₂T_x-750 °C.



Figure S2. Effects of temperature and partial pressure on equilibrium conversion for (a) ethane dehydrogenation and (b) propane dehydrogenation.



Figure S3. TPSR over 0.5% Pt/MXene for (a) ethane dehydrogenation at GHSV 57 h⁻¹ and (b) propane dehydrogenation at GHSV 119 h⁻¹.



Figure S4. TPO profiles for 24-h spent 0.5% $Pt/Mo_2TiC_2T_x$ (Pt nanolayer/MXene, blue curve) and 2-h spent 0.5% Pt/SiO_2 catalysts at 550 °C for (a) ethane dehydrogenation at GHSV 57 h⁻¹ and (b) propane dehydrogenation at GHSV 119 h⁻¹.



Figure S5. TEM scans for (a) fresh Pt/SiO_2 and (b) spent Pt/SiO_2 catalysts



Figure S6. XRD patterns for (a) fresh and spent Pt/SiO₂ catalysts, and (b) fresh and spent Pt/MXene catalysts



Figure S7. Investigations on ethane and propane kinetics, (a): fitting of ethane dehydrogenation, (b): Arrhenius plot for the rate constants of ethane dehydrogenation, (c): fitting of propane dehydrogenation, and (d): Arrhenius plot for the rate constants of propane dehydrogenation.



Figure S8. Charge Density Differences of Propane Dehydrogenation, (a) Pt(111) from the top view, (b) Pt(111) from the side view, (c) Pt/Mo_2TiC_2 from the top view, and (d) Pt/Mo_2TiC_2 from the side view. Blue color: negatively charged; Yellow color: positively charged

Sample	Scattering Pair	S_0^{2*}	CN	Bond Length (Å) #	σ^2 (Å ²) #	$\Delta E_0 (eV) \#$
Pt Foil	Pt-Pt	0.80	12	2.77	0.005	5.4
Pt/Mo ₂ TiC ₂ T _x	Pt-Pt	0.80	7.9	2.75	0.014	4.0
R550C	Pt-Mo		1.6	2.69	0.006	

Table S1. Fitting results for the k^2 weighted EXAFS for Pt/Mo₂TiC₂T_x-R550 °C.

* The S_0^2 for Pt/Mo₂TiC₂T_x samples are fixed at the value (0.80) obtained by fitting the Pt Foil

The average error in bond length is 0.01 Å, in σ^2 is 0.002 Å 2 and in ΔE_0 is 0.9 eV.

chemisorption							
	H ₂ -O ₂ titration	H ₂ chemisorption	CO chemisorption				
fresh Pt/SiO ₂	31%	33%	35%				
spent Pt/SiO ₂	18%	16%	21%				
fresh Pt/MXene	98%	95%	93%				
spent Pt/MXene	98%	94%	94%				

Table S2. Comparison of Pt dispersion measurements by H2-O2 titration, H2 chemisorption and CO chemisorption